108TH CONGRESS
*1st Session*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
108–106

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

---

## R E P O R T

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

## H.R. 1588

together with

## ADDITIONAL, DISSENTING, AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 16, 2003.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

108TH CONGRESS
*1st Session*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
108–106

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

## R E P O R T

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

## H.R. 1588

together with

## ADDITIONAL, DISSENTING, AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 16, 2003.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

00–000 WASHINGTON : 2003

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS

DUNCAN HUNTER, California, *Chairman*

CURT WELDON, Pennsylvania
JOEL HEFLEY, Colorado
JIM SAXTON, New Jersey
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
TERRY EVERETT, Alabama
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, California
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
JOHN N. HOSTETTLER, Indiana
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
JIM RYUN, Kansas
JIM GIBBONS, Nevada
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
HEATHER WILSON, New Mexico
KEN CALVERT, California
ROB SIMMONS, Connecticut
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia
ED SCHROCK, Virginia
W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
JEFF MILLER, Florida
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
TOM COLE, Oklahoma
JEB BRADLEY, New Hampshire
ROB BISHOP, Utah
MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
PHIL GINGREY, Georgia
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona

IKE SKELTON, Missouri
JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
LANE EVANS, Illinois
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii
MARTY MEEHAN, Massachusetts
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas
JIM TURNER, Texas
ADAM SMITH, Washington
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ, Texas
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
BARON P. HILL, Indiana
JOHN B. LARSON, Connecticut
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
STEVE ISRAEL, New York
RICK LARSEN, Washington
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
JIM MARSHALL, Georgia
KENDRICK B. MEEK, Florida
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
RODNEY ALEXANDER, Louisiana
TIM RYAN, Ohio

ROBERT S. RANGEL, *Staff Director*

# CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Explanation of the Committee Amendments | 1 |
| Purpose | 2 |
| Relationship of Authorization to Appropriations | 2 |
| Summary of Authorization in the Bill | 2 |
| Summary Table of Authorizations | 3 |
| Rationale for the Committee Bill | 11 |
| Hearings | 16 |
| DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION | 17 |
| TITLE I—PROCUREMENT | 18 |
| OVERVIEW | 18 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | 19 |
| Overview | 19 |
| Items of Special Interest | 23 |
| Kiowa warrior | 23 |
| UH-60 blackhawk | 23 |
| UH-60 modifications | 23 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | 24 |
| Overview | 24 |
| Items of Special Interest | 27 |
| Patriot PAC–3 | 27 |
| Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army | 27 |
| Overview | 27 |
| Items of Special Interest | 31 |
| Counterattack corps modernization | 31 |
| Ammunition Procurement, Army | 32 |
| Overview | 32 |
| Items of Special Interest | 36 |
| Army ammunition procurement | 36 |
| Joint ammunition production base upgrades and capacity | 36 |
| Other Procurement, Army | 37 |
| Overview | 37 |
| Items of Special Interest | 47 |
| Communications-electronics equipment fielding | 47 |
| Construction equipment ESP | 47 |
| Family of heavy tactical vehicles | 47 |
| Full tracked tractor | 48 |
| High mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicles (HMMWVs) | 48 |
| Joint tactical area command systems | 48 |
| Knight family | 49 |
| Land warrior | 49 |
| Lightweight video reconnaissance system (LVRS) | 50 |
| Local area network upgrades | 50 |
| Logistic support vessel (LSV) | 50 |
| Nonsystem training devices | 51 |
| Warfighter information network-tactical (WIN–T) | 51 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy | 51 |
| Overview | 51 |
| Items of Special Interest | 56 |
| AV–8B series modifications | 56 |
| EA–6B modifications | 56 |
| Joint Primary Air Training System (JPATS) | 57 |
| P–3 series modifications | 57 |
| T–45A to T–45C conversion | 58 |

Page
Weapons Procurement, Navy ..... 58
Overview ..... 58
Items of Special Interest ..... 62
Close-in weapon system (CIWS) block 1B upgrade ..... 62
GQM–163A coyote supersonic sea skimming target ..... 62
Tomahawk missile ..... 62
Ammunition Procurement, Navy & Marine Corps ..... 63
Overview ..... 63
Items of Special Interest ..... 66
Marine Corps ammunition procurement ..... 66
Navy ammunition procurement ..... 66
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy ..... 66
Overview ..... 66
Items of Special Interest ..... 70
Landing craft air cushion (LCAC) service life extension program (SLEP) ..... 70
Minehunter small waterplane area twin hull (SWATH) boats ..... 70
Other Procurement, Navy ..... 70
Overview ..... 70
Items of Special Interest ..... 79
Fuel and engine maintenance savings system (FEMSS) ..... 79
Law enforcement information exchange ..... 79
Naval fires control system (NFCS) ..... 79
Navy tactical data systems ..... 79
Non-lethal swimmer detection systems ..... 80
Operating forces industrial plant equipment ..... 80
Other supply support equipment ..... 80
Radar support ..... 81
Procurement, Marine Corps ..... 81
Overview ..... 81
Items of Special Interest ..... 86
Night vision equipment ..... 86
Radio systems ..... 86
Weapons and combat vehicles under $5.0 million ..... 86
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force ..... 87
Overview ..... 87
Items of Special Interest ..... 94
Air Force air refueling transfer account ..... 94
B–1B modifications ..... 95
B–2 modifications and development ..... 95
C–5 modifications and force structure ..... 96
C–17 ..... 97
C–130 modifications ..... 98
E–8C joint surveillance and target attack radar system (JSTARS) reengining ..... 98
F–15 modifications ..... 98
F–16 Air National Guard (ANG) force structure ..... 99
F–16 modifications ..... 99
F/A–22 ..... 100
Fixed aircrew standardized seats (FASS) ..... 101
H–60 modifications ..... 101
Predator B unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) ..... 102
Ammunition Procurement, Air Force ..... 102
Overview ..... 102
Items of Special Interest ..... 104
Air Force ammunition procurement ..... 104
Missile Procurement, Air Force ..... 104
Overview ..... 104
Other Procurement, Air Force ..... 107
Overview ..... 107
Items of Special Interest ..... 113
Air Force information technology procurement ..... 113
Combat arms training system (CATS) ..... 113
General information technology ..... 113
Miniature-multiple threat emitter system (Mini-MUTES) ..... 114
Point of maintenance initiative (POMX) ..... 114
Procurement, Defense-Wide ..... 114

Page

Overview ..... 114
Items of Special Interest ..... 119
Chemical/biological defense procurement program ..... 119
Defense wide information technology procurement ..... 119
Department of defense budget justification documentation ..... 119
Information technology ..... 121
Military tactical radio procurement ..... 121
Operation Iraqi Freedom lessons learned ..... 121
Secure wireless technology ..... 122
Special operations forces (SOF) ordnance ..... 122
Special operations forces (SOF) weapons improvements ..... 123
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 123
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 123
Sections 101–104—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 123
Subtitle B—Army Programs ..... 123
Section 111—Stryker Vehicle Program ..... 123
Subtitle C—Navy Programs ..... 123
Section 121—Multiyear Procurement Authority for F/A–18 Aircraft Program ..... 123
Section 122—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Tactical Tomahawk Cruise Missile Program ..... 123
Section 123—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Virginia Class Submarine Program ..... 124
Section 124—Multiyear Procurement Authority for E–2C Aircraft Program ..... 124
Section 125—LPD–17 Class Vessel ..... 124
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs ..... 124
Section 131—Air Force Air Refueling Transfer Account ..... 124
Section 132—Increase in Number of Aircraft Authorized to be Procured Under Multiyear Procurement Authority for Air Force C–130J Aircraft Program ..... 125
Section 133—Limitation on Retiring C–5 Aircraft ..... 125
Section 134—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for Procurement of F/A–22 Aircraft ..... 125
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION ..... 125
OVERVIEW ..... 125
Army Research, Development, Test, & Evaluation ..... 128
Overview ..... 128
Items of Special Interest ..... 140
Advanced battery technology initiative ..... 140
Advanced cluster energetics ..... 140
Advanced electric drive ..... 140
Advanced precision kill weapon system (APKWS) ..... 141
Armored Systems Modernization ..... 141
Army Centers of Excellence ..... 142
Army Evaluation Center ..... 142
Army information dominance center expanded processing for advanced data analysis ..... 143
Army integrated broadcast service integration ..... 143
Army manufacturing and maintenance organization ..... 143
Army unmanned aerial vehicle advocacy ..... 143
Asbestos pilot project ..... 144
Brilliant anti-armor submunition ..... 144
Broad area unmanned responsive re-supply operations ..... 145
Brooks Energy and Sustainability Lab ..... 145
Cadmium zinc telluride detectors ..... 145
Commercial-off-the Shelf (COTS) fuel filtration device ..... 145
Defense Language Institute research and development ..... 146
Desert terrain analysis ..... 146
Electromagnetic Gun Initiative ..... 146
Hemoglobin-based oxygen carrier ..... 147
Intelligence and Security Command global information portal ..... 148
Legacy parts reinvention ..... 148
Medium Extended Air Defense System ..... 148
Metallic particles in defense applications obscurant smokes ..... 149
Micro electro-mechanical systems inertial measurement unit/global positioning system ..... 149

Page
Modular multi function laser system ..... 149
Non system training devices and constructive simulation systems development ..... 149
Objective force bandwidth report ..... 150
Palletized synthetic aperture radar moving target indicator radar sets ..... 150
Patriot PAC–3 ..... 150
Patriot PAC–2 ..... 151
Portable and mobile emergency broadband system ..... 151
Pseudofollicullitus Barbae Research ..... 151
Reconfiguring tooling ..... 151
Remote acoustic hemostasis ..... 152
Rugged textile electronic garments for combat casualty care ..... 152
ScramFire 120mm powered munition ..... 152
Wire detection, wind sensor and obstacle avoidance system for helicopters ..... 153
Navy Research, Development, Test & Evaluation ..... 153
Overview ..... 153
Items of Special Interest ..... 167
Advanced cable design for mine and submarine warfare ..... 167
Advanced composite sail phase II ..... 167
Advanced Navy materials ..... 167
Advanced sensor initiative ..... 167
Advanced WaterJet-21 ..... 168
Aegis open architecture ..... 168
Affordable towed array construction (ATAC) program ..... 169
Affordable weapons system ..... 169
Airborne buried mine detection ..... 170
ALE–55 development testing ..... 170
All optical underwater segments ..... 171
Anti-surface warfare improvement program (AIP) phased capability update (PCU) ..... 171
Automated wire analysis ..... 171
Autonomous naval support round ..... 171
AV–8B engine life management program (ELMP) ..... 172
Battle force tactical training coalition interoperability ..... 172
Biomedical Research Imaging ..... 173
Claymore Marine ..... 173
COBRA JUDY ..... 173
Combat systems integration/battle force interoperability ..... 173
Consolidated undersea situational awareness system ..... 174
Cruise missile real time retargeting/laser radar technology ..... 174
DD(X) multi-mission surface combatant ..... 175
Deployable joint command and control ..... 175
Digital intelligence situation mapboard ..... 176
DP–2 thrust vectoring system ..... 177
Emerging/Critical interconnection technology ..... 177
Fire-retarded POSS composites ..... 178
Formable aligned carbon thermosets ..... 178
Global Hawk maritime demonstration ..... 178
High performance electric brush ..... 179
High temperature superconducting AC synchronous ship propulsion motor ..... 179
IMPRINT ..... 180
Integrated Maritime Picture System of Systems ..... 180
Integrated radar optical surveillance and sighting system ..... 180
Joint integrated satellite communications technology (JIST) ..... 181
Joint warfare experiments ..... 181
Joint warfare experimentation program ..... 181
Knowledge projection for fleet maintenance ..... 182
Littoral combat ship ..... 182
Littoral combat ship mission module development ..... 183
Littoral support craft-experiment ..... 184
Low acoustic signature motor/propulsor ..... 185
Low-power mega-performance unmanned aerial vehicle processing engines ..... 185
Low probability of intercept surveillance radar demonstration ..... 185

Page
Manned reconnaissance aircraft replacement ..... 186
Marine mammal research program ..... 186
Metrology ..... 187
Mobile expandable shelters ..... 187
Modeling and simulation of surgical procedures for battlefield trauma ..... 187
Multi-mission maritime aircraft ..... 187
Naval architecture and engineering ..... 188
Naval collaboration tool set ..... 188
Naval fires network tactical dissemination module ..... 189
Navy circuit breaker electronic trip unit second source ..... 189
Navy information technology research and development ..... 189
Nonlinear dynamics stochastic resonance ..... 189
Offshore mobile basing ..... 190
Open architecture wireless sensors ..... 190
Organ transfer technology ..... 190
Project M ..... 191
Quad hull security caisson technical demonstration ..... 192
Rapid deployment fortification wall live-fire testing ..... 192
Reduction of catapult post-retraction exhaust discharge ..... 192
Remote ocean surveillance system ..... 193
Shadow 200 system components for the Marine Corps ..... 193
Shipboard fire protection ..... 193
Silver Fox unmanned aerial vehicle ..... 194
Station-keeping ocean environment sensors ..... 194
Submarine payloads and sensors ..... 194
Submarine sonar improvements ..... 195
Superconducting DC homopolar motor ..... 195
Surface Navy integrated undersea tactical technology—mine warfare trainer ..... 195
Theater undersea warfare initiative ..... 196
Unmanned aerial vehicle joint operational test bed system ..... 197
Unmanned aerial vehicles concept of operations ..... 197
Vacuum electronics ..... 197
Virginia class multi-mission module ..... 198
Wide band gap semiconductor power electronics ..... 198
Air Force Research, Development, Test, & Evaluation ..... 199
Overview ..... 199
Items of Special Interest ..... 212
3D Bias Woven Preforms ..... 212
Advanced extremely high frequency MILSATCOM ..... 212
Advanced spacecraft technology ..... 212
Advanced Threat Alert Receiver (ATAR)/Lightweight Modular Support Jammer (LMSJ) ..... 212
Advanced wideband system ..... 213
Aircraft turbine engine sustainment ..... 213
Air Force information technology research and development ..... 213
Air Force space fence ..... 213
Ballistic missile technology program ..... 214
Central measurement intelligence office ..... 214
Civil reserve space service ..... 214
Common aero vehicle ..... 214
Distributed common ground system ..... 215
Distributed mission interoperability toolkit (DMIT) program ..... 215
Enhanced techniques for detection of explosives ..... 215
F–15 C/D radar block upgrade ..... 216
F–16 squadrons ..... 216
F–16 theater airborne reconnaissance system (TARS) ..... 217
Flexible display and integrated communications devices ..... 217
Force protection and survivability for deployed forces ..... 217
Fusion SIGINT enhancements for network-centric intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance ..... 218
Global Hawk advanced imagery architecture ..... 218
Hardening technologies for satellite protection ..... 218
High Accuracy network determination system ..... 218
Hybrid bearings ..... 219
Integrated broadcast service ..... 219

Page

Integrated High Payoff Rocket Propulsion Technology (IHPRPT) program ... 219
Link 16 weapon data terminal ... 219
Low emission/efficient hybrid aviation refueling truck propulsion ... 220
Metals affordability ... 220
Nanomaterials ... 220
National operational signature production and research capability ... 220
NAVSTAR Global positioning system III ... 220
Next generation bomber program ... 221
Nuclear detonation detection system ... 221
Operationally responsive launch ... 221
Precision location and identification (PLAID) technology program ... 222
Space based radar ... 222
Defense-Wide Research, Development, Test, & Evaluation ... 222
Overview ... 222
Items of Special Interest ... 233
Advanced Micro/Nano-Electromechanical Systems Technology ... 233
Advanced sensor applications program ... 233
Advanced solid-state dye laser ... 233
Advanced target identification capability for AC–130U gunships ... 233
Air to air technology ... 234
Anti-radiation drug development and trials program ... 234
Asymmetric protocols for biological defense ... 234
Ballistic missile defense ... 235
Technology and advanced concepts ... 235
Terminal defense segment ... 236
Midcourse defense segment ... 236
System interceptor ... 237
System core segment ... 237
Products ... 238
Ballistic missile defense testing ... 238
Ballistic missile defense reporting requirements ... 238
Blast mitigation and analysis technology ... 239
Chemical/biological defense research, development, test and evaluation program ... 239
Chemical biological defense applied research initiative ... 240
Chemical biological defense advanced technology development initiative ... 240
Chemical biological electrostatic decontamination system ... 241
Cobra blue force tracking ... 241
Connectory for rapid identification of technology sources ... 241
Department of Defense information technology research and development ... 242
Defense science and technology funding ... 242
Advanced concept technology demonstrations and technology transition ... 243
Devolvement ... 243
Navy science and technology program ... 244
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency ... 244
Facial recognition access control technology ... 244
Integrated nano- and micro-manufacturing technology ... 245
Magnetic Quadrupole Resonance Explosives Detection ... 245
Man Portable Air Defense System (MANPADS) Defense Program ... 245
Medical free electron laser ... 245
Multi-wavelength surface scanning biologics sensor ... 246
National Defense University sponsored research program ... 246
Nuclear weapons effects ... 247
"PackBot" tactical mobile robot ... 247
Primate biomedical laboratory test and evaluation capability ... 247
Re-defined Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence) role ... 248
Special Operations Advanced Technology Development ... 249
Support to homeland security ... 249
Technology development ... 249
Unmanned aerial vehicle acquisition management ... 249
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense ... 250
Overview ... 250

Page

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 252
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 252
Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 252
Section 202—Amount for Defense Science and Technology ..... 252
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations ..... 252
Section 211—Collaborative Program for Development of Electromagnetic Gun Technology ..... 252
Section 212—Authority to Select Civilian Employees of Department of Defense as Director of Department of Defense Test Resource Management Center ..... 253
Section 213—Joint Tactical Radio System ..... 254
Section 214—Future Combat Systems ..... 254
Section 215—Army Program To Pursue Technologies Leading To The Enhanced Production Of Titanium By The United States ..... 254
Section 216—Extension of Reporting Requirement for RAH-66 Comanche Aircraft Program ..... 254
Section 217—Future Fleet Architecture Studies ..... 255
Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense ..... 257
Section 221—Ballistic Missile Defense System ..... 257

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ..... 257
READINESS OVERVIEW ..... 257
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 290
Budget Request Adjustments—Readiness ..... 290
Budget Request Display Issues—Readiness ..... 291
Base Operating Support ..... 291
Civilian Career Program Relocations—Air Force ..... 291
Civilian Personnel Budget—Army ..... 291
Civilian Separation Incentives—Air Force ..... 291
Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities—Defense Logistics Agency ..... 292
Consumable Repair Parts—Army ..... 292
Contingency Operations Funding—Southwest Asia ..... 292
Defense Information Systems Agency ..... 292
Defense Policy Analysis Office ..... 292
Depot Funding ..... 293
Army ..... 293
Air Force ..... 293
Navy ..... 294
Marine Corps ..... 294
Fuel Costs—Defense Logistics Agency ..... 294
Initial Issue Equipment—Marine Corps ..... 295
Office of Secretary of Defense, Contracts and Other Support Services ..... 295
Overseas Contingency Operations Fund ..... 295
Supply Management Activity Group—Air Force ..... 295
Transportation Working Capital Fund—Air Force ..... 296
Working Capital Fund Cash Management ..... 296
Budget Request—Other Matters ..... 296
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction ..... 296
Defense and Security Cooperation with Poland, Bulgaria, and Romania 298
Expansion of Export Control Database ..... 298
Information Technology Issues ..... 299
Overview ..... 299
Budget Displays ..... 300
General Reductions ..... 300
Global Information Grid Bandwidth Expansion ..... 300
Information Technology Specific Reductions ..... 301
Nationwide Dedicated Fiber Optic Network (NDFON) ..... 302
Other Issues ..... 302
Budget Justification Exhibit Materials ..... 302
Cash Management ..... 303
Depot Maintenance Long-Term Strategy ..... 304
Expansion of Export Control Database ..... 304
Facility Sustainment, Renovation and Modernization ..... 305
Foreign Currency Accounts ..... 305
Maintaining the Strategic Domestic Beryllium Supply ..... 305
Ship Intermediate and Depot Maintenance Funding ..... 306
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 306

Page
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 306
Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding ..... 306
Section 302—Working Capital Funds ..... 306
Section 303—Other Department of Defense Programs ..... 306
Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions ..... 306
Section 311—Reauthorization and Modification of Title I of Sikes Act ... 306
Section 312—Authorization for Defense Participation in Wetland Mitigation Banks ..... 307
Section 313—Inclusion of Environmental Response Equipment and Services in Navy Definitions of Salvage Facilities and Salvage Services ..... 307
Section 314—Clarification of Department of Defense Response to Environmental Emergencies ..... 307
Section 315—Requirements for Restoration Advisory Boards and Exemption from Federal Advisory Committee Act ..... 307
Section 316—Report Regarding Impact of Civilian Community Encroachment and Certain Legal Requirements on Military Installations and Ranges ..... 307
Section 317—Military Readiness and Conservation of Protected Species ..... 308
Section 318—Military Readiness and Marine Mammal Protection ..... 308
Section 319—Limitation on Department of Defense Responsibility for Civilian Water Consumption Impacts Related to Fort Huachuca, Arizona ..... 309
Section 320—Construction of Wetland Crossings, Camp Shelby Combined Arms Maneuver Area, Camp Shelby, Mississippi ..... 309
Subtitle C—Workplace and Depot Issues ..... 310
Section 321—Exclusion of Certain Expenditures from Percentage Limitation on Contracting for Performance of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair Workloads ..... 310
Section 322—High-Performing Organization Business Process Reengineering Pilot Program ..... 310
Section 323—Delayed Implementation of Office of Revised Management and Budget Circular A–76 by Department of Defense Pending Report ..... 311
Section 324—Naval Aviation Depots Multi-Trades Demonstration Project ..... 311
Subtitle D—Information Technology ..... 311
Section 331—Performance-based and Results-based Management Requirements for Chief Information Officers of Department of Defense .. 311
Subtitle E—Other Matters ..... 311
Section 341—Cataloging and Standardization for Defense Supply Management ..... 311
Section 342—Space-Available Transportation for Dependents of Members Assigned to Overseas Duty Locations for Continuous Period in Excess of One Year ..... 312
Section 343—Preservation of Military Weather Reconnaissance Mission ..... 312
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 312
OVERVIEW ..... 312
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 313
Military Manpower Reductions ..... 313
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 314
Subtitle A—Active Forces ..... 314
Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces ..... 314
Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels ..... 315
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces ..... 315
Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve ..... 315
Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves ..... 315
Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status) ..... 316
Section 414—Fiscal Year 2004 Limitation on Non-Dual Satus Technicians ..... 316
Section 415—Permanent Limitations on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians ..... 316
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 316

Page
Section 421—Military Personnel ..... 316
Section 422—Armed Forces Retirement Home ..... 317
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY ..... 317
OVERVIEW ..... 317
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 317
Department of Defense Education Partnerships ..... 317
Department of Defense Overseas Schools Teacher Recruitment Incentives ..... 317
Electronic Voting Demonstration ..... 318
Federal Write-In Absentee Ballot ..... 318
Joint Advertising and Market Research ..... 318
Warrant Officer Appointments for the Army National Guard ..... 319
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 319
Subtitle A—General and Flag Officer Matters ..... 319
Section 501—Standardization of Qualifications for Appointment as Service Chief ..... 319
Subtitle B—Other Officer Personnel Policy Matters ..... 319
Section 511—Repeal of Prohibition on Transfer Between Line of the Navy and Navy Staff Corps Applicable to Regular Navy Officers in Grades Above Lieutenant Commander ..... 319
Section 512—Retention of Health Professions Officers to Fulfill Active-Duty Service Commitments Following Promotion Nonselection ..... 320
Section 513—Increased Flexibility for Voluntary Retirement for Military Officers ..... 320
Subtitle C—Reserve Component Matters ..... 320
Section 521—Streamlined Process for Continuation of Officers on the Reserve Active-Status List ..... 320
Section 522—Consideration of Reserve Officers for Position Vacancy Promotions in Time of War or National Emergency ..... 320
Section 523—Simplification of Determination of Annual Participation for Purposes of Ready Reserve Training Requirements ..... 321
Section 524—Authority for Delegation of Required Secretarial Special Finding for Placement of Certain Retired Members in Ready Reserve 321
Section 525—Authority to Provide Expenses of Army and Air Staff Personnel and National Guard Bureau Personnel Attending National Conventions of Certain Military Associations ..... 321
Subtitle D—Military Education and Training ..... 321
Section 531—Authority for the Marine Corps University to Award the Degree of Master of Operational Studies ..... 321
Section 532—Expanded Educational Assistance Authority for Cadets and Midshipmen Receiving ROTC Scholarships ..... 321
Section 533—Increase in Allocation of Scholarships Under Army Reserve ROTC Scholarship Program to Students at Military Junior Colleges ..... 322
Section 534—Inclusion of Accrued Interest in Amounts that May be Repaid Under Selected Reserve Critical Specialties Education Loan Repayment Program ..... 322
Section 535—Authority for Nonscholarship Senior ROTC Sophomores to Voluntarily Contract for and Receive Subsistence Allowance ..... 322
Section 536—Appointments to Military Service Academies from Nominations Made by Delegates from Guam, Virgin Islands, and American Samoa ..... 322
Section 537—Readmission to Service Academies of Certain Former Cadets and Midshipmen ..... 322
Section 538—Authorization for Naval Postgraduate School to Provide Instruction to Enlisted Members Participating in Certain Programs .. 323
Section 539—Defense Task Force on Sexual Harassment and Violence at the Military Service Academies ..... 323
Subtitle E—Administrative Matters ..... 323
Section 541—Enhancements to High-Tempo Personnel Program ..... 323
Section 542—Enhanced Retention of Accumulated Leave for High-Deployment Members ..... 324
Section 543—Standardization of Time-in-Service Requirements for Voluntary Retirement of Members of the Navy and Marine Corps with Army and Air Force Requirements ..... 324

Page

Section 544—Standardization of Statutory Authorities for Exemptions from Requirement for Access to Secondary Schools by Military Recruiters ..... 324
Section 545—Procedures for Consideration of Applications for Award of the Purple Heart Medal to Veterans Held as Prisoners of War Before April 25, 1962 ..... 324
Section 546—Authority for Reserve and Retired Regular Officers to Hold State and Local Elective Office Notwithstanding Call to Active Duty ..... 324
Section 547—Clarification of Offense Under the Uniform Code of Military Justice Relating to Drunken or Reckless Operation of a Vehicle, Aircraft or Vessel ..... 324
Section 548—Public Identification of Casualties No Sooner than 24 Hours After Notification of Next-of-Kin ..... 325
Subtitle F—Benefits ..... 325
Section 551—Additional Classes of Individuals Eligible to Participate in the Federal Long-Term Care Insurance Program ..... 325
Section 552—Authority to Transport Remains of Retirees and Retiree Dependents Who Die in Military Treatment Facilities Outside the United States ..... 325
Section 553—Eligibility for Dependents of Certain Mobilized Reservists Stationed Overseas to Attend Defense Dependents Schools Overseas . 325
Subtitle G—Other Matters ..... 326
Section 561—Extension of Requirement for Exemplary Conduct by Commanding Officers and Others in Authority to Include Civilians in Authority in the Department of Defense ..... 326
Section 562—Recognition of Military Families ..... 326
Section 563—Assistance to Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees ..... 326
Section 564—Permanent Authority for Support for Certain Chaplain-Led Military Family Support Programs ..... 326
Section 565—Department of Defense—Department of Veterans Affairs Joint Executive Committee ..... 326
Section 566—Limitation on Aviation Force Structure Changes in the Department of the Navy ..... 327
Section 567—Impact-Aid Eligibility for Heavily Impacted Local Educational Agencies Affected by Privatization of Military Housing ..... 327
Section 568—Investigation into the 1991 Death of Marine Corps Colonel James E. Sabow ..... 327
Subtitle H—Domestic Violence ..... 327
Section 571—Travel and Transportation for Dependents Relocating for Reasons of Personal Safety ..... 327
Section 572—Commencement and Duration of Payment of Transitional Compensation ..... 327
Section 573—Flexibility in Eligibility for Transitional Compensation ..... 328
Section 574—Types of Administrative Separations Triggering Coverage 328
Section 575—On-Going Review Group ..... 328
Section 576—Resources for Department of Defense Implementation Organization ..... 328
Section 577—Fatality Reviews ..... 328
Section 578—Sense of Congress ..... 328
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS ..... 328
OVERVIEW ..... 328
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 329
Survivor Benefit Program ..... 329
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 329
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances ..... 329
Section 601—Increase in Basic Pay for Fiscal Year 2004 ..... 329
Section 602—Computation of Basic Pay Rate for Commissioned Officers with Prior Enlisted or Warrant Officer Service ..... 329
Section 603—Special Subsistence Allowance Authorities for Members Assigned to High-Cost Duty Location or Under Other Unique and Unusual Circumstances ..... 330
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays ..... 330
Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces ..... 330

Page

Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Certain Health Care Professionals ..... 330
Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers ..... 330
Section 614—One-Year Extension of Other Bonus and Special Pay Authorities ..... 330
Section 615—Computation of Hazardous Duty Incentive Pay for Demolition Duty and Parachute Jumping by Members of Reserve Components Entitled to Compensation Under Section 206 of Title 37 ..... 330
Section 616—Availability of Hostile Fire and Imminent Danger Pay for Reserve Component Members on Inactive Duty ..... 331
Section 617—Expansion of Overseas Tour Extension Incentive Program to Officers ..... 331
Section 618—Eligibility of Appointed Warrant Officers for Accession Bonus for New Officers in Critical Skills ..... 331
Section 619—Incentive Pay for Duty on Ground in Antarctica or on Arctic Icepack ..... 331
Section 620—Special Pay for Service as Member of Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team ..... 331
Section 621—Incentive Bonus for Agreement to Serve in Critically Short Military Occupational Specialty ..... 331
Section 622—Increase in Rate for Imminent Danger Pay and Family Separation Allowance Related to Service in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom ..... 331
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowance ..... 332
Section 631—Shipment of Privately Owned Motor Vehicle Within Continental United States ..... 332
Section 632—Payment or Reimbursement of Student Baggage Storage Costs for Dependent Children of Members Stationed Overseas ..... 332
Section 633—Reimbursement for Lodging Expenses of Certain Reserve Component and Retired Members During Authorized Leave From Temporary Duty Location ..... 332
Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivors Benefits ..... 332
Section 641—Funding for Special Compensation Authorities for Department of Defense Retirees ..... 332
Subtitle E—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits ..... 333
Section 651—Expanded Commissary Access for Selected Reserve Members, Reserve Retirees Under Age 60, and Their Dependents ..... 333
Section 652—Defense Commissary System and Exchange Stores System ..... 333
Section 653—Limitations on Private Operation of Defense Commissary Store Functions ..... 333
Section 654—Use of Appropriated Funds to Operate Defense Commissary System ..... 333
Section 655—Recovery of Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality and Commissary Store Investments in Real Property at Military Installations Closed or Realigned ..... 333
Section 656—Commissary Shelf-Stocking Pilot Program ..... 334
Subtitle F—Other Matters ..... 334
Section 661—Repeal of Congressional Notification Requirement for Designation of Critical Military Skills for Retention Bonus ..... 334
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS ..... 334
OVERVIEW ..... 334
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 335
Cost Containment in Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care System ..... 335
Force Health Protection and Surveillance ..... 336
Military-Civilian Education Programs Related to Sexual Health Decision-Making ..... 336
Population-Based Medical Research ..... 337
Study of Cost and Feasibility of TRICARE Eligibility for Adult Disabled Family Members ..... 337
Study of TRICARE Options for Puerto Rico ..... 337
TRICARE Provider Participation ..... 338
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 338

Page

Section 701—Revision of Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund to Permit More Accurate Actuarial Valuations ... 338
Section 702—Transfer of Certain Members from Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee to Uniform Formulary Beneficiary Advisory Panel Under the Pharmacy Benefits Program ... 338
Section 703—Permanent Extension of Authority to Enter into Personal Services Contracts for the Performance of Health Care Responsibilities at Locations Other than Military Medical Treatment Facilities ... 339
Section 704—Plan for Providing Health Coverage Information to Members, Former Members and Dependents Eligible for Certain Health Benefits ... 339
Section 705—Working Group on Military Health Care for Persons Reliant on Health Care Facilities at Military Installations to be Closed or Realigned ... 339
Section 706—Acceleration of Implementation of Chiropractic Health Care for Members on Active Duty ... 340
Section 707—Medical and Dental Screening for Members of Selected Reserve Units Alerted for Mobilization ... 340

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS ... 340
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 340
Medical Equipment and Supplies ... 340
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 341
Subtitle A—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations ... 341
Section 801—Extension of Authority to Carry Out Certain Prototype Projects ... 341
Section 802—Elimination of Certain Subcontract Notification Requirements ... 341
Section 803—Elimination of the Requirement to Furnish Written Assurances of Technical Data Conformity ... 341
Section 804—Limitation Period for Task and Delivery Order Contracts . 341
Section 805—Additional Authorities Relating to Obtaining Personal Services ... 341
Subtitle B—United States Defense Industrial Base Provisions ... 342
Part I—Critical Items Identification and Domestic Production Capabilities Improvement Program ... 342
Section 811—Assessment of United States Defense Industrial Base Capabilities ... 342
Section 812—Identification of Critical Items: Military System Breakout List ... 343
Section 813—Procurement of Certain Critical Items from American Sources ... 343
Section 814—Production Capabilities Improvement for Certain Critical Items Using Defense Industrial Base Capabilities Fund ... 343
Part II—Requirements Relating to Specific Items ... 344
Section 821—Domestic Source Limitation for Certain Additional Items . 344
Section 822—Requirements Relating To Buying Specialty Metals from American Sources ... 344
Section 823—Elimination of Unreliable Sources of Defense Items and Components ... 345
Section 824—Congressional Notification Required Before Exercising Exception to Requirement to Buy Specialty Metals from American Sources ... 345
Section 825—Repeal of Authority for Foreign Procurement of Para-Aramid Fibers and Yarns ... 346
Section 826—Requirement for Major Defense Acquisition Programs to use Machine Tools Entirely Produced within the United States ... 346
Part III—General Provisions ... 346
Section 831—Definitions ... 346

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT ... 346
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 346
Commandant of the Coast Guard and the Joint Chiefs of Staff ... 346
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 347

Page

Section 901—Change in Title of Secretary of the Navy to Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps ..... 347
Section 902—Redesignation of National Imagery and Mapping Agency as National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency ..... 347
Section 903—Pilot Program for Provision of Space Surveillance Network Services to Non-United States Government Entities ..... 347
Section 904—Clarification of Responsibility of Military Departments to Support Combatant Commands ..... 347
Section 905—Biennial Review of National Military Strategy by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff ..... 347
Section 906—Authority for Acceptance by Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies of Gifts and Donations from Non-foreign Sources ..... 348
Section 907—Repeal of Rotating Chairmanship of Economic Adjustment Committee ..... 348
Section 908—Pilot Program for Improved Civilian Personnel Management ..... 348
Section 909—Extension of Certain Authorities Applicable to the Pentagon Reservation to Include Designated Pentagon Continuity-of-Government Locations ..... 349
Section 910—Defense Acquisition Workforce Reductions ..... 349
Section 911—Required Force Structure ..... 349
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS ..... 350
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 350
Counter-Drug Activities ..... 350
Overview ..... 350
Items of Special Interest ..... 350
Intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance and tanker support ..... 350
Ground based end game operations ..... 351
Airborne Reconnaissance Low ..... 351
Maritime patrol aircraft upgrades ..... 351
Hemispheric radar system ..... 351
Counter-Drug Command and Management System ..... 351
Pacific command operations support ..... 352
Southwest Border Fence ..... 352
Intelligence analysts and mobile training teams ..... 352
Counter-drug airborne intelligence systems ..... 352
Expanded use of National Guard counter-drug aircraft ..... 353
Global War on Terrorism ..... 354
Overview ..... 354
Effective use of the National Guard ..... 354
Integration of Departments of Defense and Homeland Security Activities ..... 355
United States Northern Command ..... 355
United States Special Operations Command ..... 355
Strategic Force Structure ..... 356
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 357
Subtitle A—Financial Matters ..... 357
Section 1001—Transfer Authority ..... 357
Section 1002—Authorization of Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2003 ..... 357
Section 1003—Authority to Transfer Procurement Funds for a Major Defense Acquisition Program for Continued Development Work on that Program ..... 357
Section 1004—Restoration of Authority to Enter into 12-month Leases at any Time During the Fiscal Year ..... 357
Section 1005—Authority for Retention of Additional Amounts Realized from Energy Cost Savings ..... 357
Section 1006—Repeal of Requirement for Two-Year Budget Cycle for the Department of Defense ..... 358
Section 1007—Authority to Provide Reimbursement for Cellular Telephones When Used for Official Government Business ..... 358
Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards ..... 358
Section 1011—Repeal of Requirement Regarding Preservation of Surge Capability for Naval Surface Combatants ..... 358
Section 1012—Enhancement of Authority Relating to Use for Experimental Purposes of Vessels Stricken from Naval Vessel Register ..... 358

Page

Section 1013—Authorization for Transfer of Vessels Sticken From the Naval Vessel Register for Use as Artificial Reefs ..... 358
Section 1014—Pilot Program for Sealift Ship Construction ..... 359
Subtitle C—Reports ..... 359
Section 1021—Repeal and Modification of Various Reporting Requirements Applicable to the Department of Defense ..... 359
Section 1022—Department of Defense Report on the Conduct of Operation Iraqi Freedom ..... 359
Section 1023—Report on Department of Defense Post-Conflict Activities in Iraq ..... 359
Section 1024—Report on Development of Mechanisms to Better Connect Department of Defense Space Capabilities to the War Fighter .... 360
Subtitle D—Procurement of Defense Biomedical Countermeasures ..... 360
Section 1031—Research and Development of Defense Bio-Medical Countermeasures ..... 360
Section 1032—Procurement of Defense Biomedical Countermeasures .... 361
Section 1033—Authorization for Use of Medical Products in Emergencies ..... 361
Subtitle E—Other Matters ..... 361
Section 1041—Codification and Revision of Defense Counterintelligence Polygraph Program Authority ..... 361
Section 1042—Codification and Revision of Limitation on Modification of Major Items of Equipment Scheduled for Retirement or Disposal ... 362
Section 1043—Additional Definitions for Purposes of Title 10, United States Code ..... 362
Section 1044—Inclusion of Annual Military Construction Authorization Request in Annual Defense Authorization Request ..... 362
Section 1045—Technical and Clerical Amendments ..... 362
Section 1046—Authority to Provide Living Quarters for Certain Students in Cooperative and Summer Education Programs of the National Security Agency ..... 362
Section 1047—Use of Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Funds to Support Activities of the Government of Colombia ..... 362
Section 1048—Authority for Joint Task Forces to provide Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counter-Terrorism Activities 363
Section 1049—Use of National Driver Register for Personnel Security Investigations and Determinations ..... 363
Section 1050—Protection of Operational Files of the National Security Agency ..... 363
Section 1051—Assistance for Study of Feasibility of Biennial International Air Trade Show in the United States and for Initial Implementation ..... 363
Section 1052—Continuation of Reasonable Access to Military Installations for Personal Commercial Solicitation ..... 364
Section 1053—Commission on Nuclear Strategy of the United States .... 364
Section 1054—Extension of Counterproliferation Program Review Committee ..... 365
TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL ..... 365
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 365
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Civilian Personnel Generally ..... 365
Section 1101—Modification of the Overtime Pay Cap ..... 365
Section 1102—Military Leave for Mobilized Federal Civilian Employees ..... 365
Section 1103—Common Occupational and Health Standards for Differential Payments as a Consequence of Exposure to Asbestos ..... 365
Section 1104—Increase in Annual Student Loan Repayment Authority . 365
Section 1105—Authorization for Cabinet Secretaries, Secretaries of Military Departments, and Heads of Executive Agencies to be Paid on a Biweedly Basis ..... 365
Section 1106—Senior Executive Service and Performance ..... 366
Section 1107—Design Elements of Pay-for-Performance Systems in Demonstration Projects ..... 366
Section 1108—Federal Flexible Benefits Plan Administrative Costs ..... 366
Section 1109—Clarification to Hatch Act: Limitation on Disclosure of Certain Records ..... 367
Section 1110—Employee Surveys ..... 367
Subtitle B—Department of Defense National Security Personnel System .. 367

Page

Section 1111—Department of Defense National Security Personnel System ... 367

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS ... 368
OVERVIEW ... 368
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 368
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 369
Section 1201—Expansion of Authority to Provide Administrative Support and Services and Travel and Subsistence Expenses for Certain Foreign Liaison Officers ... 369
Section 1202—Recognition of Superior Noncombat Achievements or Performance by Members of Friendly Foreign Forces and Other Foreign Nationals ... 369
Section 1203—Expansion of Authority to Waive Charges for Costs of Attendance at George C. Marshall Center for Security Studies ... 370
Section 1204—Goods and Technologies Critical for Military Superiority 370
Section 1205—Report on Iraqi Acquisition of Advanced Weapons ... 370
Section 1206—Authority for Check-Cashing and Currency Exchange Services to be Provided to Foreign Military Members Participating in Certain Activities with United States Forces ... 371
Section 1207—Requirements for Transfer to Foreign Countries of Certain Specified Types of Excess Aircraft ... 371
Section 1208—Limitation on Number of United States Military Personnel in Colombia ... 371

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION ... 371
OVERVIEW ... 371
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 374
Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds ... 374
Section 1302—Funding Allocations ... 374
Section 1303—Limitation on Use of Funds until Certain Permits Obtained ... 374
Section 1304—Limitation on Use of Funds for Biological Research in the Former Soviet Union ... 374
Section 1305—Authority and Funds for Nonproliferation and Disarmament ... 375
Section 1306—Requirement for On-site Managers ... 375
Section 1307—Provisions Relating to Funding for Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility in Russia ... 376

TITLE XIV—SERVICES ACQUISITION REFORM ... 377
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 377
Section 1401—Short Title ... 377
Section 1402—Executive Agency Defined ... 377
Subtitle A—Acquisition Workforce and Training ... 377
Section 1411—Definition of Acquisition ... 377
Section 1412—Acquisition Workforce Training Fund ... 377
Section 1413—Acquisition Workforce Recruitment Program ... 377
Section 1414—Architectural and Engineering Acquisition Workforce ... 378
Subtitle B—Adaptation of Business Acquisition Practices ... 378
Part I—Adaptation of Business Management Practices ... 378
Section 1421—Chief Acquisition Officers ... 378
Section 1422—Chief Acquisition Officers Council ... 378
Section 1423—Statutory and Regulatory Review ... 379
Part II—Other Acquisition Improvements ... 379
Section 1426—Extension of Authority to Carry Out Franchise Fund Programs ... 379
Section 1427—Agency Acquisition Protests ... 379
Section 1428—Improvements in Contracting for Architectural and Engineering Services ... 379
Section 1429—Authorization of Telecommuting for Federal Contractors 380
Subtitle C—Contract Incentives ... 380
Section 1431—Incentives for Contract Efficiency ... 380
Subtitle D—Acquisition of Commercial Items ... 380
Section 1441—Preference for Performance-Based Contracting ... 380
Section 1442—Authorization of Additional Commercial Contract Types . 380
Section 1443—Clarification of Commercial Services Definition ... 381

Page

Section 1444—Designation of Commercial Business Entities ..... 381
Subtitle E—Other Matters ..... 381
Section 1451—Authority to Enter into Certain Procurement-Related Transactions and to Carry Out Certain Prototype Projects ..... 381
Section 1452—Authority to Make Inflation Adjustments to Simplified Acquisition Threshold ..... 382
Section 1453—Technical Correction Related to Duplicative Amendments ..... 382
Section 1454—Prohibition on Use of Quotas ..... 382
Section 1455—Applicability of Certain Provisions to Sole Source Contracts for Goods and Services Treated as Commercial Items ..... 382
Section 1456—Public Disclosure of Noncompetitive Contracting for the Reconstruction of Infrastructure in Iraq ..... 382
DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 382
PURPOSE ..... 382
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OVERVIEW ..... 383
TITLE XXI—ARMY ..... 399
SUMMARY ..... 399
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 399
Planning and Design ..... 399
Unspecified Minor Construction ..... 399
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 399
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 399
Section 2102—Family Housing ..... 399
Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units ..... 399
Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army ..... 399
Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal year 2002 Projects ..... 400
TITLE XXII—NAVY ..... 400
SUMMARY ..... 400
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 400
Planning and Design ..... 400
Unspecified Minor Construction ..... 400
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 400
Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 400
Section 2202—Family Housing ..... 400
Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units ..... 400
Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy ..... 401
TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE ..... 401
SUMMARY ..... 401
Reserve Associate Program ..... 401
Planning and Design ..... 401
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 402
Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 402
Section 2302—Family Housing ..... 402
Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units ..... 402
Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force ..... 402
TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES ..... 402
SUMMARY ..... 402
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 402
Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs Health Care Sharing ..... 402
Planning and Design ..... 403
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 403
Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 403
Section 2402—Family Housing ..... 403
Section 2403—Improvements to Military Housing Units ..... 403
Section 2404—Energy Conservation Projects ..... 403
Section 2405—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies ..... 403
TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE ..... 404
OVERVIEW ..... 404
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 404

Page

Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 404
Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO ..... 404
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES ..... 404
SUMMARY ..... 404
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 404
Planning and Design, Air National Guard ..... 404
Planning and Design, Air Reserve ..... 405
Planning and Design, Army National Guard ..... 405
Unspecified Minor Construction, Army National Guard ..... 405
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 405
Section 2601—Authorized Guard and Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ..... 405
TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 405
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 405
Section 2701—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law ..... 405
Section 2702—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2001 Projects ..... 406
Section 2703—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2000 Projects ..... 406
Section 2704—Effective Date ..... 406
TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS ..... 406
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 406
Housing Privatization Programs ..... 406
U.S.-Mexico Border Airspace ..... 407
Base Realignment and Closure ..... 407
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 408
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes ..... 408
Section 2801—Increase in Maximum Amount of Authorized Annual Emergency Construction ..... 408
Section 2802—Authority to Lease Military Family Housing Units in Italy ..... 408
Section 2803—Changes to Alternative Authority for Acquisition and Improvement of Military Housing ..... 408
Section 2804—Additional Material for Annual Report on Housing Privatization Program ..... 408
Section 2805—Authority to Convey Property at Military Installations Closed or to be Closed in Exchange for Military Construction Activities ..... 409
Section 2806—Congressional Notification and Reporting Requirements and Limitations Regarding Use of Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction ..... 409
Section 2807—Increase in Authorized Maximum Lease Term for Family Housing and Other Facilities in Certain Foreign Countries ..... 410
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration ..... 410
Section 2811—Real Property Transactions ..... 410
Subtitle C—Land Conveyances ..... 411
Section 2821—Termination of Lease and Conveyance of Army Reserve Center, Conway, Arkansas ..... 411
Section 2822—Actions to Quiet Title, Fallin Waters Subdivision, Eglin Air Force Base, Florida ..... 411
Section 2823—Modification of Land Conveyance, Eglin Air Force Base, Florida ..... 411
Section 2824—Land Conveyance, Fort Campbell, Kentucky and Tennessee ..... 411
Section 2825—Land Conveyance, Army and Air Force Exchange Service Property, Dallas, Texas ..... 411
Section 2826—Land Conveyance, Naval Reserve Center, Orange, TX ..... 412
Subtitle D—Other Matters ..... 412
Section 2841—Redesignation of Yuma Training Range Complex as Bob Stump Training Range Complex ..... 412
Section 2842—Modification of Authority to Conduct a Round of Realignments and Closures of Military Installations in 2005 ..... 412

Page

Section 2843—Use of Force-Structure Plan for the Armed Forces in Preparation of Selection Criteria for Base Closure Round ..... 412
Section 2844—Requirement for Unanimous Vote of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission to Recommend Closure of Military Installation not Recommended for Closure by Secretary of Defense .... 413

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATION AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS ..... 413

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ..... 413
OVERVIEW ..... 413
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 427
National Nuclear Security Administration ..... 427
Overview ..... 427
Adjustments to the Budget Request ..... 427
Reductions ..... 427
Increases ..... 429
Advanced Weapons Concepts ..... 429
Coordination of Nonproliferation and Threat Reduction Programs ..... 430
Management of Stockpile Life Extension Programs ..... 430
NNSA Management Structure ..... 431
Support for Los Alamos Public Schools ..... 431
Test Readiness ..... 432
Environmental and Other Defense Activities ..... 432
Overview ..... 432
Adjustments to the Budget Request ..... 432
Reductions ..... 432
Increases ..... 432
Cleanup Acceleration ..... 433
Energy Supply ..... 433
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 434
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations ..... 434
Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration ..... 434
Section 3102—Defense Environmental Management ..... 434
Section 3103—Other Defense Activities ..... 434
Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal ..... 434
Section 3105—Energy Supply ..... 434
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations ..... 434
Section 3111—Modification of Prohibition Relating to Low-Yield Nuclear Weapons ..... 434
Section 3112—Termination of Requirement for Annual Updates of Long-Term Plan for Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Life Extension Program ..... 434
Section 3113—Extension to All DOE Facilities of Authority to Prohibit Dissemination of Certain Unclassified Information ..... 435
Section 3114—Department of Energy Project Review Groups Not Subject to Federal Advisory Committee Act by Reason of Inclusion of Employees of Department of Energy Management and Operating Contractors ..... 435
Section 3115—Availability of Funds ..... 435
Section 3116—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for Nuclear Test Readiness Program ..... 435
Section 3117—Requirement for On-Site Managers ..... 435
Subtitle C—Consolidation of National Security Provisions ..... 436
Section 3121—Consolidation and Assembly of Recurring and General Provisions on Department of Energy National Security Programs ..... 436

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD ..... 436
LEGISLATIVE PROVISION ..... 436
Section 3201—Authorization ..... 436

TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE ..... 436
LEGISLATIVE PROVISION ..... 436
Section 3301—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds .... 436
Section 3302—Revisions to Objectives for Receipts for Fiscal Year 2000 Disposals ..... 437

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES ..... 437
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 437
Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 437

Page

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION ..... 437
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ..... 437
Authorization of Maritime Security Program ..... 437
Obsolete Vessel Disposal ..... 439
Merchant Mariner Training to Meet Sealift Requirements ..... 440
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ..... 441
Subtitle A—General Provisions; Maritime Administration Authorization ..... 441
Section 3501—Short Title ..... 441
Section 3502—Definitions ..... 441
Subtitle B—Maritime Security Fleet ..... 441
Section 3511—Establishment of Maritime Security Fleet ..... 441
Section 3512—Award of Operating Agreements ..... 441
Section 3513—Effectiveness of Operating Agreements ..... 441
Section 3514—Obligations and Rights Under Operating Agreements ..... 441
Section 3515—Payments ..... 442
Section 3516—National Security Requirements ..... 442
Section 3517—Regulatory Relief ..... 442
Section 3518—Special Rule Regarding Age of Former Participating Fleet Vessel ..... 442
Section 3519—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 442
Section 3520—Amendment to Shipping Act, 1916 ..... 442
Section 3521—Regulations ..... 443
Section 3522—Repeals and Conforming Amendments ..... 443
Section 3523—Effective Dates ..... 443
Subtitle C—National Defense Tank Vessel Construction Assistance ..... 443
Section 3531—National Defense Tank Vessel Construction Program ..... 443
Section 3532—Application Procedure ..... 443
Section 3533—Award of Assistance ..... 443
Section 3534—Priority for Title XI Assistance ..... 443
Section 3535—Authorization of Appropriations ..... 444
Subtitle D—Maritime Administration ..... 444
Section 3541—Authorization of Appropriations for Maritime Administration for Fiscal Year 2004 ..... 444
Section 3542—Authority to Convey Vessel USS Hoist (ARS-40) ..... 444
Departmental Data ..... 444
Department of Defense Authorization Request ..... 444
Military Transformation Authorization Request ..... 445
Committee Position ..... 445
Communications From Other Committees ..... 445
Fiscal Data ..... 458
Congressional Budget Office Estimate ..... 458
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate ..... 459
Committee Cost Estimate ..... 483
Oversight Findings ..... 483
General Performance Goals and Objectives ..... 484
Constitutional Authority Statement ..... 485
Statement of Federal Mandates ..... 485
Roll Call Votes ..... 486
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported ..... 514
Additional, Dissenting, and Supplemental Views ..... 515
Additional views of Ike Skelton, John Spratt, Gene Taylor, Lane Evans, Marty Meehan, Neil Abercrombie, Silvestre Reyes, Ciro D. Rodriguez, Vic Snyder, Loretta Sanchez, Susan A. Davis, Rick Larsen, Jim Cooper, Baron P. Hill, Ellen O. Tauscher, John B. Larson, Kendrick B. Meek, Jim Langevin, Tim Ryan, Adam Smith, Robert A. Brady, Rodney Alexander, Jim Turner, Steve Israel, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Mike McIntyre, Solomon P. Ortiz, Jim Marshall ..... 515
Additional views of Ike Skelton, John Spratt, Gene Taylor, Lane Evans, Marty Meehan, Neil Abercrombie, Silvestre Reyes, Vic Snyder, Loretta Sanchez, Adam Smith, Robert A. Brady, Rodney Alexander, Jim Turner, Rick Larsen, Jim Cooper, Baron P. Hill, Ellen O. Tauscher, John B. Larson, Kendrick B. Meek, Jim Langevin, Tim Ryan, Steve Israel, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Susan A. Davis, Solomon P. Ortiz ..... 518
Additional views of Susan A. Davis, Lane Evans, Neil Abercrombie, Ciro D. Rodriguez, Loretta Sanchez, Ellen O. Tauscher, Jim Langevin, Tim Ryan, John B. Larson ..... 522

Page

Additional views of Jim Cooper, Ike Skelton, John Spratt, Gene Taylor, Ciro D. Rodriguez, Silvestre Reyes, Neil Abercrombie, Susan A. Davis, Adam Smith, James Langevin, John B. Larson, Steve Israel, Robert A. Brady, Kendrick B. Meek, Solomon P. Ortiz, Rick Larsen, Tim Ryan, Ellen O. Tauscher ..... 524
Additional and Supplemental views of Tim Ryan ..... 526
Dissenting views of Lane Evans ..... 527

108TH CONGRESS, 1st Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 108–106

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

MAY 16, 2003.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

## R E P O R T

together with

## ADDITIONAL, DISSENTING, AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 1588]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 1588) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

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

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

## EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute during the consideration of H.R. 1588. The title of the bill is amended to reflect the amendment to the text of the bill. The remainder of the report discusses the bill, as amended.

## PURPOSE

The bill would—(1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for procurement and for research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2004: (a) the personnel strength for each active duty component of the military departments; (b) the personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each reserve component of the armed forces; (c) the military training student loads for each of the active and reserve components of the military departments; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (7) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (8) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for the Maritime Administration.

## RELATIONSHIP OF AUTHORIZATION TO APPROPRIATIONS

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

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

## SUMMARY OF AUTHORIZATION IN THE BILL

The President requested budget authority of $399.7 billion for the national defense budget function for fiscal year 2004. Of this amount, the President requested $379.6 billion for the Department of Defense, including $9.1 billion for military construction and family housing. The defense budget request for fiscal year 2004 also included $17.3 billion for Department of Energy national security programs and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The committee recommends an overall level of $400.5 billion in budget authority. This amount represents an increase of approximately $17.7 billion from the amount authorized for appropriation by the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314).

## SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATIONS

The following table provides a summary of the amounts requested and that would be authorized for appropriation in the bill (in the column labeled "Budget Authority Implication of Committee

Recommendation") and the committee's estimate of how the committee's recommendations relate to the budget totals for the national defense function. For purposes of estimating the budget authority implications of committee action, the table reflects the numbers contained in the President's budget for proposals not in the committee's legislative jurisdiction.

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2004
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | FY 2004 Budget Authority Request | Committee Change From Request | FY 2004 Committee Recommendation | BA Implication of Committee Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PROCUREMENT** | | | | | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | 2,128,485 | 2,128,485 | 66,100 | 2,194,585 | 2,194,585 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | 1,459,462 | 1,459,462 | 135,200 | 1,594,662 | 1,594,662 |
| Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army | 1,640,704 | 1,640,704 | 556,700 | 2,197,404 | 2,197,404 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Army | 1,309,966 | 1,309,966 | 119,000 | 1,428,966 | 1,428,966 |
| Other Procurement, Army | 4,216,854 | 4,216,854 | 104,642 | 4,321,496 | 4,321,496 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy | 8,788,148 | 8,788,148 | 261,900 | 9,050,048 | 9,050,048 |
| Weapons Procurement, Navy | 1,991,821 | 1,991,821 | 538,000 | 2,529,821 | 2,529,821 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps | 922,355 | 922,355 | 41,000 | 963,355 | 963,355 |
| Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy | 11,438,984 | 11,438,984 | 33,400 | 11,472,384 | 11,472,384 |
| Other Procurement, Navy | 4,679,443 | 4,679,443 | (64,551) | 4,614,892 | 4,614,892 |
| Procurement, Marine Corps | 1,070,999 | 1,070,999 | 83,300 | 1,154,299 | 1,154,299 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Air Force | 12,079,360 | 12,079,360 | 525,091 | 12,604,451 | 12,604,451 |
| Missile Procurement, Air Force | 4,393,039 | 4,393,039 | (45,000) | 4,348,039 | 4,348,039 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force | 1,284,725 | 1,284,725 | 40,000 | 1,324,725 | 1,324,725 |
| Other Procurement, Air Force | 11,583,659 | 11,583,659 | (207,600) | 11,376,059 | 11,376,059 |
| Procurement, Defense-wide | 3,665,506 | 3,665,506 | 69,315 | 3,734,821 | 3,734,821 |
| Procurement, National Guard & Reserve Equipment | - | | | | |
| Defense Production Act Purchases | | 67,516 | | | 67,516 |
| **Total Procurement** | **72,653,510** | **72,721,026** | **2,256,497** | **74,910,007** | **74,977,523** |
| **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION** | | | | | |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army | 9,122,825 | 9,122,825 | 209,557 | 9,332,382 | 9,349,382 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy | 14,106,653 | 14,106,653 | 236,707 | 14,343,360 | 14,343,360 |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2004
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | FY 2004 Budget Authority Request | Committee Change From Request | FY 2004 Committee Recommendation | BA Implication of Committee Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force | 20,336,258 | 20,336,258 | 212,609 | 20,548,867 | 20,548,867 |
| Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide | 17,974,257 | 17,974,257 | 200,128 | 18,174,385 | 18,174,385 |
| Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense | 286,661 | 286,661 | | 286,661 | 286,661 |
| **Total Research, Development, Test & Evaluation** | **61,826,654** | **61,826,654** | **859,001** | **62,685,655** | **62,702,655** |
| **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE & OTHER PROGRAMS** | | | | | |
| **Operation and Maintenance** | | | | | |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army | 24,965,342 | 24,965,342 | 85,245 | 25,050,587 | 25,050,587 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy | 28,287,690 | 28,287,690 | (385,900) | 27,901,790 | 27,901,790 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps | 3,406,656 | 3,406,656 | 111,100 | 3,517,756 | 3,517,756 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force | 27,793,931 | 27,793,931 | (2,359,471) | 25,434,460 | 25,434,460 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide | 16,570,847 | 16,570,847 | (436,800) | 16,134,047 | 16,134,047 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve | 1,952,009 | 1,952,009 | 2,000 | 1,954,009 | 1,954,009 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve | 1,171,921 | 1,171,921 | | 1,171,921 | 1,171,921 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve | 173,952 | 173,952 | 25,500 | 199,452 | 199,452 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve | 2,179,188 | 2,179,188 | (9,000) | 2,170,188 | 2,170,188 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard | 4,211,331 | 4,211,331 | (17,000) | 4,194,331 | 4,194,331 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard | 4,402,646 | 4,402,646 | 2,000 | 4,404,646 | 4,404,646 |
| United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces | 10,333 | 10,333 | | 10,333 | 10,333 |
| Environmental Restoration, Army | 396,018 | 396,018 | | 396,018 | 396,018 |
| Environmental Restoration, Navy | 256,153 | 256,153 | | 256,153 | 256,153 |
| Environmental Restoration, Air Force | 384,307 | 384,307 | | 384,307 | 384,307 |
| Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide | 24,081 | 24,081 | | 24,081 | 24,081 |
| Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites | 212,619 | 212,619 | | 212,619 | 212,619 |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2004
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | FY 2004 Budget Authority Request | Committee Change From Request | FY 2004 Committee Recommendation | BA Implication of Committee Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cooperative Threat Reduction | 450,800 | 450,800 | | 450,800 | 450,800 |
| Support for International Sporting Competitions, Defense | | | | | |
| Overseas Military Investment Recovery | | 1,331 | | | 1,331 |
| Disposal of DoD Real Property | | 7,303 | | | 16,303 |
| Lease of DoD Real Property | | 14,770 | | | 14,770 |
| Payment to Kaho' Olawe Island Fund | | | | | |
| Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, & Civic Aid | 59,000 | 59,000 | | 59,000 | 59,000 |
| National Science Center, Army | | 5 | | | 5 |
| Burdensharing | | 210,000 | | | 500,000 |
| Rocky Mountain Arsenal | | 10,210 | | | 6,210 |
| United States Industrial Base Capabilities Fund | | | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund | 50,000 | 50,000 | (50,000) | | |
| Defense Cooperation | | | | | |
| **Subtotal Operation and Maintenance** | **116,958,824** | **117,202,443** | (2,932,326) | **114,026,498** | **114,565,117** |
| **Other Programs** | | | | | |
| Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense | 817,371 | 817,371 | | 817,371 | 817,371 |
| Defense Health Program | 15,270,509 | 15,270,509 | 46,554 | 15,317,063 | 15,317,063 |
| Office of the Inspector General | 162,449 | 162,449 | | 162,449 | 162,449 |
| Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense | 1,650,076 | 1,650,076 | (69,815) | 1,580,261 | 1,580,261 |
| **Subtotal Other Programs** | **17,900,405** | **17,900,405** | (23,261) | **17,877,144** | **17,877,144** |
| **Total Operation and Maintenance & Other Programs** | **134,859,229** | **135,102,848** | (2,955,587) | **131,903,642** | **132,442,261** |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2004
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | FY 2004 Budget Authority Request | Committee Change From Request | FY 2004 Committee Recommendation | BA Implication of Committee Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS** | | | | | |
| Defense Working Capital Funds | 1,721,507 | 1,721,507 | | 1,721,507 | 1,721,507 |
| National Defense Sealift Fund | 1,062,762 | 1,062,762 | 40,000 | 1,102,762 | 1,102,762 |
| National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund | | (72,558) | | | (99,558) |
| Armed Forces Retirement Home Fund | 65,279 | | | 65,279 | |
| Other (Defense Health Program) | 45,000 | 45,000 | (45,000) | | |
| **Total Revolving and Management Funds** | **2,894,548** | **2,756,711** | (5,000) | **2,889,548** | **2,724,711** |
| **MILITARY PERSONNEL** | | | | | |
| **Total Military Personnel** | 98,956,065 | 98,956,065 | (17,554) | 98,938,511 | 98,938,511 |
| **MILITARY CONSTRUCTION** | | | | | |
| Military Construction, Army | 1,678,210 | 1,536,010 | (73,730) | 1,604,480 | 1,462,280 |
| Military Construction, Navy | 1,147,537 | 1,132,858 | 104,409 | 1,251,946 | 1,237,267 |
| Military Construction, Air Force | 830,671 | 830,671 | 155,405 | 986,076 | 986,076 |
| Military Construction, Defense-wide | 655,381 | 694,301 | 147,168 | 802,549 | 841,469 |
| Military Construction, Army National Guard | 168,298 | 168,298 | 85,490 | 253,788 | 253,788 |
| Military Construction, Air National Guard | 60,430 | 60,430 | 62,978 | 123,408 | 123,408 |
| Military Construction, Army Reserve | 68,478 | 68,478 | 21,362 | 89,840 | 89,840 |
| Military Construction, Naval Reserve | 28,032 | 28,032 | 17,730 | 45,762 | 45,762 |
| Military Construction, Air Force Reserve | 44,312 | 44,312 | 16,831 | 61,143 | 61,143 |
| Military Construction, Foreign Currency Fluctuations | | | | | 55,000 |
| Base Realignment and Closure IV | 370,427 | 370,427 | | 370,427 | 370,427 |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2004
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | FY 2004 Budget Authority Request | Committee Change From Request | FY 2004 Committee Recommendation | BA Implication of Committee Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NATO Security Investment Program | 169,300 | 169,300 | | 169,300 | 169,300 |
| **Total Military Construction** | **5,221,076** | **5,103,117** | **537,643** | **5,758,719** | **5,695,760** |
| **FAMILY HOUSING** | | | | | |
| Family Housing Construction, Army | 409,191 | 356,891 | | 409,191 | 356,891 |
| Family Housing Support, Army | 1,043,026 | 1,043,026 | | 1,043,026 | 1,043,026 |
| Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps | 184,193 | 184,193 | | 184,193 | 184,193 |
| Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps | 852,778 | 852,778 | | 852,778 | 852,778 |
| Family Housing Construction, Air Force | 657,065 | 637,718 | | 657,065 | 637,718 |
| Family Housing Support, Air Force | 834,468 | 834,468 | | 834,468 | 834,468 |
| Family Housing Construction, Defense-wide | 350 | 350 | | 350 | 350 |
| Family Housing Support, Defense-wide | 49,440 | 49,440 | | 49,440 | 49,440 |
| Homeowners Assistance Fund | | | | | |
| DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund | 300 | 300 | | 300 | 300 |
| **Total Family Housing** | **4,030,811** | **3,959,164** | | **4,030,811** | **3,959,164** |
| **Total Military Construction and Family Housing** | **9,251,887** | **9,062,281** | **537,643** | **9,789,530** | **9,654,924** |
| **OTHER DoD MILITARY** | | | | | |
| Spending of Card Refunds | | | | | |
| General Transfer Authority [non-additive] | | | | | |
| National Security Education Trust Fund | | | | | |
| Other Trust Funds | | 253,439 | | | 271,439 |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2004
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | FY 2004 Budget Authority Request | Committee Change From Request | FY 2004 Committee Recommendation | BA Implication of Committee Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Interfund Transfers | | | | | |
| Surcharge Collections | | | | | |
| Foreign Employee Separation Pay | | | | | |
| Voluntary Separation Incentive Trust Fund | | | | | |
| Sale of Material in National Defense Stockpile | | (78,573) | | | (139,573) |
| Defense Vessel Transfer Program Account | | | | | |
| Kaho' Olawe Island Conveyance Fund | | | | | |
| Receipts from travel and purchase card refunds | | | | | 44,000 |
| Nonappropriated Fund BRAC Reserve Account | | | | | 70,000 |
| Offsetting Receipts and Other | | (970,546) | | | (1,233,546) |
| **Total Other DoD Military** | | **(795,680)** | | | **(987,680)** |
| **TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY (051)** | **380,441,893** | **379,629,905** | **675,000** | **381,116,893** | **380,452,905** |
| **ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)** | | | | | |
| Energy Supply | 110,473 | 110,473 | | 110,473 | 110,473 |
| Weapons Activities | 6,378,000 | 6,378,000 | 15,000 | 6,393,000 | 6,393,000 |
| NNSA Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation | 1,340,195 | 1,340,195 | (27,500) | 1,312,695 | 1,312,695 |
| Naval Reactors | 768,400 | 768,400 | | 768,400 | 768,400 |
| Office of the Administrator | 347,980 | 347,980 | | 347,980 | 347,980 |
| Defense Facilities Closure Projects | 5,814,635 | 5,814,635 | 9,500 | 5,824,135 | 5,824,135 |
| Defense Environmental Management Privatization | 995,179 | 995,179 | | 995,179 | 995,179 |
| Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal | 430,000 | 430,000 | | 430,000 | 430,000 |
| Other Defense Activities | 494,331 | 494,331 | 3,000 | 497,331 | 497,331 |
| Cerro Grande Fire Activities Recession | | (75,000) | | | (75,000) |

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2004
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | FY 2004 Budget Authority Request | Committee Change From Request | FY 2004 Committee Recommendation | BA Implication of Committee Recommendation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corps of Engineers - Civil Works | | 140,000 | | | 140,000 |
| Department of Homeland Security | | 92,000 | | | 92,000 |
| Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board | 19,559 | 19,559 | | 19,559 | 19,559 |
| Energy Employees Illness Compensation Fund | | 385,000 | | | 425,000 |
| Energy Employees Compensation - Administration | | 55,000 | | | 55,000 |
| **TOTAL ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)** | **16,698,752** | **17,295,752** | | **16,698,752** | **17,335,752** |
| **DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)** | | | | | |
| Department of Education | | 8,000 | | | 8,000 |
| Department of Energy | | | | | |
| Department of Homeland Security | | 1,575,000 | | | 1,575,000 |
| Department of Justice | | 524,000 | | | 524,000 |
| Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund | | 107,000 | | | 107,000 |
| Department of Transportation - MARAD Maritime Security Program | | 99,000 | | | 99,000 |
| Intelligence Community Management Account | | 125,000 | | | 125,000 |
| CIA Retirement & Disability | | 226,000 | | | 226,000 |
| National Science Foundation - Antarctic research activities | | 68,000 | | | 68,000 |
| Other Defense Civil Programs | | 28,000 | | | 28,000 |
| **TOTAL DEFENSE-RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)** | | **2,760,000** | | | **2,760,000** |
| **TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)** | **397,140,645** | **399,685,657** | **675,000** | **397,815,645** | **400,548,657** |

## RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

The fiscal year 2004 National Defense Authorization Act is the first defense authorization act prepared in the aftermath of Operation Iraqi Freedom. That victory, combined with the extraordinary defeat of the Taliban in Afghanistan, has placed the ongoing debate about the future of the U.S. armed forces in sharper focus.

Advocates of rapid transformation argue that Operation Enduring Freedom's unique combination of airpower and special operations forces, networked with advanced sensors and communication systems, constituted a new "transformational" model for waging warfare. The new model stresses speed and information over firepower and mass in conducting military operations. Many such advocates would reduce our current force structure as a means of freeing up resources to accelerate a transformation in the U.S. military to lighter, faster forces.

An alternative view points to the success of well-armored Army and Marine divisions in toppling Saddam Hussein's regime and the critical contributions of long-range conventional bombers to victory over Taliban and Al Qaeda forces in Afghanistan as evidence of our continued dependence on the existing force structure. This school of thought argues that transformation should be pursued at a more measured pace, lest it undermine the effectiveness of our current systems, which have proven their worth repeatedly in combat. The debate among defense analysts, both inside and outside the Department of Defense, presents the committee with an interesting dilemma. Outside forces urge Congress to adopt one position to the exclusion of the other.

At its core, the current debate revolves around the assumption and management of near- and long-term risk. Most analysts agree that the U.S. armed forces must change in order to meet the challenges of the 21st century. However, accelerating transformation by reducing current force structure to pay for future systems may undermine the readiness and capabilities of the forces we rely on today. This approach could endanger our current security if those forces develop vulnerabilities or are called on to perform missions for which they are no longer prepared. Thus, rapid transformation involves increased near-term risk. On the other hand, focusing on modernizing our current force structure at the expense of transformation creates long term risks if it precludes the military from adopting technologies or creating capabilities that improve its future effectiveness against adversaries developing asymmetric means of countering existing forces.

The committee believes that discussions of U.S. national security cannot, and must not, be reduced to such an oversimplified and unrealistic choice. Instead, the United States must strike a balance between: (1) modernizing and enhancing the combat forces that have demonstrated their lethality to America's adversaries and (2) developing transformational capabilities that ensure the United States military maintains its effectiveness advantages over all future adversaries. H.R. 1588, therefore, contains provisions that will invest in key transformational capabilities for the long term, while recommending increased spending on our currently deployed capabilities to ensure their continued battlefield dominance. Drawing on early lessons from the war in Afghanistan and Operation Iraqi

Freedom, H.R. 1588 authorizes incremental improvements to sustain current capabilities and force structure while investing in transformational technologies and initiatives.

*Transformation*

The Committee has a long and bipartisan history of supporting the development of transformational technologies and capabilities. The success of transformational systems, ranging from the enhanced intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities made possible by Unmanned Aerial Vehicles to the increased lethality of Precision Guided Munitions (PGMs) demonstrates the wisdom of that approach. Overall for fiscal year 2004, the committee recommends an increase of $663 million over the Administration's request for defense Science and Technology programs, which traditionally drive long-term improvements in U.S. military capability. The increases are spread across several categories, including strike systems, advanced munitions, sensors, and communications.

During Operation Desert Storm nine percent of all weapons dropped by the United States were PGMs. Conversely, PGMs constituted 67 percent of all weapons employed by the Air Force during Operation Iraqi Freedom, a clear indicator of their superior value to the U.S. military. Combined with an innovative campaign strategy and the best soldiers in the world, precision strike capabilities enabled the coalition during Operation Iraqi Freedom to achieve a broader and significantly more challenging objective with fewer forces, when compared to their Operation Desert Storm predecessors. Thus, the bill would add $376 million to the Administration's request for procurement of such successful transformational technologies as the Tactical Tomahawk cruise missile and $178 million for the Affordable Weapon System, a committee initiative to reduce the cost of PGMs through the development of more affordable military systems. Additionally, the committee recommends beginning research and development on new strike platforms; in particular it recommends $100 million to begin research and development work on a new deep strike bomber to complement or succeed the current fleet of B–1, B–2, and B–52 bombers. Such systems represent an investment in 21st deep strike capabilities and will help address basing problems highlighted during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

In addition to transformational delivery platforms and munitions, the committee recognizes the transformational value of advanced sensor, network, and positioning systems in their role as force multipliers. Therefore, the committee recommends approving the budget request for E–2 Hawkeye aircraft, and increasing funding by $132 million over the request for the EA–6B Prowler, by $27 million for the E–8C Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS), by $10 million for surface combatant systems engineering to improve the development of an open architecture for the Aegis system and $17 million for a new Littoral Surveillance System. The committee also recommends authorizing the funds requested for the Global Hawk Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV), an $18 million increase over the request for the Predator UAV, and a $20.9 million increase for advanced research and development for the Shadow 200 Tactical UAV. The committee also recommends

full funding for the Space-Based Radar, a program that could revolutionize our sensor capabilities and reduce the demands made on tactical surveillance systems in the long term. These systems are increasingly important high-demand, low-density systems that give U.S. military forces a decisive information advantage over their adversaries and should continue to be improved. To the degree that information technologies enable the long-term transformation of U.S. military forces, these funding levels will help enable the Department of Defense to continue transformation in the information age.

Just as the military services are creating new capabilities to deal with the security environment of the 21st century, the Administration requested authority to transform the very management structures and processes of the Department of Defense, many of which trace their heritage back to the lessons of World War II and the National Security Act of 1947. Given the radical changes in the international security environment, the committee believes it is vital to transform the way the Department of Defense operates. Consequently, after careful consideration and coordination with the other relevant committees of the House of Representatives, the committee recommends approving significant portions of the Administration's proposed "Defense Transformation for the 21st Century Act" as elements of the fiscal year 2004 national defense authorization act.

The committee recommends development of a modernized national security personnel system. In particular, in cooperation with the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, it adopted provisions creating a more flexible merit-based pay system to attract and retain talented individuals in government service. It also recommends the establishment of an early retirement program and greater flexibility for the Secretary of Defense to hire experts with critical scientific, technical, or management skills at appropriate pay for a period of up to five years. Taken together, these provisions would help retain, protect, and support the current civilian workforce in the Department of Defense while giving the Secretary of Defense greater personnel flexibility to reward exceptional performance and address key skill shortfalls.

Taken together, these initiatives will enable the United States military to continue on the path of transformation and develop those capabilities needed to maintain, and extend, the U.S. military advantage over potential adversaries in the long term.

*Modernizing the Existing Force*

At the same time, the bill recognizes that the success of transformational capabilities in operations in Afghanistan and Iraq built upon the foundation of a broad range of existing capabilities to engage adversaries across the range of conflict. Current force structure and weapons platforms, some of which are nearly four decades old, were the backbone upon which new capabilities in precision, communications, and intelligence created their transformational impact. The war in Afghanistan, for example, became famous for its horse-riding special operations forces directing modern precision-guided munitions, delivered by forty-year-old B–52 bombers onto Taliban and Al Qaeda fighting positions. That chain of capabilities is only as strong as its weakest link, which may soon prove

to be the aging delivery platforms upon which we rely to deliver firepower around the world. In Afghanistan and Iraq, the B–52, B–1, and B–2 strategic bombers proved the value of long-range airpower able to operate independently of forward bases that may not be available in future conflicts. Similarly, in Operation Iraqi Freedom, the deployment of heavily armored ground forces demonstrated the seriousness of coalition intent, while their firepower, mobility, and protective capabilities were key in demonstrating to Saddam Hussein and his regime that resistance was futile. By moving about at will throughout Baghdad, the coalition deprived Saddam Hussein's regime of its control over the capital, contributing to its quick downfall.

Recognizing these realities, and that transformational technologies work when married to proven systems, the committee recommends several measures that will sustain and improve the lethality of our existing forces. In particular, the committee recommends provisions to preserve our existing deep-strike capabilities, which make fewer demands on forward operating bases. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $20.3 million to the administration's request for improvements in the B1–B Lancer in order to begin the regeneration process for 23 B1–Bs currently slated for retirement. This provision would enable the United States military to retain more than the 60 B1–Bs it currently plans to protect from retirement. Additionally, the committee recommends increasing funding for the B–2 Spirit bomber by $85.3 million to sustain its mission capability rates and invest in communications capabilities.

The committee is particularly concerned about redressing shortfalls in the improvement in our ground systems experienced over the last decade. In Iraq, heavy armor proved that the combination of mass, speed, and firepower remain decisive. Abrams tanks and Bradley Fighting Vehicles operating in Baghdad demonstrated the seriousness of American purpose while ensuring that all units were strong enough to deal with any type of resistance. As the President noted in a speech at the Lima, Ohio M–1 Abrams plant, "In the liberation of Iraq, we've applied powerful weapons, like the tank you build here, to strike our enemy with speed and precision. In the use of the Abrams tank we have got a vehicle that is the most safe vehicle for our fighting personnel, precise enough to protect innocent lives. . . . Throughout the campaign, our enemy learned that when Abrams tanks are on the battlefield, America means business." Thus, the committee believes it is vital to sustain this critical and unique capability and recommends an increase of $726.8 million for heavy forces modernization. Of these funds, the committee recommends $424 million for the M1A2 Abrams systems enhancement program, $258.8 million for M3A2 upgrades, and $44 million for combat support and service support improvements.

Finally, the committee continues to believe that military personnel are the U.S. armed forces' greatest asset. Therefore, it recommends an average increase of 4.1% in base pay for our men and women in uniform and placing housing allowances on a path to eliminate out-of-pocket expenses completely by fiscal year 2005. The committee also recommends supplemental subsistence allowances for military personnel assigned to areas with a high cost of living and extending active duty special pay and bonuses.

The committee also notes that our total force policies developed after the Vietnam war have combined with the global war on terror to make increasing demands on personnel and units located in the reserves and national guard. Therefore, the committee recommends increasing the budget request by $196.7 million for reserve component training and readiness and extending certain special pay and bonuses for reserve personnel through the end of calendar year 2004.

Collectively, these initiatives will maintain and enhance the military advantages that our current forces have over potential adversaries, ensuring that when the President and Congress contemplate sending the nation's young men and women into combat, those personnel will have the best equipment and training that the United States can provide.

*Force Structure*

During much of the last decade, the U.S. military was subjected to force structure reductions that have increasingly stressed it. At the same time, changes in the international security environment are making increased demands on the Department of Defense. As a result of ongoing peacekeeping operations in the Balkans and Sinai Peninsula, Cold War deployments in Korea and Europe, and the need to deploy and conduct operations in the global war on terror in places as diverse as Afghanistan and Iraq, U.S. military units find themselves facing an extraordinary operational tempo. For example, during the first quarter of fiscal year 2003, the U.S. Navy exceeded its planned number of steaming days by roughly 18 percent. While the U.S. Navy has performed magnificently under these conditions, they cannot be endured indefinitely. Other services are under similar stress.

While the committee retains full confidence that the men and women of the United States military will continue to perform their missions successfully and admirably, it is concerned that the increased demands made on individual units may make it more difficult for them to achieve their missions in the future. This creates risk for U.S. national security. In 1991, the Defense Department development the concept of a "base force" to guide our post-Cold War force structure. As the official history of the development of the base force notes, certain elements in the Department of Defense believed, "this force option provided the minimum force structure that the United States could adopt without incurring undue risk." The committee notes that the 1991 base force was slightly larger than our current force structure, and that in 1991 the United States was a country at peace, not in the midst of a global war on terror.

While transformation and modernization may reduce some strains, ultimately it will be necessary to explore changes in the current force structure in order to ensure the security of the American people. Therefore, the committee recommends two provisions that will factor into this process.

First, the committee recommends a provision that would establish the current force structure of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as a legislative minimum, just as Congress did for the Marine Corps. Given the growing demands on our current forces, uncertainty about the security environment, and uncertainty about the

success of certain transformational efforts, the committee believes that cutting force structure below current levels would create an unacceptable degree of risk to U.S. national security.

Second, the committee recommends a more aggressive look into the future in order to assess the force structure that will be needed in the new security environment. It endorsed a provision calling for a national military strategy to be prepared by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the respective service chiefs. The national military strategy will help connect broad policy guidelines contained in the President's National Security Strategy and the Quadrennial Defense Review to more specific military capabilities, deployments, basing decisions, and force structure. Additionally, the committee recommends a measure that would connect future military forces to the Department of Defense's global infrastructure. The bill contains a provision that would specify the assumptions to be made during the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process. The provision would direct the BRAC Commission to consider the need to surge U.S. capabilities over and above our current force structure and the possibility that it may become necessary to base our forces entirely in the United States when assessing DOD infrastructure within the BRAC process. The committee believes that doing so will ensure that the Department of Defense retains sufficient infrastructure to accommodate a larger force structure, should one prove necessary.

*Conclusion*

Some might argue that the United States cannot afford to both modernize its existing force structure while developing the transformational capabilities needed for the future. The committee believes that as a country at war with global terrorism, the United States can ill afford not to do both. In 1983, the United States spent roughly six percent of its gross domestic product on defense. In 2004, in the midst of a war on global terrorism that has already required it to eliminate threats from two nation-states, the United States is projected to spend roughly 3.4 percent of gross domestic product on defense. In that context, it is vital that defense budgets properly manage risks by funding the long-term transformation of the military forces critical to our future security while sustaining and modernizing those forces upon which our security rests today. H.R. 1588 does that.

## HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 results from hearings that began on February 5, 2003 and that were completed on May 2, 2003. The full committee conducted 11 sessions. In addition, a total of 25 sessions were conducted by six different subcommittees on various titles of the bill.

# DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

## TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

### OVERVIEW

The amended budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $72,653.5 million for procurement. This represents a $1,315.8 million decrease from the amount authorized for fiscal year 2003.

The committee recommends authorization of $74,910.0 million, an increase of $2,256.5 million from the fiscal year 2004 request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 procurement program are identified in the table below. Major issues are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY | 0 | 2,128,485 | 0 | 66,100 | 0 | 166,100 | 0 | (100,000) | 0 | 2,194,585 |
| MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY | 0 | 1,459,462 | 0 | 135,200 | 0 | 135,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,594,662 |
| PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY | 0 | 1,640,704 | 0 | 556,700 | 0 | 696,700 | 0 | (140,000) | 0 | 2,197,404 |
| PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY | 0 | 1,309,966 | 0 | 119,000 | 0 | 120,000 | 0 | (1,000) | 0 | 1,428,966 |
| OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY | 0 | 4,216,854 | 0 | 104,642 | 0 | 270,700 | 0 | (166,058) | 0 | 4,321,496 |
| **TOTAL ARMY** | **0** | **10,755,471** | **0** | **981,642** | **0** | **1,388,700** | **0** | **(407,058)** | **0** | **11,737,113** |
| AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY | 0 | 8,788,148 | 0 | 261,900 | 0 | 261,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9,050,048 |
| WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY | 0 | 1,991,821 | 0 | 538,000 | 0 | 538,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,529,821 |
| PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS | 0 | 922,355 | 0 | 41,000 | 0 | 41,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 963,355 |
| SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY | 0 | 11,438,984 | 0 | 33,400 | 0 | 33,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11,472,384 |
| OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY | 0 | 4,679,443 | 0 | (64,551) | 0 | 82,000 | 0 | (146,551) | 0 | 4,614,892 |
| PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS | 0 | 1,070,999 | 0 | 83,300 | 0 | 83,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,154,299 |
| **TOTAL NAVY** | **0** | **28,891,750** | **0** | **893,049** | **0** | **1,039,600** | **0** | **(146,551)** | **0** | **29,784,799** |
| AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | 0 | 12,079,360 | 0 | 525,091 | 0 | 696,091 | 0 | (171,000) | 0 | 12,604,451 |
| PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE | 0 | 1,284,725 | 0 | 40,000 | 0 | 40,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,324,725 |
| MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | 0 | 4,393,039 | 0 | (45,000) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (45,000) | 0 | 4,348,039 |
| OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE | 0 | 11,583,659 | 0 | (207,600) | 0 | 59,400 | 0 | (267,000) | 0 | 11,376,059 |
| **TOTAL AIR FORCE** | **0** | **29,340,783** | **0** | **312,491** | **0** | **795,491** | **0** | **(483,000)** | **0** | **29,653,274** |
| PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE | 0 | 3,665,506 | 0 | 69,315 | 0 | 88,000 | 0 | (18,685) | 0 | 3,734,821 |
| PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **TOTAL DEFENSE-WIDE** | **0** | **3,665,506** | **0** | **69,315** | **0** | **88,000** | **0** | **(18,685)** | **0** | **3,734,821** |
| **GRAND TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE** | **0** | **72,653,510** | **0** | **2,256,497** | **0** | **3,311,791** | **0** | **(1,055,294)** | **0** | **74,910,007** |

## AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $2,128.5 million for Aircraft Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $2,194.6 million, an increase of $66.1 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Aircraft Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **FIXED WING** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT | - | - | 1 | 7,800 | | | | | 1 | 7,800 |
| | UC-35 aircraft | | | | | 1 | 7,800 | | | | |
| | **ROTARY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | 10 | 161,943 | 9 | 112,800 | | | | | 19 | 274,743 |
| | UH-60Ls - additional 5 for ARNG | | | | | 5 | 52,000 | | | | |
| | HH-60Ls - additional 4 for ARNG | | | | | 4 | 60,800 | | | | |
| 2 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | - | (23,084) | | | | | | | - | (23,084) |
| 3 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 3 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 3 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 3 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 3 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 3 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 3 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 3 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | - | 16,585 | | | | | | | - | 16,585 |
| 3 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | - | 11,556 | | | | | | | - | 11,556 |
| 3 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT** | | **167,000** | | **120,600** | | **120,600** | | **-** | | **287,600** |
| | **MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA) | - | 3,176 | | | | | | | - | 3,176 |
| 6 | ARL MODS (TIARA) | - | 5,707 | | | | | | | - | 5,707 |
| 7 | AH-64 MODS | - | 58,879 | | 15,500 | | | | | - | 74,379 |
| | AH-64 Bladefold Kits | | | | | | 15,500 | | | | |
| 8 | CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS | - | 516,710 | | 6,000 | | | | | - | 522,710 |
| | Crashworthy Crew Seats | | | | | | 6,000 | | | | |
| 8 | CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS | - | (21,185) | | | | | | | - | (21,185) |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 9 | CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 9 | CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 9 | CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS | - | 20,515 | | | | | | | - | 20,515 |
| 9 | CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 10 | UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS | - | 10,448 | | | | | | | - | 10,448 |
| 11 | OH-58 MODS | - | 477 | | | | | | | - | 477 |
| 12 | AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS | - | 762 | | | | | | | - | 762 |
| 13 | LONGBOW | - | 792,177 | | | | | | | - | 792,177 |
| 13 | LONGBOW | - | (29,713) | | | | | | | - | (29,713) |
| 14 | LONGBOW | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 14 | LONGBOW | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 14 | LONGBOW | - | 14,204 | | | | | | | - | 14,204 |
| 15 | UH-60 MODS | - | 136,496 | | (100,000) | | | | | - | 36,496 |
| | Transfer to PE 23744A | | | | | | | | (100,000) | | |
| 16 | KIOWA WARRIOR | - | 45,051 | | 9,000 | | | | | - | 54,051 |
| | COTS Helmet Mounted Display | | | | | | 9,000 | | | | |
| 17 | AIRBORNE AVIONICS | - | 71,206 | | | | | | | - | 71,206 |
| 18 | GATM ROLLUP | - | 59,104 | | | | | | | - | 59,104 |
| 19 | AIRBORNE DIGITIZATION | - | 1,906 | | | | | | | - | 1,906 |
| | **TOTAL MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT** | | **1,685,920** | | **(69,500)** | | **30,500** | | **(100,000)** | | **1,616,420** |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | SPARE PARTS (AIR) | - | 11,299 | | | | | | | - | 11,299 |
| | **TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **11,299** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **11,299** |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT | - | 14,879 | | | | | | | - | 14,879 |
| 22 | ASE INFRARED CM | - | 75,713 | | | | | | | - | 75,713 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL | - | 26,594 | | | | | | | - | 26,594 |
| 24 | AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 13,295 | | 15,000 | | | | | - | 28,295 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | Additional Aviation Night Vision System Goggles | | | | | | 15,000 | | | | |
| 25 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | - | 16,597 | | | | | | | - | 16,597 |
| 26 | AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS | - | 28,894 | | | | | | | - | 28,894 |
| 27 | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | - | 59,963 | | | | | | | - | 59,963 |
| 28 | INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | - | 1,203 | | | | | | | - | 1,203 |
| 29 | LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET | - | 2,512 | | | | | | | - | 2,512 |
| 30 | AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS | - | 24,616 | | | | | | | - | 24,616 |
| | **TOTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | **264,266** | | **15,000** | | **15,000** | | **-** | | **279,266** |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | **2,128,485** | | **66,100** | | **166,100** | | **(100,000)** | | **2,194,585** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Kiowa warrior*

The budget request contained $45.1 million for the procurement of Kiowa Warrior safety modifications, but included no funds to procure helmet-mounted displays for OH–58D Kiowa Warrior aircrew.

The committee understands that a commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS), daylight readable, see-through display, which can be mounted to exiting Army aircrew helmets is capable of being integrated into the OH–58D Kiowa Warrior. The committee believes this system would improve aircrew operational effectiveness and safety and provide a low-cost, aircraft sensor targeting capability.

The committee recommends $54.1 million for the Kiowa Warrior program, an increase of $9.0 million for procurement of COTS, daylight readable, see-through, helmet-mounted displays for Kiowa Warrior aircrew.

*UH–60 blackhawk*

The budget request contained $138.9 million for the procurement of 10 UH–60L Blackhawks for the Army, but no funds were requested for additional helicopters for the Army National Guard (ARNG).

The committee notes that the Army's ongoing deployments in both Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom have precluded the cascading of certain active component unit's aircraft to the ARNG, as directed by the Army's aviation modernization plan. Accordingly, the committee notes that the ARNG continues to have an outstanding requirement for additional Blackhawk helicopters.

The committee recommends $251.7 million, an increase of $52.0 million for 5 UH–60L utility variants, and $60.8 million for 4 HH–60L medical evacuation aircraft, for a total increase of $112.8 million, for additional ARNG Blackhawk helicopters.

*UH–60 modifications*

The budget request contained $136.5 million for UH–60 modifications, of which $113.5 million is for the UH–60M recapitalization and upgrade program.

The committee understands that the UH–60M upgrade program, which will incorporate airframe and engine power improvements, as well as a digitized cockpit for enhanced long-range precision navigation, command and control interoperability, and future worldwide air traffic management requirements, has experienced cost growth as a result of added requirements and the implementation of earned value management on the development program. The committee is concerned with cost growth for an upgrade program of an aircraft which has been in production for over 25 years and will closely monitor the progress of the restructured development program through fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommends a transfer of $100.0 million from UH–60 modifications to PE 23744A for continued development and procurement of additional prototype aircraft, in the hopes of mitigating the impact of the delay of fielding this upgrade to soldiers.

## MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $1,459.5 million for Missile Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1,594.7 million, an increase of $135.2 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Missile Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **OTHER MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY | 108 | 561,555 | 30 | 126,000 | | | | | 138 | 687,555 |
| | PAC-3 | | | | | | 126,000 | | | | |
| 2 | STINGER SYSTEM SUMMARY | - | 2,942 | | | | | | | - | 2,942 |
| 3 | AVENGER SYSTEM SUMMARY | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYSTEM SUMMARY: | - | 7,452 | | | | | | | - | 7,452 |
| | **AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY | - | 33,061 | | | | | | | - | 33,061 |
| 5 | HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | APKWS (ADVANCED PRECISION KILL WEAPON SYSTEM) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 7 | APKWS (ADVANCED PRECISION KILL WEAPON SYSTEM) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY | 901 | 133,115 | | | | | | | 901 | 133,115 |
| 8 | JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 9 | JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY | - | 7,600 | | | | | | | - | 7,600 |
| 10 | LINE OF SIGHT ANTI-TANK (LOSAT) SYSTEM SUM | 76 | 43,232 | | | | | | | 76 | 43,232 |
| 10 | LINE OF SIGHT ANTI-TANK (LOSAT) SYSTEM SUM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 11 | LINE OF SIGHT ANTI-TANK (LOSAT) SYSTEM SUM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 12 | TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY | 200 | 10,010 | | | | | | | 200 | 10,010 |
| 12 | TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 13 | TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY | - | 12,946 | | | | | | | - | 12,946 |
| 13 | TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY | - | 3,420 | | | | | | | - | 3,420 |
| 14 | GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS) | 786 | 107,759 | | | | | | | 786 | 107,759 |
| 15 | MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR) | 2,934 | 14,646 | | | | | | | 2,934 | 14,646 |
| 16 | MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS | - | 40,155 | | | | | | | - | 40,155 |
| 17 | HIMARS LAUNCHER | 24 | 124,191 | | | | | | | 24 | 124,191 |
| 18 | ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM | 50 | 50,301 | | | | | | | 50 | 50,301 |
| 19 | ATACMS BLKII SYSTEM SUMMARY | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 20 | ATACMS PENETRATOR | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL OTHER MISSILES** | | **1,152,385** | | **126,000** | | **126,000** | | **-** | | **1,278,385** |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **MODIFICATION OF MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **MODIFICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | PATRIOT MODS | - | 212,575 | | | | | | | - | 212,575 |
| 22 | STINGER MODS | - | 973 | | | | | | | - | 973 |
| 23 | AVENGER MODS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 24 | ITAS/TOW MODS | - | 15,707 | | 9,200 | | | | | - | 24,907 |
| | Improved Target Acquisition System Lithium Batteries | | | | | | 9,200 | | | | |
| 25 | MLRS MODS | - | 19,918 | | | | | | | - | 19,918 |
| 26 | HIMARS MODIFICATIONS: (NON AAO) | - | 467 | | | | | | | - | 467 |
| | **TOTAL MODIFICATIONS OF MISSILES** | | **249,640** | | **9,200** | | **9,200** | | **-** | | **258,840** |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 50,542 | | | | | | | - | 50,542 |
| | **TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **50,542** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **50,542** |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | AIR DEFENSE TARGETS | - | 3,464 | | | | | | | - | 3,464 |
| 29 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES) | - | 10 | | | | | | | - | 10 |
| 30 | MISSILE DEMILITARIZATION | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 31 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT | - | 3,421 | | | | | | | - | 3,421 |
| | **TOTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | **6,895** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **6,895** |
| | **TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | **1,459,462** | | **135,200** | | **135,200** | | **-** | | **1,594,662** |

### Items of Special Interest

*Patriot PAC–3*

The budget request contained $561.6 million for Patriot PAC–3 procurement.

The committee is encouraged by the performance of Patriot PAC–3 in testing and actual operations. Therefore, the committee recommends $687.6 for the Patriot PAC–3 system, an increase of $126.0 million, of which $90.0 million is to be used for procurement of 30 additional PAC–3 missiles, and $36.0 million is to be used for upgraded radars and launch communication enhancements.

## WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $1,640.7 million for Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $2,197.4 million, an increase of $556.7 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD | - | 6,252 | | | | | | | - | 6,252 |
| 2 | BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT | - | 113,302 | | 258,800 | | | | | - | 372,102 |
| | Bradley A20DS-D+ for Counterattack Corps Modernization | | | | | | 258,800 | | | | |
| 2 | BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 3 | BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD) | - | 3,397 | | | | | | | - | 3,397 |
| 5 | ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | STRYKER | 301 | 955,027 | | | | | | | 301 | 955,027 |
| 7 | FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEMS: (FCS) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | CARRIER, MOD | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 9 | FIST VEHICLE (MOD) | - | 16,756 | | | | | | | - | 16,756 |
| 10 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, FIST VEHICLE | - | 676 | | | | | | | - | 676 |
| 11 | BFVS SERIES (MOD) | - | 23,126 | | | | | | | - | 23,126 |
| 12 | HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD) | - | 36,092 | | | | | | | - | 36,092 |
| 13 | FAASV PIP TO FLEET | - | 10,981 | | | | | | | - | 10,981 |
| 14 | IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 15 | HEAVY ASSAULT BRIDGE (HAB) SYS (MOD) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 16 | ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 17 | M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD) | - | 268,644 | | (108,000) | | | | | - | 160,644 |
| | LV100 Engine unable to enter procurement | | | | | | | | (108,000) | | |
| 18 | M1A1D RETROFIT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 19 | SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2 | - | - | | 424,000 | | | | | - | 424,000 |
| | M1A2 SEP upgrades for Counterattack Corps Modernization | | | | | | 284,000 | | | | |
| | Reprioritized from M1 Abrams Tank Modifications | | | | | | 108,000 | | | | |
| | Reprioritized from Abrams Upgrade Program | | | | | | 32,000 | | | | |
| 20 | ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM | - | 92,942 | | (32,000) | | | | | - | 60,942 |
| | M1A1 AIM funds not required | | | | | | | | (32,000) | | |
| 20 | ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 21 | ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV) | - | 489 | | | | | | | - | 489 |
| 23 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV) | - | 10,188 | | | | | | | - | 10,188 |
| | **TOTAL TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES** | | **1,537,872** | | **542,800** | | **682,800** | | **(140,000)** | | **2,080,672** |
| | **WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240 SERIES | 1,480 | 16,559 | | | | | | | 1,480 | 16,559 |
| 25 | MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW) | - | - | | 13,900 | | | | | - | 13,900 |
| | Additional M249 Squad Automatic Weapons | | | | | | 7,000 | | | | |
| | Transfer from OPA-136 "Land Warrior" | | | | | | 6,900 | | | | |
| 26 | GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 27 | MORTAR SYSTEMS | 59 | 10,102 | | | | | | | 59 | 10,102 |
| 28 | M16 RIFLE | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 29 | XM107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE | 600 | 8,753 | | | | | | | 600 | 8,753 |
| 30 | 5.56 CARBINE M4 | 8,635 | 8,978 | | | | | | | 8,635 | 8,978 |
| 31 | HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T) | - | 4,998 | | | | | | | - | 4,998 |
| | **MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | MARK-19 MODIFICATIONS | - | 3,845 | | | | | | | - | 3,845 |
| 33 | M4 CARBINE MODS | - | 6,660 | | | | | | | - | 6,660 |
| 34 | SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD) | - | 5,096 | | | | | | | - | 5,096 |
| 35 | MEDIUM MACHINE GUNS (MODS) | - | 2,970 | | | | | | | - | 2,970 |
| 36 | HOWITZER, TOWED, 155MM, M198 (MODS) | 13 | 882 | | | | | | | 13 | 882 |
| 37 | M119 MODIFICATIONS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 38 | M16 RIFLE MODS | - | 2,369 | | | | | | | - | 2,369 |
| 39 | MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | - | 2,220 | | | | | | | - | 2,220 |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | - | 489 | | | | | | | - | 489 |
| 41 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV) | - | 7,089 | | | | | | | - | 7,089 |
| 42 | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | - | 2,675 | | | | | | | - | 2,675 |
| 43 | SMALL ARMS (SOLDIER ENH PROG) | - | 1,117 | | | | | | | - | 1,117 |
| 44 | CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES** | | **84,802** | | **13,900** | | **13,900** | | **-** | | **98,702** |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV) | - | 18,030 | | | | | | | - | 18,030 |
| | **TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **18,030** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **18,030** |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY** | | **1,640,704** | | **556,700** | | **696,700** | | **(140,000)** | | **2,197,404** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Counterattack corps modernization*

The budget request included $113.3 million for fielding M2"A3" Bradley Fighting Vehicle upgrades procured in prior fiscal years. The budget request also included no funds in the M1A2 System Enhancement Program (SEP) for upgrading M1A2 Abrams tanks to the M1A2 SEP tank variant. The budget request also included $268.6 million for M1 Abrams tank modifications, of which $154.4 million is for the procurement of the LV100 engine. However, both the M2 Bradley upgrade and M1A2 Abrams tank upgrade programs were terminated in the fiscal year 2004 budget request.

In light of the dominant role that heavy armored forces played in Operation Iraqi Freedom and their ability to employ rapid maneuver and lethality, as well as support infantry in urban combat, the committee is concerned that the Army has chosen to terminate its heavy armor digitized upgrades at two divisions. In prior years, and in its fiscal year 2003 budget, the Army originally planned to field a counterattack corps comprised of three and one third heavy armored, digitized divisions. However in the fiscal year 2004 budget request, the Army terminated its heavy armored force digital upgrades. The committee is extremely concerned with both the force structure and industrial implications that this new plan may have.

The committee understands that the Army was faced with a series of difficult choices in the construct of its fiscal year 2004 budget request in order to fund Future Combat Systems (FCS) and fulfill other current modernization goals. However, the committee is very concerned that the Army has now abandoned its counterattack corps digital upgrade initiative and not developed a transition plan for the heavy armor production industrial base before it determines what type of FCS ground vehicle technologies and production requirements are needed in order to both sustain its legacy force, which is planned to be maintained through at least 2030, and if required, also transition to be able to produce the next generation FCS ground vehicles.

The committee also understands that an armored cavalry regiment (ACR), the reconnaissance and scout "eyes and ears" of its counterattack corps, was originally scheduled to receive digital upgrades in prior year plans. Currently, this unit has approximately 130 analog M3A2 Bradley scout vehicles and 129 M1A2 Abrams tanks, which can be upgraded with improved digital technologies, such as a second generation forward looking infrared sensor, Force XXI Battle Command, Brigade and Below situational awareness system, and a zero-mile vehicle refurbishment. The committee understands that a M1A2 to M1A2 SEP upgrade unit cost would be $3.6 million per tank and the committee's recommended increase herein for SEP upgrades is based on that cost.

The committee notes that the current AGT–1500 engine in the Abrams tank is the highest operations and support (O&S) cost driver of the vehicle and represents approximately 60 percent of the O&S costs. The committee also notes that the replacement LV100 engine, once fully tested and integrated into the Abrams tank, is expected to result in a 20 percent improvement in fuel consumption and a 43 percent reduction of parts. While the committee is supportive of this program and understands its benefits, it notes

that the LV100 is not ready to enter into procurement because of technical delays due to power shortfalls, and therefore, recommends a decrease of $108.0 million from the Abrams Modification program for the procurement of LV100 engines and a transfer of these funds to the M1A2 SEP program for the procurement of 43 M1A2 Abrams SEP upgrades. Additionally, the committee notes $32.0 million for Abrams Integrated Management refurbishment within the Abrams Upgrade Program is not required if M1A2 SEP tank upgrades are continued and recommends a transfer of this amount to the M1A2 SEP program.

Additionally, the committee notes that $108.0 million for procurement of LV100 engines may become available depending on the outcome of engine reliability testing scheduled for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2003. Also, the committee understands that up to $68.0 million for SEP program components of fiscal year 2003 funds has not been executed. In order to accelerate Abrams SEP tank upgrades, the committee strongly urges the Secretary of the Army to reprogram these funds if they are available to begin upgrades of 43 M1A2 Abrams tanks to the M1A2 Abrams SEP configuration in fiscal year 2003.

The committee recommends $372.1 million, an increase of $258.8 million, for Bradley M3A2 Operation Desert Storm "D+" upgrades, and, an increase of $424.0 million for M1A2 Abrams to M1A2 Abrams SEP tank upgrades, both for counterattack corps modernization and to maintain a warm heavy armor production industrial base. An increase of $44.0 million is also recommended within Other Procurement, Army, for combat support and combat service support equipment for counterattack corps modernization.

## AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $1,310.0 million for Ammunition Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1,429.0 million, an increase of $119.0 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Ammunition Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES | - | 183,731 | | | | | | | - | 183,731 |
| 2 | CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES | - | 65,414 | | | | | | | - | 65,414 |
| 3 | CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES | - | 5,557 | | | | | | | - | 5,557 |
| 4 | CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES | - | 60,484 | | | | | | | - | 60,484 |
| 5 | CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES | - | 8,812 | | 25,000 | | | | | - | 33,812 |
| | M919 Armor Piercing round | | | | | | 25,000 | | | | |
| 7 | CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES | - | 12,941 | | | | | | | - | 12,941 |
| 8 | CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES | - | 126,994 | | | | | | | - | 126,994 |
| | **MORTAR AMMUNITION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | 60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | - | 45,408 | | (1,000) | | | | | - | 44,408 |
| | M769 Full Range Practice round - no production requirement | | | | | | | | (1,000) | | |
| 10 | 81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | - | 14,104 | | | | | | | - | 14,104 |
| 11 | CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ALL TYPES | - | 53,621 | | 12,000 | | | | | - | 65,621 |
| | M930A1 Illumination round | | | | | | 5,000 | | | | |
| | M931 Full Range Practice round | | | | | | 2,000 | | | | |
| | M934A1 HE round | | | | | | 5,000 | | | | |
| | **TANK AMMUNITION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES | - | 20,607 | | | | | | | - | 20,607 |
| 13 | 120MM TANK TRAINING, ALL TYPES | - | 134,270 | | | | | | | - | 134,270 |
| 14 | CTG, TANK, 120MM TACTICAL, ALL TYPES | - | 42,408 | | | | | | | - | 42,408 |
| | **ARTILLERY AMMUNITION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | CTG, ARTY, 75MM: ALL TYPES | - | 34 | | | | | | | - | 34 |
| 16 | CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES | - | 30,151 | | 4,000 | | | | | - | 34,151 |
| | M314 Illumination cartridge | | | | | | 4,000 | | | | |
| 17 | CTG, ARTY, 155MM, ALL TYPES | - | 77,781 | | | | | | | - | 77,781 |
| 18 | REMOTE AREA DENIAL ARTILLERY MUNITION (RADAM) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 19 | MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T | - | 78,949 | | 20,000 | | 20,000 | | | - | 98,949 |
| | **ARTILLERY FUZES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES | - | 47,400 | | | | | | | - | 47,400 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **MINES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 22 | MINE AT VOLCANO,: ALL TYPES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 23 | MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES | - | 14,564 | | | | | | | - | 14,564 |
| 24 | WIDE AREA MUNITIONS (WAM), ALL TYPES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 25 | ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE ALTERNATIVES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **ROCKETS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | SHOULDER FIRED ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | - | 13,836 | | | | | | | - | 13,836 |
| 27 | ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES | - | 21,981 | | 11,000 | | 11,000 | | | - | 32,981 |
| | **OTHER AMMUNITION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | - | 24,959 | | 4,000 | | | | | - | 28,959 |
| | Modernization Demolition Initiators | | | | | | 4,000 | | | | |
| 29 | GRENADES, ALL TYPES | - | 27,010 | | | | | | | - | 27,010 |
| 30 | SIGNALS, ALL TYPES | - | 8,999 | | | | | | | - | 8,999 |
| 31 | SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES | - | 9,035 | | | | | | | - | 9,035 |
| | **MISCELLANEOUS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES | - | 10,529 | | | | | | | - | 10,529 |
| 33 | NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 34 | CAD/PAD ALL TYPES | - | 4,808 | | | | | | | - | 4,808 |
| 35 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 7,697 | | | | | | | - | 7,697 |
| 36 | AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT | - | 7,415 | | | | | | | - | 7,415 |
| 37 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO) | - | 11,868 | | | | | | | - | 11,868 |
| 38 | CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES | - | 98 | | | | | | | - | 98 |
| | **TOTAL AMMUNITION** | | **1,171,465** | | **75,000** | | **76,000** | | **(1,000)** | | **1,246,465** |
| | **AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | - | 33,570 | | 44,000 | | | | | - | 77,570 |
| | Flexible LAP for Modern Munitions | | | | | | 15,000 | | | | |
| | Small Caliber Production Line Upgrades | | | | | | 24,000 | | | | |
| | Medium Caliber Links Manufacturing Die Sets | | | | | | 5,000 | | | | |
| 40 | LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | - | 13,020 | | | | | | | - | 13,020 |
| 41 | MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES | - | 9,664 | | | | | | | - | 9,664 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 42 | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION | - | 77,592 | | | | | | | - | 77,592 |
| 43 | ARMS INITIATIVE | - | 4,655 | | | | | | | - | 4,655 |
| | **TOTAL AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT** | | **138,501** | | **44,000** | | **44,000** | | **-** | | **182,501** |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY** | | **1,309,966** | | **119,000** | | **120,000** | | **(1,000)** | | **1,428,966** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Army ammunition procurement*

The budget request contained $1,310.0 million for procurement of ammunition and production base support. The committee recommends $1,429.0 million, an increase of $119.0 million, for the following types of ammunition programs, of which ammunition production is among the top unfunded requirements identified by the Army Chief of Staff in fiscal year 2004:

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Small/Medium Caliber Ammunition: | |
| CTG 25mm, APFSDS–T M919 | 25.0 |
| Mortar Ammunition: | |
| CTG 60mm Full Range Practice, M769 | (1.0) |
| CTG 120mm M930A1 Illum | 5.0 |
| CTG 120mm M931 Full Range Practice | 2.0 |
| CTG 120mm M934A1 HE | 5.0 |
| Artillery Ammunition: | |
| Cartridge, Artillery 105mm Illum M314 | 4.0 |
| Modular Artillery Charge System | 20.0 |
| Rockets: | |
| HYDRA–70, All Types | 11.0 |
| Demolition Munitions, All Types: | |
| Modernization Demolition Initiators | 4.0 |
| Production Base Support: | |
| Flexible LAP for modern munitions | 15.0 |
| Small Caliber production line upgrades | 24.0 |
| Medium Caliber Links manf. die sets | 5.0 |

*Joint ammunition production base upgrades and capacity*

The budget request contained $138.5 million for ammunition production base support, of which $33.6 million is for the provision of industrial facilities. However, no funds were requested for flexible load, assemble, and pack (LAP) upgrades for modern munitions or small and medium caliber production line upgrades.

In the committee report on H.R. 4546 (H. Rept. 107–436), the committee directed the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by January 15, 2003, which would outline the conventional ammunition industrial base requirements, including LAP capacity, to fulfill the ammunition requirements for the Department of Defense's new capabilities-based strategy and Army Chief of Staff unfunded requirements. The service secretary requested an extension on February 25, 2003, for submission of the report to the congressional defense committees because the strategy needed to be briefed to the Office of the Secretary of Defense prior to its submission to the congressional defense committees. The committee did not receive the report prior to its action on the fiscal year 2004 budget request.

Absent this information, the committee firmly believes that the Department of Defense has not adequately funded or addressed the requirements for production line upgrades to the nation's ammunition production industrial base. Further, the committee believes that these upgrades are required, to not only update World War II-era production lines, but are also needed to fulfill the increased production requirements of the growing shortfalls in war reserve and training ammunition, which have occurred from increased ammunition use in the war on terrorism. These increased requirements span the spectrum, from small to large caliber conventional

ammunition, as well as conventional bombs and other explosive materials. The increased ammunition use rate, combined with the atrophy of the ammunition production industrial base, which occurred as a result of the reduction of procurement funds during the 1990's, has resulted in a limited production capacity in the United States, as well as an increased reliance on foreign sources for ammunition for U.S. soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. The committee is disturbed with these trends.

Absent the Secretary's input, which would have aided the committee in determining where additional resources could have been properly applied, the committee recommends $182.5 million for production base support, an increase of $44.0 million for the following ammunition production base upgrades:

(1) $15.0 million for flexible LAP for modern munitions;

(2) $24.0 million for small caliber production line upgrades; and

(3) $5.0 million for medium caliber links manufacturing die sets.

The committee understands that additional resources will be required to complete these production line upgrades and strongly urges the Secretary of Defense to provide the resources necessary in future fiscal year budgets to complete these upgrades in order to ensure that the U.S. conventional ammunition production base will support the transformational requirements of the nation's 21st Century military.

## OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $4,216.9 million for Other Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $4,321.5 million, an increase of $104.6 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Other Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS | - | 17,977 | | | | | | | - | 17,977 |
| 2 | SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED: | - | 23,950 | | | | | | | - | 23,950 |
| 3 | SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS | - | 9,499 | | | | | | | - | 9,499 |
| 4 | HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV) | - | 137,847 | | 18,000 | | | | | - | 155,847 |
| | Additional M1114s for AR | | | | | | 9,000 | | | | |
| | Additional M1114s for ARNG | | | | | | 9,000 | | | | |
| 5 | TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV) | - | 309,810 | | 40,000 | | | | | - | 349,810 |
| | Additional A1CR vehicles | | | | | | 40,000 | | | | |
| 7 | FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT | - | 14,968 | | | | | | | - | 14,968 |
| 8 | FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV) | - | 133,130 | | 30,900 | | | | | - | 164,030 |
| | Additional HEMTTs for Counterattack Corps | | | | | | 11,900 | | | | |
| | Additonal HEMTTs for ARNG | | | | | | 10,000 | | | | |
| | Movement Tracking System for AR | | | | | | 9,000 | | | | |
| 9 | ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 10 | TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916 | - | 45,772 | | | | | | | - | 45,772 |
| 11 | TOWING DEVICE, 5TH WHEEL | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 12 | TRUCK, TRACTOR, YARD TYPE, M878 (C/S) | 5 | 979 | | | | | | | 5 | 979 |
| 13 | HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV P | 139 | 24,838 | | | | | | | 139 | 24,838 |
| 14 | LINE HAUL ESP | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 15 | MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP | - | 57,061 | | | | | | | - | 57,061 |
| 16 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH) | - | 245 | | | | | | | - | 245 |
| 17 | TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL | 40 | 1,958 | | | | | | | 40 | 1,958 |
| | **NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN | 4 | 608 | | | | | | | 4 | 608 |
| 19 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | - | 3,078 | | | | | | | - | 3,078 |
| 20 | NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER | 85 | 6,260 | | | | | | | 85 | 6,260 |
| | **TOTAL TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES** | | **787,980** | | **88,900** | | **88,900** | | **-** | | **876,880** |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 22 | WIN - TACTICAL PROGRAM | - | 3,231 | | (3,231) | | | | | - | - |
| | Unjustified Request | | | | | | | | (3,231) | | |
| 23 | JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM) | - | 4,570 | | | | | | | - | 4,570 |
| | **COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM | - | 98,272 | | | | | | | - | 98,272 |
| 25 | SHF TERM | - | 17,492 | | | | | | | - | 17,492 |
| 26 | SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE) | - | 5,154 | | | | | | | - | 5,154 |
| 27 | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE) | 14,195 | 44,290 | | | | | | | 14,195 | 44,290 |
| 28 | SMART-T (SPACE) | - | 48,585 | | | | | | | - | 48,585 |
| 29 | SCAMP (SPACE) | - | 600 | | | | | | | - | 600 |
| 30 | SCAMP BLOCK II | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 31 | GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS | - | 8,859 | | | | | | | - | 8,859 |
| 32 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT) | - | 10,668 | | | | | | | - | 10,668 |
| | **COMM - C3 SYSTEM** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS) | - | 16,499 | | | | | | | - | 16,499 |
| | **COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO) | - | 52,384 | | 3,500 | | | | | - | 55,884 |
| | Additional EPLRS for Counterattack Corps | | | | | | 3,500 | | | | |
| 35 | RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2) | - | 2,937 | | | | | | | - | 2,937 |
| 36 | SINCGARS FAMILY | - | 39,275 | | 8,000 | | | | | - | 47,275 |
| | Additional SINCGARS for ARNG | | | | | | 8,000 | | | | |
| 37 | MULTI-PURPOSE INFORMATION OPERATIONS SYSTEMS | 1 | 6,087 | | | | | | | 1 | 6,087 |
| 38 | JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS | - | 850 | | 8,000 | | | | | - | 8,850 |
| | AN/ARS-6(V) COTS Upgrades | | | | | | 8,000 | | | | |
| 39 | ACUS MOD PROGRAM | - | 108,391 | | | | | | | - | 108,391 |
| 40 | COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING | - | 15,903 | | 8,000 | | | | | - | 23,903 |
| | AN/PRC-148 Multiband Inter-Team Radios | | | | | | 8,000 | | | | |
| 41 | SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS | - | 8,025 | | | | | | | - | 8,025 |
| 42 | COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL) | - | 15,393 | | | | | | | - | 15,393 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 43 | MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4) | - | 6,602 | | | | | | | - | 6,602 |
| | **COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | JWICS CONNECTIVITY | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 45 | CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE | - | 1,241 | | | | | | | - | 1,241 |
| | **INFORMATION SECURITY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 46 | TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS) | - | 2,702 | | | | | | | - | 2,702 |
| 47 | INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP | - | 124,419 | | | | | | | - | 124,419 |
| | **COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 | TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION | - | 10,332 | | | | | | | - | 10,332 |
| 49 | BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS | - | 46,835 | | | | | | | - | 46,835 |
| 50 | ARMY DISN ROUTER | - | 6,016 | | | | | | | - | 6,016 |
| 51 | ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP) | - | 457 | | | | | | | - | 457 |
| 52 | WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP) | - | 2,975 | | | | | | | - | 2,975 |
| | **COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 53 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS | - | 328,188 | | | | | | | - | 328,188 |
| 54 | DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS) | - | 12,435 | | | | | | | - | 12,435 |
| 55 | LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN) | - | 96,475 | | 8,000 | | | | | - | 104,475 |
| | Local Area Networks | | | | | | 8,000 | | | | |
| 56 | PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM | - | 14,424 | | | | | | | - | 14,424 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 57 | FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI) | - | 1,624 | | | | | | | - | 1,624 |
| 58 | GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP) | - | 24,632 | | | | | | | - | 24,632 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 59 | ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA) | - | 36,980 | | 700 | | | | | - | 37,680 |
| | Additional ASAS for Counterattack Corps | | | | | | 700 | | | | |
| 60 | JTT/CIBS-M (TIARA) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 61 | PROPHET GROUND (TIARA) | - | 3,175 | | | | | | | - | 3,175 |
| 62 | TUAV | 8 | 73,764 | | | | | | | 8 | 73,764 |
| 63 | ARMY COMMON GROUND STATION (CGS) (TIARA) | - | 8,261 | | | | | | | - | 8,261 |
| 64 | DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA) | - | 13,003 | | | | | | | - | 13,003 |
| 65 | DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 66 | TACTICAL EXPLOITATION SYSTEM (TIARA) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 67 | DCGS-A UNIT OF EMPLOYMENT (JMIP) | - | 2,687 | | | | | | | - | 2,687 |
| 68 | JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION MODS (JTAGS) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 69 | TROJAN (TIARA) | - | 6,535 | | | | | | | - | 6,535 |
| 70 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA) | - | 2,619 | | | | | | | - | 2,619 |
| 71 | CI HUMINT INFO MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CHIMS) (TIA | - | 7,892 | | | | | | | - | 7,892 |
| 72 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TIARA) | 4 | 4,983 | | | | | | | 4 | 4,983 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 73 | SHORTSTOP | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 74 | COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES | - | 2,296 | | | | | | | - | 2,296 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 75 | FAAD GBS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 76 | SENTINEL MODS | - | 17,595 | | | | | | | - | 17,595 |
| 77 | NIGHT VISION DEVICES | - | 65,629 | | | | | | | - | 65,629 |
| 78 | LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | 110 | 50,125 | | | | | | | 110 | 50,125 |
| 79 | LTWT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS) | - | - | | 10,700 | | | | | - | 10,700 |
| | Additional LVRS for USASOC | | | | | | 10,700 | | | | |
| 80 | NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT | 3,104 | 50,504 | | | | | | | 3,104 | 50,504 |
| 81 | COMBAT IDENTIFICATION / AIMING LIGHT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 82 | ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP | - | 13,594 | | | | | | | - | 13,594 |
| 83 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MMS) | - | 644 | | | | | | | - | 644 |
| 84 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MVS) | - | 274 | | | | | | | - | 274 |
| 85 | PROFILER | 10 | 12,591 | | | | | | | 10 | 12,591 |
| 86 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SURV) | - | 35,169 | | | | | | | - | 35,169 |
| 87 | FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2) | 2,674 | 83,200 | | | | | | | 2,674 | 83,200 |
| 88 | LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER | 45 | 12,302 | | | | | | | 45 | 12,302 |
| 89 | MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM | 158 | 39,517 | | | | | | | 158 | 39,517 |
| 90 | INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - TIARA | - | 9,080 | | | | | | | - | 9,080 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 91 | TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS | - | 45,613 | | 23,900 | | | | | - | 69,513 |
| | Additional TOCs for Counterattack Corps | | | | | | 23,900 | | | | |
| 92 | ADV FA TAC DATA SYS / EFF CTRL SYS (AFATDS/EC | - | 22,324 | | | | | | | - | 22,324 |
| 93 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, AFATDS | - | 2,059 | | | | | | | - | 2,059 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 94 | LIGHT WEIGHT TECH FIRE DIRECTION SYS (LWT | - | 3,223 | | | | | | | - | 3,223 |
| 95 | CMBT SVC SUPT CONTROL SYS (CSSCS) | - | 22,197 | | | | | | | - | 22,197 |
| 96 | FAAD C2 | - | 19,474 | | | | | | | - | 19,474 |
| 97 | AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (AMD | - | 8,996 | | | | | | | - | 8,996 |
| 98 | FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE / LIGHTWEIGHT FED (FED/L | - | 6,023 | | | | | | | - | 6,023 |
| 99 | KNIGHT FAMILY | - | 6,732 | | 28,500 | | | | | - | 35,232 |
| | Knight Family for ARNG | | | | | | 28,500 | | | | |
| 100 | LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS) | - | 1,814 | | | | | | | - | 1,814 |
| 101 | LOGTECH | - | 8,774 | | | | | | | - | 8,774 |
| 102 | TC AIMS II | - | 17,492 | | | | | | | - | 17,492 |
| 103 | GUN LAYING AND POS SYS (GLPS) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 104 | ISYSCON EQUIPMENT | - | 21,528 | | | | | | | - | 21,528 |
| 105 | JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JNMS) | - | 9,452 | | | | | | | - | 9,452 |
| 106 | TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER | - | 8,321 | | | | | | | - | 8,321 |
| 107 | MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS) | 201 | 37,141 | | 4,000 | | | | | 201 | 41,141 |
| | Additional MCS for Counterattack Corps | | | | | | 4,000 | | | | |
| 108 | STAMIS TACTICAL COMPUTERS (STACOMP) | - | 46,233 | | | | | | | - | 46,233 |
| 109 | STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM | - | 361 | | | | | | | - | 361 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 110 | ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION | - | 6,186 | | | | | | | - | 6,186 |
| 111 | AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP | - | 213,055 | | | | | | | - | 213,055 |
| 112 | RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS) | - | 45,789 | | | | | | | - | 45,789 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 113 | SPECIAL INFORMATION OPERATIONS (SIO) (TIARA) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 114 | AFRTS | - | 2,519 | | | | | | | - | 2,519 |
| 115 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V) | - | 3,879 | | | | | | | - | 3,879 |
| 116 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT) | - | 2,047 | | | | | | | - | 2,047 |
| | **ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 117 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E) | - | 426 | | | | | | | - | 426 |
| | **TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | **2,300,899** | | **100,069** | | **103,300** | | **(3,231)** | | **2,400,968** |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 118 | SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM) | - | 35,252 | | | | | | | - | 35,252 |
| | **BRIDGING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 119 | TACTICAL BRIDGING | - | 42,539 | | | | | | | - | 42,539 |
| 120 | TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON | - | 59,393 | | | | | | | - | 59,393 |
| | **ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 121 | DISPENSER, MINE M139 | - | 5,231 | | | | | | | - | 5,231 |
| 122 | TOWED VOLCANO DELIVERY SYSTEM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 123 | VOLCANO LIGHT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 124 | HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-HST | 69 | 1,766 | | | | | | | 69 | 1,766 |
| 125 | KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING | 12 | 2,314 | | | | | | | 12 | 2,314 |
| 126 | GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (GSTAMIDS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 127 | WIDE AREA MUNITIONS (REMOTE CONTROL UNIT) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 128 | ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS) | 36 | 8,247 | | | | | | | 36 | 8,247 |
| 129 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT) | - | 9,398 | | | | | | | - | 9,398 |
| 130 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT | 3 | 624 | | | | | | | 3 | 624 |
| | **COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 131 | HEATERS AND ECU'S | - | 13,544 | | | | | | | - | 13,544 |
| 132 | LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES | - | 5,979 | | | | | | | - | 5,979 |
| 133 | FLOODLIGHT SET, ELEC, TRL MTD, 3 LIGHTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 134 | SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT | 795 | 4,286 | | | | | | | 795 | 4,286 |
| 135 | LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME) | - | 7,577 | | | | | | | - | 7,577 |
| 136 | LAND WARRIOR | 2,425 | 94,827 | (2,425) | (94,827) | | | (2,425) | | - | - |
| | Transfer to W&TCV-25 "M249 SAW" | | | | | | | | (6,900) | | |
| | Transfer to PE 64713A | | | | | | | | (58,500) | | |
| | Transfer to OPA-40 | | | | | | | | (8,000) | | |
| | Reduction - Not ready for procurement | | | | | | | | (21,427) | | |
| 137 | AUTHORIZED STOCKAGE LIST MOBILITY SYSTEM (ASL | - | 4,451 | | | | | | | - | 4,451 |
| 138 | FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT | - | 16,021 | | | | | | | - | 16,021 |
| 139 | AIR DROP PROGRAM | - | 4,892 | | | | | | | - | 4,892 |
| 140 | CAMOUFLAGE: ULCANS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 141 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (ENG SPT EQ) | - | 10,947 | | | | | | | - | 10,947 |
| 142 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CSS EQ) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 143 | QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 144 | DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER | - | 24,205 | | | | | | | - | 24,205 |
| 145 | INLAND PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM | - | 1,182 | | | | | | | - | 1,182 |
| | **WATER EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 146 | WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS | - | 15,809 | | | | | | | - | 15,809 |
| | **MEDICAL EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 147 | COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL | - | 16,555 | | 2,000 | | | | | - | 18,555 |
| | Medical Logistics Battalion Computer Sets | | | | | | 2,000 | | | | |
| | **MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 148 | SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP) | 186 | 12,855 | | | | | | | 186 | 12,855 |
| 149 | WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD | 112 | 5,873 | | | | | | | 112 | 5,873 |
| 150 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ) | - | 4,002 | | | | | | | - | 4,002 |
| | **CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 151 | GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 152 | SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 153 | DISTR, WATER, SP MIN 2500G SEC/NON-SEC | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 154 | MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING | - | 16,607 | | | | | | | - | 16,607 |
| 155 | COMPACTOR | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 156 | LOADERS | - | 8,148 | | | | | | | - | 8,148 |
| 157 | HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 158 | DEPLOYABLE UNIVERSAL COMBAT EARTH MOVERS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 159 | TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED | - | - | | 10,000 | | | | | - | 10,000 |
| | Additional Dozers for Counterattack Corps | | | | | | 5,000 | | | | |
| | Additional Dozers for ARNG | | | | | | 5,000 | | | | |
| 160 | CRANES | - | 4,131 | | | | | | | - | 4,131 |
| 161 | CRUSHING/SCREENING PLANT, 150 TPH | 1 | 1,781 | | | | | | | 1 | 1,781 |
| 162 | PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING | 1 | 1,937 | | | | | | | 1 | 1,937 |
| 163 | ARMORED COMBAT EARTHMOVER, M9 ACE | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 164 | HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) | 15 | 4,842 | | | | | | | 15 | 4,842 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 165 | CONST EQUIP ESP | - | - | | 10,000 | | | | | - | 10,000 |
| | SLEP for ARNG and AR | | | | | | 10,000 | | | | |
| 166 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP) | - | 6,305 | | | | | | | - | 6,305 |
| | **RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 167 | FLOATING CRANE, 100-250 TON | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 168 | LOGISTIC SUPPORT VESSEL (LSV) | - | - | 1 | 36,500 | 1 | 33,000 | | | 1 | 36,500 |
| | Small Tugs | | | | | | 3,500 | | | | |
| 169 | CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 170 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL) | - | 7,860 | | | | | | | - | 7,860 |
| | **GENERATORS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 171 | GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP | - | 62,853 | | | | | | | - | 62,853 |
| | **MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 172 | ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH) | 72 | 36,237 | | | | | | | 72 | 36,237 |
| 173 | ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM | 142 | 22,422 | | | | | | | 142 | 22,422 |
| 174 | MHE EXTENDED SERVICE PROGRAM (ESP) | 6 | 1,329 | | | | | | | 6 | 1,329 |
| 175 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MHE) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TRAINING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 176 | COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS (CTC) SUPPORT | - | 36,827 | | | | | | | - | 36,827 |
| 177 | TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM | - | 165,254 | | 10,000 | | | | | - | 175,254 |
| | Laser Markmanship Training Systems for Army Reserve | | | | | | 10,000 | | | | |
| 178 | CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER | - | 71,692 | | | | | | | - | 71,692 |
| 179 | AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (AVCA | - | 10,295 | | | | | | | - | 10,295 |
| | **TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 180 | CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT | - | 18,304 | | | | | | | - | 18,304 |
| 181 | INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE) | - | 27,952 | | 10,000 | | | | | - | 37,952 |
| | Additional TSC-750 Maintenance Support Devices | | | | | | 10,000 | | | | |
| 182 | TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD) | - | 14,718 | | | | | | | - | 14,718 |
| 183 | ARMY DIAGNOSTICS IMPROVEMENT PGM (ADIP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 184 | RECONFIGURABLE SIMULATORS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 185 | PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3) | - | 75,288 | | | | | | | - | 75,288 |
| 186 | BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT | - | 15,026 | | | | | | | - | 15,026 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 187 | MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3) | - | 47,918 | | | | | | | - | 47,918 |
| 188 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH) | - | 2,571 | | | | | | | - | 2,571 |
| 189 | SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING | - | 11,526 | | | | | | | - | 11,526 |
| 190 | MA8975 | - | 2,419 | | | | | | | - | 2,419 |
| 191 | CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | **1,082,011** | | **(16,327)** | | **78,500** | | **(94,827)** | | **1,065,684** |
| | **SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **OPA2** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 192 | INITIAL SPARES - C&E | - | 44,714 | | | | | | | - | 44,714 |
| | **OPA3** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 193 | INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP | - | 1,250 | | | | | | | - | 1,250 |
| | **TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **45,964** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **45,964** |
| | Information Technology General Reduction | | | | (68,000) | | | | (68,000) | | (68,000) |
| | **TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY** | | **4,216,854** | | **104,642** | | **270,700** | | **(166,058)** | | **4,321,496** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Communications-electronics equipment fielding*

The budget request contained $15.9 million for the procurement and fielding of communications-electronics equipment, but included no funds for the procurement of the AN/PRC–148 Multiband Inter-Team Radio (MBITR).

The AN/PRC–148 MBITR is the interim platoon, squad and specials operations team leader radio for selected light infantry units, which provides small unit secure and non-secure communications. The committee notes that this radio will provide small unit communications until the Joint Tactical Radio System handheld "cluster II" requirements are identified and developed and that additional requirements for the MBITR exist in infantry units. The committee also notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified a $9.4 million fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirement for the AN/PRC–148 MBITR as part of the rapid fielding initiative.

The committee recommends $23.9 million, an increase of $8.0 million, for additional AN/PRC–148 MBITR systems for the rapid fielding initiative and notes that this increase is a transfer of funds from the Land Warrior program.

*Construction equipment ESP*

The budget request contained no funds for a construction equipment service life extension program (SLEP) for the Army National Guard or Army Reserve.

The committee notes that this SLEP has been an extremely successful program in prior fiscal years for both the active and reserve components and provides for an overhaul and "zero-mile" refurbishment of aging combat construction equipment. The committee also notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified a $10.2 million fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirement for this purpose.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for construction equipment SLEP for the reserve component.

*Family of heavy tactical vehicles*

The budget request contained $133.0 million to procure palletized load systems, heavy equipment transporter systems, heavy expanded mobility tactical trucks and other related equipment of which $10.4 million was included to procure 656 movement tracking systems (MTS). However, no funds were budgeted for the Army Reserve.

The MTS is a satellite-based tracking, communication system providing combat service support units with total asset visibility, global positioning system vehicle location, and tracking and two-way text messaging between stationary base locations and vehicles.

The committee understands the MTS significantly enhances the Army's ability to strategically position vehicles based on battlefield requirements, monitor, and track re-supply items, while providing near real-time command and control of in-theater logistical requirements and assets. As Army Reserve deployments increase, the committee believes there is an increasing need for better communications interoperability between the digitized Counterattack Corps and mobilized Reserve combat service support units directly participating in real world scenarios. The committee also notes the

Chief of the Army Reserve has identified a fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirement for MTS.

The committee recommends $142.0 million for the family of heavy tactical vehicles, an increase of $9.0 million, to accelerate procurement of MTS for the Army Reserve.

*Full tracked tractor*

The budget request contained no funds to procure full tracked tractor dozers for either the Counterattack Corps or the Army National Guard (ARNG).

The full tracked tractor dozer provides a heavy dozing and clearing capability for combat heavy construction battalions and construction support companies in support of heavy forces and national emergency response by the ARNG. The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified a fiscal year 2004, $18.4 million unfunded requirement for these vehicles.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million, $5.0 million for active component dozers, and, $5.0 million for ARNG dozers to field additional capability in support of heavy counterattack corps and ARNG requirements.

*High mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicles (HMMWVs)*

The budget request contained $137.8 million for HMMWVs, of which $38.4 million was included to procure 250 of the M1114 Up-Armor variant.

The Up-Armor HMMWV is a multi-service, four wheel drive utility vehicle that provides proven ballistic protection for soldiers from anti-personnel and anti-tank mines and armored piercing munitions. The committee notes the Chief of the National Guard has identified a critical shortfall of 3,410 vehicles, and the Chief of the Army Reserve has identified this program as a top unfunded requirement. The committee understands these additional vehicles will supplement deployed Army Reserve units in combat support missions and also accelerate fielding to the National Guard, now performing expanded homeland security duties.

The committee recommends $155.8 million, an increase of $18.0 million for additional M1114 Up-Armor HMMWVs to address guard and reserve shortfalls, recognizing the ongoing importance of force protection and in light of lessons learned from previous urban and combat operations.

*Joint tactical area command systems*

The budget request contained $900,000 for management of joint tactical area command systems, but included no funds to upgrade existing AN/ARS–6 (V) personnel locator communications systems with state-of-the-art, commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) technology.

The AN/ARS–6 (V) personnel locator communications system is an airborne electronic locator, which can precisely locate survivors on the ground equipped with AN/PRC–112 survival radios. The committee understands that this COTS upgrade will include a global positioning system waveform for currently fielded systems, but is also required as well to provide interoperability with next generation Combat Survivor Evader Locator survival radios. The committee believes that this capability may aid in the rescue and recovery of personnel and survivors in extremis situations.

The committee recommends $8.9 million for joint tactical area command systems, an increase of $8.0 million, for AN/ARS–6 (V) COTS insertion upgrades.

*Knight family*

The budget request contained $6.7 million for engineering support and fielding of the Knight command and control and targeting system, but included no funds for the procurement of Knight systems for the Army National Guard (ARNG).

The Knight system is a high mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicle mounted system, which incorporates a Bradley fire support vehicle mission equipment package of a laser rangefinder/designator, thermal sight, handheld computer, and both inertial navigation and global positioning systems. The Knight system is operated by combat observation lasing teams as an integral part of heavy and light division and ARNG enhanced separate brigade reconnaissance teams to locate and designate targets for laser-guided ordnance.

The committee notes that the system will be terminated in fiscal year 2004, which will only allow this system to be fielded to Counterattack Corps units and that funds appropriated in prior years for the ARNG Knight systems enabled the fielding of only approximately 50 percent of the requirement for an ARNG enhanced separate brigade.

The committee recommends $35.2 million, an increase of $28.5 million for 39 Knight family systems to accelerate fielding to the ARNG.

*Land warrior*

The budget request contained $94.8 million for the procurement of Land Warrior systems. The committee notes that this system failed developmental tests and that the program has been restructured in fiscal year 2003 to continue development of system software to correct reliability deficiencies which resulted in the developmental test failure. The committee also notes that this is the Army's second unsuccessful attempt to enter into procurement of the Land Warrior system, the last of which occurred six years ago in fiscal year 1999. The committee understands that technologies incorporated into this system, which would enhance a soldier's situational awareness, are continually improving. As a result, the committee is very concerned with these continued program delays and that the Army has not structured this program to field capabilities in a block format. The committee strongly urges the Army to freeze an achievable design so this system can enter into procurement and be fielded to warfighters who would benefit from it. The committee will monitor the system's progress through fiscal year 2004 and will consider less costly alternative technologies in the future, which are readily available and can be rapidly fielded, if this system does not show improvement in development.

Consequently, the Army has restructured the program and requested, and the committee recommends, that $58.5 million be transferred from procurement to PE 64713A for continued system development and demonstration. Further, the committee recommends no funds for the procurement of the Land Warrior system, however, it recommends a transfer of $6.9 million to Weapons

and Tracked Combat Vehicles for the procurement of Squad Automatic Weapons, and, $8.0 million to Other Procurement, Army, Communications-Electronics Equipment Fielding for AN/PRC–148 radios.

*Lightweight video reconnaissance system (LVRS)*

The budget request contained no funds for LVRS.

The LVRS provides scouts, long range surveillance units, and special operations forces the capability to capture still frame photographic images in all light conditions, especially low light and low visibility situations, and then transmit those images via military radio to higher headquarters for near real-time information, intelligence and enhanced situational awareness. The committee notes this system was terminated by the Secretary of the Army in the fiscal year 2004 budget request because the Land Warrior system was to replace its capability. However, the committee notes that the Land Warrior system will not enter into procurement in fiscal year 2004 as originally planned, and notes that an increase of $10.7 million would procure enough LVRS to complete fielding to the United States Army Special Operations Command (USASOC).

The committee recommends an increase of $10.7 million for the procurement of LVRS to complete the fielding of this system to USASOC.

*Local area network upgrades*

The budget request contained $96.5 million to upgrade the local area networks at several Army installations. The local area network forms the communications backbone of an installation, and is a critical component that enables an installation to rapidly and efficiently deploy the combat units resident at that installation. The committee is concerned that the installations hosting XVIII Airborne Corps major units have not received necessary upgrades to ensure that the Army's combat power can move quickly when needed and believes that additional effort is required to fully upgrade these local area networks. At some locations, outmoded asynchronous transmission mode switching equipment has not been replaced by gigabit ethernet switching with open standard spaced software. The committee believes the installations hosting these important units should be upgraded as soon as possible to ensure compatibility with Army-wide open standard systems.

The committee recommends $104.5 million for upgrades of Army installation local area networks, an increase of $8.0 million.

*Logistic support vessel (LSV)*

The budget request contained no funds for procurement of an LSV.

The Department of the Army's eight-ship LSV fleet provides worldwide transport of its combat vehicles, personnel and sustainment cargo, and is capable of ship-to-shore operations including those in remote areas with unimproved beaches or inland waterways. The committee notes that the recent Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom have highlighted the importance of LSV's to the Army's strategic vision of rapid brigade and division deployment, and believes that an additional LSV would meet emerging requirements to support the global war on terrorism.

The committee recommends an increase of $33.0 million for an additional LSV.

*Nonsystem training devices*

The budget request contained $165.3 million to procure nonsytem training devices, but included no funds to procure BEAMHIT laser marksmanship training systems (LMTS) for the Army Reserve.

The committee understands that the Army Reserve lacks adequate BEAMHIT LMTS to maintain marksmanship training skills. The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff increased marksmanship training and readiness requirements for combat service support (CSS) and combat support (CS) units to fight the global war on terrorism, after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States. The committee also notes that the Army Reserve comprises a substantial amount of the Army's CSS and CS units.

The committee recommends $175.3 million, an increase of $10.0 million, for additional BEAMHIT LMTS for the Army Reserve.

*Warfighter information network-tactical (WIN–T)*

The budget request contained $3.2 million for the procurement of "prototype sensor particulate, noble gas detection equipment and associated field station infrastructure for automated, remote operation for WIN–T."

The committee notes that the justification for this program does not fit the information system requirements outlined in the WIN–T operational requirements document and notes that procurement was not planned to begin until fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommends a decrease of $3.2 million for WIN–T.

## AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $8,788.1 million for Aircraft Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $9,050.0 million, an increase of $261.9 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Aircraft Procurement, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **COMBAT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP) | - | 12,493 | | | | | | | - | 12,493 |
| 2 | F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) | 42 | 3,054,092 | | 25,000 | | | | | 42 | 3,079,092 |
| | F/A-18E/F Aircraft Armament Equipment | | | | | | 25,000 | | | | |
| 2 | F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) | - | (107,712) | | | | | | | - | (107,712) |
| 3 | F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 3 | F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 3 | F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) | - | 84,765 | | | | | | | - | 84,765 |
| 3 | F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 5 | V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) | 9 | 874,045 | | | | | | | 9 | 874,045 |
| 5 | V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) | - | (40,936) | | | | | | | - | (40,936) |
| 6 | V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) | - | 39,058 | | | | | | | - | 39,058 |
| 6 | V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 7 | AH-1W (HELICOPTER) SEA COBRA | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 8 | UH-1Y/AH-1Z | 9 | 310,799 | | | | | | | 9 | 310,799 |
| 9 | MH-60S (MYP) | 13 | 413,896 | | | | | | | 13 | 413,896 |
| 9 | MH-60S (MYP) | - | (77,360) | | | | | | | - | (77,360) |
| 10 | MH-60S (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 10 | MH-60S (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 10 | MH-60S (MYP) | - | 94,972 | | | | | | | - | 94,972 |
| 10 | MH-60S (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 11 | MH-60R | 6 | 380,723 | | | | | | | 6 | 380,723 |
| 11 | MH-60R | - | (28,666) | | | | | | | - | (28,666) |
| 12 | MH-60R | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 12 | MH-60R | - | 46,472 | | | | | | | - | 46,472 |
| 12 | MH-60R | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 13 | E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP) | 2 | 238,063 | | | | | | | 2 | 238,063 |
| 13 | E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP) | - | (26,966) | | | | | | | - | (26,966) |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 14 | E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 14 | E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 14 | E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP) | - | 17,409 | | | | | | | - | 17,409 |
| 14 | E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL COMBAT AIRCRAFT** | | **5,285,147** | | **25,000** | | **25,000** | | **-** | | **5,310,147** |
| | **AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | MH-60S (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 15 | MH-60S (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 16 | UC-35 | 2 | 15,579 | | | | | | | 2 | 15,579 |
| 17 | C-40A | 1 | 63,952 | | | | | | | 1 | 63,952 |
| 18 | C-37 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | **79,531** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **79,531** |
| | **TRAINER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | T-39 | 1 | 22,018 | | | | | | | 1 | 22,018 |
| 20 | T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK | 15 | 339,201 | | | | | | | 15 | 339,201 |
| 20 | T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 21 | JPATS | - | 2,399 | | 14,700 | | | | | - | 17,099 |
| | T-6A aircraft and ground based systems | | | | | | 14,700 | | | | |
| | **TOTAL TRAINER AIRCRAFT** | | **363,618** | | **14,700** | | **14,700** | | **-** | | **378,318** |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | KC-130J | - | 39,163 | | | | | | | - | 39,163 |
| 22 | KC-130J | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 23 | KC-130J | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 23 | KC-130J | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 23 | KC-130J | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 23 | KC-130J | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 23 | KC-130J | - | 40,000 | | | | | | | - | 40,000 |
| 23 | KC-130J | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 24 | F-5 | 4 | 1,947 | | | | | | | 4 | 1,947 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | **81,110** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **81,110** |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | EA-6 SERIES | - | 207,146 | | 132,400 | | | | | - | 339,546 |
| | EA-6B OWP | | | | | | 60,000 | | | | |
| | EA-6B OBOGS | | | | | | 6,000 | | | | |
| | EA-6B ICAP III kits | | | | | | 66,400 | | | | |
| 26 | AV-8 SERIES | - | 20,866 | | 37,000 | | | | | - | 57,866 |
| | Litening AT pods and conversion of Litening II to AT | | | | | | 37,000 | | | | |
| 27 | F-14 SERIES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 28 | ADVERSARY | - | 2,649 | | | | | | | - | 2,649 |
| 29 | F-18 SERIES | - | 335,894 | | | | | | | - | 335,894 |
| 30 | H-46 SERIES | - | 81,072 | | 4,000 | | | | | - | 85,072 |
| | CH-46 OSIP Inventory Adjustment | | | | | | 4,000 | | | | |
| 31 | AH-1W SERIES | - | 5,810 | | | | | | | - | 5,810 |
| 32 | H-53 SERIES | - | 9,676 | | | | | | | - | 9,676 |
| 33 | SH-60 SERIES | - | 18,405 | | | | | | | - | 18,405 |
| 34 | H-1 SERIES | - | 3,492 | | 12,000 | | | | | - | 15,492 |
| | AH/UH-1 IR Suppression System mods. | | | | | | 12,000 | | | | |
| 35 | H-3 SERIES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 36 | EP-3 SERIES | - | 31,506 | | 8,700 | | | | | - | 40,206 |
| | USQ-146 Communication Jammer Upgrade | | | | | | 8,700 | | | | |
| 37 | P-3 SERIES | - | 94,972 | | 9,000 | | | | | - | 103,972 |
| | Electro-optics and Communications Upgrades | | | | | | 9,000 | | | | |
| 38 | S-3 SERIES | - | 8,364 | | | | | | | - | 8,364 |
| 39 | E-2 SERIES | - | 43,139 | | | | | | | - | 43,139 |
| 40 | TRAINER A/C SERIES | - | 10,497 | | | | | | | - | 10,497 |
| 41 | C-2A | - | 35,318 | | | | | | | - | 35,318 |
| 42 | C-130 SERIES | - | 6,554 | | | | | | | - | 6,554 |
| 43 | FEWSG | - | 565 | | | | | | | - | 565 |
| 44 | CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES | - | 13,290 | | | | | | | - | 13,290 |
| 45 | E-6 SERIES | - | 48,517 | | | | | | | - | 48,517 |
| 46 | EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES | - | 26,537 | | | | | | | - | 26,537 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 47 | SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT | - | 49,601 | | | | | | | - | 49,601 |
| 48 | T-45 SERIES | - | 22,321 | | 19,100 | | | | | - | 41,421 |
| | T-45A to C Conversion | | | | | | 19,100 | | | | |
| 49 | POWER PLANT CHANGES | - | 21,564 | | | | | | | - | 21,564 |
| 50 | JPATS SERIES | - | 534 | | | | | | | - | 534 |
| 51 | AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS | - | 6,358 | | | | | | | - | 6,358 |
| 52 | COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT | - | 20,729 | | | | | | | - | 20,729 |
| 53 | COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES | - | 148,627 | | | | | | | - | 148,627 |
| 54 | MV-22 MODIFICATIONS | - | 4,814 | | | | | | | - | 4,814 |
| | **TOTAL MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT** | | **1,278,817** | | **222,200** | | **222,200** | | **-** | | **1,501,017** |
| | **AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 1,158,057 | | | | | | | - | 1,158,057 |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **1,158,057** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **1,158,057** |
| | **AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (M) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 57 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (88) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 58 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJ (89) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 59 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (90) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 60 | PEACEKEEPER | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 61 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | - | 460,865 | | | | | | | - | 460,865 |
| 62 | AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | - | 15,487 | | | | | | | - | 15,487 |
| 63 | WAR CONSUMABLES | - | 11,247 | | | | | | | - | 11,247 |
| 64 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | - | 25,790 | | | | | | | - | 25,790 |
| 65 | SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 26,785 | | | | | | | - | 26,785 |
| 66 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | - | 1,694 | | | | | | | - | 1,694 |
| 67 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | **541,868** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **541,868** |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | **8,788,148** | | **261,900** | | **261,900** | | **-** | | **9,050,048** |

Items of Special Interest

*AV–8B series modifications*

The budget request contained $20.9 million for AV–8B series modifications, but included no funds for Litening advanced airborne targeting and navigation (AT) pods or for the upgrade of Litening II pods to the Litening AT configuration.

The Litening AT pod is the next generation Litening pod system that will incorporate an advanced forward-looking infra-red radar and other enhancements to the existing multi-sensor and precision strike capability. The committee understands that the Marine Corps has a requirement for 98 Litening targeting pods but has thus far only procured 76, for a shortfall of 22. Additionally, the committee understands that the Marine Corps has a requirement to upgrade eight Litening II pods to the Litening AT configuration so that all AV–8B Litening pods maintain the same configuration. The committee notes that both the 22 Litening AT pods and the upgrade of eight Litening II pods to the Litening AT configuration are included among the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommends $57.9 million for AV–8B series modifications, an increase of $37.0 million for this purpose.

*EA–6B modifications*

The budget request contained $207.1 million for EA–6B modifications, of which $89.6 million was included for improved capabilities (ICAP) III modification kits, but included no funds to replace the outer wing panel (OWP), or for the on-board oxygen-generating system (OBOGS). The Department of the Navy's fleet of 121 EA–6B aircraft is the Department of Defense's only aircraft configured to provide the electronic-jamming capability to deny and degrade the acquisition of friendly forces by enemy air defense systems.

The ICAP III modification significantly improves the EA–6B's ability to suppress and destroy modern enemy air defenses by accurately identifying the specific emitter type, and by providing the enemy emitter's range and bearing thereby allowing timely employment of suppression or destruction weapons. The committee notes that both the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps have included additional ICAP III modification kits among their unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2004, and therefore recommends an increase of $66.4 million for eight additional ICAP III modification kits.

The committee understands that recent EA–6B fatigue life inspections have revealed that OWPs are aging more rapidly than expected due to fatigue cracking, and that this situation has prompted the Navy to ground eight of its EA–6Bs in December 2002, and to restrict EA–6B flight operations in 23 aircraft to less than three times the force of gravity, or "g's," rather than its full operating envelope of 5.5 g's. To restore these aircraft to their full operating envelope, OWPs must be replaced and the committee notes that the Chief of Naval Operations has included replacement EA–6B OWPs among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2004. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $60.0 million to procure and install 18 OWP sets.

The OBOGS replaces the antiquated liquid oxygen system by creating a continuous supply of breathing oxygen to aircrews by using pressurized engine bleed air routed through a molecular sieve which removes nitrogen, yielding 93 percent pure oxygen. The committee understands that the EA–6B is one of two remaining non-OBOGS equipped carrier wing aircraft, and that additional funds are required in fiscal year 2004 to complete non-recurring engineering to fully integrate OBOGS in the EA–6B. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million for this purpose.

In total, the committee recommends $339.5 million for EA–6B modifications, an increase of $132.4 million.

*Joint Primary Air Training System (JPATS)*

The budget request contained $2.4 million for procurement of JPATS support equipment, but included no funds to procure T–6A aircraft or associated ground-based training systems.

The JPATS, consisting of both the T–6A aircraft and a ground-based training system, will be used by the Navy and Air Force for primary pilot training. The T–6A will replace both the Navy's T–34 and Air Force's T–37B fleets, providing safer, more economical and more effective training for future student pilots.

Despite the Department of the Navy's intention not to continue JPATS procurement until fiscal year 2007, the committee continues to believe that its procurement for the Navy would not only reduce procurement costs for both the Navy and the Air Force but would also reduce operations and maintenance costs.

The committee recommends $17.1 million for JPATS, an increase of $14.7 million for T–6A aircraft and associated ground-based training systems.

*P–3 series modifications*

The budget request contained $95.0 million for P–3 series modifications but included no funds for procurement of electro-optic sensors and communications upgrades for non anti-surface warfare improvement program (AIP) equipped aircraft.

The AIP upgrade improves the P–3's communications, survivability, and over-the-horizon targeting capabilities through the installation of commercial-off-the-shelf components. The committee understands that AIP-equipped P–3s are the theater commander's platform of choice for overland intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) missions, and that, as a result of extensive tasking, AIP-equipped P–3s are rapidly consuming aircraft life. The committee notes, however, that of the Navy's 288-aircraft P–3 inventory, only 69 aircraft have been, or are planned to be, modified with the AIP upgrade leaving 219 aircraft that have been subject to a diminished theater commander demand. The committee understands that some of the remaining 219 non-AIP equipped aircraft could be upgraded with electro-optic sensors and communication upgrades allowing those P–3 aircraft to assume lower priority ISR missions thereby conserving aircraft life on AIP-equipped P–3 aircraft.

The committee recommends $104.0 million, an increase of $9.0 million for procurement of electro-optic sensors and communication upgrades for one non-AIP equipped P–3 aircraft and its associated non-recurring engineering.

*T–45A to T–45C conversion*

The budget request contained $22.3 million for T–45 series modifications, but included no funds for the conversion of T–45A aircraft to the T–45C configuration. The T–45 is a two-seat, aircraft carrier-capable aircraft used for the Navy's intermediate-level undergraduate pilot training. The T–45A has an analog cockpit, while the T–45C is equipped with digital cockpit displays.

The committee understands that the T–45A's analog cockpit display configuration does not provide the same quality of training provided by the T–45C's digital cockpit display design since current aircraft such as the F/A–18E/F are equipped with digital cockpit displays and future aircraft such as the F–35 are also planned to have digital cockpit displays. The committee also understands that the Navy Chief of Naval Air Training has identified the conversion of T–45A's to the T–45C configuration as his number two priority.

The committee recommends $41.4 million for T–45 series modifications, an increase of $19.1 million for conversion of T–45A aircraft to the T–45C configuration, to improve the quality of T–45 pilot training.

## WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $1,991.8 million for Weapons Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $2,529.8 million, an increase of $538.0 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Weapons Procurement, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **BALLISTIC MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | TRIDENT II | 12 | 688,028 | | | | | | | 12 | 688,028 |
| 1 | TRIDENT II | - | (12,819) | | | | | | | - | (12,819) |
| 2 | TRIDENT II | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **MODIFICATION OF MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | TRIDENT II MODS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | - | 1,305 | | | | | | | - | 1,305 |
| | **TOTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES** | | **676,514** | | - | | - | | - | | **676,514** |
| | **OTHER MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **STRATEGIC MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | TOMAHAWK | 267 | 277,588 | 333 | 376,000 | | | | | 600 | 653,588 |
| | Additional Missiles | | | | | 333 | 336,000 | | | | |
| | Tooling and Testing | | | | | | 40,000 | | | | |
| 5a | AFFORDABLE WEAPON | | | 2,000 | 138,000 | 2,000 | 138,000 | | | 2,000 | 138,000 |
| 6 | ESSM | 105 | 112,774 | | | | | | | 105 | 112,774 |
| | **TACTICAL MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | AMRAAM | 53 | 37,648 | | | | | | | 53 | 37,648 |
| 8 | SIDEWINDER | 167 | 35,818 | | | | | | | 167 | 35,818 |
| 9 | JSOW | 429 | 138,451 | | | | | | | 429 | 138,451 |
| 10 | SLAM-ER | 84 | 54,145 | | | | | | | 84 | 54,145 |
| 11 | STANDARD MISSILE | 75 | 148,308 | | | | | | | 75 | 148,308 |
| 12 | RAM | 90 | 48,315 | | | | | | | 90 | 48,315 |
| 13 | AERIAL TARGETS | - | 70,676 | | 15,000 | | | | | - | 85,676 |
| | GQM-163A Coyote Supersonic Sea Skimming Target | | | | | | 15,000 | | | | |
| 14 | DRONES AND DECOYS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 15 | OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT | - | 10,943 | | | | | | | - | 10,943 |
| | **MODIFICATION OF MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | SIDEWINDER MODS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 17 | HARM MODS | - | 7,787 | | | | | | | - | 7,787 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 18 | STANDARD MISSILES MODS | - | 50,836 | | | | | | | - | 50,836 |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | - | 7,443 | | | | | | | - | 7,443 |
| 20 | FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 15,361 | | | | | | | - | 15,361 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER MISSILES** | | **1,016,093** | | **529,000** | | **529,000** | | **-** | | **1,545,093** |
| | **TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | ASW TARGETS | - | 25,532 | | | | | | | - | 25,532 |
| | **MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | MK-46 TORPEDO MODS | - | 34,249 | | | | | | | - | 34,249 |
| 24 | MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS | - | 60,372 | | | | | | | - | 60,372 |
| 25 | QUICKSTRIKE MINE | - | 3,210 | | | | | | | - | 3,210 |
| | **SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 24,943 | | | | | | | - | 24,943 |
| 27 | ASW RANGE SUPPORT | - | 12,811 | | | | | | | - | 12,811 |
| | **DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | - | 2,776 | | | | | | | - | 2,776 |
| | **TOTAL TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT** | | **163,893** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **163,893** |
| | **OTHER WEAPONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | - | 4,240 | | | | | | | - | 4,240 |
| 30 | COAST GUARD WEAPONS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 31 | AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | CIWS MODS | - | 41,448 | | 9,000 | | | | | - | 50,448 |
| | CIWS Block 1B Upgrade | | | | | | 9,000 | | | | |
| 33 | 5/54 GUN MOUNT MODS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 34 | GUN MOUNT MODS | - | 27,263 | | | | | | | - | 27,263 |
| | **OTHER** | | | | | | | | | | |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 35 | PIONEER | - | 13,622 | | | | | | | - | 13,622 |
| 36 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 37 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJ (89) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL OTHER WEAPONS** | | **86,573** | | **9,000** | | **9,000** | | **-** | | **95,573** |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 48,748 | | | | | | | - | 48,748 |
| | **TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **48,748** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **48,748** |
| | **TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | **1,991,821** | | **538,000** | | **538,000** | | **-** | | **2,529,821** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Close-in weapon system (CIWS) block 1B upgrade*

The budget request contained $41.4 million for CIWS modifications, all of which is for the CIWS block 1B upgrade.

The CIWS is a high-fire rate weapon system that automatically acquires, tracks and destroys anti-ship missiles that have penetrated all the other ship's defenses. The CIWS block 1B upgrade incorporates a thermal imager, to further improve anti-ship missile defense, and an automatic acquisition video tracker that provides the additional capability to engage small, high-speed maneuvering surface craft and low, slow aircraft and helicopters. The committee notes that the Department of the Navy plans to increase CIWS block 1B upgrade annual budgets by over 350 percent for fiscal years 2005 through 2009, and believes that, since this upgrade provides significant anti-terrorism and force protection capability, it should be accelerated in fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommends $50.4 million for CIWS modifications, an increase of $9.0 million to accelerate procurement of CIWS block 1B systems.

*GQM–163A coyote supersonic sea skimming target*

The budget request contained $70.7 million for procurement of Navy aerial targets, including $17.6 million for procurement of supersonic sea skimming targets (SSST).

The Navy is developing the GQM–163A Coyote SSST to replace the VANDAL SSST, which is now out of production and the supply of which is almost exhausted. The GQM–163A is a high-fidelity target that will replicate the performance of sophisticated anti-ship cruise missiles.

The committee recommends $85.7 million for procurement of Navy aerial targets, including an increase of $15.0 million to accelerate the procurement of the GQM–163A Coyote SSST.

*Tomahawk missile*

The budget request contained $277.6 million for 267 tactical tomahawk (TACTOM) missiles.

The Tomahawk missile is a long-range, precision-strike cruise missile launched from surface ships or submarines. The TACTOM missile will provide improved performance at a lower unit cost than previous missile versions. The existing maximum TACTOM production capacity is 450 missiles per year.

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy's programmed budget for Tomahawk missiles would result in an inventory that is significantly below the Navy's stated Tomahawk required inventory levels, and that recent Tomahawk missile expenditures, which have been in excess of 700 for Operation Iraqi Freedom, have exacerbated this shortfall. The committee also notes that the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 108–11) established a $15.7 billion Iraqi Freedom Fund to provide for additional expenses associated with the ongoing military operations in Iraq including the replacement of munitions. Additionally, the statement of the managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 1559 (H. Rept. 108–76) specifically identified TACTOM missiles among those precision guided

munitions that should be procured from the funds provided. Since the committee believes that the Tomahawk missile shortage is severe and should be aggressively addressed in fiscal year 2003, it directs the Department of Defense to obligate at least $24.0 million from funds provided in the Iraqi Freedom Fund by Public Law 108–11 to increase TACTOM production capacity to 600 missiles per year and to obligate at least $336.0 million for an additional 300 TACTOMs. The committee understands that the additional TACTOMs can be delivered beginning in January 2005 with an associated production rate increase to 600 missiles per year beginning in November 2006.

To sustain TACTOM production at a rate of 600 missiles per year for fiscal year 2004, the committee recommends an increase of $336.0 million for an additional 333 TACTOM missiles.

The committee also believes that future wartime expenditures may require inventory replenishment rates up to 900 missiles per year. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million for further tooling and test equipment, and understands that a contract award in the second quarter of fiscal year 2004 would allow a 900-missile-per-year production capacity to be achieved by the second quarter of fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommends $653.6 million for the TACTOM missile, an increase of $376.0 million.

## AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, NAVY & MARINE CORPS

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $922.4 million for Ammunition Procurement, Navy & Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $963.4 million, an increase of $41.0 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Ammunition Procurement, Navy & Marine Corps program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy & Marine Corps request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **PROC AMMO, NAVY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **NAVY AMMUNITION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | - | 164,105 | | 20,000 | | | | | - | 184,105 |
| | To be used only for Bomb Bodies to synchronize with PGM Kits | | | | | | 20,000 | | | | |
| 2 | JDAM | 12,326 | 277,347 | | | | | | | 12,326 | 277,347 |
| 3 | AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | - | 28,245 | | | | | | | - | 28,245 |
| 4 | MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION | - | 17,933 | | | | | | | - | 17,933 |
| 5 | PRACTICE BOMBS | - | 51,417 | | | | | | | - | 51,417 |
| 6 | CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES | - | 26,374 | | | | | | | - | 26,374 |
| 7 | AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS | - | 10,904 | | | | | | | - | 10,904 |
| 8 | AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES | - | 44,068 | | | | | | | - | 44,068 |
| 9 | JATOS | - | 4,627 | | | | | | | - | 4,627 |
| 10 | 5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION | - | 13,248 | | | | | | | - | 13,248 |
| 11 | EXTENDED RANGE GUIDED MUNITIONS (ERGM) | - | 3,776 | | | | | | | - | 3,776 |
| 12 | 76MM GUN AMMUNITION | - | 1,226 | | | | | | | - | 1,226 |
| 13 | OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION | - | 16,368 | | | | | | | - | 16,368 |
| 14 | SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO | - | 17,724 | | | | | | | - | 17,724 |
| 15 | PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION | - | 10,469 | | | | | | | - | 10,469 |
| 16 | MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 17 | AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 2,173 | | | | | | | - | 2,173 |
| 18 | CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL PROC AMMO, NAVY** | | **690,004** | | **20,000** | | **20,000** | | **-** | | **710,004** |
| | **PROC AMMO, MC** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | 5.56 MM, ALL TYPES | - | 24,618 | | 5,000 | | | | | - | 29,618 |
| | M855 Lead Free round | | | | | | 5,000 | | | | |
| 20 | 7.62 MM, ALL TYPES | - | 6,351 | | | | | | | - | 6,351 |
| 21 | LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES | - | 36,552 | | | | | | | - | 36,552 |
| 22 | .50 CALIBER | - | 10,218 | | | | | | | - | 10,218 |
| 23 | 40 MM, ALL TYPES | - | 10,191 | | | | | | | - | 10,191 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 24 | 60 MM HE M888 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 25 | 60MM, ALL TYPES | - | 6,064 | | 6,000 | | | | | - | 12,064 |
| | M720A1 HE round | | | | | | 6,000 | | | | |
| 26 | 81MM, ALL TYPES | - | 19,361 | | | | | | | - | 19,361 |
| 27 | 120MM, ALL TYPES | - | 18,691 | | | | | | | - | 18,691 |
| 28 | FUZE, ET, XM762 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 29 | CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES | - | 3,859 | | | | | | | - | 3,859 |
| 30 | 9 MM ALL TYPES | - | 2,706 | | | | | | | - | 2,706 |
| 31 | GRENADES, ALL TYPES | - | 7,914 | | | | | | | - | 7,914 |
| 32 | STINGER SLEP | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 33 | ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | - | 15,461 | | | | | | | - | 15,461 |
| 34 | ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES | - | 49,813 | | 10,000 | | | | | - | 59,813 |
| | M795 HE round | | | | | | 10,000 | | | | |
| 35 | AAAV | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 36 | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | - | 3,752 | | | | | | | - | 3,752 |
| 37 | FUZE, ALL TYPES | - | 4,397 | | | | | | | - | 4,397 |
| 38 | NON LETHALS | - | 3,671 | | | | | | | - | 3,671 |
| 39 | AMMO MODERNIZATION | - | 7,116 | | | | | | | - | 7,116 |
| 40 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 1,616 | | | | | | | - | 1,616 |
| | **TOTAL PROC. AMMO, MC** | | **232,351** | | **21,000** | | **21,000** | | **-** | | **253,351** |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS** | | **922,355** | | **41,000** | | **41,000** | | **-** | | **963,355** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Marine Corps ammunition procurement*

The budget request contained $232.4 million for procurement of ammunition. The committee recommends $253.4 million, an increase of $21.0 million for the following types of ammunition, which were identified as top unfunded requirements by the Commandant of the Marine Corps for fiscal year 2004:

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| 5.56mm, All Types: | |
| M855 lead-free | 5.0 |
| 60mm, All Types: | |
| M720A1 HE | 6.0 |
| Artillery, All Types: | |
| 155mm M795 HE | 10.0 |

*Navy ammunition procurement*

The budget request contained $690.0 million for the procurement of conventional ammunition. The committee recommends $710.0 million, an increase of $20.0 million for the procurement of ammunition, which was a top unfunded requirement identified by the Chief of Naval Operations for fiscal year 2004:

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| General Purpose Bombs | 20.0 |
| (to be used only for the procurement of bomb bodies to synchronize with precision guided munitions kits) | |

## SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $11,439.0 million for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $11,472.4 million, an increase of $33.4 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **OTHER WARSHIPS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 2 | CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 2 | CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 2 | CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM | - | 1,186,564 | | | | | | | - | 1,186,564 |
| 2 | CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 3 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | 1 | 2,152,235 | | | | | | | 1 | 2,152,235 |
| 3 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | - | (640,300) | | | | | | | - | (640,300) |
| 4 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | - | 266,147 | | | | | | | - | 266,147 |
| 4 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | - | 490,251 | | | | | | | - | 490,251 |
| 4 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | - | 129,887 | | | | | | | - | 129,887 |
| 4 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | - | 129,887 | | | | | | | - | 129,887 |
| 4 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 5 | SSGN CONVERSION | 2 | 1,610,948 | | | | | | | 2 | 1,610,948 |
| 5 | SSGN CONVERSION | - | (680,248) | | | | | | | - | (680,248) |
| 6 | SSGN CONVERSION | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | SSGN CONVERSION | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | SSGN CONVERSION | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | SSGN CONVERSION | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | SSGN CONVERSION | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | SSGN CONVERSION | - | 236,600 | | | | | | | - | 236,600 |
| 7 | CRUISER CONVERSION | 1 | 259,125 | | | | | | | 1 | 259,125 |
| 7 | CRUISER CONVERSION | - | (64,685) | | | | | | | - | (64,685) |
| 8 | CRUISER CONVERSION | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 9 | CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 9 | CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 10 | CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 10 | CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 10 | CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | 367,832 | | | | | | | - | 367,832 |
| 11 | SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | 3,110 | | | | | | | - | 3,110 |
| 11 | SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | (3,110) | | | | | | | - | (3,110) |
| 12 | SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 12 | SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 12 | SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 12 | SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 12 | SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 12 | SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 12 | SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | 76,351 | | | | | | | - | 76,351 |
| 12 | SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | 88,021 | | | | | | | - | 88,021 |
| 12 | SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 12 | SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 13 | DDG-51 | 3 | 3,328,998 | | | | | | | 3 | 3,328,998 |
| 13 | DDG-51 | - | (130,687) | | | | | | | - | (130,687) |
| 13 | DDG-51 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 14 | DDG-51 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 14 | DDG-51 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL OTHER WARSHIPS** | | **8,806,926** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **8,806,926** |
| | **AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP | - | 355,006 | | | | | | | - | 355,006 |
| 15 | LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 16 | LPD-17 | 1 | 1,364,400 | | | | | | | 1 | 1,364,400 |
| 16 | LPD-17 | - | (172,366) | | | | | | | - | (172,366) |
| 17 | LPD-17 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS** | | **1,547,040** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **1,547,040** |
| | **AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM** | | | | | | | | | | |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 18 | LCU(X) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 19 | OUTFITTING | - | 344,949 | | | | | | | - | 344,949 |
| 20 | SERVICE CRAFT | - | 31,480 | | 3,000 | | | | | - | 34,480 |
| | Yard Oiler | | | | | | 3,000 | | | | |
| 21 | LCAC SLEP | 3 | 73,087 | 1 | 21,000 | 1 | 21,000 | | | 4 | 94,087 |
| 22 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 23 | MINE HUNTER | - | - | 2 | 9,400 | | | | | 2 | 9,400 |
| | Minehunter SWATH | | | | | 2 | 9,400 | | | | |
| 24 | COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS | - | 635,502 | | | | | | | - | 635,502 |
| | **TOTAL AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAMS** | | **1,085,018** | | **33,400** | | **33,400** | | **-** | | **1,118,418** |
| | **TOTAL SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY** | | **11,438,984** | | **33,400** | | **33,400** | | **-** | | **11,472,384** |

## Items of Special Interest

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

The budget request contained $73.1 million for three LCAC SLEPs.

The LCAC is the only surface platform that can provide high-speed, heavy lift for Marine Corps amphibious operations from over-the-horizon. The SLEP, which includes hull, engine and communications upgrades, would extend the LCAC's service life from twenty years to thirty years. The committee understands that an annual quantity of three LCAC SLEPs is one less than the minimum production sustainment level and that production of four LCAC SLEPs in fiscal year 2004 would prevent a production line break. The committee believes that uninterrupted production is critical to a cost-effective LCAC SLEP program.

The committee recommends $94.1 million, an increase of $21.0 million for the procurement of one additional LCAC SLEP.

*Minehunter small waterplane area twin hull (SWATH) boats*

The budget request contained no funds for procurement of second generation Minehunter SWATH boats or for their associated mine countermeasures equipment suites.

The Minehunter SWATH boat is a 40-foot, twin-hull vessel that can operate in very shallow water with increased stability in rough seas compared to a similar size mono hull ship. The second generation Minehunter SWATH boat will be capable of remote operation, greatly reducing manning requirements. The Navy's mine hunting fleet includes one Minehunter SWATH boat, which is its only surface mine warfare vessel capable of operating in very shallow water or capable of transport by C–5 aircraft for operational deployment within 24 hours. The committee believes that the capability to provide prompt mine hunting support to United States harbors is critical to the homeland security mission.

The committee recommends an increase of $9.4 million for the procurement of two second generation Minehunter SWATH boats and their associated mine countermeasures equipment suites.

## OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $4,679.4 million for Other Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $4,614.9 million, a decrease of $64.6 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Other Procurement, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | LM-2500 GAS TURBINE | - | 10,664 | | | | | | | - | 10,664 |
| 2 | ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE | - | 12,910 | | | | | | | - | 12,910 |
| | **PROPELLERS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | SUBMARINE PROPELLERS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT | - | 15,130 | | | | | | | - | 15,130 |
| | **UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT | - | 1,398 | | | | | | | - | 1,398 |
| | **PERISCOPES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP | - | 33,391 | | | | | | | - | 33,391 |
| | **OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT | - | 22,015 | | | | | | | - | 22,015 |
| 8 | COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD | - | 4,102 | | | | | | | - | 4,102 |
| 9 | POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT | - | 50,392 | | | | | | | - | 50,392 |
| 10 | SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 8,830 | | | | | | | - | 8,830 |
| 11 | VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 12 | SUBMARINE BATTERIES | - | 11,471 | | | | | | | - | 11,471 |
| 13 | STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP | - | 26,660 | | | | | | | - | 26,660 |
| 14 | DSSP EQUIPMENT | - | 27,493 | | | | | | | - | 27,493 |
| 15 | LCAC | - | 10,627 | | | | | | | - | 10,627 |
| 16 | MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT | - | 13,592 | | | | | | | - | 13,592 |
| 17 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 124,214 | | 3,000 | | | | | - | 127,214 |
| | Fuel and Engine Maintenance Savings System | | | | | | 3,000 | | | | |
| 18 | CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 19 | SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM | - | 14,591 | | | | | | | - | 14,591 |
| | **REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | REACTOR POWER UNITS | - | 333,107 | | | | | | | - | 333,107 |
| 21 | REACTOR COMPONENTS | - | 211,030 | | | | | | | - | 211,030 |
| | **OCEAN ENGINEERING** | | | | | | | | | | |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 22 | DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT | - | 7,258 | | | | | | | - | 7,258 |
| | **SMALL BOATS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | STANDARD BOATS | - | 53,913 | | | | | | | - | 53,913 |
| | **TRAINING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT | - | 8,115 | | | | | | | - | 8,115 |
| | **PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | OPERATING FORCES IPE | - | 5,499 | | 8,000 | | | | | - | 13,499 |
| | Expeditionary Maintence Facility | | | | | | 8,000 | | | | |
| | **OTHER SHIP SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS | - | 128,441 | | | | | | | - | 128,441 |
| | **DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | **1,134,843** | | **11,000** | | **11,000** | | **-** | | **1,145,843** |
| | **COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SHIP RADARS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | RADAR SUPPORT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 29 | TISS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **SHIP SONARS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | SPQ-9B RADAR | - | 9,739 | | 19,800 | | | | | - | 29,539 |
| | Shipboard Radar Transmitter | | | | | | 19,800 | | | | |
| 31 | AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 32 | SSN ACOUSTICS | - | 265,423 | | | | | | | - | 265,423 |
| 33 | UUV PROGRAM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 34 | UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 5,758 | | | | | | | - | 5,758 |
| 35 | SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS | - | 13,644 | | | | | | | - | 13,644 |
| | **ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM | - | 24,631 | | 3,000 | | | | | - | 27,631 |
| | Acoustic Intercept Improvement | | | | | | 3,000 | | | | |
| 37 | SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE (SSTD) | - | 11,277 | | | | | | | - | 11,277 |
| 38 | ADVANCE DEPLOYABLE SYSTEM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 39 | FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | - | 46,360 | | | | | | | - | 46,360 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 40 | SURTASS | - | 15,228 | | | | | | | - | 15,228 |
| 41 | ASW OPERATIONS CENTER | - | 6,516 | | | | | | | - | 6,516 |
| | **ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 | AN/SLQ-32 | - | 19,429 | | | | | | | - | 19,429 |
| 43 | INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS | - | 4,191 | | | | | | | - | 4,191 |
| | **RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT | - | 123,267 | | | | | | | - | 123,267 |
| | **SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG | - | 71,411 | | | | | | | - | 71,411 |
| | **OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 46 | NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM | - | - | | 6,500 | | 6,500 | | | - | 6,500 |
| 47 | COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY | - | 62,845 | | | | | | | - | 62,845 |
| 48 | GCCS-M EQUIPMENT | - | 52,398 | | | | | | | - | 52,398 |
| 49 | NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS) | - | 52,594 | | | | | | | - | 52,594 |
| 50 | ADVANCED TACTICAL DATA LINK (ATDLS) | - | 16,197 | | | | | | | - | 16,197 |
| 51 | MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT | - | 18,324 | | | | | | | - | 18,324 |
| 52 | NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE) | - | 15,674 | | | | | | | - | 15,674 |
| 53 | ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV | - | 4,194 | | | | | | | - | 4,194 |
| 54 | STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP | - | 8,560 | | | | | | | - | 8,560 |
| | **TRAINING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | OTHER SPAWAR TRAINING EQUIPMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 56 | OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT | - | 50,542 | | | | | | | - | 50,542 |
| | **AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 57 | MARINE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL (MATCALS) | - | 15,629 | | | | | | | - | 15,629 |
| 58 | SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | - | 7,860 | | | | | | | - | 7,860 |
| 59 | AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM | - | 17,493 | | | | | | | - | 17,493 |
| 60 | NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM | - | 30,095 | | | | | | | - | 30,095 |
| 61 | AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 7,633 | | | | | | | - | 7,633 |
| 62 | MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 63 | FACSFAC | - | 4,337 | | | | | | | - | 4,337 |
| 64 | ID SYSTEMS | - | 21,829 | | | | | | | - | 21,829 |
| 65 | NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS | - | 8,639 | | | | | | | - | 8,639 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 66 | DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT | - | 46,551 | | (46,551) | | | | (46,551) | - | - |
| 67 | TADIX-B | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 68 | NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 69 | DIMHRS | - | 5,512 | | | | | | | - | 5,512 |
| 70 | COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS | - | 60,600 | | | | | | | - | 60,600 |
| 71 | RADIAC | - | 8,600 | | | | | | | - | 8,600 |
| 72 | GPETE | - | 10,006 | | | | | | | - | 10,006 |
| 73 | INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY | - | 8,726 | | | | | | | - | 8,726 |
| 74 | EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION | - | 6,469 | | | | | | | - | 6,469 |
| 75 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 15,420 | | 4,000 | | | | | - | 19,420 |
| | Law Enforcement Information Exchange (LINX) | | | | | | 4,000 | | | | |
| | **SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 | SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS / JTRS | - | 49,430 | | | | | | | - | 49,430 |
| 77 | SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION | - | 175,087 | | | | | | | - | 175,087 |
| 78 | COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M | - | 25,213 | | | | | | | - | 25,213 |
| | **SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 79 | SHORE LF/VLF COMMUNICATIONS | - | 16,591 | | | | | | | - | 16,591 |
| 80 | SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT | - | 104,935 | | | | | | | - | 104,935 |
| | **SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 81 | SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | - | 257,388 | | | | | | | - | 257,388 |
| | **SHORE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 82 | JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT | - | 3,939 | | | | | | | - | 3,939 |
| 83 | ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS | - | 1,437 | | | | | | | - | 1,437 |
| 84 | NSIPS / IT | - | 363 | | | | | | | - | 363 |
| 85 | JEDMICS / IT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 86 | NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS | - | 75,336 | | | | | | | - | 75,336 |
| | **CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 87 | INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) | - | 81,938 | | | | | | | - | 81,938 |
| | **CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 88 | CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP | - | 24,739 | | | | | | | - | 24,739 |
| | **OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 89 | COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT | - | 12,582 | | | | | | | - | 12,582 |
| | **DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 90 | OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | **2,002,579** | | **(13,251)** | | **33,300** | | **(46,551)** | | **1,989,328** |
| | **AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SONOBUOYS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 91 | SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES | - | 85,632 | | | | | | | - | 85,632 |
| | **AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 92 | WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 30,981 | | | | | | | - | 30,981 |
| 93 | EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS | - | 7,569 | | | | | | | - | 7,569 |
| 94 | AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT | - | 11,850 | | | | | | | - | 11,850 |
| 95 | AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT | - | 20,277 | | | | | | | - | 20,277 |
| 96 | METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT | - | 25,658 | | | | | | | - | 25,658 |
| 97 | OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT | - | 1,775 | | | | | | | - | 1,775 |
| 98 | AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT | - | 27,749 | | | | | | | - | 27,749 |
| 99 | AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES | - | 13,624 | | 10,000 | | | | | - | 23,624 |
| | Mk-105 Influence Mine Sweeping System | | | | | | 10,000 | | | | |
| 100 | LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT | - | 22,537 | | | | | | | - | 22,537 |
| 101 | OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 4,969 | | | | | | | - | 4,969 |
| | **TOTAL AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | **252,621** | | **10,000** | | **10,000** | | **-** | | **262,621** |
| | **ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 102 | GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 103 | NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM | - | 4,301 | | 4,700 | | 4,700 | | | - | 9,001 |
| 104 | MK98-NIGHT VISION DEVICES | - | 12,638 | | | | | | | - | 12,638 |
| | **SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 105 | NATO SEASPARROW | - | 32,797 | | | | | | | - | 32,797 |
| 106 | RAM GMLS | - | 31,300 | | | | | | | - | 31,300 |
| 107 | SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM | - | 58,089 | | | | | | | - | 58,089 |
| 108 | AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 105,227 | | | | | | | - | 105,227 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 109 | SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 63,423 | | | | | | | - | 63,423 |
| 110 | SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIP | - | 5,786 | | | | | | | - | 5,786 |
| 111 | VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS | - | 7,875 | | | | | | | - | 7,875 |
| | **FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 112 | STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 113 | STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP | - | 103,874 | | | | | | | - | 103,874 |
| | **ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 114 | SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS | - | 68,032 | | | | | | | - | 68,032 |
| 115 | SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 4,951 | | | | | | | - | 4,951 |
| 116 | SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 4,780 | | | | | | | - | 4,780 |
| 117 | ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 7,275 | | | | | | | - | 7,275 |
| | **OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 118 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP | - | 8,083 | | | | | | | - | 8,083 |
| 119 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 4,726 | | | | | | | - | 4,726 |
| | **OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 120 | ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM | - | 44,757 | | | | | | | - | 44,757 |
| 121 | SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS | - | 7,352 | | | | | | | - | 7,352 |
| 122 | SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS | - | 25,150 | | | | | | | - | 25,150 |
| | **TOTAL ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | **600,416** | | **4,700** | | **4,700** | | **-** | | **605,116** |
| | **CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 123 | ARMORED SEDANS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 124 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | - | 2,305 | | | | | | | - | 2,305 |
| 125 | GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS | - | 1,472 | | | | | | | - | 1,472 |
| 126 | CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP | - | 19,721 | | | | | | | - | 19,721 |
| 127 | FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT | - | 8,834 | | | | | | | - | 8,834 |
| 128 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | - | 38,745 | | | | | | | - | 38,745 |
| 129 | AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT | - | 4,251 | | | | | | | - | 4,251 |
| 130 | POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT | - | 5,007 | | | | | | | - | 5,007 |
| 131 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION | - | 13,608 | | | | | | | - | 13,608 |
| 132 | PHYSICAL SECURITY VECHICLES | - | 943 | | | | | | | - | 943 |
| | **TOTAL CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | **94,886** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **94,886** |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 133 | MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | - | 15,053 | | | | | | | - | 15,053 |
| 134 | OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 13,883 | | 6,000 | | | | | - | 19,883 |
| | Serial number tracking system | | | | | | 6,000 | | | | - |
| 135 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | - | 5,197 | | | | | | | - | 5,197 |
| 136 | SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS | - | 75,571 | | | | | | | - | 75,571 |
| | **TOTAL SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | **109,704** | | **6,000** | | **6,000** | | **-** | | **115,704** |
| | **PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TRAINING DEVICES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 137 | TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 2,532 | | | | | | | - | 2,532 |
| | **COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 138 | COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 60,688 | | | | | | | - | 60,688 |
| 139 | EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 7,786 | | | | | | | - | 7,786 |
| 140 | MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 9,511 | | | | | | | - | 9,511 |
| 141 | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 21,148 | | | | | | | - | 21,148 |
| 142 | OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 9,219 | | | | | | | - | 9,219 |
| 143 | MOBILE SENSOR PLATFORM | - | 35,899 | | | | | | | - | 35,899 |
| 144 | ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 15,349 | | | | | | | - | 15,349 |
| 145 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | - | 74,626 | | 17,000 | | | | | - | 91,626 |
| | Non-Lethal Swimmer Detection Systems | | | | | | 17,000 | | | | |
| | **PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 146 | JUDGEMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **OTHER** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 147 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 148 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (88) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | **236,758** | | **17,000** | | **17,000** | | **-** | | **253,758** |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 149 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 247,636 | | | | | | | - | 247,636 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **247,636** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **247,636** |
| | Information Technology General Reduction | | | | (100,000) | | | | (100,000) | | (100,000) |
| | **TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY** | | **4,679,443** | | **(64,551)** | | **82,000** | | **(146,551)** | | **4,614,892** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Fuel and engine maintenance savings system (FEMSS)*

The budget request included no funds for FEMSS. The committee understands that the request for fiscal year 2004 has been slipped to 2006.

The FEMSS has demonstrated a savings of more than $200,000 per ship per year in fuel and maintenance costs, paying for itself in five years.

The committee recommends an authorization of $3.0 million to procure three ship sets of FEMMS for the procurement and installation of FEMS on three LSD 41/49 class of ships.

*Law enforcement information exchange*

The budget request contained $15.4 million for items less than $5.0 million, but contained no funding for the Law Enforcement Information Exchange system. This system would allow the Naval Criminal Investigation Service to share law enforcement information with other federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies to detect and deter terrorist activities.

The committee recommends $19.4 million for items less than $5.0 million, an increase of $4.0 million.

*Naval fires control system (NFCS)*

The budget request contained $4.3 million for the procurement of the NFCS, however, no funds were requested for the Littoral Surveillance System (LSS).

The LSS is a high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle-based node within the Joint Fires Network which provides intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, and targeting from imagery, signals, and measurement/signature intelligence data. The LSS receives its data from both manned and unmanned aircraft and unmanned ground, underwater and space-based sensors. The committee notes that the Chief of Naval Operations has identified a fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirement of $14.7 million for LSS hardware, software, and communications upgrades, which would make LSS units 1 and 2 fully operational. The committee is supportive of networked fire support that will provide targeting data and solutions for naval and joint assets to employ precision guided munitions in support of time critical strike and time sensitive targeting missions.

The committee recommends $9.0 million for NFCS, an increase of $4.7 million, for LSS hardware, software, and communications upgrades to make LSS units 1 and 2 fully operational.

*Navy tactical data systems*

The budget request contained no funds for Navy tactical data systems.

The committee is aware of the high cost of replacing peripheral sub systems and equipment in the front line Aegis platforms that are currently globally deployed. Obsolescing equipment used to load programs into the Aegis weapons system are incurring high maintenance costs as they continue to be utilized beyond their anticipated life cycles. Digital support equipment based on commercial-off-the-shelf technologies would significantly reduce maintenance costs and would increase weapons systems availability.

The committee recommends $6.5 million for Navy tactical data systems to replace Aegis Combat System peripheral equipment.

*Non-lethal swimmer detection systems*

The budget request contained $74.6 million for physical security equipment, but included no funds for non-lethal swimmer detection systems.

Non-lethal swimmer detection systems include a variety of new technologies and systems that provide shipboard force protection for pier side or anchored Navy ships, when they are most vulnerable to submerged swimmer threats. The committee understands that the Navy does not have any non-lethal swimmer detection capability for its ships at pier side or at anchorage, and that non-lethal swimmer detections systems would automate the detection and identification of underwater threats, allowing the ship's crew to take the necessary actions to prevent the placement of underwater devices intended to cause damage to a ship or injury to its crew.

To address this shortfall, the committee notes that the Chief of Naval Operations included non-lethal swimmer detection systems among his top four unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2003.

The committee recommends $91.6 million for physical security systems, an increase of $17.0 million for non-lethal swimmer detection systems.

*Operating forces industrial plant equipment*

The budget request contained $5.5 million for operating forces industrial plant equipment, but included no funds for expeditionary maintenance facilities (EMF).

The committee is aware that the Navy has decommissioned the majority of its repair tenders to include all tenders associated with surface combatant repair. This significantly impacts the ability of the Navy to repair and perform depot level maintenance for forward deployed fleet units. The committee is aware of the capabilities imbedded in the expeditionary maintenance facilities (EMF) in that the EMF is air transportable, modular and capable of being configured to meet specific requirements based on deployment geography. The committee is also aware that this system can be deployed within 72 hours to any theater of operations where repair and maintenance support is needed. The committee believes that the EMF concept will enhance forward deployed repair requirements.

The committee recommends $13.5 million for operating forces industrial plant equipment, an increase of $8.0 million, for procurement of two EMF sets.

*Other supply support equipment*

The budget request contained $13.9 million for the procurement of other supply support equipment, of which no funds were allocated for the automatic identification technology (AIT) in support of the serial number tracking system (SNTS).

The SNTS uses commercial AIT to provide web-based, cradle-to-grave, total asset visibility on individual components throughout the supply, maintenance, and transportation transfer process within the Naval and Marine Corps aviation depots and enhances the

maintenance, remanufacture, and rebuild process of Navy and Marine Corps aircraft. The committee believes that streamlining business processes, such as SNTS, can be readily achieved by implementing AIT and has recommended increases for this technology for maintenance and ammunition tracking systems for other military services in prior fiscal years.

The committee recommends $19.9 million for other supply support equipment, an increase of $6.0 million for the SNTS.

*Radar support*

The budget request contained $9.7 million for procurement of one A/N–SPQ–9B Radar. The A/N–SPQ–9B radar is designed to provide early and reliable detection of sea skimming missiles so that they can be tracked, targeted, and neutralized. This expanded capability is added with no degradation to the original function of highly accurate surface gunfire support and navigation utilization. The committee believes that the anti-sea skimming mission is vital to the defensive capabilities of ships operating in the near coast and littoral areas of the maritime environment.

The committee recommends $29.5 million for upgrades to the remaining 20 fleet radar sets, an increase of $19.8 million.

## PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $1,071.0 million for Procurement, Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $1,154.3 million, an increase of $83.3 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Procurement, Marine Corps program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Marine Corps request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | AAV7A1 PIP | - | 11,297 | | 25,000 | | | | | - | 36,297 |
| | AAV RAM/RS | | | | | | 25,000 | | | | |
| 2 | AAAV | - | 97,915 | | | | | | | - | 97,915 |
| 3 | LAV PIP | - | 13,191 | | 12,700 | | | | | - | 25,891 |
| | LAV RAM | | | | | | 12,700 | | | | |
| 4 | IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (IRV) | - | 3,650 | | | | | | | - | 3,650 |
| 5 | MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH) | - | 6,757 | | | | | | | - | 6,757 |
| 6 | M1A1 FIREPOWER ENHANCEMENTS | - | 4,222 | | | | | | | - | 4,222 |
| | **ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | HIMARS | 1 | 17,954 | | | | | | | 1 | 17,954 |
| 8 | 155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER | 60 | 111,489 | | | | | | | 60 | 111,489 |
| 9 | MOD KITS (ARTILLERY) | - | 3,305 | | | | | | | - | 3,305 |
| 10 | MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM | - | 6,898 | | | | | | | - | 6,898 |
| 11 | WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION | - | 4,977 | | 8,100 | | | | | - | 13,077 |
| | Additional M249 Squad Automatic Weapons | | | | | | 8,100 | | | | |
| | **WEAPONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM | - | 13,712 | | | | | | | - | 13,712 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR | - | 1,349 | | | | | | | - | 1,349 |
| | **TOTAL WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES** | | **296,716** | | **45,800** | | **45,800** | | **-** | | **342,516** |
| | **GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **GUIDED MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | EADS MOD | - | 1,996 | | | | | | | - | 1,996 |
| 15 | JAVELIN | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 16 | PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS) (MYP) | - | 817 | | | | | | | - | 817 |
| 17 | HIMARS ROCKETS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 18 | PREDATOR (SRAW) | 526 | 36,398 | | | | | | | 526 | 36,398 |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 19 | MODIFICATION KITS | - | 587 | | | | | | | - | 587 |
| | **TOTAL GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT** | | **39,798** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **39,798** |
| | **COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **VEHICLE MOUNTED RADIOS AND EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | SMALL UNIT REMOTE SCOUTING SYSTEM | - | 2,058 | | | | | | | - | 2,058 |
| | **COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER | - | 29,225 | | | | | | | - | 29,225 |
| 22 | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | - | 13,548 | | | | | | | - | 13,548 |
| 23 | MULTIPLE ROLE RADAR SYSTEM | - | 1,633 | | | | | | | - | 1,633 |
| 24 | JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS | - | 13,919 | | | | | | | - | 13,919 |
| 25 | TRANSITION SWITCH MODULE | - | 23,072 | | | | | | | - | 23,072 |
| 26 | COMPLIMENTARY LOW ALTITUDE WEAPON | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | AUTO TEST EQUIP SYS | - | 20,462 | | | | | | | - | 20,462 |
| 28 | GENERAL PURPOSE ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP. | - | 8,369 | | | | | | | - | 8,369 |
| | **RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | RADAR SET AN/TPS-59 | - | 18,211 | | | | | | | - | 18,211 |
| | **INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | TACTICAL REMOTE SENSOR SYSTEM | - | 9,476 | | | | | | | - | 9,476 |
| 31 | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 12,476 | | | | | | | - | 12,476 |
| 32 | MOD KITS (INTEL) | - | 7,856 | | | | | | | - | 7,856 |
| 33 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (INTELL) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | GENERAL PURPOSE MECHANICAL TMDE | - | 13,215 | | | | | | | - | 13,215 |
| | **OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT | - | 24,428 | | 10,400 | | | | | - | 34,828 |
| | AN/PVS-14 Monocular Night Vision Device | | | | | | 5,400 | | | | |
| | AN/PVS-17 Miniature Night Sights | | | | | | 5,000 | | | | |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC) | - | 463 | | | | | | | - | 463 |
| 37 | COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES | - | 61,514 | | | | | | | - | 61,514 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 38 | COMMAND POST SYSTEMS | - | 9,316 | | | | | | | - | 9,316 |
| 39 | RADIO SYSTEMS | - | 10,633 | | 9,600 | | | | | - | 20,233 |
| | AN/PRC-148 Tactical Hand Held Radios | | | | | | 9,600 | | | | |
| 40 | COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS | - | 19,252 | | | | | | | - | 19,252 |
| 41 | COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT | - | 24,360 | | | | | | | - | 24,360 |
| 42 | MOD KITS MAGTF C41 | - | 20,786 | | | | | | | - | 20,786 |
| 43 | AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS | - | 10,790 | | | | | | | - | 10,790 |
| 44 | INTELLIGENCE C2 SYSTEMS | - | 3,626 | | | | | | | - | 3,626 |
| 45 | FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM | - | 28,444 | | | | | | | - | 28,444 |
| | **TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT** | | **387,132** | | **20,000** | | **20,000** | | **-** | | **407,132** |
| | **SUPPORT VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 46 | COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES | 30 | 963 | | | | | | | 30 | 963 |
| 47 | COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES | - | 10,278 | | | | | | | - | 10,278 |
| | **TACTICAL VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 | 5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP) | 1,738 | 124,548 | | | | | | | 1,738 | 124,548 |
| 49 | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT | - | 4,611 | | | | | | | - | 4,611 |
| 50 | LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP | - | 3,386 | | | | | | | - | 3,386 |
| 51 | FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 52 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 4,027 | | | | | | | - | 4,027 |
| | **TOTAL SUPPORT VEHICLES** | | **147,813** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **147,813** |
| | **ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 53 | ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT | - | 2,724 | | | | | | | - | 2,724 |
| 54 | COMBAT BREACHER VEHICLE | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 55 | BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT | - | 15,812 | | | | | | | - | 15,812 |
| 56 | TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS | - | 5,067 | | | | | | | - | 5,067 |
| 57 | DEMOLITION SUPPORT SYSTEMS | - | 2,041 | | | | | | | - | 2,041 |
| 58 | POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED | - | 12,982 | | | | | | | - | 12,982 |
| 59 | FAMILY OF EOD EQUIPMENT | - | 4,608 | | | | | | | - | 4,608 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 60 | BRIDGE BOATS | - | 10,760 | | | | | | | - | 10,760 |
| | **MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 61 | COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 62 | AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT | - | 21,404 | | | | | | | - | 21,404 |
| 63 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | - | 5,064 | | | | | | | - | 5,064 |
| 64 | GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP | - | 10,742 | | | | | | | - | 10,742 |
| 65 | MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP | - | 27,885 | | | | | | | - | 27,885 |
| 66 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | - | 8,091 | | | | | | | - | 8,091 |
| | **GENERAL PROPERTY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 67 | FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT | - | 1,975 | | | | | | | - | 1,975 |
| 68 | TRAINING DEVICES | - | 19,988 | | 8,000 | | | | | - | 27,988 |
| | Battle Effects Simulators | | | | | | 4,000 | | | | |
| | Common Range Instrumentation System | | | | | | 4,000 | | | | |
| 69 | CONTAINER FAMILY | - | 5,150 | | | | | | | - | 5,150 |
| 70 | FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT | - | 14,380 | | | | | | | - | 14,380 |
| 71 | FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 72 | RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 73 | FAMILY OF INCIDENT RESPONSE | - | 3,447 | | | | | | | - | 3,447 |
| 74 | MODIFICATION KITS | - | 2,597 | | | | | | | - | 2,597 |
| 75 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | - | 5,206 | | 9,500 | | | | | - | 14,706 |
| | 6T/NATO Equivalent Absorbed Glass Mat Batteries | | | | | | 9,500 | | | | |
| 76 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (M) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT** | | **179,923** | | **17,500** | | **17,500** | | **-** | | **197,423** |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 77 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 19,617 | | | | | | | - | 19,617 |
| | **TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **19,617** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **19,617** |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS** | | **1,070,999** | | **83,300** | | **83,300** | | **-** | | **1,154,299** |

Items of Special Interest

*Night vision equipment*

The budget request contained $24.4 million to procure night vision equipment, but included no funds to procure either AN/PVS–14 night vision goggles or AN/PVS–17 miniature night sights.

The AN/PVS–14 is a state-of-the-art, lightweight, helmet-mounted, image-intensification, monocular night vision device used by light forces for night visual enhancement and situational awareness.

The AN/PVS–17 is a lightweight, rifle-mounted, generation III, image intensification night vision sight that replaces obsolete, post-Vietnam era AN/PVS–4 sights.

The committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirements of $5.4 million to procure additional AN/PVS–14 monocular night vision devices, and $10.5 million for additional AN/PVS–17 night vision sights. In support of the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded requirements and consistent with prior year actions, the committee continues to recognize the increased benefits of night vision technology.

The committee recommends $34.8 million for night vision equipment, an increase of $5.4 million for AN/PVS–14 monocular night vision devices and an increase of $5.0 million for AN/PVS–17 miniature night vision sights, for a total increase of $10.4 million.

*Radio systems*

The budget request contained $10.6 million to procure radio systems, but included no funds to procure AN/PRC–148 Tactical Hand Held Radios (THHR) for the Marine Corps Reserve.

The AN/PRC–148 THHR is a multi-band, secure voice and data radio that provides Marine reconnaissance teams and squad/platoon-size units with a lightweight, standardized, maintainable communications capability that is interoperable with numerous Department of Defense legacy communications radios. The committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified a fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirement for AN/PRC–148 THHRs.

The committee recommends $20.2 million for radio systems, an increase of $9.6 million, for both active and reserve Marine Corps forces.

*Weapons and combat vehicles under $5.0 million*

The budget request contained $5.0 million for the procurement of weapons and combat vehicles under $5.0 million, of which $3.1 million was for the procurement of the M249 squad automatic weapon (SAW). The M249 SAW is a lightweight machine gun capable of delivering a sustained volume of automatic, accurate, and highly lethal fire up to 800 meters in range. The committee notes that this has been one of the infantry's critical weapon systems in both Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. Further, the committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified a $8.1 million fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirement to alleviate an increasing failure rate of currently fielded weapons.

The committee recommends $13.1 million for procurement of weapons and combat vehicles under $5.0 million, an increase of $8.1 million to replace obsolete M249 SAWs.

## AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $12,079.4 million for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $12,604.5 million, an increase of $525.1 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Aircraft Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **COMBAT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL FORCES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 2 | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 3 | F-22 RAPTOR | 22 | 4,257,727 | | (161,000) | | | | | 22 | 4,096,727 |
| | Program reduction | | | | | | | | (161,000) | | |
| 3 | F-22 RAPTOR | - | (530,634) | | | | | | | - | (530,634) |
| 4 | F-22 RAPTOR | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | F-22 RAPTOR | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | F-22 RAPTOR | - | 498,285 | | | | | | | - | 498,285 |
| 4 | F-22 RAPTOR | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | F-22 RAPTOR | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | F-22 RAPTOR | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | F-22 RAPTOR | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | F-22 RAPTOR | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | F-22 RAPTOR | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL COMBAT AIRCRAFT** | | **4,225,378** | | **(161,000)** | | **-** | | **(161,000)** | | **4,064,378** |
| | **AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL AIRLIFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | C-17A (MYP) | 11 | 2,232,372 | 1 | 172,000 | | | | | 12 | 2,404,372 |
| | Additional Aircraft | | | | | | 182,000 | | | | |
| | AF requested Transfer | | | | | | | | (10,000) | | |
| 5 | C-17A (MYP) | - | (204,800) | | | | | | | - | (204,800) |
| 6 | C-17A (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | C-17A (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | C-17A (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | C-17A (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | C-17A (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | C-17A (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | C-17A (MYP) | - | 345,200 | | | | | | | - | 345,200 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 6 | C-17A (MYP) | - | 118,800 | | | | | | | - | 118,800 |
| 6 | C-17A (MYP) | - | 40,100 | | | | | | | - | 40,100 |
| 6 | C-17A (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | C-17A (MYP) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 7 | C-17 ICS | - | 927,627 | | | | | | | - | 927,627 |
| | **OTHER AIRLIFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | C-130H | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 9 | C-130J | 5 | 335,991 | | | | | | | 5 | 335,991 |
| 9 | C-130J | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 10 | C-130J | - | 110,000 | | | | | | | - | 110,000 |
| 10 | C-130J | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | **3,905,290** | | **172,000** | | **182,000** | | **(10,000)** | | **4,077,290** |
| | **TRAINER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **UPT TRAINERS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **OPERATIONAL TRAINERS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | JPATS | 52 | 280,569 | | | | | | | 52 | 280,569 |
| | **TOTAL TRAINER AIRCRAFT** | | **280,569** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **280,569** |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **HELICOPTERS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | V-22 OSPREY | 2 | 227,953 | | | | | | | 2 | 227,953 |
| 13 | V-22 OSPREY | - | (10,100) | | | | | | | - | (10,100) |
| 14 | V-22 OSPREY | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 14 | V-22 OSPREY | - | 15,150 | | | | | | | - | 15,150 |
| 14 | V-22 OSPREY | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | C-32B FEST/DEST AIRCRAFT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 16 | CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C | 27 | 2,540 | | | | | | | 27 | 2,540 |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | TARGET DRONES | - | 48,402 | | | | | | | - | 48,402 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request QTY. | FY 2004 Authorization Request COST | Committee Change QTY. | Committee Change COST | Committee Increase QTY. | Committee Increase COST | Committee Decrease QTY. | Committee Decrease COST | FY 2004 Committee Authorization QTY. | FY 2004 Committee Authorization COST |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | E-8C | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 18 | E-8C | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 19 | E-8C | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 20 | HAEUAV | 4 | 238,912 | | | | | | | 4 | 238,912 |
| 20 | HAEUAV | - | (41,000) | | | | | | | - | (41,000) |
| 21 | HAEUAV | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 21 | HAEUAV | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 21 | HAEUAV | - | 55,000 | | | | | | | - | 55,000 |
| 21 | HAEUAV | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 22 | PREDATOR UAV | 16 | 193,569 | | 18,000 | | | | | 16 | 211,569 |
| | Predator B Unmanned Aerial Vehicle | | | | | | 18,000 | | | | |
| | **TOTAL OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | **730,426** | | **18,000** | | **18,000** | | - | | **748,426** |
| | **MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | B-2A | - | 76,464 | | 51,791 | | | | | - | 128,255 |
| | AF requested transfer | | | | | | 24,691 | | | | |
| | Aft deck modification | | | | | | 27,100 | | | | |
| 24 | B-1B | - | 91,623 | | 20,300 | | 20,300 | | | - | 111,923 |
| 25 | B-52 | - | 61,133 | | 19,000 | | | | | - | 80,133 |
| | Wiring Kits/Targeting Pods | | | | | | 19,000 | | | | |
| 26 | F-117 | - | 16,790 | | | | | | | - | 16,790 |
| | **TACTICAL AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | A-10 | - | 17,769 | | | | | | | - | 17,769 |
| 28 | F-15 | - | 197,605 | | 40,000 | | | | | - | 237,605 |
| | E-Kits | | | | | | 30,000 | | | | |
| | ALQ-135 Band 1.5 | | | | | | 10,000 | | | | |
| 29 | F-16 | - | 300,596 | | 14,200 | | | | | - | 314,796 |
| | Falcon STAR | | | | | | 5,800 | | | | |
| | OBOGS retrofit | | | | | | 8,400 | | | | |
| 30 | F22 RAPTOR | - | 8,284 | | | | | | | - | 8,284 |
| 31 | T/AT-37 | - | 79 | | | | | | | - | 79 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | C-5 | - | 92,047 | | 39,400 | | | | | - | 131,447 |
| | C-5 AMP | | | | | | 39,400 | | | | |
| 33 | C-9 | - | 978 | | | | | | | - | 978 |
| 34 | C-17A | - | 42,801 | | 6,300 | | | | | - | 49,101 |
| | AF requested transfer | | | | | | 6,300 | | | | |
| 35 | C-21 | - | 1,367 | | | | | | | - | 1,367 |
| 36 | C-32A | - | 189 | | | | | | | - | 189 |
| 37 | C-37A | - | 355 | | | | | | | - | 355 |
| 38 | C-141 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TRAINER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | T6 MODIFICATIONS | - | 4,201 | | | | | | | - | 4,201 |
| 40 | T-38 | - | 132,196 | | | | | | | - | 132,196 |
| 41 | T-41 AIRCRAFT | - | 88 | | | | | | | - | 88 |
| 42 | T-43 | - | 8,224 | | | | | | | - | 8,224 |
| | **OTHER AIRCRAFT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 | KC-10A (ATCA) | - | 20,622 | | | | | | | - | 20,622 |
| 44 | C-12 | - | 5,769 | | | | | | | - | 5,769 |
| 45 | C-18 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 46 | C-20 MODS | - | 444 | | | | | | | - | 444 |
| 47 | VC-25A MOD | - | 69,857 | | | | | | | - | 69,857 |
| 48 | C-40 | - | 200 | | | | | | | - | 200 |
| 49 | C-130 | - | 195,737 | | 6,100 | | | | | - | 201,837 |
| | AN/APN-241 Radars for ANG | | | | | | 6,100 | | | | |
| 50 | C130J MODS | - | 9,759 | | | | | | | - | 9,759 |
| 51 | C-135 | - | 176,382 | | 229,200 | | | | | - | 405,582 |
| | Air Force Air Refueling Transfer Account | | | | | | 229,200 | | | | |
| 52 | C-29A MODS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 53 | DARP | - | 90,133 | | 15,500 | | | | | - | 105,633 |
| | Cobra Ball Multi-Channel Tracker | | | | | | 7,000 | | | | |
| | Senior Scout Intelligent Communications Explotation Prog. | | | | | | 3,000 | | | | |
| | Rivet Joint SIGINT Modernization | | | | | | 5,500 | | | | |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 54 | E-3 | - | 53,467 | | 8,800 | | | | | - | 62,267 |
| | AWACS RSIP | | | | | | 8,800 | | | | |
| 55 | E-4 | - | 58,708 | | | | | | | - | 58,708 |
| 56 | E-8 | - | 36,017 | | 27,000 | | | | | - | 63,017 |
| | JSTARS Reengining | | | | | | 27,000 | | | | |
| 57 | H-1 | - | 3,367 | | | | | | | - | 3,367 |
| 58 | H-60 | - | 44,723 | | 4,700 | | | | | - | 49,423 |
| | AN/ARS-6 V12 | | | | | | 4,700 | | | | |
| 59 | OTHER AIRCRAFT | - | 69,706 | | 4,800 | | | | | - | 74,506 |
| | Fixed Aircrew Standardized Seats | | | | | | 4,800 | | | | |
| 60 | PREDATOR MODS | - | 14,178 | | | | | | | - | 14,178 |
| 61 | CV-22 MODS | - | 279 | | | | | | | - | 279 |
| | **OTHER MODIFICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 62 | CLASSIFIED PROJECTS | - | 16,525 | | 9,000 | | | | | - | 25,525 |
| | COMPASS CALL - Block 35 Upgrade | | | | | | 9,000 | | | | - |
| | **TOTAL MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT** | | **1,918,662** | | **496,091** | | **496,091** | | **-** | | **2,414,753** |
| | **AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 63 | REPLEN SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | - | 190,132 | | | | | | | - | 190,132 |
| 64 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES | - | 11,381 | | | | | | | - | 11,381 |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **201,513** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **201,513** |
| | **AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 65 | COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | - | 216,219 | | | | | | | - | 216,219 |
| | **POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 66 | B-1 | - | 8,448 | | | | | | | - | 8,448 |
| 67 | B-2A | - | 6,919 | | | | | | | - | 6,919 |
| 68 | B-2A | - | 31,556 | | | | | | | - | 31,556 |
| 69 | C-130 | - | 8,470 | | | | | | | - | 8,470 |
| 70 | F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT | - | 7,292 | | | | | | | - | 7,292 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 71 | F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT | - | 13,871 | | | | | | | - | 13,871 |
| | **INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 72 | REPLEN SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | - | 21,728 | | | | | | | - | 21,728 |
| | **WAR CONSUMABLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 73 | WAR CONSUMABLES | - | 25,716 | | | | | | | - | 25,716 |
| | **OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 74 | REPLEN SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | - | 327,231 | | | | | | | - | 327,231 |
| 75 | DEPOT MODERNIZATION | - | 57,690 | | | | | | | - | 57,690 |
| | **CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 | REPLEN SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | - | 9,449 | | | | | | | - | 9,449 |
| | **DARP** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 77 | DARP | - | 82,933 | | | | | | | - | 82,933 |
| | **CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 78 | SUPPLY DEPOTS/OPERATIONS (NON-IF) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES** | | **817,522** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **817,522** |
| | **TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | **12,079,360** | | **525,091** | | **696,091** | | **(171,000)** | | **12,604,451** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Air Force air refueling transfer account*

The budget request contained no funds for an Air Force air refueling transfer account.

The Air Force air refueling tanker fleet is comprised of 59 KC–10 aircraft and 544 KC–135 aircraft. While the first KC–10 aircraft were delivered in 1981 and the fleet's average age is about 17 years, the KC–135s were delivered to the Air Force between 1957 and 1965 and the KC–135 fleet's average age is 42 years. Since the KC–135 comprises most of the Air Force's air refueling tanker fleet, the committee is concerned that a substantial portion of the Air Force's air refueling fleet will reach simultaneous maturity, and will require substantial investment to operate, maintain, and eventually replace this fleet.

The committee also notes that air refueling aircraft have been used extensively during the past four years in Operations Allied Force, Noble Eagle, Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. Accordingly, the committee believes that recent operational demands have further consumed aircraft life and will increase costs for future maintenance and repair activity. As recent Air Force combat operations have demonstrated, the committee further believes that future Air Force air combat operations are likely to require increased air refueling tanker capacity. Moreover, the committee notes that the Tanker Requirements Study for Fiscal Year 2005, which was released before the current defense planning guidance increased combat capability requirements to conduct theater operations and homeland defense activities, identified tanker shortfalls driven in large part by the high number of KC–135 aircraft in a depot status. Consequently, the committee is perplexed by the Air Force's decision to retire, rather than upgrade, 44 KC–135E aircraft in fiscal year 2004 and a remaining 22 KC–135E aircraft within the future years defense program.

Additionally, the committee notes that the Air Force budget would only provide for seventy-nine percent of depot purchased equipment maintenance (DPEM) in fiscal year 2004, and that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included $516.0 million to provide for increased DPEM funding for the Air Force's aircraft fleet as his first, of sixty-six, unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2004. The committee understands that of the $516.0 million amount, thirty-five percent would be planned for KC–135 aircraft depot-level repairs to sustain the aircraft's mission readiness.

To replace the KC–135 fleet, the Air Force has informed the committee that it supports a lease or procurement of replacement tanker aircraft, but the committee is puzzled by the Air Force's decision not to budget funds in fiscal year 2004 for this purpose. However, the committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included $132.0 million for the necessary expenses to prepare for the lease, or $154.0 million for the necessary expenses to prepare for the purchase, of replacement tanker aircraft as his sixth unfunded priority for fiscal year 2004.

To address the Air Force's air refueling tanker fleet requirements for fiscal year 2004 within a flexible funding framework, the committee recommends a provision (Section 131) that would establish a $229.2 million Air Force air refueling transfer account which

would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to use these funds for the necessary fiscal year 2004 expenses to proceed with any combination of the following that best meets tanker requirements: (1) lease preparation: $132.0 million; (2) purchase preparation: $154.0 million; (3) retaining 44 KC–135E aircraft: $75.2 million; and/or (4) KC–135 DPEM: $180.6 million.

*B–1B modifications*

The budget request contained $91.6 million for B–1B modifications but included no funds for the modifications required to regenerate 23 additional aircraft. The B–1B is a multi-engine, supersonic, long-range bomber capable of delivering nuclear or conventional munitions.

The committee notes that the Air Force plans to retire 32 of its 92 B–1B aircraft fleet by the end of fiscal year 2003. However, the committee observed the B–1B's long-range capability to deliver conventional precision-guided munitions against strategic and tactical targets during the recent Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom, and believes that the B–1B's contributions were crucial to the success of both operations. Moreover, the committee believes that future conflicts will require an increased number of long-range bomber aircraft to deliver precision-guided munitions since basing for shorter range aircraft may not be assured.

To address the need for additional long-range bomber aircraft, the committee understands that 23, of the 32 B–1B aircraft to be retired in fiscal year 2003, are available to be regenerated, and that the Air Force-preferred force structure would be to reconstitute one 12-aircraft squadron, with two additional training aircraft and nine additional attrition reserve or back-up aircraft.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $111.9 million for B–1B modifications, an increase of $20.3 million, for the additional fiscal year 2004 modification costs to begin the regeneration of the 23 B–1B aircraft. Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends increases for military construction, personnel and base operating support for this purpose.

In making this recommendation to reconstitute the additional 23 B–1B aircraft,the committee understands that the Department of the Air Force would need to budget for an additional $1.1 billion in its B–1B future years defense program, and the committee strongly urges the Department to take this action.

*B–2 modifications and development*

The procurement budget request contained $76.5 million for various B–2 modifications, but included no funds to modify the B–2's aft deck. Additionally, the research, development, test and evaluation (RDTE) budget request contained $152.1 million in line 68 in PE 64240F for B–2 system development, but included no funds to complete development activities to modify the B–2's aft deck or to develop the extremely high frequency (EHF) satellite communications (SATCOM) system. Also, the RDTE budget request contained $24.7 million in line 116, again labeled PE 64240F, for the B–2 advanced technology bomber. The B–2 is the Department of Defense's most advanced long-range strike aircraft, capable of global force projection in a highly defended target environment.

The committee understands that recently-discovered crack growth in the B–2's aft deck requires a modification to improve its durability and to sustain both its existing mission capable rates and low-observable performance characteristics. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase in RDTE line 68 in PE 64240F of $3.9 million to complete development and design of aft deck repair kits, and an increase in B–2 modifications of $27.1 million to procure aft deck repair.

The EHF SATCOM system is being developed to provide high bandwidth communications for both nuclear and conventional B–2 missions. The committee understands that the Air Force's programmed EHF SATCOM development budget will not deliver any EHF SATCOM equipped B–2 aircraft at the time required by the Commander of the Strategic Command, and therefore recommends an increase of $29.6 million in line 68 RDTE PE 64240F to accelerate development of the EHF SATCOM system by one year to deliver 17 EHF SATCOM equipped B–2 aircraft by the need date established by the Commander of the Strategic Command.

Subsequent to submission of the budget request, the Air Force informed the committee that it had inadvertently placed $24.7 million in RDTE line 116 in PE 64240F, which should have been included for B–2 procurement modifications. Accordingly, the committee recommends no funds for PE 64240F in RDTE line 116, a decrease of $24.7 million, and a corresponding increase of $24.7 million for B–2 procurement modifications.

The committee recommends $128.3 million for B–2 procurement modifications, an increase of $51.8 million; $185.6 million in line 68 RDTE PE 64240F, an increase of $33.5 million; and no funds in line 116 RDTE PE 64240F, a decrease of $24.7 million.

*C–5 modifications and force structure*

The budget request contained $92.0 million for C–5 modifications, of which $79.9 million was included for 18 C–5 AMP kits.

The C–5 AMP replaces unreliable and unsupportable engine flight instruments and flight system components. The committee notes that the budget request is 32 kits lower than projected for fiscal year 2004 when the fiscal year 2003 budget request was submitted last year, and that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included 12 C–5 AMP kits among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommends $131.4 million for C–5 modifications, an increase of $39.4 million for 12 C–5 AMP kits.

Additionally, the committee notes that the Secretary of the Air Force testified before the committee on February 27, 2003, that the Air Force hypothesizes that its fleet of C–5As will prove too costly to maintain. However, the committee understands that current Air Force plans include the retention of at least 62 C–5A's and 50 C–5B's for a total of 112 C–5 aircraft, and that a reliability and re-engining program (RERP) is underway to develop and test a RERP configuration for two C–5B's and one C–5A. Subsequent to the test and evaluation of both the RERP-configured C–5A and the C–5B aircraft, the committee understands that the Department of the Air Force will then decide whether its fleet of C–5A's are too costly to maintain, and believes that this course of action is prudent to sustain the required strategic airlift capability. To ensure that the Air

Force's current C–5 force structure plan is fully evaluated before C–5A retirement decisions are made, the committee recommends a provision (section 133) that would limit the Secretary of the Air Force from proceeding with a decision to retire C–5A aircraft from the active inventory if the active inventory of such aircraft would fall below 112, until a RERP-configured C–5A aircraft completes a dedicated initial operational test and evaluation, and the Department of Defense's Director of the Operational Test and Evaluation has provided his assessment of the RERP-configured C–5A's performance to both the Secretary of Defense and the congressional defense committees.

*C–17*

The budget request contained $2,027.6 million to procure 11 C–17 aircraft and $504.1 million for advance procurement of 14 aircraft in fiscal year 2005. The budget request also contained $42.8 million for C–17 modifications.

The C–17 is a strategic cargo aircraft, capable of rapid delivery to main operating bases, or directly to forward bases in the deployment area, and is also capable of performing tactical airlift and airdrop missions. The C–17 is currently procured under a multiyear procurement contract that ends in fiscal year 2008 at a delivery rate of 15 aircraft per year.

The committee notes that the January 2001 Mobility Requirements Study 2005 (MRS–05) concluded that the airlift capacity to transport 54.5 million ton miles per day (MTM/D) is needed to execute the national military strategy with a moderate degree of risk, but understands that currently airlift capacity is approximately 47.4 MTM/D. While the committee further understands that the Department of the Air Force plans to achieve 54.5 MTM/D airlift capacity in fiscal year 2012 by procuring a total of 180 C–17s and modernizing the C–5 aircraft fleet, it notes that the MRS–05 was completed before the global war on terrorism began, and believes that achieving a 54.5 MTM/D airlift capacity should be accelerated to meet emerging airlift requirements. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $182.0 million for procurement of one additional aircraft in fiscal year 2004. In making this recommendation, the committee expects that the Department of the Air Force will increase its C–17 production rate in order to deliver 16 aircraft per year for the remaining years of the current multiyear procurement contract.

Subsequent to submission of the budget request, the Department of the Air Force informed the committee of an error in both its C–17 aircraft procurement and its C–17 modification budget lines and requested that the committee make the appropriate corrections. Consistent with the Department's request, the committee recommends a decrease of $10.0 million for C–17 procurement and an increase of $6.3 million for C–17 modifications.

In total, the committee recommends $2,199.6 million for C–17 procurement, an increase of $172.0 million; and $49.1 million for C–17 modifications, an increase of $6.3 million.

*C–130 modifications*

The budget request contained $195.7 million for C–130 modifications but included no funds for the AN/APN–241 radar for the Air National Guard's (ANG) C–130 fleet.

The AN/APN–241 is a weather and navigation radar that replaces the 1950's-era 1AN/APN–59 radar currently installed on the ANG's C–130 aircraft fleet. The committee understands that the AN/APN–59, in addition to being obsolete, has a mean-time-between-failure (MTBF) rate of 50 hours and is very costly to maintain while the AN/APN–241 radar has significantly improved performance capabilities, and a MTBF rate of 1000 hours. Additionally, the committee notes that the Air National Guard director has included the AN/APN–241 radar as his highest unfunded C–130 modernization priority for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommends $201.8 million for C–130 modifications, an increase of $6.1 million for eight AN/APN–241 radars for the ANG's C–130 fleet.

*E–8C joint surveillance and target attack radar system (JSTARS) reengining*

The budget request contained $36.0 million for E–8 modifications, but included no funds to reengine the E–8C Joint STARS aircraft.

The E–8C Joint STARS aircraft provides near real-time surveillance and targeting information on moving and stationary ground targets, enabling battlefield commanders to quickly make and execute engagement decisions. The committee understands that the E–8C's current engines are old, inefficient, provide marginal power to support the E–8C's mission tasking, and are expensive to operate and maintain compared to new engines currently available in the commercial marketplace. The committee believes that new, replacement engines would allow the E–8C to climb more rapidly to the operationally required altitudes, maintain longer on-station times, provide improved aircraft availability, and would be more economical to operate and maintain.

The committee recommends $63.0 million for E–8 modifications, an increase of $27.0 million to begin a reengining program for the E–8C Joint STARS aircraft.

*F–15 modifications*

The budget request contained $197.6 million for F–15 modifications, of which $67.8 million was included for 32 F100 conversion kits and $17.1 million was included for four ALQ–135 band 1.5 modification kits, but included no funds to convert the Air National Guard's (ANG) F100 engines in their F–15 aircraft to the F100–220E configuration.

The ALQ–135 band 1.5 countermeasures system modification provides a self-protection jamming capability against modern surface-to-air enemy missiles and is integrated with the F–15E's existing internal countermeasure set and its ALR–56C radar warning receiver to provide full threat coverage. The committee believes that improved self-protection capability such as the ALQ–135 band 1.5 countermeasures system modification addresses critical deficiencies identified subsequent to Operation Allied Force in 1999, and that the ALQ–135 band 1.5 countermeasures system should be

produced at the most efficient rates and installed in all F–15E aircraft as rapidly as possible. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to procure four additional ALQ–135 band 1.5 modification kits, and encourages the Air Force to complete ALQ–135 band 1.5 production and installation all F–15E aircraft by fiscal year 2006.

Conversion kits for the F–15's F100 engine, also known as "E-kits," provide increased thrust, greater reliability, better fuel efficiency, and reduced operations and maintenance costs. The committee notes that the ANG's F–15 aircraft make a critical contribution to the both the Air Force's Air Expeditionary Forces and to homeland security in the air defense mission, and believes that engine conversion kits for the ANG's F–15 aircraft should be continued. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million to continue to convert the ANG F–15's F100 engines to the F100–220E configuration.

In total, the committee recommends $237.6 million for F–15 modifications, an increase of $40.0 million.

*F–16 Air National Guard (ANG) force structure*

The committee notes that the 177th Fighter Wing (FW) in Atlantic City, New Jersey has recently been designated as one of the several full time combat air patrol (CAP) alert sites by the United States Northern Command. The 177th FW currently possesses a primary assigned aircraft (PAA) strength of only 15 F–16 aircraft, but the committee believes that an increase to 24 PAA would enable the 177th FW to meet its CAP commitments to protect the citizens and property located on the east coast of the United States.

The committee understands that the 144th FW at Fresno, California, which currently flies the F–16 block 25 aircraft, is scheduled to convert to the F–15 aircraft, and the committee encourages the Air Force to accelerate the 144th FW's planned conversion and to transfer 11 of the 144th FW's block 25 F–16 aircraft to the 177th FW in order to increase the 177th FW's PAA by nine aircraft and to provide two aircraft as back up inventory.

*F–16 modifications*

The budget request contained $300.6 million for F–16 modifications, of which $43.0 million was included for the Falcon structural augmentation roadmap (STAR), but included no funds to retrofit the Air Reserve Component's (ARC) F–16 aircraft with the onboard oxygen-generating system (OBOGS). The ARC is comprised of both the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve.

Falcon STAR is a depot-level upgrade program that replaces or modifies known life-limited F–16 aircraft structure to preclude the onset of widespread fatigue damage, maintain safety of flight, enhance aircraft availability, and extend the life of affected components to 8,000 hours. The committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included additional funding for the Falcon STAR program to address depot labor rate cost increases among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2004, and therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.8 million for this purpose.

The F–16 OBOGS replaces the antiquated liquid oxygen system by creating a continuous supply of breathing oxygen to pilots by using pressurized engine bleed air routed through a molecular

sieve which removes nitrogen, yielding 93 percent pure oxygen. The committee understands that Air Force studies project that each aircraft equipped with OBOGS will result in a $12,000 per year savings, and the investment to install the OBOGS will be returned within three to five years. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $8.4 million to install the OBOGS on ARC F–16 aircraft.

The committee recommends $314.8 million for F–16 modifications, an increase of $14.2 million.

*F/A–22*

The budget request contained $3,727.1 million for 22 F/A–22 aircraft.

The committee notes that although $4,061.9 million was appropriated for 23 F/A–22 in fiscal year 2003, the Department of Defense requested a recent reprogramming to decrease that amount by $27.9 million leaving $4,034.0 million and sufficient funds for a planned quantity of only 20 F/A–22 aircraft in fiscal year 2003. However, the Department of the Air Force informed the committee that, as a result of increased efficiencies and lower negotiated vendor costs, actual contracted unit costs for the airframe, engine and avionics were reduced, and the Air Force will procure an additional aircraft in fiscal year 2003.

Since the fiscal year 2003 unit costs have been reduced, the committee believes that fiscal year 2004 unit costs will also be reduced due to increased learning curve efficiencies and lower negotiated vendor costs, and that the F/A–22 budget request exceeds requirements by $161.0 million for the planned quantity of 22 aircraft.

Therefore, the committee recommends $3,566.1 million for 22 F/A–22 aircraft, a decrease of $161.0 million.

Additionally, the committee notes that the Air Force testified before the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on April 2, 2003, that the F/A–22 program's key challenge is to deliver a stable and fully tested avionics software operational flight program (OFP) that runs for a sufficient period of time before an instability event occurs. Also in testimony before the subcommittee, the General Accounting Office stated that software instability had hampered efforts to integrate advanced avionics capabilities into the F/A–22 system, and that in its research on the F/A–22 program, the Air Force acknowledged that avionics have failed or shut down during numerous tests of F/A–22 aircraft due to software problems and that these shutdowns have occurred when the pilot attempts to use the radar, communication, navigation, identification, and electronic systems concurrently. The committee further notes that the Air Force testified that its then-current avionics software OFP version was only performing at a rate of 1.3 hours mean time between instability events (MTBIE), but understands that the Air Force plans to introduce avionics software OFP version 3.1.2, or a later version, that would achieve a goal of 20 hours MTBIE before the commencement of dedicated initial operational test and evaluation (DIOT&E), currently scheduled for October 2003. As a result of this testimony, the committee believes that attaining a goal of at least 20 hours MTBIE before the commencement of the F/A–22 DIOT&E program is critical to successful completion of DIOT&E, for intro-

duction of the F/A–22 into the Air Force's operational fleet, and for continuation of F/A–22 production at requested rates.

Consequently, the committee recommends a provision (section 134) that would limit the obligation of $136.0 million of the amount appropriated for fiscal year 2004 F/A–22 aircraft procurement, or an amount for one F/A–22 aircraft, until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics certifies to the congressional defense committees that the four primary aircraft designated to participate in the F/A–22's DIOT&E program have been equipped with the avionics software OFP version 3.1.2, or a later version, and that before the commencement of the DIOT&E, those four aircraft demonstrate, on average, an avionics software MTBIE of at least 20 hours. If the Under Secretary notifies the Secretary of Defense that the Under Secretary is unable to make the certification described above, then the Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation by notifying the congressional defense committees of his reasons therefore, and funds may be obligated at the end of a 30–day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary's notification is received by the committees.

*Fixed aircrew standardized seats (FASS)*

The budget request contained $69.7 million for other modifications, but included no funds for FASS.

FASS would provide crewmembers and passengers on C–130, C–135, C–141, C–5, E–3, KC–10, C–17, and E–8 aircraft protection against aircraft crash loads up to 16 times the force of gravity. In prior years, the committee has supported the development of the FASS, and understands that production-ready seats can be procured for the C–130 and KC–135 aircraft by the second quarter of fiscal year 2004. The committee continues to believe that FASS procurement would not only increase safety, but would also reduce supply and maintenance costs through commonality and interchangeability of parts.

The committee recommends $74.5 million for other modifications, an increase of $4.8 million for procurement of 240 FASS.

*H–60 modifications*

The budget request contained $44.7 million for H–60 modifications, but included no funds to upgrade the AN/ARS–6 personnel locator system (PLS) with version 12 capability.

The AN/ARS–6 PLS is a radio system which has been in use with the Air National Guard for the past 15 years, used to detect and locate downed military and civilian aviators. The version 12 upgrade would allow operation with all current and future survival radios, including emergency beacons in both the defense and civil environments. The committee understands that the AN/ARS–6 PLS version 12 upgrade also includes technology upgrades making the system lighter and more powerful.

The committee recommends $49.7 million for H–60 modifications, an increase of $4.7 million to upgrade the AN/ARS–6 PLS with version 12 capability and to conduct an operational evaluation of this system for the search and rescue mission.

*Predator B unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV)*

The budget request contained $193.6 million for procurement of 16 Predator UAV systems.

The Predator UAV system provides long-dwell, real-time intelligence information to Joint Task Force Commanders. The committee notes that the employment of the Predator UAV system in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom demonstrated both Predator system intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities and Hellfire missile delivery capability. As missions for the Predator UAV system expand, the committee believes that the improved speed and payload capacity of the Predator B UAV is critical to future combat operations.

The committee recommends $211.6 million, an increase of $18.0 million for Predator B UAV systems and associated spare parts.

## AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $1,284.7 million for Ammunition Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $1,324.7 million, an increase of $40.0 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Ammunition Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **ROCKETS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | ROCKETS | - | 64,494 | | 10,000 | | 10,000 | | | - | 74,494 |
| | **CARTRIDGES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | CARTRIDGES | - | 159,746 | | | | | | | - | 159,746 |
| | **BOMBS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | PRACTICE BOMBS | - | 45,909 | | | | | | | - | 45,909 |
| 4 | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | - | 167,834 | | 20,000 | | | | | - | 187,834 |
| | To be used only for Bomb Bodies to synchronize with PGM Kits | | | | | | 20,000 | | | | |
| 5 | CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | SENSOR FUZED WEAPON | 294 | 117,841 | | | | | | | 294 | 117,841 |
| 7 | JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION | 20,244 | 427,709 | | | | | | | 20,244 | 427,709 |
| 8 | WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISP | 2,516 | 72,411 | | | | | | | 2,516 | 72,411 |
| | **FLARE, IR MJU-7B** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | CAD/PAD | - | 20,030 | | | | | | | - | 20,030 |
| 10 | EXPLOSIVE ORDINANCE DISPOSAL | - | 3,175 | | | | | | | - | 3,175 |
| 11 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 164 | | | | | | | - | 164 |
| 12 | REPLENISHMENT SPARES | - | 3,167 | | | | | | | - | 3,167 |
| 13 | MODIFICATIONS <5M | - | 189 | | | | | | | - | 189 |
| 14 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 336 | | | | | | | - | 336 |
| | **FUZES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | FLARES | - | 146,221 | | 10,000 | | 10,000 | | | - | 156,221 |
| 16 | FUZES | - | 36,466 | | | | | | | - | 36,466 |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE** | | **1,265,692** | | **40,000** | | **40,000** | | **-** | | **1,305,692** |
| | **WEAPONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SMALL ARMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | SMALL ARMS | - | 19,033 | | | | | | | - | 19,033 |
| | **TOTAL WEAPONS** | | **19,033** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **19,033** |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE** | | **1,284,725** | | **40,000** | | **40,000** | | **-** | | **1,324,725** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Air Force ammunition procurement*

The budget request contained $1,265.7 million for procurement of ammunition. The committee recommends $1,305.7 million, an increase of $40.0 million for the following types of ammunition programs, which were identified as top unfunded requirements by the Chief of Staff of the Air Force for fiscal year 2004:

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Rockets: | |
| 2.75 inch War Reserve/Training rounds | 10.0 |
| Bombs: | |
| General Purpose Bombs | 20.0 |
| (to be used only for the procurement of bomb bodies to synchronize with precision guided munitions kits) | |
| Flares: | |
| War Reserve/Training Pyrotechnics | 10.0 |

## MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $4,393.0 million for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $4,348.0 million, a decrease of $45.0 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Missile Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **BALLISTIC MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLIS | - | 50,713 | | | | | | | - | 50,713 |
| | **TOTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES** | | **50,713** | | - | | - | | - | | **50,713** |
| | **OTHER MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TACTICAL** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | JASSM | 250 | 102,534 | | | | | | | 250 | 102,534 |
| 3 | JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON | 325 | 79,981 | | | | | | | 325 | 79,981 |
| 4 | SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X) | 386 | 69,072 | | | | | | | 386 | 69,072 |
| 5 | AMRAAM | 201 | 105,246 | | | | | | | 201 | 105,246 |
| 6 | PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE | 280 | 23,117 | | | | | | | 280 | 23,117 |
| 7 | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | REPLEN SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | - | 1,948 | | | | | | | - | 1,948 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER MISSILES** | | **381,898** | | - | | - | | - | | **381,898** |
| | **MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **CLASS IV** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE | - | 3,498 | | | | | | | - | 3,498 |
| 10 | MM III MODIFICATIONS | - | 606,964 | | | | | | | - | 606,964 |
| 11 | AGM-65D MAVERICK | - | 318 | | | | | | | - | 318 |
| 12 | AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE | - | 11,478 | | | | | | | - | 11,478 |
| 13 | PEACEKEEPER (M-X) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **TOTAL MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES** | | **622,258** | | - | | - | | - | | **622,258** |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | REPLEN SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | - | 78,449 | | | | | | | - | 78,449 |
| | **TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **78,449** | | - | | - | | - | | **78,449** |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **OTHER SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SPACE PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | ADVANCED EHF | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 16 | WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES | - | 34,588 | | | | | | | - | 34,588 |
| 16 | WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 17 | WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 18 | SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC) | - | 9,145 | | | | | | | - | 9,145 |
| 19 | GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) | - | 229,599 | | | | | | | - | 229,599 |
| 19 | GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) | - | (2,977) | | | | | | | - | (2,977) |
| 20 | GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 20 | GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) | - | 32,230 | | | | | | | - | 32,230 |
| 20 | GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 21 | NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 22 | DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(S | - | 68,026 | | | | | | | - | 68,026 |
| 23 | DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE | - | 113,067 | | | | | | | - | 113,067 |
| 24 | DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM | - | 12,479 | | | | | | | - | 12,479 |
| 25 | TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS(SPACE) | - | 91,499 | | (45,000) | | | | | - | 46,499 |
| | Titan Space Boosters | | | | | | | | (45,000) | | |
| 26 | EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH | 4 | 609,310 | | | | | | | 4 | 609,310 |
| 27 | MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE) | - | 91,128 | | | | | | | - | 91,128 |
| | **SPECIAL PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 29 | DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM | - | 292,000 | | | | | | | - | 292,000 |
| 30 | SPECIAL PROGRAMS | - | 1,552,081 | | | | | | | - | 1,552,081 |
| 31 | SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS | - | 127,546 | | | | | | | - | 127,546 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER SUPPORT** | | **3,259,721** | | **(45,000)** | | **-** | | **(45,000)** | | **3,214,721** |
| | **TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | **4,393,039** | | **(45,000)** | | **-** | | **(45,000)** | | **4,348,039** |

## OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

### Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $11,583.7 million for Other Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $11,376.1 million, a decrease of $207.6 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Other Prucurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | SEDAN, 4 DR 4X2 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 2 | STATION WAGON, 4X2 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 3 | BUSES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 4 | AMBULANCES | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 5 | LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 6 | ARMORED VEHICLE | 1 | 243 | | | | | | | 1 | 243 |
| 7 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLE | 269 | 12,031 | | | | | | | 269 | 12,031 |
| | **CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4 | - | 15,515 | | | | | | | - | 15,515 |
| 9 | TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4 | - | 5,374 | | | | | | | - | 5,374 |
| 10 | TRUCK MAINT/UTILITY/DELIVERY | - | 10,244 | | | | | | | - | 10,244 |
| 11 | TRUCK CARRYALL | - | 9,552 | | | | | | | - | 9,552 |
| 12 | FAMILY MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE | - | 5,687 | | | | | | | - | 5,687 |
| 13 | HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP) | - | 3,714 | | | | | | | - | 3,714 |
| 14 | CAP VEHICLES | - | 786 | | | | | | | - | 786 |
| 15 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 38,283 | | | | | | | - | 38,283 |
| | **SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | TRUCK TANK FUEL R-11 | - | 14,115 | | | | | | | - | 14,115 |
| 17 | HMMWV, ARMORED | - | 2,968 | | | | | | | - | 2,968 |
| 18 | HMWWV, UP-ARMORED | - | 5,809 | | | | | | | - | 5,809 |
| 19 | TRACTOR, A/C TOW, MB-2 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 20 | TRACTOR, A/C TOW, MB-4 | - | 3,768 | | | | | | | - | 3,768 |
| 21 | TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE | - | 6,052 | | | | | | | - | 6,052 |
| 22 | TRUCK HYDRANT FUEL | - | 1,397 | | | | | | | - | 1,397 |
| 23 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 24,028 | | | | | | | - | 24,028 |
| | **FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | TRUCK CRASH P-19 | - | 4,836 | | | | | | | - | 4,836 |
| 25 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 5,564 | | | | | | | - | 5,564 |
| | **MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 26 | TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB | - | 8,510 | | | | | | | - | 8,510 |
| 27 | TUNNER LOADER | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 28 | HALVERSEN LOADER | 30 | 19,339 | | | | | | | 30 | 19,339 |
| 29 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 9,423 | | | | | | | - | 9,423 |
| | **BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | LOADER, SCOOP | - | 5,656 | | | | | | | - | 5,656 |
| 31 | TRUCK, DUMP | - | 4,990 | | | | | | | - | 4,990 |
| 32 | RUNWAY SNOW REMOVAL & CLEANING | - | 16,298 | | | | | | | - | 16,298 |
| 33 | MODIFICATIONS | - | 564 | | | | | | | - | 564 |
| 34 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 12,260 | | | | | | | - | 12,260 |
| | **TOTAL VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT** | | **247,006** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **247,006** |
| | **ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | COMSEC EQUIPMENT | - | 30,417 | | | | | | | - | 30,417 |
| 36 | MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC) | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT | - | 2,935 | | | | | | | - | 2,935 |
| 38 | INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP | - | 1,683 | | | | | | | - | 1,683 |
| | **ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYS (AT | - | 74,664 | | | | | | | - | 74,664 |
| 40 | NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM | - | 33,704 | | | | | | | - | 33,704 |
| 41 | THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPRO | - | 29,849 | | | | | | | - | 29,849 |
| 42 | WEATHER OBSERVE/FORECAST | - | 32,839 | | 3,900 | | | | | - | 36,739 |
| | NPOESS Support Initiative | | | | | | 3,900 | | | | |
| 43 | STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL | - | 43,094 | | | | | | | - | 43,094 |
| 44 | CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX | - | 20,613 | | | | | | | - | 20,613 |
| 45 | TAC SIGINT SUPPORT | - | 389 | | | | | | | - | 389 |
| 46 | DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM | - | 403 | | | | | | | - | 403 |
| 47 | HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MO | - | 48,927 | | (25,000) | | | | | - | 23,927 |
| | High Performance Computing Mo | | | | | | | | (25,000) | | |
| | **SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS** | | | | | | | | | | |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 48 | GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY | - | 119,534 | | (5,000) | | | | | - | 114,534 |
| | Joint Personnel Adjudication System | | | | | | | | (17,000) | | |
| | SELDI | | | | | | 12,000 | | | | |
| 49 | AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL S | - | 23,457 | | | | | | | - | 23,457 |
| 50 | MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL | - | 9,247 | | | | | | | - | 9,247 |
| 51 | AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY S | - | 34,877 | | | | | | | - | 34,877 |
| 52 | COMBAT TRAINING RANGES | - | 23,442 | | 8,800 | | | | | - | 32,242 |
| | Mini MUTES | | | | | | 8,800 | | | | |
| 53 | MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY C | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 54 | C3 COUNTERMEASURES | - | 11,634 | | | | | | | - | 11,634 |
| 55 | GCSS-AF FOS | - | 17,147 | | | | | | | - | 17,147 |
| 56 | THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS | - | 50,803 | | | | | | | - | 50,803 |
| 57 | AIR OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC) | - | 45,954 | | | | | | | - | 45,954 |
| | **AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 58 | BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE | - | 268,408 | | (25,000) | | | | | - | 243,408 |
| | Defend the Enclave | | | | | | | | (25,000) | | |
| 59 | USCENTCOM | - | 30,335 | | | | | | | - | 30,335 |
| 60 | DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS) | - | 10,555 | | | | | | | - | 10,555 |
| | **DISA PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 61 | SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PROG SP | - | 95,421 | | | | | | | - | 95,421 |
| 62 | NAVSTAR GPS SPACE | - | 10,332 | | | | | | | - | 10,332 |
| 63 | NUDET DETECTION SYS (NDS) SPA | - | 10,786 | | | | | | | - | 10,786 |
| 64 | AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK | - | 48,229 | | | | | | | - | 48,229 |
| 65 | SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE | - | 80,635 | | | | | | | - | 80,635 |
| 66 | MILSATCOM SPACE | - | 42,329 | | | | | | | - | 42,329 |
| 67 | SPACE MODS SPACE | - | 30,747 | | | | | | | - | 30,747 |
| 68 | COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **ORGANIZATION AND BASE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 69 | TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT | - | 158,322 | | | | | | | - | 158,322 |
| 70 | COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATE | - | 8,839 | | 13,700 | | | | | - | 22,539 |
| | Program increase | | | | | | 13,700 | | | | |
| 71 | RADIO EQUIPMENT | - | 8,750 | | | | | | | - | 8,750 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 72 | TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV) | - | 2,590 | | | | | | | - | 2,590 |
| 73 | CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT | - | 3,238 | | | | | | | - | 3,238 |
| 74 | BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE | - | 160,558 | | | | | | | - | 160,558 |
| 75 | CAP COM & ELECT | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 76 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 5,960 | | | | | | | - | 5,960 |
| 77 | COMM ELECT MODS | - | 38,732 | | | | | | | - | 38,732 |
| | **TOTAL ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT** | | **1,670,378** | | **(28,600)** | | **38,400** | | **(67,000)** | | **1,641,778** |
| | **OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **TEST EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 78 | BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE | - | 13,528 | | | | | | | - | 13,528 |
| 79 | PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY | - | 1,074 | | | | | | | - | 1,074 |
| 80 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 9,382 | | | | | | | - | 9,382 |
| | **PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 81 | NIGHT VISION GOGGLES | - | 5,340 | | | | | | | - | 5,340 |
| 82 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 7,435 | | | | | | | - | 7,435 |
| | **DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 83 | MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING | - | 13,919 | | 12,000 | | | | | - | 25,919 |
| | Point of Maintenance Initiative | | | | | | 12,000 | | | | |
| 84 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 11,702 | | | | | | | - | 11,702 |
| | **ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 85 | FLOODLIGHTS | - | 5,616 | | | | | | | - | 5,616 |
| 86 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 9,570 | | | | | | | - | 9,570 |
| | **BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 87 | BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT | - | 9,617 | | 9,000 | | | | | - | 18,617 |
| | Combat Arms Training System | | | | | | 9,000 | | | | |
| 88 | MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT | - | 13,889 | | | | | | | - | 13,889 |
| 89 | ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS | - | 664 | | | | | | | - | 664 |
| 90 | AIR BASE OPERABILITY | - | 5,502 | | | | | | | - | 5,502 |
| 91 | PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT | - | 5,708 | | | | | | | - | 5,708 |
| 92 | PRODUCTIVITY ENHANCING CAPITA | - | 6,210 | | | | | | | - | 6,210 |
| 93 | MOBILITY EQUIPMENT | - | 92,951 | | | | | | | - | 92,951 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| 94 | AIR CONDITIONERS | - | 10,238 | | | | | | | - | 10,238 |
| 95 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | - | 14,940 | | | | | | | - | 14,940 |
| | **SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 96 | PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES | - | 50,442 | | | | | | | - | 50,442 |
| 97 | TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ | - | 3,998 | | | | | | | - | 3,998 |
| 98 | DARP RC135 | - | 16,775 | | | | | | | - | 16,775 |
| 99 | DARP, MRIGS | - | 99,915 | | | | | | | - | 99,915 |
| 100 | SELECTED ACTIVITIES | - | 8,981,728 | | | | | | | - | 8,981,728 |
| 101 | SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM | - | 220,228 | | | | | | | - | 220,228 |
| 102 | DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE | - | 14,141 | | | | | | | - | 14,141 |
| 103 | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 104 | MODIFICATIONS | - | 201 | | | | | | | - | 201 |
| 105 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | - | 4,980 | | | | | | | - | 4,980 |
| | **TOTAL OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP** | | **9,629,693** | | **21,000** | | **21,000** | | **-** | | **9,650,693** |
| | **SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 106 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 36,582 | | | | | | | - | 36,582 |
| | **TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS** | | **36,582** | | **-** | | **-** | | **-** | | **36,582** |
| | Information Technology General Reduction | | | | (200,000) | | | | (200,000) | | (200,000) |
| | **TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE** | | **11,583,659** | | **(207,600)** | | **59,400** | | **(267,000)** | | **11,376,059** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Air Force information technology procurement*

The budget request for Other Procurement, Air Force, contained $48.9 million for high performance computing modernization, $119.5 million for general information technology, and $268.4 million for base information infrastructure.

The committee is concerned about the excessive and unjustified growth in the Air Force's procurement for information technology (IT) programs. While the committee supports the procurement of IT systems that will transform the way the Air Force plans and tasks weather, intelligence gathering, targeting and airspace information, the committee is also concerned that some of the programs lack credible evidence to justify the double or triple amount of growth in this budget.

The committee recommends $23.9 million for high performance computing modernization, a decrease of $25.0 million; a decrease of $17.0 million in the Joint Personnel Adjudication System requested in general information technology; and $243.4 million for base information infrastructure, a decrease of $25.0 million in the Defending the Enclave Boundary Program.

*Combat arms training system (CATS)*

The budget request contained $9.6 million for base procured equipment, but included no funds for CATS. CATS is a computer-based simulation system that provides both marksmanship and tactical situation scenario training for security force personnel.

The committee understands that since September 11, 2001, Air National Guard (ANG) bases, which are each equipped with one CATS, are used daily to train security force personnel, and that, as a result of this daily use, two additional systems are required at each ANG base leaving a shortfall of 184 systems. With limited access to firing ranges and training munitions, the committee believes that the CATS is proving to be an essential asset to meet the ANG personnel marksmanship and weapons certification training, and to meet situational scenario readiness requirements.

The committee recommends $18.6 million for base procured equipment, an increase of $9.0 million for the CATS.

*General information technology*

The budget request contained $119.5 million for general information technologies, but included no funds for procurement of the science and engineering lab data integration (SELDI) program.

The Air Force Material Command's science and engineering lab captures, analyzes and disseminates lab test data to the Air Force's engineering and system overhaul operations, and the committee notes that the SELDI program facilitates this mission by providing more rapid lab data access affecting overhaul operations, providing accident investigators with immediate access to lab results of failed components, enabling component failure trend analysis, and implementing new acoustic signature sensors to ensure the proper chemical composition of materials and equipment.

The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million for the SELDI program, and understands that the SELDI program would

improve operational aircraft readiness, increase flight safety and reduce support costs.

*Miniature-multiple threat emitter system (Mini-MUTES)*

The budget request contained $23.4 million for combat training ranges, but included no funds for Mini-MUTES initial spares.

The Mini-MUTEs is an electronic warfare training system which simulates radar emissions for use in aircrew training. The committee understands that the Mini-MUTES is undergoing a modernization program to improve its capabilities to simulate advanced surface-to-air missile threats, but that initial spares for the modernization program have not been budgeted. The committee further understands that providing for initial spares in fiscal year 2004 would save an additional $3.0 million in future years, and notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included Mini-MUTES initial spares among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommends $32.2 million for combat training ranges an increase of $8.8 million for initial spares for Mini-MUTES modernization program.

*Point of maintenance initiative (POMX)*

The budget request contained $13.9 million for mechanized material handling equipment, but included no funds for procurement of the POMX.

The POMX is a maintenance data collection program that uses equipment and methodologies that are currently in widespread commercial use to increase the timeliness and accuracy of the critical data collected. Examples of POMX equipment include: handheld terminals, bar codes, and wireless local area networks. The committee notes that the POMX objective is to increase the timeliness and accuracy of maintenance data collection while reducing the administrative burden on maintenance technicians, and understands that its use has already been validated at one Air Force base.

The committee recommends $25.9 million for mechanized material handling equipment, an increase of $12.0 million, to continue the POMX.

## PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

### Overview

The amended budget request for fiscal year 2004 contained $3,665.5 million for Procurement, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends authorization of $3,734.8 million, an increase of $69.3 million, for fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2004 Procurement, Defense-Wide program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Defense-Wide request are discussed following the table.

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | WHS MOTOR VEHICLES | 2 | 70 | | | | | | | 2 | 70 |
| 2 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD | - | 37,291 | | | | | | | - | 37,291 |
| 3 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS | - | 21,622 | | (5,000) | | | | | - | 16,622 |
| | Case Control Management System | | | | | | | | (5,000) | | |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 5 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 6 | DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PGM | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 7 | DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE COUNTERDRUG PROGRAM | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY | - | 32,860 | | | | | | | - | 32,860 |
| 9 | CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 10 | DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM | - | 5,277 | | (5,277) | | | | (5,277) | - | - |
| 11 | GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS | - | 4,743 | | | | | | | - | 4,743 |
| 12 | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | - | 2,507 | | | | | | | - | 2,507 |
| 13 | TELEPORTS | - | 58,160 | | | | | | | - | 58,160 |
| 14 | GLOBAL INFORMATION GRID | - | 380,135 | | | | | | | - | 380,135 |
| 15 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5M | - | 70,025 | | (8,408) | | | | | - | 61,617 |
| | Program Reduction | | | | | | | | (8,408) | | |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 17 | INTELLIGENCE PLANNING AND REVIEW ACTIVITIES | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 18 | HEADQUARTERS MANAGEMENT DIA | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 19 | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO OSD COUNTER-NARCOTICS | | | | | | | | | | - |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | - | 8,545 | | | | | | | - | 8,545 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M | - | 1,500 | | | | | | | - | 1,500 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS | - | 46,114 | | | | | | | - | 46,114 |
| | **MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | PATRIOT PAC-3 | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION | - | 7,312 | | | | | | | - | 7,312 |
| | **NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NIMA | | | | | | | | | | - |
| | **DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | VEHICLES | - | 200 | | | | | | | - | 200 |
| 27 | OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT | - | 37,350 | | | | | | | - | 37,350 |
| | **DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT | - | 209 | | | | | | | - | 209 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS | - | 6,824 | | | | | | | - | 6,824 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODDE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS | - | 2,337 | | | | | | | - | 2,337 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | - | 9,908 | | | | | | | - | 9,908 |
| | **MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DTSA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | - | 590 | | | | | | | - | 590 |
| | **TOTAL MAJOR EQUIPMENT** | | **733,579** | | **(18,685)** | | **-** | | **(18,685)** | | **714,894** |
| | **SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **AVIATION PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES | - | 675,063 | | | | | | | - | 675,063 |
| 34 | SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS | - | 56,133 | | | | | | | - | 56,133 |
| 35 | MC-130H COMBAT TALON II | - | 8,838 | | | | | | | - | 8,838 |
| 36 | CV-22 SOF MODIFICATION | 2 | 108,790 | | | | | | | 2 | 108,790 |
| 37 | AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION | - | 390,054 | | | | | | | - | 390,054 |
| 38 | C-130 MODIFICATIONS | - | 214,798 | | | | | | | - | 214,798 |
| 39 | AIRCRAFT SUPPORT | - | 295 | | | | | | | - | 295 |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **SHIPBUILDING** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS | - | 8,351 | | | | | | | - | 8,351 |
| 40 | ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 41 | ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 41 | ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS | - | 23,573 | | | | | | | - | 23,573 |
| 41 | ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 42 | MK VIII MOD 1 - SEAL DELIVERY VEH | - | 10,100 | | | | | | | - | 10,100 |
| | **AMMUNITION PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 | SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT | - | 35,746 | | | | | | | - | 35,746 |
| 44 | CONVENTIONAL AMMO WORKING CAPITAL FUND | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 45 | SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION | - | 22,506 | | 10,500 | | | | | - | 33,006 |
| | Special Operations Forces (SOF) Ordnance | | | | | | 10,500 | | | | |
| | **OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 46 | COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS | - | 56,225 | | | | | | | - | 56,225 |
| 47 | SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS | - | 16,522 | | | | | | | - | 16,522 |
| 48 | SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS | - | 16,003 | | 16,500 | | | | | - | 32,503 |
| | Mini Night Vision Sight (SOPMOD) | | | | | | 8,000 | | | | |
| | Infrared Zoom Laser Illuminator/Designator | | | | | | 3,500 | | | | |
| | Light Weight Counter Mortar Radar | | | | | | 5,000 | | | | |
| 49 | JOINT MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM | - | 18,269 | | | | | | | - | 18,269 |
| 50 | ITV | - | 5,206 | | | | | | | - | 5,206 |
| 51 | MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODS | - | 1,316 | | | | | | | - | 1,316 |
| 52 | SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS | - | 9,981 | | | | | | | - | 9,981 |
| 53 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | - | 7,995 | | | | | | | - | 7,995 |
| 54 | SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT | - | 1,990 | | | | | | | - | 1,990 |
| 55 | DRUG INTERDICTION | - | - | | | | | | | - | - |
| 56 | MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT | - | 11,207 | | | | | | | - | 11,207 |
| 57 | SOF PLANNING AND REHEARSAL SYSTEM | - | 292 | | | | | | | - | 292 |
| 58 | SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS | - | 235,269 | | | | | | | - | 235,269 |
| | Budget Amendment | | | | | | | | | | |
| 59 | PSYOP EQUIPMENT | - | 18,264 | | | | | | | - | 18,264 |
| | **TOTAL SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND** | | **1,952,786** | | **27,000** | | **27,000** | | **-** | | **1,979,786** |

**Title I - PROCUREMENT**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | | Committee Change | | Committee Increase | | Committee Decrease | | FY 2004 Committee Authorization | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST | QTY. | COST |
| | **CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **CBDP** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 60 | INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION | - | 85,018 | | | | | | | - | 85,018 |
| 61 | DECONTAMINATION | - | 12,643 | | | | | | | - | 12,643 |
| 62 | JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | - | 71,952 | | | | | | | - | 71,952 |
| 63 | COLLECTIVE PROTECTION | - | 17,608 | | 36,000 | | | | | - | 53,608 |
| | Collective Protection Systems | | | | | | 31,000 | | | | |
| | M28 Protective Equipment | | | | | | 5,000 | | | | |
| 64 | CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE | - | 318,516 | | 25,000 | | | | | - | 343,516 |
| | Joint Chemical Agent Detector | | | | | | 15,000 | | | | |
| | M22 Automatic Chemical Agent Alarm | | | | | | 10,000 | | | | |
| | **TOTAL CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE** | | **505,737** | | **61,000** | | **61,000** | | **-** | | **566,737** |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | - | 473,404 | | | | | | | - | 473,404 |
| | **TOTAL CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS** | | **473,404** | | **-** | | | | | | **473,404** |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE** | | **3,665,506** | | **69,315** | | **88,000** | | **(18,685)** | | **3,734,821** |

Items of Special Interest

*Chemical/biological defense procurement program*

The budget request contained $505.7 million for chemical/biological defense (CBD) procurement, including $85.0 million for procurement of individual protection equipment, $12.6 million for decontamination equipment, $72.0 million for the joint biological defense program, $17.6 million for collective protection equipment, and $318.5 million for contamination avoidance equipment.

The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million for procurement of the Joint Chemical Agent Detector (JCAD), an increase of $10.0 million for procurement of the M22 Automatic Chemical Agent Alarm for the Army National Guard, and a total of $53.6 million for collective protection equipment, including an increase of $31.0 million for procurement of chemical biological protective shelters for field medical treatment, forward surgical teams, and battalion medical units, and $5.0 million for M28 collective protection equipment.

*Defense wide information technology procurement*

The budget request contained $21.6 million for procurement for Washington Headquarters Services, including $10.4 million for the Case Control Management System.

This program supports the Defense Security Service's (DSS) mission to handle personnel security investigations by providing the processing of military, civilian, and contractor personnel security actions for the Department of Defense. The committee is concerned that the overall plan to incorporate this system with the Air Force Joint Personnel Adjudication System has not been clearly defined in order to seamlessly merge these two systems into one functioning system that will serve the entire Department.

The committee recommends $16.6 million for procurement for Washington Headquarters Services procurement, a decrease of $5.0 million in the Case Control Management System.

*Department of defense budget justification documentation*

The committee notes the delayed submission, perfunctory content, conflicting budgetary data, and administratively-challenged display of many of the exhibits included in the budget justification documentation provided to the congressional defense committees by the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and the military services.

Several OSD exhibits dated February 2003 were provided to the committees in April. Individual programs were often randomly organized, misidentified, duplicated item numbers, and aggregated unrelated projects. In the OSD submission for procurement, Patriot is identified as item 23 in the P–1 summary table exhibit and item 10 in the budget estimate exhibit. Also in the OSD procurement submission, there are two items identified as 15. Under the second, "Items under $5 million," one item requested is for $16.054 million, one item for $9.75 million, one item for $6.5 million, etc. The total for this P–1 line item is $70.0 million. The total requested in the budget estimate displays is $61.592 million. The committee recommends $61.592 million, a reduction of $8.408 million.

Since December 2002, the Department has been unable to provide a cross walk between budget lines items and the $27.0 billion identified in its "Information Technology FY 2003 Budget Estimates" exhibit. The Department has similarly failed to provide the same requested information for the fiscal year 2004 submission of $27.9 billion. As a result, it is not possible to validate the $27.9 billion request.

Numerous inconsistencies in program identification and item enumeration exist between the OSD provided tables; P–1 and R–1; and justification in the biennial budget estimate exhibits. OSD and the military services increasingly aggregate large numbers of often unrelated projects in common program elements, effectively limiting congressional oversight.

The Navy identified a request in its R–1, line 111, for "unguided conventional air launched weapons" of $9.701 million. Examination of the R–2, line 108, indicated that the request was for the precision guided Standoff Land Attack Missile. The Navy also requested $25.137 million for the Tri-Service Standoff Attack Missile, a program cancelled ten years ago. Further examination of the backup material indicated the request was for the Joint Air to Surface Standoff Missile. Similarly, the budget request for EA–18G, a projected multi-billion dollar program, is subsumed in the budget request for electronic warfare with five other projects. The committee directs that a new program element be established for the EA–18G of PE 64271N of $204.822 million, with a corresponding reduction in PE 64270N.

The Air Force used the same program element numbers for the same program in different phases of development, one in advanced technology development, the other in operational systems development, and randomly aggregated and incorrectly enumerated much of the materials provided in the research and development submission. Further, programs were frequently placed in research and development budget activities without regard to the actual phase of development, e.g., MC2A.

The Army request included extraneous, unrelated descriptive material for the Warfighter Information Network request and identified many of its special access programs using program element numbers unrelated to the provided R–1 exhibit.

Taken individually, these examples may seem trifling. Yet, they involve billions of taxpayer dollars. Taken together, these inconsistencies and mistakes call into question the effectiveness of the oversight provided by OSD. As noted above, the procurement and research and development displays for similar items in the military services are more often than not arrayed and consolidated differently, making meaningful comparisons among service programs more difficult for Congress, the Executive Office of the President, and OSD. Given the Secretary of Defense's emphasis on transformation, joint warfighting, and auditable financial systems and the responsibilities of senior executive branch officials and members of Congress to make reasoned judgments about spending taxpayer dollars, the committee believes that more rigorous oversight of budget exhibits by responsible OSD officials is required. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2003 his recommenda-

tions for providing timely, consistent, clear, and meaningful budget presentations to Congress.

*Information technology*

The budget request included $10.8 billion, $28.9 billion, and $29.3 billion in Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, in procurement and $9.1 billion, $14.1 billion, $20.3 billion, and $17.1 billion, respectively, in Army, Navy, Air Force, and defense-wide Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E), including information technology (IT) systems and programs. The committee is concerned about the lack of oversight and management attention in many of these IT programs. Therefore the committee recommends the following reductions:

*Other procurement*

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Army | 68.0 |
| Navy | 100.0 |
| Air Force | 200.0 |

*RDT&E*

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Army | 68.0 |
| Navy | 100.0 |
| Air Force | 200.0 |
| Defense-wide | 100.0 |

*Military tactical radio procurement*

The committee is aware that the Secretary of Defense requires a waiver prior to a military service purchase of tactical radios that are not compliant with the joint tactical radio system (JTRS) standards. The committee notes that delay in fielding JTRS has created a need for the military services to purchase non-compliant radios to bridge the gap until JTRS is fielded. The committee further notes that the existing waiver process may hinder timely replacement of radios and place an undue administrative burden on the military services. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to simplify or hold in abeyance the requirement for waivers for tactical radio systems until JTRS deployment is more predictable and delivery dates make JTRS purchase in lieu of legacy radios logical, as was originally intended by the waiver requirement.

*Operation Iraqi Freedom lessons learned*

As a result of early lessons learned emerging from Operation Iraqi Freedom, military officials reviewed the performance of their respective weapon systems and determined that certain programs would benefit from increased funds, many of which were official, Service chiefs' unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2004. Upon cessation of hostilities in Iraq, the senior operations officers for each of the military services, in testimony before the committee, highlighted that Operation Iraqi Freedom combat operations validated the need to accelerate procurement of both new systems and ongoing upgrade programs for several weapon systems, many of which will remain in the United States' (U.S.) inventory for the foreseeable future. The committee has responded with increases for several programs, noted elsewhere in the report.

The Army highlighted the benefits of 2nd generation forward looking infrared sensors, for additional Bradley A2 Operation Desert Storm "D+" Fighting Vehicles and for M1A2 Abrams System Enhancement Program tank upgrades; Soldier Rapid Fielding Initiative weapons and communications equipment; and night vision devices for light infantry brigades, which are addressed elsewhere in the report.

The Navy identified a requirement to accelerate procurement of additional F/A–18 E/F aircraft armament equipment kits and that limited numbers of these kits inhibited combat operations for these aircraft due to the seven carrier air wings deployed for this operation. The Marine Corps outlined the need to accelerate procurement of H–1 helicopter infrared (IR) suppressors to mitigate IR surface-to-air-missile threats and Amphibious Assault Vehicle and Light Armored Vehicle reliability, availability, and maintainability (RAM) upgrades for its pre-positioned equipment.

Finally, the Air Force identified both Global Positioning System (GPS) III satellite program upgrades, to counter GPS jammers (covered elsewhere in the report), which can inhibit the guidance and accuracy of GPS precision guided munitions, and additional wiring kits and targeting pods for B–52 bombers, which enable these aircraft to carry targeting pods, in order to provide a rapid, precise onboard target acquisition capability for precision guided munitions.

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Navy: | |
| F/A–18 E/F Aircraft Armament Equipment | 25.0 |
| Marine Corps: | |
| H–1 IR Suppressors | 12.0 |
| Amphibious Assault Vehicle RAM | 25.0 |
| Light Armored Vehicle RAM | 12.7 |
| Air Force: | |
| B–52 wiring kits/targeting pods | 19.0 |

*Secure wireless technology*

The committee believes that homeland security could be greatly enhanced through the increased use of National Security Agency (NSA) approved secure cell phones for communications. The committee is aware that the faster-than-expected development of the next-generation, nationwide, integrated Type 1 secure digital cell phones provides an opportunity to fill this urgent security requirement. The committee encourages the Department of Defense and NSA to take advantage of this opportunity and accelerate the deployment of these next generation secure cell phones.

*Special operations forces (SOF) ordnance*

The budget request contained $22.5 million to procure SOF weapons, but included no funds to procure the AT4-confined space (CS) anti-armor and bunker defeat and breeching weapon. The committee notes that the AT4–CS is the primary shoulder fired SOF weapons system for use in confined space and is high on the unfunded priority list of the commander of the Special Operations Command.

The committee recommends $33.0 million for SOF ordnance acquisition, an increase of $10.5 million for additional AT4–CS weapons.

*Special operations forces (SOF) weapons improvements*

The budget request contained $16.0 million to procure Special Operations Forces (SOF) small arms and weapons, but included no funding to procure the AN/PVS–17A mini night sight, no funding to procure the infrared zoom laser illuminator/designator, and no funding to procure the light weight counter mortar radar, all of which promise to increase the combat capability of special operations tactical units. The AN/PVS–17A mini night sight will be a very effective addition to the M–4 carbine Special Operations Peculiar Modification (SOPMOD) kit and the infrared zoom laser illuminator/designator will permit the surgical delivery of global positioning system guided weapons onto targets identified by special forces operators. In addition, the light weight counter mortar radar will allow special forces under mortar attack to neutralize the enemy with accurate, timely counter fire. The committee notes that all three of these items are on the unfunded priority list of the commander of the Special Operations Command.

The committee recommends $32.5 million for SOF small arms and weapons procurement, an increase of $8 million in the M–4 carbine SOPMOD kit program for the procurement of mini night vision sights, an increase of $3.5 million for the procurement of infrared zoom laser illuminator/designator, and an increase of $5.0 million for initial fielding of the light weight counter mortar radar.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

#### Sections 101–104—Authorization of Appropriations

These sections would authorize the recommended fiscal year 2004 funding levels for all procurement accounts.

### SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

#### Section 111—Stryker Vehicle Program

This section would authorize appropriations of $655.0 million of the $955.0 million fiscal year 2004 budget request for the Stryker Vehicle Program and condition authorization of the remaining $300.0 million upon receipt by the congressional defense committees of a report and certification.

### SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

#### Section 121—Multiyear Procurement Authority for F/A–18 Aircraft Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear procurement contract for F/A–18E, F/A–18F and EA–18G aircraft beginning with the fiscal year 2005 program year.

#### Section 122—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Tactical Tomahawk Cruise Missile Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear procurement contract for Tactical Tomahawk mis-

siles beginning with the fiscal year 2004 program year for a quantity of missiles to be determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

### Section 123—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Virginia Class Submarine Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Navy to enter into a multiyear procurement contract for seven Virginia Class submarines beginning with the fiscal year 2004 program year subject to a certification to the congressional defense committees that each of the conditions specified in Section 2306b(a) of title 10, United States Code have been satisfied with respect to that contract, and a period of thirty days has elapsed after the date of the transmission of such certification.

### Section 124—Multiyear Procurement Authority for E–2C Aircraft Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a four-year multiyear procurement contract for E–2C and TE–2C aircraft and their associated engines beginning with the fiscal year 2004 program year.

### Section 125—LPD–17 Class Vessel

This section would, if after May 7, 2003, Congress enacts a Department of Defense supplemental appropriations Act for fiscal year 2003 that includes appropriations for Tomahawk missiles, reduce the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Tomahawk missile by an equivalent amount of the supplemental request, or $200.0 million, whichever is less. The reduction in Tomahawk missile authorization would be applied to advance procurement of long lead items, to include the advance fabrication of components for one LPD–17 class vessel.

## SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

### Section 131—Air Force Air Refueling Transfer Account

This section would establish a $229.2 million Air Force air refueling transfer account which would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to use these funds for the necessary fiscal year 2004 expenses to prepare for either the lease or purchase of replacement tanker aircraft; retaining, rather than retiring, KC–135E aircraft; or for KC–135 depot purchased equipment maintenance. Funds provided from the Air Force air refueling transfer account would be limited so that they would not be used to enter into contracts for either the lease or purchase of tanker replacement, and the Secretary of the Air Force could not transfer funds until the congressional defense committees were notified of the proposed transfer and thirty days had elapsed after the notice was received by those committees.

Section 132—Increase in Number of Aircraft Authorized to be Procured Under Multiyear Procurement Authority for Air Force C–130J Aircraft Program

This section would amend section 131(a) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (P.L. 107–314) by striking "40 C–130J aircraft" and inserting "42 C–130J aircraft".

Section 133—Limitation on Retiring C–5 Aircraft

This section would limit the Secretary of the Air Force from proceeding with a decision to retire C–5A aircraft from the active inventory if the active inventory of such aircraft would fall below 112, until a reliability and reengining program (RERP)-configured C–5A aircraft completes a dedicated initial operational test and evaluation, and the Department of Defense's Director of the Operational Test and Evaluation has provided his assessment of the RERP—configured C–5A's performance to both the Secretary of Defense and the congressional defense committees.

Section 134—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for Procurement of F/A–22 Aircraft

This section would limit the obligation of $136.0 million of the amount appropriated for fiscal year 2004, F/A–22 aircraft procurement until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics certifies to the congressional defense committees that the four primary aircraft designated to participate in the dedicated initial operational test and evaluation (DIOT&E) program for the F/A–22 aircraft have been equipped with the version of the avionics software operational flight program known as version 3.1.2 or a later version, and that before the commencement of the DIOT&E, those four aircraft demonstrate, on average, an avionics software mean time between instability events of at least 20 hours. If the Under Secretary notifies the Secretary of Defense that the Under Secretary is unable to make the certification described above, then the Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation by notifying the congressional defense committees of his reasons therefor, and funds may be obligated at the end of a 30–day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary's notification is received by the committees.

# TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, & EVALUATION

## OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $61,826.7 million for research, development, test, & evaluation (RDT&E). The committee recommends $62,685.7 million, an increase of $859.0 million to the budget request.

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH | 343,037 | 12,100 | 12,100 | 0 | 355,137 |
| TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH | 641,263 | 114,600 | 114,600 | 0 | 755,863 |
| TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 805,696 | 114,800 | 114,800 | 0 | 920,496 |
| TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 784,347 | (252,856) | 25,500 | (278,356) | 531,491 |
| TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 4,737,771 | 135,913 | 159,400 | (23,487) | 4,873,684 |
| TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 860,457 | 5,900 | 15,900 | (10,000) | 866,357 |
| TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 950,254 | 147,100 | 147,100 | 0 | 1,097,354 |
| Information Technology Reduction | 0 | (68,000) | 0 | (68,000) | (68,000) |
| **TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY** | **9,122,825** | **209,557** | **589,400** | **(379,843)** | **9,332,382** |
| TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH | 456,586 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 0 | 462,586 |
| TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH | 535,943 | 62,700 | 62,700 | 0 | 598,643 |
| TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 721,773 | 10,658 | 175,400 | (164,742) | 732,431 |
| TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 2,600,045 | 103,149 | 157,200 | (54,051) | 2,703,194 |
| TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 6,239,357 | 100,500 | 146,000 | (45,500) | 6,339,857 |
| TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 651,123 | 1,600 | 1,600 | 0 | 652,723 |
| TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 2,901,826 | 52,100 | 60,500 | (8,400) | 2,953,926 |
| Information Technology Reduction | 0 | (100,000) | 0 | (100,000) | (100,000) |
| **TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY** | **14,106,653** | **236,707** | **609,400** | **(372,693)** | **14,343,360** |
| TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH | 322,041 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 0 | 327,041 |
| TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH | 757,960 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 0 | 792,960 |
| TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 1,146,130 | 74,400 | 74,400 | 0 | 1,220,530 |
| TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 2,176,984 | 152,000 | 232,000 | (80,000) | 2,328,984 |
| TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 4,577,185 | 73,800 | 73,800 | 0 | 4,650,985 |
| TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 630,365 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 630,365 |
| TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 10,725,593 | 72,409 | 129,300 | (56,891) | 10,798,002 |
| Information Technology Reduction | 0 | (200,000) | 0 | (200,000) | (200,000) |
| **TOTAL. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE** | **20,336,258** | **212,609** | **549,500** | **(336,891)** | **20,548,867** |

**Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH | 186,860 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 0 | 193,860 |
| TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH | 1,734,825 | 57,000 | 57,000 | 0 | 1,791,825 |
| TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 2,566,243 | 162,658 | 220,458 | (57,800) | 2,728,901 |
| TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES | 7,635,658 | 150,559 | 376,659 | (226,100) | 7,786,217 |
| TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION | 358,383 | (30,209) | 12,500 | (42,709) | 328,174 |
| TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT | 612,038 | (1,000) | 2,000 | (3,000) | 611,038 |
| TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 4,880,250 | (45,880) | 34,450 | (80,330) | 4,834,370 |
| Information Technology Reduction | 0 | (100,000) | 0 | (100,000) | (100,000) |
| **TOTAL, RDT&E, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **17,974,257** | **200,128** | **710,067** | **(509,939)** | **18,174,385** |
| **TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE** | **286,661** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **286,661** |
| **TOTAL, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT** | **61,826,654** | **859,001** | **2,458,367** | **(1,599,366)** | **62,685,655** |

## ARMY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, & EVALUATION

### Overview

The budget request contained $9,122.8 million for Army research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $9,332.4 million, an increase of $209.6 million to the budget request.

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY** | | | | | |
| | | **BASIC RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0601101A | 1 | In-House Laboratory Independent Research | 24,121 | | | | 24,121 |
| 0601102A | 2 | Defense Research Sciences | 128,798 | 6,000 | | | 134,798 |
| | | Advanced Deployable Nano-sensors | | | 2,000 | | |
| | | Desert Terrain Analysis | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0601103A | 3 | University Research Initiatives | 71,642 | | | | 71,642 |
| 0601104A | 4 | University and Industry Research Centers | 84,816 | 6,100 | | | 90,916 |
| | | Jidoka Project | | | 1,500 | | |
| | | Army Centers of Excellence | | | 2,500 | | |
| | | Electromagnetic Gun Initiative | | | 2,100 | | |
| 0601105A | 5 | Force Health Protection | 9,847 | | | | 9,847 |
| 0601114A | 6 | Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research | 9,730 | | | | 9,730 |
| 0601228A | 7 | Historically Black Colleges and Universities/Minority Instit | 14,083 | | | | 14,083 |
| | | **TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH** | **343,037** | **12,100** | **12,100** | **0** | **355,137** |
| | | **APPLIED RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0602105A | 8 | Materials Technology | 15,186 | 20,000 | | | 35,186 |
| | | Composite Multifunction Material Technology for Future Combat Systems | | | 5,000 | | |
| | | Volumetrically Controlled Manufacturing (VCM) | | | 15,000 | | |
| 0602120A | 9 | Sensors and Electronic Survivability | 22,765 | | | | 22,765 |
| 0602122A | 10 | TRACTOR HIP | 5,835 | | | | 5,835 |
| 0602211A | 11 | Aviation Technology | 39,459 | | | | 39,459 |
| 0602270A | 12 | EW Technology | 17,029 | | | | 17,029 |
| 0602303A | 13 | Missile Technology | 43,269 | 10,000 | | | 53,269 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Micro Electro-mechanical Systems Inertial Measurement Unit/GPS | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0602307A | 14 | Advanced Weapons Technology/HEL | 14,189 | 7,000 | | | 21,189 |
| | | Diode-Pumped Solid-State High Energy Laser | | | 7,000 | | |
| 0602308A | 15 | Advanced Concepts and Simulation | 15,941 | | | | 15,941 |
| 0602601A | 16 | Combat Vehicle and Automotive Technology | 80,910 | 9,900 | | | 90,810 |
| | | Advanced Electric Drive | | | 3,000 | | |
| | | M-Gator Advanced Powertrains | | | 4,400 | | |
| | | Fuel Preporator | | | 2,500 | | |
| 0602618A | 17 | Ballistics Technology/FCS | 53,478 | | | | 53,478 |
| 0602622A | 18 | Chemical, Smoke and Equipment Defeating Technology | 3,540 | 5,000 | | | 8,540 |
| | | Metal Particles in Defense Applications Obscurant Smokes | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0602623A | 19 | Joint Service Small Arms Program | 5,835 | 5,000 | | | 10,835 |
| | | Anti-Material Sniper Rifle | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0602624A | 20 | Weapons and Munitions Technology | 39,485 | 16,500 | | | 55,985 |
| | | Alloy Tungsten (LA-T) Kinetic Energy Penetrator Technology Ammo | | | 5,500 | | |
| | | Generation 2 (X-Caliber) Warhead Technology | | | 3,000 | | |
| | | TEMPER | | | 8,000 | | |
| 0602705A | 21 | Electronics and Electronic Devices | 33,694 | 24,000 | | | 57,694 |
| | | Advanced Battery Technology Initiative | | | 20,000 | | |
| | | Flexible Display Initiative | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0602709A | 22 | Night Vision Technology | 22,233 | | | | 22,233 |
| 0602712A | 23 | Countermine Systems | 21,291 | | | | 21,291 |
| 0602716A | 24 | Human Factors Engineering Technology | 16,749 | 3,500 | | | 20,249 |
| | | Human Systems Integration (MANPRINT) | | | 3,500 | | |
| 0602720A | 25 | Environmental Quality Technology | 18,252 | | | | 18,252 |
| 0602782A | 26 | Command, Control, Communications Technology | 18,728 | | | | 18,728 |
| 0602783A | 27 | Computer and Software Technology | 4,142 | | | | 4,142 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0602784A | 28 | Military Engineering Technology | 45,407 | 2,000 | | | 47,407 |
| | | Brooks Energy and Sustainability Lab | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0602785A | 29 | Manpower/Personnel/Training Technology | 15,548 | | | | 15,548 |
| 0602786A | 30 | Warfighter Technology | 29,421 | 3,500 | | | 32,921 |
| | | Advanced Microbial Technology for Treating Military Textiles & Clothing | | | 3,500 | | |
| 0602787A | 31 | Medical Technology | 58,877 | 8,200 | | | 67,077 |
| | | Remote Acoustic Hemostasis | | | 8,200 | | |
| 0602805A | 32 | Dual Use Science and Technology | 0 | | | | 0 |
| | | **TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH** | **641,263** | **114,600** | **114,600** | **0** | **755,863** |
| | | **ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0603001A | 33 | Warfighter Advanced Technology | 63,882 | | | | 63,882 |
| 0603002A | 34 | Medical Advanced Technology | 35,168 | 9,000 | | | 44,168 |
| | | Hemoglobin-based Oxygen Carrier | | | 5,000 | | |
| | | Pseudofollicullitus Barbae Research | | | 1,000 | | |
| | | Rugged textile electronic garments for combat casualty care | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0603003A | 35 | Aviation Advanced Technology | 72,083 | 17,700 | | | 89,783 |
| | | Airborne Manned/Unmanned System Technology | | | 5,000 | | |
| | | Broad Area Unmanned Responsive Re-Supply Operations | | | 9,700 | | |
| | | Reconfiguring Tooling System | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0603004A | 36 | Weapons and Munitions Advanced Technology | 47,752 | 5,000 | | | 52,752 |
| | | ScramFire 120mm Powered Munition | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603005A | 37 | Combat Vehicle and Automotive Advanced Technology | 210,856 | 10,000 | | | 220,856 |
| | | Aluminum Lightweight Structure Initiative | | | 5,000 | | |
| | | Advanced Army Composite Bridge | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603006A | 38 | Command, Control, Communications Advanced Technology | 10,379 | | | | 10,379 |
| 0603007A | 39 | Manpower, Personnel and Training Advanced Technology | 4,931 | 5,000 | | | 9,931 |

**Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION**

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Ground Systems Team Training | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603008A | 40 | Electronic Warfare Advanced Technology (H) | 40,347 | 18,600 | | | 58,947 |
| | | Applied Communication and Information Networking | | | 10,000 | | |
| | | Portable and Mobile Emergency Broadband System | | | 8,600 | | |
| 0603009A | 41 | TRACTOR HIKE | 8,781 | | | | 8,781 |
| 0603015A | 42 | Next Generation Training & Simulation Systems | 18,649 | | | | 18,649 |
| 0603017A | 43 | TRACTOR RED | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603020A | 44 | TRACTOR ROSE | 2,872 | | | | 2,872 |
| 0603103A | 45 | Explosives Demilitarization Technology | 9,349 | | | | 9,349 |
| 0603105A | 46 | Military HIV Research | 6,733 | | | | 6,733 |
| 0603125A | 47 | Combating Terrorism, Technology Development | 4,916 | | | | 4,916 |
| 0603238A | 48 | Global Surveillance/Air Defense/Precision Strike Technology Demonstration | 12,660 | | | | 12,660 |
| 0603270A | 49 | EW Technology | 11,273 | | | | 11,273 |
| 0603313A | 50 | Missile and Rocket Advanced Technology | 111,321 | 5,000 | | | 116,321 |
| | | Army Manufacturing and Maintenance Organization | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603322A | 51 | TRACTOR CAGE | 7,592 | | | | 7,592 |
| 0603606A | 52 | Landmine Warfare and Barrier Advanced Technology | 24,552 | | | | 24,552 |
| 0603607A | 53 | Joint Service Small Arms Program | 6,193 | | | | 6,193 |
| 0603654A | 54 | Line-Of-Sight Technology Demonstration | 8,847 | | | | 8,847 |
| 0603710A | 55 | Night Vision Advanced Technology | 47,088 | 25,500 | | | 72,588 |
| | | Buster Backpack Unmanned Aerial Vehicle | | | 10,000 | | |
| | | Night Vision Fusion (I2 & IR) | | | 5,000 | | |
| | | DOD Firefighter Helmet Mounted Thermal Imaging Camera System | | | 5,500 | | |
| | | Wire Detection, Wind Sensor, and Obstacle Avoidance System | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603728A | 56 | Environmental Quality Technology Demonstrations | 15,776 | | | | 15,776 |
| 0603734A | 57 | Military Engineering Advanced Technology | 3,441 | | | | 3,441 |
| 0603772A | 58 | Advanced Tactical Computer Science and Sensor Technology | 20,255 | 19,000 | | | 39,255 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Lightweight Counter Mortar Radar | | | 8,000 | | |
| | | Multi-Mission Radar Program | | | 7,000 | | |
| | | Palletized SAR MTI Radar Sets | | | 4,000 | | |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | **805,696** | **114,800** | **114,800** | **0** | **920,496** |
| | | **ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | | | | | |
| 0603305A | 59 | Army Missile Defense Systems Integration (Non Space)/MTHEL | 51,547 | 11,500 | | | 63,047 |
| | | Advanced Battery Technology Demonstration and Validation | | | 4,000 | | |
| | | Advanced Tactical Operations Center | | | 7,500 | | |
| 0603308A | 60 | Army Missile Defense Systems Integration (Space) | 9,632 | | | | 9,632 |
| 0603327A | 61 | Air and Missile Defense Systems Engineering | 79,959 | 7,000 | | | 86,959 |
| | | Army Air and Missile Defense (AMD) Architecture Analysis (A3) Program | | | 7,000 | | |
| 0603619A | 62 | Landmine Warfare and Barrier - Adv Dev | 36,976 | | | | 36,976 |
| 0603627A | 63 | Smoke, Obscurant and Target Defeating Sys-Adv Dev | 10,262 | | | | 10,262 |
| 0603639A | 64 | Tank and Medium Caliber Ammunition | 11,249 | | | | 11,249 |
| 0603653A | 65 | Advanced Tank Armament System (ATAS) | 61,377 | | | | 61,377 |
| 0603747A | 66 | Soldier Support and Survivability | 13,987 | | | | 13,987 |
| 0603748A | XX | Defense Language Institute | 0 | 5,000 | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| 0603766A | 67 | Tactical Electronic Surveillance System - Adv Dev | 17,068 | | | | 17,068 |
| 0603774A | 68 | Night Vision Systems Advanced Development | 5,283 | | | | 5,283 |
| 0603779A | 69 | Environmental Quality Technology | 11,514 | 2,000 | | | 13,514 |
| | | Asbestos Pilot Project | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0603782A | 70 | Warfighter Information Network-Tactical | 90,774 | | | | 90,774 |
| 0603790A | 71 | NATO Research and Development | 4,779 | | | | 4,779 |
| 0603801A | 72 | Aviation - Adv Dev | 9,968 | | | | 9,968 |
| 0603802A | 73 | Weapons and Munitions - Adv Dev / OICW | 31,856 | | | | 31,856 |
| 0603804A | 74 | Logistics and Engineer Equipment - Adv Dev | 12,008 | | | | 12,008 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603805A | 75 | Combat Service Support Control System Evaluation and Analysis | 8,682 | | | | 8,682 |
| 0603807A | 76 | Medical Systems - Adv Dev | 11,042 | | | | 11,042 |
| 0603850A | 77 | Integrated Broadcast Service (JMIP/DISTP) | 2,097 | (2,097) | | | 0 |
| | | Program Reduction | | | | (2,097) | |
| 0603851A | 78 | TRACTOR CAGE | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603854A | 79 | Artillery Systems | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603856A | 80 | SCAMP Block II | 28,028 | | | | 28,028 |
| 0603869A | 81 | Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) Concepts | 276,259 | (276,259) | | | 0 |
| | | MEADS Transfer | | | | (276,259) | |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | **784,347** | **(252,856)** | **25,500** | **(278,356)** | **531,491** |
| | | **SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | | | | | |
| 0604201A | 82 | Aircraft Avionics | 64,650 | | | | 64,650 |
| 0604220A | 83 | Armed, Deployable OH-58D | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604223A | 84 | Comanche | 1,079,257 | | | | 1,079,257 |
| 0604270A | 85 | EW Development | 33,214 | | | | 33,214 |
| 0604280A | 86 | Joint Tactical Radio | 134,693 | | | | 134,693 |
| 0604321A | 87 | All Source Analysis System | 20,168 | | | | 20,168 |
| 0604328A | 88 | TRACTOR CAGE | 16,215 | | | | 16,215 |
| 0604329A | 89 | Common Missile | 183,790 | | | | 183,790 |
| 0604601A | 90 | Infantry Support Weapons | 21,637 | | | | 21,637 |
| 0604604A | 91 | Medium Tactical Vehicles/FMTV | 4,366 | | | | 4,366 |
| 0604609A | 92 | Smoke, Obscurant and Target Defeating Sys-SDD | 12,094 | | | | 12,094 |
| 0604611A | 93 | JAVELIN | 956 | | | | 956 |
| 0604619A | 94 | Landmine Warfare | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604622A | 95 | Family of Heavy Tactical Vehicles | 9,200 | | | | 9,200 |
| 0604633A | 96 | Air Traffic Control | 2,514 | | | | 2,514 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0604641A | 97 | Tactical Unmanned Ground Vehicle (TUGV) | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604642A | 98 | Light Tactical Wheeled Vehicles | 15,700 | | | | 15,700 |
| 0604645A | 99 | Future Combat Systems | 1,245,118 | | | | 1,245,118 |
| 0604646A | XX | Networked Fires Systems Technology - SDD | 102,971 | | | | 102,971 |
| 0604647A | XX | Objective Force Indirect Fires - SDD | 353,242 | | | | 353,242 |
| 0604649A | 100 | Engineer Mobility Equipment Development | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604710A | 101 | Night Vision Systems - SDD | 29,022 | 3,000 | | | 32,022 |
| | | Modular Multi Function Laser System | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0604713A | 102 | Combat Feeding, Clothing, and Equipment | 67,283 | 58,500 | | | 125,783 |
| | | Transfer from OPA-136 "Land Warrior" | | | 58,500 | | |
| 0604715A | 103 | Non-System Training Devices - SDD | 71,616 | (8,767) | | (8,767) | 62,849 |
| 0604716A | 104 | Terrain Information - SDD | 6,977 | | | | 6,977 |
| 0604726A | 105 | Integrated Meteorological Support System | 3,309 | | | | 3,309 |
| 0604738A | 106 | JSIMS Core Program | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604741A | 107 | Air Defense Command, Control and Intelligence - SDD | 29,297 | | | | 29,297 |
| 0604742A | 108 | Constructive Simulation Systems Development | 16,994 | (14,720) | | (14,720) | 2,274 |
| 0604746A | 109 | Automatic Test Equipment Development | 4,634 | | | | 4,634 |
| 0604760A | 110 | Distributive Interactive Simulations (DIS) - SDD | 26,358 | | | | 26,358 |
| 0604766A | 111 | Tactical Surveillance Systems - SDD | 19,695 | 6,000 | | | 25,695 |
| | | Broadband Intelligence Training System | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0604768A | 112 | Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS) | 55,075 | | | | 55,075 |
| 0604770A | 113 | Joint Surveillance/Target Attack Radar System | 4,705 | | | | 4,705 |
| 0604778A | 114 | Positioning Systems Development (SPACE) | 1,574 | | | | 1,574 |
| 0604780A | 115 | Combined Arms Tactical Trainer (CATT) Core | 3,998 | | | | 3,998 |
| 0604783A | 116 | Joint Network Management System | 9,437 | | | | 9,437 |
| 0604801A | 117 | Aviation - SDD | 2,379 | | | | 2,379 |
| 0604802A | 118 | Weapons and Munitions - SDD | 129,409 | 9,000 | | | 138,409 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Advanced Precision Kill Weapon System | | | 9,000 | | |
| 0604804A | 119 | Logistics and Engineer Equipment - SDD | 86,288 | | | | 86,288 |
| 0604805A | 120 | Command, Control, Communications Systems - SDD | 219,088 | | | | 219,088 |
| 0604807A | 121 | Medical Materiel/Medical Biological Defense Equipment - SDD | 12,202 | | | | 12,202 |
| 0604808A | 122 | Landmine Warfare/Barrier - SDD | 90,396 | | | | 90,396 |
| 0604814A | 123 | Artillery Munitions | 133,994 | | | | 133,994 |
| 0604817A | 124 | Combat Identification/BCIS | 3,541 | | | | 3,541 |
| 0604818A | 125 | Army Tactical Command & Control Hardware & Software | 98,129 | 3,900 | | | 102,029 |
| | | Army Airborne Command & Control System (A2CS2) | | | 3,900 | | |
| 0604819A | 126 | LOSAT | 30,809 | | | | 30,809 |
| 0604820A | 127 | Radar Development | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604823A | 128 | Firefinder | 27,107 | | | | 27,107 |
| 0604854A | 129 | Artillery Systems | 32,629 | | | | 32,629 |
| 0604865A | 130 | Patriot PAC-3 Theater Missile Defense Acquisition | 174,475 | 79,000 | | | 253,475 |
| | | PAC-3 R&D | | | 79,000 | | |
| 0605013A | 131 | Information Technology Development | 47,566 | | | | 47,566 |
| | | **TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | **4,737,771** | **135,913** | **159,400** | **(23,487)** | **4,873,684** |
| | | **RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | | | | | |
| 0604256A | 132 | Threat Simulator Development | 17,751 | | | | 17,751 |
| 0604258A | 133 | Target Systems Development | 13,890 | | | | 13,890 |
| 0604759A | 134 | Major T&E Investment | 62,135 | | | | 62,135 |
| 0605103A | 135 | Rand Arroyo Center | 22,804 | | | | 22,804 |
| 0605301A | 136 | Army Kwajalein Atoll | 137,307 | | | | 137,307 |
| 0605326A | 137 | Concepts Experimentation Program | 26,473 | | | | 26,473 |
| 0605502A | 138 | Small Business Innovative Research | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0605601A | 139 | Army Test Ranges and Facilities | 174,603 | 7,400 | | | 182,003 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Army Aviation Technical Test Center Upgrade for Helicopter | | | 7,400 | | |
| 0605602A | 140 | Army Technical Test Instrumentation and Targets | 54,986 | | | | 54,986 |
| 0605604A | 141 | Survivability/Lethality Analysis | 39,138 | | | | 39,138 |
| 0605605A | 142 | DOD High Energy Laser Test Facility | 17,806 | | | | 17,806 |
| 0605606A | 143 | Aircraft Certification | 3,098 | | | | 3,098 |
| 0605702A | 144 | Meteorological Support to RDT&E Activities | 9,669 | | | | 9,669 |
| 0605706A | 145 | Materiel Systems Analysis | 15,832 | | | | 15,832 |
| 0605709A | 146 | Exploitation of Foreign Items | 3,579 | | | | 3,579 |
| 0605712A | 147 | Support of Operational Testing | 67,795 | | | | 67,795 |
| 0605716A | 148 | Army Evaluation Center | 57,074 | (10,000) | | | 47,074 |
| | | Program Reduction | | | | (10,000) | |
| 0605718A | 149 | Simulation & Modeling for Acq, Rqts, & Tng (SMART) | 2,654 | | | | 2,654 |
| 0605801A | 150 | Programwide Activities | 71,555 | | | | 71,555 |
| 0605803A | 151 | Technical Information Activities | 28,520 | | | | 28,520 |
| 0605805A | 152 | Munitions Standardization, Effectiveness and Safety | 19,855 | 8,500 | | | 28,355 |
| | | Advanced Cluster Energetics (ACE) Manufacturing Technology | | | 5,000 | | |
| | | Cadmium Zinc Telluride Detectors | | | 3,500 | | |
| 0605857A | 153 | Environmental Quality Technology Mgmt Support | 4,938 | | | | 4,938 |
| 0605898A | 154 | Management Headquarters (Research and Development) | 8,995 | | | | 8,995 |
| 0909999A | 155 | Financing for Cancelled Account Adjustments | 0 | | | | 0 |
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | **860,457** | **5,900** | **15,900** | **(10,000)** | **866,357** |
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0603778A | 156 | MLRS Product Improvement Program | 84,839 | | | | 84,839 |
| 0102419A | 157 | Aerostat Joint Project Office | 57,549 | 3,000 | | | 60,549 |
| | | Lightweight X-Band Radar MEMS Antenna Technology | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0203610A | 158 | Domestic Preparedness Against Weapons of Mass Destruction | 0 | | | | 0 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0203726A | 159 | Adv Field Artillery Tactical Data System | 28,917 | | | | 28,917 |
| 0203735A | 160 | Combat Vehicle Improvement Programs | 24,486 | | | | 24,486 |
| 0203740A | 161 | Maneuver Control System - Tactical C2 | 39,581 | | | | 39,581 |
| 0203744A | 162 | Aircraft Modifications/Product Improvement Programs | 187,959 | 100,000 | | | 287,959 |
| | | Transfer from APA-15 "UH-60 Mods" | | | 100,000 | | |
| 0203752A | 163 | Aircraft Engine Component Improvement Program | 3,399 | | | | 3,399 |
| 0203758A | 164 | Digitization | 18,251 | | | | 18,251 |
| 0203759A | 165 | Force XXI Battle Command, Brigade and Below (FBCB2) | 48,436 | | | | 48,436 |
| 0203761A | 166 | Force XXI, Warfighting Rapid Acquisition Program | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0203801A | 167 | Missile/Air Defense Product Improvement Program | 44,468 | 10,000 | | | 54,468 |
| | | PAC-2 | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0203802A | 168 | Other Missile Product Improvement Programs | 9,822 | | | | 9,822 |
| 0203806A | 169 | TRACTOR RUT | 8,851 | | | | 8,851 |
| 0203808A | 170 | TRACTOR CARD | 9,255 | | | | 9,255 |
| 0208010A | 171 | Joint Tactical Communications Program (TRI-TAC) | 16,543 | | | | 16,543 |
| 0208053A | 172 | Joint Tactical Ground System | 9,767 | | | | 9,767 |
| 0301359A | 173 | Special Army Program | 5,968 | | | | 5,968 |
| 0303028A | 174 | Security and Intelligence Activities | 0 | 10,000 | | | 10,000 |
| | | Intelligence and Security Command Global Information Portal | | | 5,000 | | |
| | | Info Dominance Center Expanded Processing for Advanced Data Analysis | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0303140A | 175 | Information Systems Security Program | 20,728 | | | | 20,728 |
| 0303141A | 176 | Global Combat Support System | 58,983 | | | | 58,983 |
| 0303142A | 177 | SATCOM Ground Environment (SPACE) | 87,352 | | | | 87,352 |
| 0303142A | 178 | WWMCCS/Global Command and Control System | 20,124 | | | | 20,124 |
| 0305114A | 179 | Traffic Control, Approach and Landing System/JPALS | 956 | | | | 956 |
| 0305204A | 180 | Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicles | 60,493 | 12,400 | | | 72,893 |
| | | Shadow Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Improvements | | | 12,400 | | |

**Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION**

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0305206A | 181 | Airborne Reconnaissance Systems | 4,751 | 8,700 | | | 13,451 |
| | | Hyperspectral Long Wave Imager for the Tactical Environment (HyLite) | | | 8,700 | | |
| 0305208A | 182 | Distributed Common Ground Systems | 32,292 | | | | 32,292 |
| 0708045A | 183 | End Item Industrial Preparedness Activities | 65,981 | 3,000 | | | 68,981 |
| | | 21st Century High Technology for Legacy Parts Reinvention | | | 3,000 | | |
| 1001018A | 184 | NATO Joint STARS | 503 | | | | 503 |
| | | **TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | **950,254** | **147,100** | **147,100** | **0** | **1,097,354** |
| | xxx | Information Technology Reduction | | (68,000) | | (68,000) | (68,000) |
| | | **TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY** | **9,122,825** | **209,557** | **589,400** | **(379,843)** | **9,332,382** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Advanced battery technology initiative*

The budget request contained $33.7 million in PE 62705A for applied research in electronics and electronic devices.

The committee notes continuing requirements for small, lightweight, efficient, and portable battery and non-battery power sources for U.S. forces and of on-going applied research and development activities of the military departments that address these requirements. The committee is aware of a number of emerging battery and non-battery power technologies that have the potential for meeting the requirements of the military services, including but not limited to alkaline cylindrical cells, cylindrical zinc air batteries, high capacity nickel/zinc rechargeable cells, lithium oxyhalide and lithium ion thin-film technology, lithium carbon monoflouride cells, and proton exchange membrane fuel cells.

The committee urges that these technologies be considered for potential funded research and development under the services' on-going programs on the basis of technical merit, cost effectiveness, and the potential of the particular technology to meet service needs. The committee also urges establishment of a battery/portable power technology initiative in the Army that will address Department of Defense needs for small, light-weight, efficient, portable battery and non-battery power sources. The initiative should be conducted under the RDT&E Reliance process to insure that the program meets the needs of all the military services.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 62705A for the battery/portable power technology initiative.

*Advanced cluster energetics*

The budget request contained $19.9 million in PE 65805A for munitions standardization, effectiveness, and safety, including $2.5 million for development and assessment of munitions life cycle pilot processes.

The committee notes the development of innovative processes in cluster munitions production engineering that have resulted in the ability to manufacture uniform energetic products without the need for high stress and inherently dangerous mixing processes. These processes will result in reductions in the cost to manufacture propellants and explosives, as well as improvements in manufacturing performance and safety.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 65805A for continued development of advanced cluster energetics manufacturing technology.

*Advanced electric drive*

The budget request contained $80.9 million in PE 62601A for combat vehicle and automotive advanced technology, but included no funds for advanced electric drive.

The committee notes that present military drive systems require greater vehicle efficiency and performance. The committee is aware that the advanced electric drive (AED) project is to develop intelligent electric wheel-end and axle designs with integral drive motors that would yield higher vehicle efficiencies, greater power densities, and greater torque.

The committee recommends $83.9 million in PE 62601A, an increase of $3.0 million for AED.

*Advanced precision kill weapon system (APKWS)*

The budget request contained $35.1 million in PE 64802A for continued block I systems development and demonstration of the APKWS.

The APKWS upgrade will provide a family of precision guided rockets by combining a newly designed semi-active laser section with the air-launched, unguided 2.75 inch HYDRA–70 rocket. The APKWS block I upgrade entered systems development and demonstration in fiscal year 2003 and is planned to develop, test and qualify the laser-guided HYDRA–70 rocket. However, the committee notes that funds for future block II improvements, which would include development and qualification of an improved warhead and advanced fuzing, are not planned to be budgeted for until fiscal years 2006 and 2007. The committee understands that by adding additional funds in fiscal year 2004, the Army could accelerate technology demonstrations for block II improvements and thereby ensure continuity between fiscal years 2005 and 2006 in block I and block II development schedules. Therefore, the committee recommends $44.1 million in PE 64802A, an increase of $9.0 million, to accelerate technology demonstrations of critical technologies for APKWS block II improvements.

*Armored Systems Modernization*

The budget request included $1.7 billion in PE 64645A for Armored Systems Modernization for three projects: Future Combat System (FCS), Networked Fires Systems Technology, and Objective Force Indirect Fires.

The committee supports the Army's transformational objectives of achieving a more agile, light, and lethal objective force. The Army envisions a highly interdependent system that will be required to interface with other FCS units; complementary systems using the Joint Tactical Radio System and the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical; other systems of the objective force; and joint forces.

However, the committee has several concerns with the Armored Systems Modernization Program, as requested:

(1) The Army is embarking on a System Development and Demonstration program of major technical complexity, which to date is largely undefined with regard to architecture, requirements, schedule and cost;

(2) The key performance parameters are of such a general nature, lacking any metrics, that many current Army systems meet the key performance parameters, precluding a need for a new program;

(3) The Army's performance in major programs of significantly less complexity like Land Warrior and the Comanche helicopter program has been lacking;

(4) The intended construct of the program, placing all FCS projects in the same program element limits quantitative and qualitative congressional oversight;

(5) The Army's budget request for FCS is not supported by the program descriptive material provided to justify the budget

request of $1.7 billion for the three projects. As an example, the $1.25 billion requested for FCS includes $439.0 million for fiscal year 2004, for detailed system design that at present consists of one element: the communications network intended to link FCS systems. The Army was unable to provide the scope of work for the $439.0 million requested; and

(6) Layered management overly insulates senior Army management from FCS program managers—the only relevant Army officials that did not appreciate the original timeline for fielding the first unit equipped by 2008 was not executable were the Army's senior leadership;

Consequently, the committee recommends a provision (section 214) that would:

(7) Restructure the current three projects within the Armored Systems Modernization program into three program elements and require any future additional FCS-related programs to be requested by program element, in the appropriate budget activity;

(8) Preclude authorization of appropriations until thirty days after the congressional defense committees are provided sufficient budget descriptive detail to justify a $1.7 billion budget request.

*Army Centers of Excellence*

The budget request contained $84.8 million in PE 61104A for university and industry research centers and included $2.5 million to establish a center of excellence for optimizing cognitive readiness under combat conditions and to improve tactical mobility through innovative research initiatives.

The committee has long supported the Army's Center of Excellence program and is particularly supportive of the Army's new effort to leverage current research in the areas of modeling and simulation, protective materials, and health and human performance. The committee encourages further work in this area.

The committee recommends $87.3 million in PE 61104A for university and industry research centers, an increase of $2.5 million for competitive establishment of a center of excellence for cognitive research under the Army center of excellence program.

*Army Evaluation Center*

The budget request contained $57.1 million for the Army Evaluation Center.

This program funds evaluations of all major Army acquisition programs. The evaluation provides information and data on individual systems' performance, effectiveness, and survivability to the Army's senior leadership and Congress. The committee is concerned that the growth in this program's research, development, testing, and evaluation's budget is unclear and not supported in the documentation submitted.

The committee recommends $47.1 million in PE 65716A, a decrease of $10.0 million in this program.

*Army information dominance center expanded processing for advanced data analysis*

The budget request contained no funding in PE 33028A for the Army information dominance center's (IDC) expanded processing for advanced data analysis.

The committee is aware that additional funding would allow integration of the IDC's software analysis tools onto mainframe platforms with much higher computing capability which would increase mission effectiveness.

The committee recommends $5.0 million in PE 33028A, an increase of $5.0 million for the Army IDC's expanded processing for advanced data analysis.

*Army integrated broadcast service integration*

The budget request contained $2.1 million in PE 63850A for integrated broadcast system (IBS) (JMIP/DISTP), specifically for modules for the joint tactical radio system (JTRS) IBS function.

The committee notes that Army JTRS funding in PE 64280A increases 214 percent over last year, and contains sufficient funding to tailor JTRS to the IBS for the Army. The committee supports the need for IBS, however, it believes that the JTRS program is sufficiently funded to develop the minor modifications necessary to process the IBS waveform within the JTRS radio.

The committee recommends no funds in PE 63850A, a decrease of $2.1 million.

*Army manufacturing and maintenance organization*

The budget request contained $111.3 million in PE 63313A for missile and rocket advanced technology, but included no funds for the Army maintenance and manufacturing organization (AMMO).

The committee is aware that the AMMO of the Army Aviation and Missile Command has initiated seven projects to extend the life of weapons systems such as helicopters and missiles.

The committee recommends $116.3 million in PE 63313A, an increase of $5.0 million for the AMMO to continue its weapons systems life extension programs.

*Army unmanned aerial vehicle advocacy*

The committee notes that until now the Army unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) advocacy has been in the Army military intelligence branch. The committee is aware that the Army intends to transfer UAV advocacy, including that for the tactical UAV (TUAV) program, to the Army aviation directorate as part of overall Army reorganization. The committee understands that the Army believes that UAV's can best be developed by the aviation directorate because that directorate is fully aware of the totality of UAV missions, including those related to intelligence.

The committee is informed that only UAV advocacy is changing, and that funding for UAV's and related components will remain as is.

The committee is concerned that UAV program funding may suffer in budget competition with manned programs within the directorate, as a result of the advocacy transfer. Additionally, while assigning the Communications and Electronics Command responsibility for UAV sensor development may be an appropriate decision,

there remains a strong possibility that the split responsibility may lead to schedule conflicts between the platform and sensor programs.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to ensure that UAV and sensor programs are not weakened as a result of the proposed transfer of responsibility.

*Asbestos pilot project*

The budget request contained $11.5 million in PE 63779A for environmental quality technology, but included no funds for the asbestos pilot project. The committee supports research and development to improve asbestos waste reduction and reduce disposal cost.

The committee recommends $13.5 million in PE 63779A, an increase of $2.0 million for the asbestos pilot project.

*Brilliant anti-armor submunition*

The budget request contained $55.1 million in PE 64768A for the development of an Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS) Penetrator program. The committee notes that $30.4 million is also included in PE 64327N in the future years defense program (FYDP) to develop the system concept and architecture and demonstrate and validate an ATACMS encapsulated launch capability from a Ship, Submersible, Guided Nuclear (SSGN) platform.

The committee understands that the ATACMS Penetrator program was developed from an advanced concept technology demonstration and originated from a fiscal year 1998 Defense Threat Reduction Agency study, which identified the need to attack a finite target set in one worldwide theater of operation. The committee also understands that an adequate number of ATACMS Penetrator missiles have been produced to fulfill this requirement. However, the Army now has been burdened with a development and procurement program to produce 180 missiles to service hardened and deeply buried targets in multiple theaters of operation, which is well beyond the scope of the initial requirement. The committee understands the original requirement, however, it notes that initially the Army, Department of Energy, and the Department of the Navy were equal partners at the program inception. Now the Army alone has been directed to fund $425.2 million for this project through the FYDP out of existing budget authority for a vaguely defined Office of the Secretary of Defense project.

While the committee understands the need for options to service hardened and deeply buried targets, it believes that this weapon may have limited effectiveness against these types of targets based on technical data provided to the committee by the Department of Defense, and that other, less costly capabilities exist in the United States' inventory to better address these threats. The committee notes that the operational requirements document (ORD) is not expected to be completed until February 2004, and that it is only planned to be an Army ORD, yet an extended range variant may be developed by the Army, which would be incorporated into Navy SSGN platforms. The committee also questions the incorporation of this capability into SSGNs, which the committee believes may unnecessarily expose these submarines to threats in littoral regions when required to operate close to shore to ensure that these mis-

siles can be effectively employed against targets in interior regions of potentially hostile countries.

Prior to the obligation of any fiscal year 2004 funds for ATACMS Pentrator in PE 64768A, the committee strongly urges the Secretary of Defense to review the ATACMS Penetrator program to determine if a more efficient and cost effective ATACMS capability could be fielded versus a system with a projected $1.1 million unit cost, which only provides a limited capability to penetrate earthen or reinforced structures up to 20 feet deep. The Secretary is also urged to review the utility of the program with regards to the missile's operational ranges and the impact of those ranges on the weapon's employment by both ground forces as well as from SSGNs.

*Broad area unmanned responsive re-supply operations*

The budget request contained $72.1 million in PE 63003A for aviation advanced technology, but included no funds for broad area unmanned re-supply operations (BURRO).

The committee is aware that the Army aviation technology directorate is working to develop an autonomous external lift unmanned aerial vehicle. The committee is also aware that the Marine Corps has previously conducted similar work including BURRO. The committee recommends an increase of $9.7 million in PE 63003A to include BURRO in the quick delivery advanced concept technology demonstration.

*Brooks Energy and Sustainability Lab*

The budget request included $45.4 million in PE 62784A for military engineering technology but no funding for the Brooks Energy and Sustainability Lab.

The committee supports energy conservation initiatives of the Department of Defense, encourages further efforts to enhance infrastructure life cycle operations and cost effectiveness, and to improve energy efficiency on military installations.

The committee recommends $47.4 million in PE 62784A, an increase of $2.0 million for the Brooks Energy and Sustainability Lab.

*Cadmium zinc telluride detectors*

The budget request contained $19.9 million in PE 65805A for munitions standardization, effectiveness and safety, and included $2.5 million for lifecycle pilot processes.

The committee is aware that an important part of lifecycle cost reduction efforts is developing and prototyping critical technologies that can be transferred to the ammunition industrial base. The committee notes that cadmium zinc telluride technology holds promise of affordable x-ray detectors for both munitions inspection and baggage surveillance.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 65805A for cadmium zinc telluride detector development.

*Commercial-off-the-Shelf (COTS) fuel filtration device*

The budget request included $25.0 million in PE 62601A for leveraging commercial investments in automotive technology re-

search and development to support the Army's current and future combat and tactical wheeled vehicle fleet.

The committee has long supported efforts to advance the operational performance and overall life cycle costs of defense weapon systems and tactical vehicles. The committee is aware of and supports current Department of Defense affordability initiatives, including efforts aimed at fuel efficiency improvements. The committee is aware of a commercially-developed air/fuel separation and filtration technology offering improvements in engine performance and fuel savings in diesel, JP–8, and potential biodiesel applications. Performance tests to date indicate fuel savings as high as 40 percent in some scenarios. Tests also suggest improvements in engine torque output, horsepower, particulate emissions, and throttle response. The committee believes a comprehensive scientific test of the technology on current Army tactical vehicles would be beneficial, encourages further work in this area, and supports a collaborative effort between the Department of the Army and the Center for Environmental Science and Technology.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62601A to conduct a comprehensive collaborative test of filtration technology.

*Defense Language Institute research and development*

The budget request contained no research and development funds for the Defense Language Institute (DLI).

The committee is aware that DLI has been using operations and maintenance funding to support language training research and development. The committee notes that emerging technology offers potential to greatly improve language training, increase instructor efficiency, and support better maintenance of language proficiency. The committee believes that appropriate research and development funding should be provided to develop better language training capability.

The committee recommends an additional $5.0 million for language training technology development in PE 63748A, and directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a permanent program element for this purpose.

*Desert terrain analysis*

The budget request contained $128.8 million in PE 61102A for Defense research sciences, but included no funds for desert terrain analysis (DTA).

The committee is aware that the desert terrain analysis project is to develop technologies for predicting terrain conditions and surface responses in desert regions for the purpose of supporting military operations.

The committee recommends $132.8 million in PE 61102A, an increase of $4.0 million for DTA.

*Electromagnetic Gun Initiative*

The budget request contains $5.9 million in PE 61104A for electromagnetic gun basic research, $4.9 million in PE 62618A for applied research in electromagnetic gun technology and $19.7 million in PE 63004A for electromagnetic gun advanced technology development. The budget request also contained $50.6 million in PE

63123N for force protection advanced technology development, including $30.0 million for surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and electrical advanced technology development. The Navy's descriptive summary accompanying the budget request states that the Navy will initiate a program for the development of electromagnetic gun technology in fiscal year 2004; however, no specific funds were designated for this activity.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee has recommended a legislative provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a collaborative program to develop and demonstrate advanced technologies and concepts that would lead to advanced guns systems that use electromagnetic propulsion for direct and indirect fire applications. The committee believes that the development of electromagnetic gun technology would have potentially high payoff for U.S. armed forces in both direct and indirect fire weapons system, and that the major investment made by the Department of Defense (principally by the Army) in this technology over the last 20 years is beginning to provide significant returns. The committee believes that stable funding for continuing technology development and demonstration is needed to establish the viability of the technology for potential applications, including ground combat vehicle main guns, air defense, long-range ship-to-shore fire support, and precision air-to-ground standoff weapons.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the budget requests of $4.9 million in PE 62618A for electromagnetic gun applied research and $19.7 million in PE 63004A for electromagnetic gun advanced technology development. The committee also recommends $8.0 million in PE 61104A for electromagnetic gun basic research, an increase of $2.1 million, and an increase of $7.6 million in PE 63123N for electro-magnetic gun advanced technology development.

*Hemoglobin-based oxygen carrier*

The budget request contained $35.2 million in PE 63002A for medical advanced technology development and $9.1 million in PE 64771N for medical system development and demonstration. No funds were specifically requested to continue the development of hemoglobin-based oxygen carrier technology.

The committee notes the Department of Defense (DOD) Inspector General's audit of DOD's blood program in 2001 that highlighted programmatic shortfalls in the Department's ability to meet its stated requirements and noted specifically that hemoglobin-based oxygen carriers could minimize or eliminate the storage and transportation problems identified in the report. Congress provided $1.0 million in fiscal year 2002 to initiate a program for evaluation of hemoglobin-based oxygen carriers for the treatment of trauma casualties and an additional $4.5 million in fiscal year 2003 for an Army advanced medical technology program of phase II clinical trials. The committee understands that based on the progress in the program the Navy has established a cooperative research and development agreement for a definitive Phase III clinical trial.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63002A and $5 million in PE 64771N to continue the program for development and clinical trials of hemoglobin-based oxygen carriers for treatment of trauma casualties.

*Intelligence and Security Command global information portal*

The budget request contained no funding in PE 33028A for security and intelligence activities, including no funding for the U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command (INSCOM) global information portal. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 33028A to accelerate the Army INSCOM global information portal development.

*Legacy parts reinvention*

The budget request contained $66.0 million in PE 78045A for end-item industrial preparedness activities.

The committee notes growing logistics problems caused by the aging fleet of legacy systems and the increased cost and delays in the retooling and manufacture of specialty replacement parts because the original manufacturers either no longer produce the parts or are no longer in business. The committee is aware that by combining the capability of laser data acquisition and reverse engineering, manufacturing-ready technical data can be offered to multiple approved sources for the rapid manufacturing of obsolete components at significantly reduced costs. Laser processes utilizing scanning of parts to produce digital three-dimensional, computer aided design and manufacturing (CAD/CAM) models permit the rapid prototyping of replacement parts and development of parts technical data packages where parts data packages and design specification may not have existed.

The committee recommends $69.0 million in PE 78045A, an increase of $3.0 million to further develop the capability for use of laser data acquisition and reverse engineering for legacy parts and technical data packages in Army arsenals and depots.

*Medium Extended Air Defense System*

The budget request contained $276.3 million in PE 63869A for the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS).

The committee does not believe that MEADS has reached a level of technical maturity that would recommend it for transfer to the Army. In August 2000, MEADS began a three year risk reduction effort as a follow on to the program definition and validation phase, and has not yet entered the system development and demonstration phase. MEADS will use the PAC–3 missile, which has undergone some operational testing, but many other system components simply do not exist in any form. For example, the committee is unaware of even a prototype C-130 transportable radar with 360 degree coverage capable of pacing the maneuver force. Pursuant to subsection 224(c) of title 10, United States Code, the Department of Defense notified the committee of its intent to transfer responsibility for the program from Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to the Army on April 2, 2003. However, the committee believes the Department falls short in its obligation under subsection 224(b) to certify technical maturity. As one of a very few international cooperative efforts in ballistic missile defense, the committee takes a special interest in the viability of this program.

The committee recommends the transfer of these funds to the MDA under the terminal defense segment PE 63881C. This is the third year that the committee makes this recommendation.

*Metallic particles in defense applications obscurant smokes*

The budget request contained $3.5 million in PE 62622A for chemical, smoke and equipment defeating technology, but included no funds for the metallic particles in defense applications (MPDA) obscurant smokes project.

The committee is aware that the MDPA project is to develop metallic or metal-based composites which can be used on the battlefield where smoke screens are used to hide troops or equipment from enemy view.

The committee recommends $8.5 million in PE 62622A, an increase of $5.0 million for MDPA.

*Micro electro-mechanical systems inertial measurement unit/global positioning system*

The budget request contained $43.3 million in PE 62303A for missile technology, and included $8.9 million for a micro electromechanical systems based integrated inertial measurement unit combined with a global positioning system (MEMS IMU/GPS).

The committee notes that the Army was selected by the Secretary of Defense to lead the joint service program to develop a MEMS IMU/GPS. The MEMS IMU/GPS is essential for precision guided weapons, and this competitive program is developing a single chip device that would reduce the cost of such capability by a factor of 50–100.

The committee recommends $53.3 million in PE 62303A, an increase of $10.0 million to accelerate MEMS IMU/GPS development.

*Modular multi function laser system*

The budget request contained $2.0 million in PE 64710A for continued development of the modular multi function laser system.

The modular multi function laser system development program would miniaturize existing laser rangefinder, laser aiming-light, and digital compass technologies and combine all these capabilities into one unit, which is presently not available for soldiers. Currently, multiple different systems which provide these separate functions must be carried by soldiers or be attached to their rifles. This new technology would reduce the weight of weapons by reducing the number of modular attachments carried on those weapons and simultaneously provide enhanced lethality. The committee understands that additional funds would continue form, fit, and function development of lightweight laser applications, increase laser range finding distances, and improve target marking and designation accuracies.

The committee recommends $5.0 million in PE 64710A, an increase of $3.0 million for continued development of the modular multi function laser system to support enhanced lethality in soldier systems.

*Non system training devices and constructive simulation systems development*

The budget request contained $8.8 million for Non System Training Devices and $14.7 million for Constructive Simulations Systems Development. These two systems are also known collectively as Warfighter's Simulation system (WARSIM). WARSIM is a computer-based simulation with associated hardware to support the

training of unit commanders and their battle staffs, from battalion through theater-level, as well as for the use of command post training events in educational institutions. WARSIM is intended to provide a comprehensive training environment capable of linking its simulation-based constructive entities with virtual and live entities. WARSIM was initially planned to fit into the larger, more comprehensive Joint Simulation system (JSIM) which has been cancelled. The committee is concerned that the Army has not taken the appropriate steps to re-evaluate WARSIM and what role this system will play now that JSIM no longer exists.

The committee recommends a reduction of $8.8 million for PE 64715A and a decrease of $14.7 million in PE 64742A.

*Objective force bandwidth report*

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide to the congressional defense committees a report, on an annual basis starting February 13, 2004, identifying Objective Force bandwidth requirements, the manner in which development and testing progress will be measured against the requirements, and how bandwidth and frequency allocations will be made to the many systems that will be considered part of the network. The report should also identify and differentiate organic systems from assets borrowed or shared from other sources such as those in the commercial, national, and international domain.

The committee is aware that the Army's Objective Force will require a significant amount of bandwidth, throughput, and communications technologies improvements in order to achieve the interconnectivity among all of the components within the proposed network. This requirement will be a significant part of the Future Combat Systems design and directly affects its lethality, survivability, and effectiveness. The committee notes that a high level of risk exists with the concepts due to the need to simultaneously develop a number of technologies and operational concepts.

*Palletized synthetic aperture radar moving target indicator radar sets*

The budget request contained $20.3 million in PE 63772A for advanced technology development of advanced tactical computer and science technologies, but included no funds for Lynx palletized radar equipment sets.

The committee understands that commercially-available Lynx radar sets packaged in a palletized form would provide an affordable, state-of-the-art, synthetic aperture radar, ground moving target indicator to evaluate capabilities and requirements for potential unmanned aerial vehicle UAV sensors as part of the development of Future Combat Systems (FCS). The committee also understands that an increase in funds in fiscal year 2004 may accelerate additional situational awareness capabilities for Army combat units prior to the fielding of any FCS UAV's.

The committee recommends $24.3 million in PE 63772A, an increase of $4.0 million, for Lynx palletized radar equipment sets.

*Patriot PAC–3*

The budget request contained $174.5 million in PE 64865A for Patriot PAC–3.

The committee recognizes the need for additional funds for countermeasure improvements and aircraft identification friend or foe (IFF).

The committee recommends $253.5 million in PE 64865A, an increase of $79.0 million for Patriot PAC–3, including $10.0 million specifically for improved aircraft IFF. The committee directs that no funds for Patriot PAC–3 IFF improvement may be obligated until completion of the Army investigation into friendly fire incidents involving Patriot during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

*Patriot PAC–2*

The budget request contained $44.5 million in PE 23801A for missile/air defense product improvement.

The committee is aware that additional funding is required for Patriot PAC–2 aircraft identification friend or foe (IFF) improvements.

The committee recommends $54.5 million in PE 23801A, an increase of $10.0 million for Patriot PAC–2 aircraft IFF improvements. The committee directs that no funds for Patriot PAC–2 aircraft IFF improvement may be obligated prior to completion to the Army investigation of alleged mishaps involving Patriot during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

*Portable and mobile emergency broadband system*

The budget request contained $40.3 million in PE 63008A for electronic warfare advanced technology, but included no funding for the portable and mobile emergency broadband system. The committee is aware that the portable and mobile emergency broadband system provides a wide-area, rapidly deployable wireless voice and data network.

The committee recommends $48.9 million in PE 63008A, an increase of $8.6 million for the portable and mobile emergency broadband system.

*Pseudofollicullitus Barbae Research*

The budget request included $35.2 million in PE 63002A for medical advanced technology but no funding for the development of a treatment for Pseudofollicullitus Barbae.

The committee recognizes the importance of Pseudofollicullitus Barbae research, particularly as it affects military personnel deployability rates.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 63002A for Pseudofollicullitus Barbae research.

*Reconfiguring tooling*

The budget request contained $72.1 million in PE 63003A for aviation advanced technology, but included no funds for the reconfiguring tooling system.

The committee recognizes the impact on the Army's aviation logistic and supply system from the increase in aviation deployments world-wide. The committee notes that development of a reconfigurable tooling system (RTS) that would allow repair of aviation composite materials at the deployed site would be beneficial to aviation readiness.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63003A for RTS.

*Remote acoustic hemostasis*

The budget request contained $58.9 million in PE 62787A for medical technology applied research.

The committee notes the results of research in high-intensity focused ultrasound technology that promises to provide a highly effective means of controlling internal bleeding. Lightweight, portable, and highly effective, remote acoustic hemostasis technology provides the capability to identify, and then eliminate the source of internal bleeding. Ongoing applied research and development has produced technologies and initial devices for advanced remote acoustic hemostasis that promises to improve battlefield combat casualty care and reduce battlefield and other trauma mortality among members of the armed services and among civilian personnel.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.2 million in PE 62787A to continue the development of this highly successful remote acoustic hemostasis technology.

*Rugged textile electronic garments for combat casualty care*

The budget request contained $35.2 million in PE 63002A for medical advanced technology development, including $1.5 million for advanced field medical protection technology. No funds were provided for development of rugged textile electronic garments for combat casualty care.

The committee notes advances in sensor technology, textile electronics, information management, and medical science that have opened up the potential for remote diagnosis, monitoring, and treatment of a range of medical conditions. Positive results from combat casualty care and electronic textiles research strongly suggest that major improvements can be made in the survival of wounded soldiers through the use of these technologies in an integrated system. Congress provided $1.0 million in fiscal year 2003 to initiate a program to develop the technology for, and assess the contribution that can be made by the use of advanced textile electronic garments in combat casualty care.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63002A to continue the program for development, demonstration, and evaluation of rugged textile electronic garments for combat casualty care.

*ScramFire 120mm powered munition*

The budget request contained $47.8 million in PE 63004A for weapons and munitions advanced technology, but included no funds for the ScramFire 120mm powered munition.

The committee is aware that powered munitions that accelerate throughout flight to the target offer increased velocity at the target for direct fire weapons or increased range for indirect fire. The committee notes that both the increased velocity for higher lethality and increased range for greater survivability are desirable characteristics for the Future Combat Systems.

The committee recommends $52.8 million in PE 63004A, an increase of $5.0 million for the ScramFire 120mm powered munition.

*Wire detection, wind sensor and obstacle avoidance system for helicopters*

The budget request contained $47.1 million in PE 63710A for night vision advanced technology, but included no funds for the wire detection, wind sensor and obstacle avoidance system for helicopters.

The committee is aware that the wire detection, wind sensor and obstacle avoidance system for helicopters offers the potential to substantially reduce helicopter accidents and also improve weapons delivery accuracy.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63710A for the wire detection, wind sensor and obstacle avoidance system for helicopters.

## NAVY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, & EVALUATION

### Overview

The budget request contained $14,106.7 million for Navy research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $14,343.4 million, an increase of $236.7 million to the budget request.

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY** | | | | | |
| | | **BASIC RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0601103N | 1 | University Research Initiatives | 70,669 | 6,000 | | | 76,669 |
| | | Naval Architecture and Engineering | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0601152N | 2 | In-House Laboratory Independent Research | 17,400 | | | | 17,400 |
| 0601153N | 3 | Defense Research Sciences | 368,517 | | | | 368,517 |
| | | **TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH** | **456,586** | **6,000** | **6,000** | **0** | **462,586** |
| | | **APPLIED RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0602114N | 4 | Power Projection Applied Research | 114,144 | 27,500 | | | 141,644 |
| | | Interrogator for High-Speed Retro Reflectometer | | | 4,000 | | |
| | | Hybrid Lidar-Radar for Improved Optical Imaging | | | 3,500 | | |
| | | FireLidar | | | 2,000 | | |
| | | Silver Fox Unmanned Aerial Vehicle | | | 15,000 | | |
| | | Integrated High Payoff Rocket Propulsion Technology program | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0602123N | 5 | Force Protection Applied Research | 75,909 | 2,500 | | | 78,409 |
| | | Fire-retarded POSS composites | | | 2,500 | | |
| 0602131M | 6 | Marine Corps Landing Force Technology | 31,778 | | | | 31,778 |
| 0602232N | 7 | Communications, Command and Control, Intell, Surveillance | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0602233N | 8 | Human Systems Technology | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0602234N | 9 | Materials, Electronics and Computer Technology | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0602235N | 10 | Common Picture Applied Research | 59,022 | 6,000 | | | 65,022 |
| | | Theater Undersea Warfare Initiative | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0602236N | 11 | Warfighter Sustainment Applied Research | 52,213 | 7,700 | | | 59,913 |
| | | Marine Mammal Research Program | | | 2,200 | | |
| | | Formable Aligned Carbon Thermosets | | | 1,500 | | |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Aerospace Materials Technology Consortium | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0602271N | 12 | RF Systems Applied Research | 44,019 | 15,500 | | | 59,519 |
| | | Vacuum Electronics | | | 9,500 | | |
| | | Wide Band Gap Semiconductor Power Electronics | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0602435N | 13 | Ocean Warfighting Environment Applied Research | 48,785 | 1,000 | | | 49,785 |
| | | Station-Keeping Ocean Environment Senors | | | 1,000 | | |
| 0602633N | 14 | Undersea Warfare Weaponry Technology | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0602747N | 15 | Undersea Warfare Applied Research | 62,583 | 2,500 | | | 65,083 |
| | | Low Acoustic Signature Motor/Propulsor | | | 2,500 | | |
| 0602782N | 16 | Mine and Expeditionary Warfare Applied Research | 47,490 | | | | 47,490 |
| 0602805N | 17 | Dual Use Science and Technology Program | 0 | | | | 0 |
| | | **TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH** | **535,943** | **62,700** | **62,700** | **0** | **598,643** |
| | | **ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0603114N | 18 | Power Projection Advanced Technology | 173,478 | 30,500 | | | 203,978 |
| | | DP-2 Thrust Vectoring Program | | | 10,000 | | |
| | | Cruise Missile Real Time Retargeting/LADAR Technology | | | 10,000 | | |
| | | Low-Power Mega-Performance Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Processing Engines | | | 7,500 | | |
| | | Integrated High Payoff Rocket Propulsion Technology program | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0603123N | 19 | Force Protection Advanced Technology/CM/LSC-X | 55,780 | 89,900 | | | 145,680 |
| | | Littoral Support Craft - Experimental | | | 20,000 | | |
| | | High Temperature Superconducting AC Synchronous Ship Propulsion Motor | | | 15,800 | | |
| | | Superconducting DC Homopolar Motor | | | 8,000 | | |
| | | Advanced Waterjet 21 | | | 3,000 | | |
| | | Offshore Mobile Basing | | | 10,000 | | |
| | | Quad Hull Security Caisson Technical Demonstration | | | 16,000 | | |
| | | COTS Carbon Fiber Qualification | | | 5,500 | | |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Project M | | | 4,000 | | |
| | | Electromagnetic Gun Initiative | | | 7,600 | | |
| 0603235N | 20 | Common Picture Advanced Technology | 69,194 | 12,000 | | | 81,194 |
| | | Consolidated Undersea Situational Awareness System | | | 7,000 | | |
| | | Integrated Maritime Picture System of Systems | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603236N | 21 | Warfighter Sustainment Advanced Technology | 54,794 | 8,500 | | | 63,294 |
| | | Reduction of Catapult Post-Retraction Exhaust Discharge | | | 2,000 | | |
| | | Emerging/Critical Interconnection Technology Initiative | | | 5,000 | | |
| | | IMPRINT | | | 1,500 | | |
| 0603271N | 22 | RF Systems Advanced Technology | 45,475 | 13,000 | | | 58,475 |
| | | Remote Ocean Surveillance Systems | | | 3,000 | | |
| | | LPI Surveillance Radar Demonstration | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0603508N | 23 | Surface Ship & Submarine HM&E Advanced Technology | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603640M | 24 | Marine Corps Advanced Technology Demonstration (ATD) | 56,404 | 9,000 | | | 65,404 |
| | | Rapid deployment fortification wall live-fire testing | | | 3,500 | | |
| | | Advanced Light Strike Vehicle | | | 5,000 | | |
| | | Mobile Expandable Shelters | | | 500 | | |
| 0603706N | 25 | Medical Development | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603707N | 26 | Manpower, Personnel and Training Adv Tech Dev | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603712N | 27 | Environmental Quality and Logistics Advanced Technology | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603727N | 28 | Joint Experimentation | 151,058 | (151,058) | | | 0 |
| | | Joint Warfare Experimentation Program | | | | (151,058) | |
| 0603729N | 29 | Warfighter Protection Advanced Technology | 11,435 | 12,500 | | | 23,935 |
| | | Biomedical Research Imaging | | | 5,000 | | |
| | | Organ Transfer Technology | | | 3,000 | | |
| | | Modeling and Simulation of Surgical Procedures for Battlefield Trauma | | | 4,500 | | |
| 0603747N | 30 | Undersea Warfare Advanced Technology | 38,168 | | | | 38,168 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603757N | 31 | Joint Warfare Experiments | 13,684 | (13,684) | | | 0 |
| | | Joint Warfare Experiments | | | | (13,684) | |
| 0603758N | 32 | Navy Warfighting Experiments and Demonstrations | 20,584 | | | | 20,584 |
| 0603782N | 33 | Mine and Expeditionary Warfare Advanced Technology | 31,719 | | | | 31,719 |
| 0603792N | 34 | Advanced Technology Transition | 0 | | | | 0 |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | **721,773** | **10,658** | **175,400** | **(164,742)** | **732,431** |
| | | **ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | | | | | |
| 0603207N | 35 | Air/Ocean Tactical Applications | 22,832 | | | | 22,832 |
| 0603216N | 36 | Aviation Survivability | 6,809 | | | | 6,809 |
| 0603237N | 37 | Deployable Joint Command and Control | 79,449 | (47,000) | | | 32,449 |
| | | Program Reduction | | | | (47,000) | |
| 0603254N | 38 | ASW Systems Development | 11,149 | 6,000 | | | 17,149 |
| | | Nonlinear Dynamics Stochastic Resonance | | | 4,000 | | |
| | | Claymore Marine | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0603261N | 39 | UAV CONOPS | 7,051 | (7,051) | | | 0 |
| | | UAV Concept Program Reduction | | | | (7,051) | |
| 0603382N | 40 | Advanced Combat Systems Technology | 3,394 | | | | 3,394 |
| 0603502N | 41 | Surface and Shallow Water Mine Countermeasures | 140,731 | 9,000 | | | 149,731 |
| | | Surface Navy Integrated Undersea Tactical Technology | | | 9,000 | | |
| 0603506N | 42 | Surface Ship Torpedo Defense | 48,347 | | | | 48,347 |
| 0603512N | 43 | Carrier Systems Development | 144,965 | | | | 144,965 |
| 0603513N | 44 | Shipboard System Component Development | 20,431 | 1,500 | | | 21,931 |
| | | Navy AQB Circuit Breaker Electronic Trip Units Second Source Qualification | | | 1,500 | | |
| 0603525N | 45 | PILOT FISH | 95,301 | | | | 95,301 |
| 0603527N | 46 | RETRACT LARCH | 74,111 | | | | 74,111 |
| 0603536N | 47 | RETRACT JUNIPER | 20,526 | | | | 20,526 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603542N | 48 | Radiological Control | 1,112 | | | | 1,112 |
| 0603553N | 49 | Surface ASW | 2,506 | | | | 2,506 |
| 0603559N | 50 | SSGN Conversion | 68,988 | | | | 68,988 |
| 0603561N | 51 | Advanced Submarine System Development | 52,744 | 38,700 | | | 91,444 |
| | | High Performance Brush Program | | | 8,700 | | |
| | | Submarine Payloads and Sensors | | | 25,000 | | |
| | | Advanced Composite Sail Phase II | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0603562N | 52 | Submarine Tactical Warfare Systems | 6,027 | | | | 6,027 |
| 0603563N | 53 | Ship Concept Advanced Design | 7,679 | | | | 7,679 |
| 0603564N | 54 | Ship Preliminary Design & Feasibility Studies | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603570N | 55 | Advanced Nuclear Power Systems | 201,239 | | | | 201,239 |
| 0603573N | 56 | Advanced Surface Machinery Systems | 1,468 | | | | 1,468 |
| 0603576N | 57 | CHALK EAGLE | 17,463 | | | | 17,463 |
| 0603581N | 58 | Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) | 158,071 | 35,000 | | | 193,071 |
| | | Littoral Combat Ship Mission Module Development | | | 35,000 | | |
| 0603582N | 59 | Combat System Integration | 86,836 | | | | 86,836 |
| 0603609N | 60 | Conventional Munitions | 42,539 | | | | 42,539 |
| 0603611M | 61 | Marine Corps Assault Vehicles: AAAV | 240,695 | | | | 240,695 |
| 0603612M | 62 | Marine Corps Mine/Countermeasures Systems - Adv Dev: Mine Detector | 1,215 | | | | 1,215 |
| 0603635M | 63 | Marine Corps Ground Combat/Support System | 19,700 | | | | 19,700 |
| 0603654N | 64 | Joint Service Explosive Ordnance Development | 12,385 | | | | 12,385 |
| 0603658N | 65 | Cooperative Engagement | 72,506 | | | | 72,506 |
| 0603713N | 66 | Ocean Engineering Technology Development | 18,180 | | | | 18,180 |
| 0603721N | 67 | Environmental Protection | 30,127 | | | | 30,127 |
| 0603724N | 68 | Navy Energy Program | 1,713 | | | | 1,713 |
| 0603725N | 69 | Facilities Improvement | 1,440 | | | | 1,440 |
| 0603734N | 70 | CHALK CORAL | 61,453 | | | | 61,453 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603739N | 71 | Navy Logistic Productivity | 7,591 | | | | 7,591 |
| 0603746N | 72 | RETRACT MAPLE | 300,864 | | | | 300,864 |
| 0603748N | 73 | LINK PLUMERIA | 105,363 | | | | 105,363 |
| 0603751N | 74 | RETRACT ELM | 43,755 | | | | 43,755 |
| 0603755N | 75 | Ship Self Defense | 9,733 | | | | 9,733 |
| 0603764N | 76 | LINK EVERGREEN | 95,796 | | | | 95,796 |
| 0603787N | 77 | Special Processes | 53,450 | | | | 53,450 |
| 0603790N | 78 | NATO Research and Development | 7,941 | | | | 7,941 |
| 0603795N | 79 | Land Attack Technology | 63,434 | 67,000 | | | 130,434 |
| | | Affordable Weapon System | | | 40,000 | | |
| | | Naval Fires Network Tactical Dissemination Module | | | 5,000 | | |
| | | Autonomous Naval Support Round | | | 20,000 | | |
| | | Antijam GPS Receive/Comm Link for Hypersonic Projectile | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0603851M | 80 | Nonlethal Weapons | 43,445 | | | | 43,445 |
| 0603857N | 81 | Joint Combat Identification Evaluation Team (JCIET) | 16,765 | | | | 16,765 |
| 0603860N | 82 | Joint Precision Approach and Landing Systems | 24,304 | | | | 24,304 |
| 0603879N | 83 | Single Integrated Air Picture (SIAP) System Engineer (SE) | 15,053 | | | | 15,053 |
| 0603889N | 84 | Counterdrug RDT&E Projects | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604272N | 85 | Tactical Air Directional Infrared Countermeasures (TADIRCM) | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604327N | 86 | Hard and Deeply Buried Target Defeat System (HDBTDS) Program | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604707N | 87 | Space and Electronic Warfare (SEW) Architecture/Engineering Support | 31,369 | | | | 31,369 |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | **2,600,045** | **103,149** | **157,200** | **(54,051)** | **2,703,194** |
| | | **SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | | | | | |
| 0603662N | 88 | Foreign Counter-Intelligence (FCI) - RDT&E | | | | | 0 |
| 0603787N | 89 | Special Processes | | | | | 0 |
| 0603831N | 90 | Classified Programs | | | | | 0 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0604212N | 91 | Other Helo Development | 66,764 | 1,000 | | | 67,764 |
| | | Advanced Cable Design for Mine and Submarine Warfare | | | 1,000 | | |
| 0604214N | 92 | AV-8B Aircraft - Eng Dev | 10,527 | 7,000 | | | 17,527 |
| | | AV-8B ELMP | | | 7,000 | | |
| 0604215N | 93 | Standards Development | 50,063 | 6,000 | | | 56,063 |
| | | Metrology | | | 6,000 | | |
| 0604216N | 94 | Multi-Mission Helicopter Upgrade Development | 76,998 | | | | 76,998 |
| 0604217N | 95 | S-3 Weapon System Improvement | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604218N | 96 | Air/Ocean Equipment Engineering | 4,309 | | | | 4,309 |
| 0604221N | 97 | P-3 Modernization Program | 7,306 | 17,500 | | | 24,806 |
| | | AIP Phased Capability Upgrade | | | 17,500 | | |
| 0604230N | 98 | Naval Support System | 1,466 | | | | 1,466 |
| 0604231N | 99 | Tactical Command System | 68,805 | | | | 68,805 |
| 0604234N | 100 | E-2C Radar Modernization | 352,298 | | | | 352,298 |
| 0604245N | 101 | H-1 Upgrades | 90,589 | | | | 90,589 |
| 0604261N | 102 | Acoustic Search Sensors | 15,831 | | | | 15,831 |
| 0604262N | 103 | V-22A | 441,142 | | | | 441,142 |
| 0604264N | 104 | Air Crew Systems Development | 8,765 | 4,000 | | | 12,765 |
| | | Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System (JHMCS) | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0604270N | 105 | EW Development | 51,879 | 15,000 | | | 66,879 |
| | | IDECM ALE-55 development testing | | | 15,000 | | |
| 0604271N | XX | EA-18G | 204,822 | | | | 204,822 |
| 0604273N | 106 | VHXX Executive Helo Development | 197,431 | | | | 197,431 |
| 0604280N | 107 | Joint Tactical Radio System - Navy (JTRS-Navy) | 87,943 | | | | 87,943 |
| 0604300N | 108 | DD(X) | 1,037,987 | 4,000 | | | 1,041,987 |
| | | Knowledge Projection for Fleet Maintenance | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0604307N | 109 | AEGIS Combats Support Eng | 205,733 | 45,000 | | | 250,733 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | AEGIS Open Architecture | | | 10,000 | | |
| | | S-band Radar Prototype | | | 35,000 | | |
| 0604311N | 110 | LPD-17 Class Systems Integration | 7,989 | | | | 7,989 |
| 0604312N | 111 | JASSM | 25,137 | | | | 25,137 |
| 0604329N | 112 | Small Diameter Bomb (SDB) | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604366N | 113 | Standard Missile Improvements | 76,927 | | | | 76,927 |
| 0604373N | 114 | Airborne MCM | 88,514 | | | | 88,514 |
| 0604503N | 115 | Submarine Systems Development | 80,815 | 6,500 | | | 87,315 |
| | | Affordable Towed Array Construction | | | 6,500 | | |
| 0604504N | 116 | Air Control | 10,472 | | | | 10,472 |
| 0604507N | 117 | Enhanced Modular Signal Processor | 1,006 | | | | 1,006 |
| 0604512N | 118 | Shipboard Aviation Systems | 18,352 | | | | 18,352 |
| 0604518N | 119 | Combat Information Center Conversion | 21,244 | | | | 21,244 |
| 0604558N | 120 | Virginia Class Design Development | 112,355 | 10,000 | | | 122,355 |
| | | Virginia Class Multi-Mission Module | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0604561N | 121 | SSN-21 Developments | 13,482 | | | | 13,482 |
| 0604562N | 122 | Submarine Tactical Warfare System | 32,238 | | | | 32,238 |
| 0604567N | 123 | Ship Contract Design/ Live Fire T&E | 138,017 | | | | 138,017 |
| 0604574N | 124 | Navy Tactical Computer Resources | 2,267 | | | | 2,267 |
| 0604601N | 125 | Mine Development | 1,497 | | | | 1,497 |
| 0604603N | 126 | SLAM-ER | 9,701 | | | | 9,701 |
| 0604610N | 127 | Lightweight Torpedo Development | 3,442 | | | | 3,442 |
| 0604618N | 128 | Joint Direct Attack Munition | 33,029 | | | | 33,029 |
| 0604654N | 129 | Joint Service Explosive Ordnance Development | 8,136 | | | | 8,136 |
| 0604703N | 130 | Personnel, Training, Simulation, and Human Factors | 1,941 | | | | 1,941 |
| 0604710N | 131 | Navy Energy Program | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604721N | 132 | Ship Information Warfare | 16,942 | | | | 16,942 |

**Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION**

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0604727N | 133 | Joint Standoff Weapon Systems | 775 | | | | 775 |
| 0604755N | 134 | Ship Self Defense (Detect & Control) | 40,930 | 16,000 | | | 56,930 |
| | | Integrated Radar Optical Surveillance and Sighting System | | | 16,000 | | |
| 0604756N | 135 | Ship Self Defense (Engage: Hard Kill) | 23,076 | | | | 23,076 |
| 0604757N | 136 | Ship Self Defense (Engage: Soft Kill/EW) | 35,508 | | | | 35,508 |
| 0604771N | 137 | Medical Development | 9,121 | 5,000 | | | 14,121 |
| | | Hemoglobin-based Oxygen Carrier | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0604777N | 138 | Navigation/ID System | 45,726 | | | | 45,726 |
| 0604784N | 139 | Distributed Surveillance System | 28,755 | | | | 28,755 |
| 0604800N | 140 | Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) | 2,171,736 | | | | 2,171,736 |
| 0604910N | 141 | Navy IT | 552 | | | | 552 |
| 0605013M | 142 | Information Technology Development | 8,835 | | | | 8,835 |
| 0605013N | 143 | Information Technology Development | 30,562 | 9,000 | | | 39,562 |
| | | Naval Collaboration Tool Set | | | 8,000 | | |
| | | Open Architecture Wireless Sensors | | | 1,000 | | |
| 0605014N | 144 | IT Development | 78,724 | (28,000) | | | 50,724 |
| | | Defense Integrated Military Human Resource System | | | | (28,000) | |
| 0605015N | 145 | Joint Counter-Intelligence Assessment Group (JCAG) - RDT&E | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0605500N | 146 | Multi-mission Maritime Aircraft (MMA) | 76,243 | (17,500) | | | 58,743 |
| | | Program Reduction | | | | (17,500) | |
| 0508713N | 147 | Navy Standard Integrated Personnel System (NSIPS) | 4,653 | | | | 4,653 |
| | | **TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | **6,239,357** | **100,500** | **146,000** | **(45,500)** | **6,339,857** |
| | | **RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | | | | | |
| 0604256N | 148 | Threat Simulator Development | 28,004 | | | | 28,004 |
| 0604258N | 149 | Target Systems Development | 37,638 | | | | 37,638 |
| 0604759N | 150 | Major T&E Investment | 43,908 | | | | 43,908 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0605152N | 151 | Studies and Analysis Support - Navy | 4,431 | | | | 4,431 |
| 0605154N | 152 | Center for Naval Analyses | 40,726 | 1,600 | | | 42,326 |
| | | Fleet Architecture Studies | | | 1,600 | | |
| 0605155N | 153 | Fleet Tactical Development | 2,006 | | | | 2,006 |
| 0605502N | 154 | Small Business Innovative Research | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0605804N | 155 | Technical Information Services | 726 | | | | 726 |
| 0605853N | 156 | Management, Technical & International Support | 30,236 | | | | 30,236 |
| 0605856N | 157 | Strategic Technical Support | 3,883 | | | | 3,883 |
| 0605861N | 158 | RDT&E Science and Technology Management | 64,885 | | | | 64,885 |
| 0605862N | 159 | RDT&E Instrumentation Modernization | 13,554 | | | | 13,554 |
| 0605863N | 160 | RDT&E Ship and Aircraft Support | 78,648 | | | | 78,648 |
| 0605864N | 161 | Test and Evaluation Support | 258,471 | | | | 258,471 |
| 0605865N | 162 | Operational Test and Evaluation Capability | 12,094 | | | | 12,094 |
| 0605866N | 163 | Navy Space and Electronic Warfare (SEW) Support | 3,187 | | | | 3,187 |
| 0605867N | 164 | SEW Surveillance/Reconnaissance Support | 12,091 | | | | 12,091 |
| 0605873M | 165 | Marine Corps Program Wide Support | 16,635 | | | | 16,635 |
| 0909999N | 166 | Financing for Cancelled Account Adjustments | 0 | | | | 0 |
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | **651,123** | **1,600** | **1,600** | **0** | **652,723** |
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0603660N | 167 | Advanced Development Projects | | | | | 0 |
| 0603661N | 168 | Retract Violet | | | | | 0 |
| 0101221N | 169 | Strategic Sub & Weapons System Support | 104,793 | | | | 104,793 |
| 0101224N | 170 | SSBN Security Technology Program | 38,408 | | | | 38,408 |
| 0101226N | 171 | Submarine Acoustic Warfare Development | 2,955 | | | | 2,955 |
| 0101402N | 172 | Navy Strategic Communications/E-6B | 27,357 | | | | 27,357 |
| 0203761N | 173 | Rapid Technology Transition (RTT) | 14,662 | | | | 14,662 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0204136N | 174 | F/A-18 Squadrons | 179,047 | | | | 179,047 |
| 0204152N | 175 | E-2 Squadrons | 9,083 | | | | 9,083 |
| 0204163N | 176 | Fleet Telecommunications (Tactical) | 16,484 | | | | 16,484 |
| 0204229N | 177 | Tomahawk and Tomahawk Mission Planning Center (TMPC) | 71,385 | | | | 71,385 |
| 0204311N | 178 | Integrated Surveillance System | 14,278 | 7,500 | | | 21,778 |
| | | All Optical Underwater Segments | | | 7,500 | | |
| 0204413N | 179 | Amphibious Tactical Support Units | 5,652 | | | | 5,652 |
| 0204571N | 180 | Consolidated Training Systems Development | 21,719 | 1,000 | | | 22,719 |
| | | Battle force tactical training coalition interoperability | | | 1,000 | | |
| 0204574N | 181 | Cryptologic Direct Support | 1,466 | | | | 1,466 |
| 0204575N | 182 | Electronic Warfare (EW) Readiness Support | 11,927 | | | | 11,927 |
| 0205601N | 183 | HARM Improvement | 49,381 | | | | 49,381 |
| 0205604N | 184 | Tactical Data Links | 44,526 | | | | 44,526 |
| 0205620N | 185 | Surface ASW Combat System Integration | 12,179 | | | | 12,179 |
| 0205632N | 186 | MK-48 ADCAP | 17,227 | | | | 17,227 |
| 0205633N | 187 | Aviation Improvements | 60,073 | 3,000 | | | 63,073 |
| | | Automated Wire Analysis | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0205658N | 188 | Navy Science Assistance Program | 7,236 | | | | 7,236 |
| 0205667N | 189 | F-14 Upgrade | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0205675N | 190 | Operational Nuclear Power Systems | 62,751 | | | | 62,751 |
| 0206313M | 191 | Marine Corps Communications Systems | 235,722 | 4,000 | | | 239,722 |
| | | Digital Intelligence Situation Mapboard | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0206623M | 192 | Marine Corps Ground Combat/Supporting Arms Systems | 35,439 | | | | 35,439 |
| 0206624M | 193 | Marine Corps Combat Services Support | 19,723 | | | | 19,723 |
| 0207161N | 194 | Tactical AIM Missiles | 2,322 | | | | 2,322 |
| 0207163N | 195 | Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM) | 9,297 | | | | 9,297 |
| 0301303N | 196 | Maritime Intelligence | | | | | 0 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0301323N | 197 | Collection Management | | | | | 0 |
| 0301327N | 198 | Technical Reconnaissance and Surveillance | | | | | 0 |
| 0303109N | 199 | Satellite Communications (SPACE) | 379,541 | 10,000 | | | 389,541 |
| | | Joint Integrated Satellite Communications Technology | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0303140N | 200 | Information Systems Security Program | 18,404 | | | | 18,404 |
| 0304111N | 201 | Special Activities | | | | | 0 |
| 0305149N | 202 | COBRA JUDY | 69,369 | | | | 69,369 |
| 0305160N | 203 | Navy Meteorological and Ocean Sensors-Space (METOC) | 4,966 | | | | 4,966 |
| 0305188N | 204 | Joint C4ISR Battle Center (JBC) | 50,413 | | | | 50,413 |
| 0305192N | 205 | Joint Military Intelligence Programs | 5,314 | | | | 5,314 |
| 0305204N | 206 | Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicles | 56,521 | 17,500 | | | 74,021 |
| | | Airborne Buried Mine Detection | | | 2,000 | | |
| | | Shadow 200 System Components for USMC | | | 8,500 | | |
| | | Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Joint Operational Test Bed System | | | 7,000 | | |
| 0305205N | 207 | Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicles | 101,448 | (8,400) | | | 93,048 |
| | | Global Hawk Maritime Demonstration | | | | (8,400) | |
| 0305206N | 208 | Airborne Reconnaissance Systems | 13,345 | 11,000 | | | 24,345 |
| | | Advanced Sensor Initiative | | | 11,000 | | |
| 0305207N | 209 | Manned Reconnaissance Systems | 13,717 | | | | 13,717 |
| 0305208N | 210 | Distributed Common Ground Systems | 4,421 | 6,500 | | | 10,921 |
| | | Enterprise Targeting and Strike System (eTSS) | | | 6,500 | | |
| 0305927N | 211 | Naval Space Surveillance | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0308601N | 212 | Modeling and Simulation Support | 7,044 | | | | 7,044 |
| 0702207N | 213 | Depot Maintenance (Non-IF) | 9,073 | | | | 9,073 |
| 0708011N | 214 | Industrial Preparedness | 54,593 | | | | 54,593 |
| 0708730N | 215 | Maritime Technology (MARITECH) | 10,068 | | | | 10,068 |
| XXXXXXX | 999 | Classified Programs | 1,028,497 | | | | 1,028,497 |

**Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | **2,901,826** | **52,100** | **60,500** | **(8,400)** | **2,953,926** |
| | xxx | Information Technology Reduction | | (100,000) | | (100,000) | (100,000) |
| | | **TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY** | **14,106,653** | **236,707** | **609,400** | **(372,693)** | **14,343,360** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Advanced cable design for mine and submarine warfare*

The budget request contained $66.8 million in PE 64212N for anti-submarine warfare and other helicopter improvements.

The committee notes that anti-submarine warfare and mine countermeasures helicopters currently use heavy, steel reinforced tow cables that vibrate when deployed and degrade overall system performance. To address these shortcomings Congress added $1.2 million in fiscal year 2003 to initiate a program for development and evaluation of improvements in the cables used for towing mine and submarine warfare sensors and countermeasures.

The committee recommends $67.8 million in PE 64212N, an increase of $1.0 million to continue the program for development and evaluation of improvements in mine and submarine warfare sensor and countermeasure tow cables.

*Advanced composite sail phase II*

The budget request contained $52.7 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine system development.

The advanced composite sail program for the Virginia class submarine is intended to demonstrate substantial additional payload capacity and low-observable improvements over conventional submarine sails. Phase II of the program addresses the incorporation of full-scale design features and load specifications that would be encountered by operational submarines, including damage assessment and repair.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63561N to continue the program for development, demonstration, and validation of technologies and techniques for advanced monitoring of the operational condition of composite sails, repair procedures, and procedures for enabling future payloads to be inserted into a composite sail without major redesign of the sail structure.

*Advanced Navy materials*

The budget request included $15.3 million in PE 62236N for advanced Navy materials.

Leadership in aerospace advanced materials technology is fundamental to U.S. competitiveness in the global economy. The Aerospace Materials Technology Consortium consisting of over 30 government, industry, and academic institutions is organized to provide synergy across the aerospace materials community in the development and application of advanced aerospace materials.

The committee recommends $19.3 million in PE 62236N, an increase of $4.0 million to support partnered projects for advanced technology materials development and demonstration projects.

*Advanced sensor initiative*

The budget request contained $13.3 million in PE 35206N for airborne reconnaissance systems, but included no funds for the advanced sensor initiative.

The advanced sensor initiative is a product improvement program to the existing shared reconnaissance pod (SHARP) carried on the Navy's F/A–18E/F aircraft. The SHARP provides continuous and immediate intelligence support to the battle group commander

by employing a suite of sensors to collect infrared, visible, and synthetic aperture radar digital imagery at medium and high altitudes. The advanced sensor initiative would further develop SHARP capabilities by improving its efficiency and maintainability and by providing enhanced processing and dissemination capabilities. The committee understands that such improvements could include replacement of existing mechanical camera shutters with semiconductor computer chips, miniaturizing separate medium- and high-altitude cameras into one zoom lens, and upgrading image processing to provide more rapid data dissemination capabilities. The committee also understands that reconnaissance products developed through the advanced sensor initiative could be adapted for use on smaller and lighter platforms such as unmanned aerial vehicles.

The committee recommends $24.3 million in PE 35206N, an increase of $11.0 million for the advanced sensor initiative, to improve the capabilities of the SHARP and to develop smaller reconnaissance architecture for other platforms.

*Advanced WaterJet–21*

The budget request contained $55.8 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology. No funds were included to continue development and demonstration of the Advanced WaterJet–21 (AWJ–21).

The AWJ–21 is an advanced technology development program by the Office of Naval Research to validate the capability of the technology to meet the Navy's rigorous requirements for increased speed, stealth, maneuverability, and shallow draft that will be needed for 21st century ships operating in the littorals. Funding to date has supported construction of a one-quarter scale demonstrator and testing in the laboratory and in a water tunnel. The results to date indicate the potential for AWJ–21 technology as a low cost, low risk, and high performance propulsor for future ships.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63123N for AWJ–21 ship integration and at-sea testing to complete the AWJ–21 advanced technology demonstration.

*Aegis open architecture*

The budget request contained $205.7 million in PE 64307N for surface combatant combat system engineering, of which $80.4 million was included to continue development of the computer programs for the cruiser conversion program, but included no funds for Aegis open architecture.

The Aegis open architecture program maximizes software component interoperability for cross-platform re-use. The committee understands that the budget request is not sufficient to develop the open architecture required for introduction into the cruiser conversion program in fiscal year 2005, thereby ensuring timely introduction of the Aegis open architecture capabilities by fiscal year 2008 as required by both the Navy's and the Missile Defense Agency's sea-based missile defense 2010 plan.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 64307N for the Aegis open architecture program.

*Affordable towed array construction (ATAC) program*

The budget request contained $80.8 million in PE 64503N for submarine systems equipment development, of which $5.7 million was included to continue development of affordable towed array technology initiatives, but included no funds for the ATAC program.

The ATAC program would accelerate an already planned and budgeted development of a fiber optic upgrade to the TB–29 and TB–29A towed arrays which are used as external acoustic sensors on the Navy's Los Angeles and Ohio Class submarine fleets. The committee understands that the ATAC program would accelerate system performance verification testing, implement automated manufacturing equipment, and qualify commercial suppliers for production of new highly reliable and low cost fiber optic towed arrays. The committee further understands that the ATAC program's methodology would result in a 50 percent reduction in unit cost and provide fleet life cycle cost savings of over $100.0 million.

The committee recommends $87.3 million in PE 64503N, an increase of $6.5 million for the ATAC program, to improve towed array reliability and significantly increase cost savings.

*Affordable weapons system*

The budget request contained $63.4 million in PE 63795N for land attack technology advanced component development and prototypes.

The Office of Naval Research (ONR) Affordable Weapon System (AWS) program is an advanced technology initiative to demonstrate the ability to design, develop, and build a capable and affordable precision guided weapon system at a cost that would be an order of magnitude cheaper than comparable weapon systems and in production would achieve a stable unit production cost very early in the production cycle.

The committee notes that the ONR program has been successful in all respects. In less than four years, the AWS program has demonstrated the use of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) components to construct a 400–600 mile range, subsonic (180–220 knot), "loitering, 200 pound payload, precision strike missile with global positioning system/inertial navigation system guidance and control and a data link." The missile has both line of sight and satellite data links for interaction with ground stations and forward observers and is reprogrammable in flight. In operational use the missile would be launched from CONEX-type containers that hold between six and twenty missiles and could be carried on land, sea, or air platforms. The initiative has demonstrated that the COTS approach can reduce costs by an order of magnitude from traditional cruise missiles. The current missile cost in large scale production, exclusive of warhead, is estimated to be $60,000. Within the last 16 months there have been ten successful flight tests that have demonstrated the missile's range, accuracy and other capabilities.

The committee believes that the AWS has enormous potential both for continued development and procurement as a weapon system to fill the gap between cannons and multiple launch rockets and missile systems such as Tomahawk that have longer range and larger warheads and in developing a new paradigm for the rapid development, transition to production, and fielding of new and in-

novative weapons systems. The committee notes that there are still significant issues to be resolved in transitioning AWS through system development into production: selection and integration of warhead(s); launcher development; production engineering; logistics supportability; training development; and development and operational test. The committee understands that the program is under review by the Navy for transition in the fiscal year 2006 budget. The committee believes that the success demonstrated by the system to date and the operational contribution that the capability would provide to U.S. forces justify seeking new ways to accelerate transition from science and technology to fielded capability.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million in PE 63795N to continue development of the AWS, and $138.0 million in Weapons Procurement Navy for AWS procurement.

*Airborne buried mine detection*

The budget request contained $56.5 million in PE 35204N for tactical unmanned aerial vehicle development.

The committee understands that emerging technology for small imaging synthetic aperture radars has the potential capability for detecting the location of buried metallic and plastic land mines with relatively high accuracy. When mounted in an unmanned aerial vehicle, such a capability could meet the requirements of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps for airborne detection of buried land mines. The committee further understands that the Department of Defense has allocated $1.0 million for the demonstration of an airborne prototype of such a radar in an unmanned aerial vehicle.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 35204N to accelerate the development and demonstration of the mine detection capability of small, imaging synthetic aperture radars mounted in an unmanned aerial vehicle.

*ALE–55 development testing*

The budget request contained $256.7 million in PE 64270N for electronic warfare development, but included no funds for ALE–55 development testing. Elsewhere in this report the committee directs that the budget request of $204.8 million, for development of the EF–18G aircraft, be established in a new program element, PE 64271N, leaving $51.9 million in PE 64270N or electronic warfare development.

The ALE–55 is a fiber optic towed decoy being developed for the integrated defensive electronic countermeasures system, which is planned for future installation on the Navy's F/A–18E/F aircraft fleet. The committee understands that the ALE–55 development program has been significantly delayed due to funding limitations and terminated Air Force participation, and that further ALE–55 development delay will place F/A–18E/F aircrews at increased surface-to-air missile attack risk.

In order to complete ALE–55 development testing and operational evaluation and achieve a ALE–55 F/A–18E/F initial operational capability by fiscal year 2005, the committee recommends $66.9 million in PE 64270N, an increase of $15.0 million.

*All optical underwater segments*

The budget request contained $14.3 million in PE 24311N for integrated surveillance system operational systems development.

The committee notes continuing developments in optical fiber array technology and the Navy's application of that technology to both towed and fixed array underwater surveillance systems.

The committee recommends $21.8 million in PE 24311N, an increase of $7.5 million to accelerate the development of all-optical underwater surveillance systems.

*Anti-surface warfare improvement program (AIP) phased capability update (PCU)*

The budget request contained $7.3 million in PE 64221N for the P–3 modernization program, but included no funds for the AIP PCU program.

The AIP upgrades the P–3's communications, survivability, and over-the-horizon targeting capabilities through the installation of commercial-off-the-shelf components, and the PCU program systematically improves the AIP to meet new and emerging operational needs. The committee understands that the next PCU phase would develop a real-time targeting capability in AIP-equipped P–3 aircraft by improving sensor performance to provide precise target locations for dissemination to strike platforms.

The committee believes that real-time targeting capability is critical to the P–3's effectiveness.

The committee recommends $24.8 million in PE 64221N, an increase of $17.5 million for the AIP PCU program.

*Automated wire analysis*

The budget request contained $60.1 million in PE 25633N for aviation improvements operational systems development, including $1.4 million for development of aircraft equipment reliability and maintainability improvements.

The committee notes that in meeting today's operational requirements many Navy aircraft are flown beyond their design life, and mechanical, chemical, and thermal stress and the maritime environment degrade aircraft wiring systems. The committee is aware of automated capabilities for analysis of wiring systems, developed in conjunction with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, that can provide instant processing, and highly accurate identification and location of faults in wiring harnesses. The committee believes that the improvement in troubleshooting capabilities provided by such technology would reduce operational and logistics costs and also, contribute to the reduction of in-flight failures by providing the ability to predict where a potential failure is most likely to occur.

The committee recommends $63.1 million in PE 25633N, an increase of $3.0 million for the evaluation of automated wire analysis technology in the Navy's aircraft equipment reliability and maintainability program.

*Autonomous naval support round*

The budget request contained $63.4 million in PE 63795N for land attack technology, including $10.0 million to begin development of the Extended Range Munition.

The Navy's Extended Range Guided Munition (ERGM) program is developing a long-range, precision munition for fire support of ground forces ashore and for surface strike missions. ERGM will be capable of being fired from newer DDG–51 destroyers equipped with the 5-inch, 62 (5″/62) caliber gun, but will not be compatible with older ships equipped with the 5-inch, 54 caliber (5″/54) guns. The Autonomous Naval Support Round (ANSR) is a rolling airframe, gun-fired projectile that has been used to demonstrate advanced gun-launched projectile and guidance and control technology and is capable of being employed from all Navy 5″/54-equipped ships as well as from new 5″/62-equipped ships. The committee notes that a successful ANSR demonstration program has led the Navy to plan a $70.0 million, 24-month system development and demonstration program for an Extended Range Munition and has included $10.0 million in the budget request to begin the program. The committee further understands that the Navy intends to include funding for the balance of the program in the fiscal year 2005 program objectives memorandum.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 63795N to accelerate system development and demonstration for the Extended Range Munition.

*AV–8B engine life management program (ELMP)*

The budget request contained $10.5 million in PE 64214N for AV–8B design, development, integration and test, of which $2.3 million was included for the AV–8B ELMP.

The AV–8B ELMP is a comprehensive F402 engine program to improve its safety and reliability, and to increase the mean time between engine removals from 275 hours to 800 hours. The F402 is the single engine installed on all AV–8B aircraft. The committee understands that an increase is required in fiscal year 2004 to allow a third F402 accelerated simulated mission endurance test, to continue engine design improvements, and to provide improvements to the engine monitoring systems. The committee notes that both the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps have included the AV–8B ELMP among their unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2004.

Consequently, the committee recommends $17.5 million in PE 64214N, an increase of $7.0 million.

*Battle force tactical training coalition interoperability*

The budget request contained $21.7 million in PE 24571N for consolidated training systems development.

The Battle Force Tactical Training (BFTT) Programs provides realistic joint warfare training across the spectrum of armed conflict; realistic unit level team training in all warfare areas; a means to link together ships that are in different homeports for coordinated training; external stimulation of shipboard training systems; and simulation of non-shipboard forces. The committee believes that extending the BFTT training capability to allied forces and providing an enhanced capability for battle force and combat system team training in coalition naval operations would significantly enhance the operational capability of United States and allied naval forces.

The committee recommends $22.7 million in PE 24571N, an increase of $1.0 million to initiate a program to develop and dem-

onstrate in the BFTT program a training systems methodology and architecture that would facilitate combined battle force and combat systems team training among U.S. and allied naval forces.

*Biomedical Research Imaging*

The budget request contained $11.4 million in PE 63729N for warfighter protection advanced technology development.

The committee continues to note the progress being made in the use of advanced imaging technology in biomedical research. New imaging technology has allowed the observation of tumors as small as 1 mm in diameter and has allowed scientists to observe critical bio-chemical changes associated with tumors, strokes, and other disease states. The committee believes that these findings have important implications for advances in real-time medical diagnosis and treatment.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63729N to continue research in the applications of advanced imaging technology to biomedical research.

*Claymore Marine*

The budget request contained $11.1 million in PE 63254N for anti-submarine warfare (ASW) systems development.

The committee notes that the Navy established the Claymore Marine program to investigate and demonstrate a new littoral anti-submarine warfare (ASW) system that integrates the previously developed ATD–111 airborne ASW and mine hunting system with new signal processing algorithms to achieve a significant increase in performance. Results to date indicate that the concept should succeed. The Navy's fiscal year 2004 unfunded priorities list includes the need for an additional $2.0 million for the Claymore Marine program to support an at-sea demonstration and transition of the program to system development and demonstration.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63254N for the Claymore Marine program.

*COBRA JUDY*

The budget request contained $69.4 million in PE 35149N for COBRA JUDY.

The committee notes that following an analysis of alternatives (AoA) for a COBRA JUDY replacement, the Secretary of Defense, in agreement with the Director of Central Intelligence, has established a replacement program. The committee believes that even though the Air Force is conducting an additional AoA, the present program to provide a COBRA JUDY replacement is well founded and should go forward.

The committee is concerned that cost and schedule be maintained, and directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees any changes to the present program as a result of the AoA in progress.

*Combat systems integration/battle force interoperability*

The budget request contained $86.8 million in PE 63582N for combat systems integration/battle force interoperability (CSI/BFI) advanced component development and prototyping, including $25.0

million for the small business innovative research (SBIR) Phase III common network interface (CNI) program.

The committee believes that this program, like the multipurpose process/advanced processing build process used in the submarine acoustic rapid commercial-off-the-shelf insertion program, can offer significant alternative approaches to AEGIS combat system modernization which will permit the rapid and affordable introduction of new capabilities and competitive alternatives.

The committee recommends $86.8 million in PE 63582N for CSI/BFI advanced component development and protyping, including $25.0 million for the SBIR Phase III program for development of CNI capabilities for theater missile and air defense.

*Consolidated undersea situational awareness system*

The budget request contained $69.2 million in PE 63235N for common picture advanced technology development.

The committee notes that command and control in combat is a complicated undertaking across all military problem domains, and it is particularly hard for those domains where the commander must make decisions based on a mass of dynamically changing, uncertain, and at best, partially correct critical data. The Consolidated Undersea Situational Awareness System (CUSAS) is an agent-based decision support system under development for submarine operations that uses an innovative hybrid Bayesian/differential game modeling approach. The resulting theory and technology will facilitate submarine operations by addressing such practical problems as tradeoff evaluation for course of action and maintaining tactical advantage while avoiding counter detection. In addition, the CUSAS system incorporates environmental data by integrating existing Navy programs and sonar operator training systems. The committee believes that successful development of the CUSAS decision support system would provide a capability that significantly assists submarine commanders who are under the stress of critical combat operations to make rapid, informed, and superior decisions.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63235N to continue the program for development and demonstration of the consolidated undersea situational awareness system.

*Cruise missile real time retargeting/laser radar technology*

The budget request contained $173.5 million in PE 63114N for power projection advanced technology development, including $67.9 million advanced development of time-critical strike technologies.

The committee notes progress in the Navy's program for development of low-cost, active terminal seekers for cruise missile real time retargeting. The combination of the three-dimensional mapping capability of a laser radar seeker, automated target recognition algorithms, and mission planning software which is used to relay new target search areas and retarget the missile while it is in flight provides the capability for rapid and accurate engagement of time-critical targets.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63114N to accelerate the Navy's program for cruise missile real-time retargeting.

*DD(X) multi-mission surface combatant*

The budget request contained $1 billion in PE 64300N to continue the program for development of the DD(X) class of U.S. Navy surface combatants, advanced development of component technologies and systems that are integral to DD(X), and preliminary and system design for the first DD(X) class ship. DD(X) is a multi-mission surface combatant tailored for land attack in support of the ground campaign and maritime dominance. The program is in the pre-systems acquisition phase of development, leading to design reviews in fiscal year 2004 and a Milestone B acquisition decision in fiscal year 2005. Delivery of the first ship of the class to the fleet is planned for fiscal year 2011.

The committee notes that the DD(X) program will provide the baseline for spiral development of technology and engineering required to meet future maritime requirements and for development of a range of future ships such as the future cruiser CG(X) and the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS). Just as its predecessor the DD–21, DD(X) will be the advanced technology platform for transformational technologies including an integrated power system and electric drive; the Advanced Gun System; the new Multi-Function Radar/Volume Search Radar suite; optimal manning through advanced system automation; stealth through reduced acoustic, magnetic, infrared, and radar cross-section signature; and enhanced survivability through automated damage control and fire protection systems.

The original concept for DD–21 that carried over into the DD(X) program included an Advanced Gun System and an Advanced Land Attack Missile System (ALAM) to provide naval surface fires for support of ground forces ashore and precision strike capabilities. These requirements have been major factors in driving a ship design for a DD(X) of approximately 17,000 tons, significantly larger than the current DDG–51 Arleigh Burke Class destroyer. However, an interim land attack missile system based on the Navy's Standard Missile was terminated in the fall of 2001 and there is no funding for development of ALAM in FY2003 or in the FY2004 budget request.

The committee notes that the Navy is currently engaged in a reassessment of the DD–21 operational requirements document and key performance parameters as a part of the DD(X) Spiral Development review, and that the results of the review may lead to decisions with regard to the design and size of the ship. The committee requests that the Secretary of the Navy inform the congressional defense committees on the results of the review and impact on the design and capabilities of DD(X).

The committee recommends $1 billion in PE 64300N as requested in the budget to continue the development of DD(X).

*Deployable joint command and control*

The budget request contained $79.4 million in PE 63237N for advanced component development and prototyping of the Deployable Joint Command and Control System (DJC2) and $46.6 million for procurement of a DJC2 suite for Pacific Command and of a technology update for the prototype DJC2 suite deployed with Central Command.

DJC2 is a Secretary of Defense and Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, priority transformation initiative that would provide a standardized, deployable command and control capability for each regional combatant commander and one maritime variant, replacing the ad hoc command and control arrangements that are drawn from deploying forces and brought together at the last minute during a crisis. DJC2 supports the standing joint forces headquarters concept and doctrine developed by Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) in coordination with other regional combatant commanders and the Joint Staff, as directed in the Defense Planning Guidance, and would support day-to-day operations (including peacetime), as well as training and contingency operations.

The committee has supported the concept of establishing a standing joint force headquarters in each of the regional combatant commands and of providing standing and standardized joint command and control capabilities for the commands.

The committee, however, questions the acquisition strategy and program plan that has been proposed for DJC2. The committee notes that the initial DJC2 prototype was fielded in Central Command and used during Operation Iraqi Freedom and believes that there is much to be learned from the experience gained with the prototype. The committee notes further that because of the late establishment of the program office, the program is following an accelerated, highly parallel and overlapping schedule for concept formulation, analysis of alternatives, and operational requirements documentation leading to a Defense Acquisition Milestone B in April–June 2003, at the same time that the military services are compiling and prioritizing service command and control applications to create a DJC2 baseline and establish benchmarks for determining future needs. The fiscal year 2004 program includes procurement of two DJC2 equipment suites for JFCOM for testing and for experimentation, while at the same time developing a third suite for Pacific Command and upgrading the Central Command prototype. In order to make use of the lessons learned from the Central Command experience and to provide the opportunity for meaningful testing and experimentation before establishing the requirements for and fielding the next generation system, the committee believes a more deliberate development and acquisition process should be followed. The committee also questions the wisdom of separating the program office from the technical capabilities of the military departments' command, control, and communications research, development, and engineering activities.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $32.4 million in PE 63237N for continued development of DJC2, a reduction of $47.0 million, and no funding for DJC2 procurement, a reduction of $46.6 million. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy in coordination with the Commander, Joint Forces Command, to report to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2003, the operational requirement, program plan and schedule, funding required, and management plan for development of DJC2.

*Digital intelligence situation mapboard*

The budget request contained $235.7 million in PE 26313M for Marine Corps communications systems, but included no funding for the digital intelligence situation mapboard (DISM).

The committee strongly endorses the use of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) technology to meet the needs of the Marine Corps, while reducing development costs and schedules. The committee notes that DISM is a map-based situational awareness system employing standard military maps and messaging, that runs on ruggedized palmtop computers and connects to the existing Marine Corps SINGARS and other tactical radio networks. The committee is aware that after successful demonstration, DISM production was accelerated to equip deploying Marines.

The committee supports continued development of this capability, and recommends $239.7 million in PE 26313M, an increase of $4.0 million for DISM development.

*DP–2 thrust vectoring system*

The budget request contained $173.5 million in PE 63114N for power projection advanced technology development, but included no funding for continuation of the DP–2 thrust vectoring system demonstration.

DP–2 is a proof-of-concept program to demonstrate the use of jet-powered, thrust vector control in a light weight composite airframe to achieve vertical takeoff and short takeoff and landing in a one-half scale flight test vehicle. The committee notes the progress to date in the DP–2 program and believes that the potential of the DP–2 proof-of-concepts justifies continuation of the program.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63114N to continue development and demonstration of the DP–2 thrust vector system concept, leading to potential flight tests of the one-half scale airframe.

*Emerging/Critical interconnection technology*

The budget request contained $54.8 million in PE 63236N for warfighter sustainment advanced technology development, but included no funds for continuation of the emerging/critical interconnection technology program.

The committee notes that printed circuit boards are fundamental components of military navigation, guidance and control, electronic warfare, missile, and surveillance and communication equipment. Most printed circuit boards for military systems are characterized by the need for high performance, high reliability and the ability to operate under extreme environmental conditions, and require the use of high density, highly rugged and highly reliable interconnection technology. The committee also notes that the commercial printed circuit board industry focuses on the design and high-volume production of low-cost boards, and that the United States has lost much of its printed circuit board manufacturing capability to overseas sources. Recognizing the need to enhance the U.S. capability for development and production of high density, highly reliable printed circuit boards for use in U.S. military systems, Congress provided an increase of $1.0 million to the fiscal year 2003 budget request to accelerate improvements in printed circuit board technology to meet U.S. military requirements now and in the future.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63236N to continue the program for development of emerging and critical printed circuit interconnection technology.

*Fire-retarded POSS composites*

The budget request contained $75.9 million in PE 62123N for force protection applied research.

The committee notes that the use of composite materials in naval aircraft continues to increase and the use of composites for ship and submarine applications is becoming more acceptable. Organic polymers are the main component of the composite resin technology that is currently in use; however, the limited capability of composites to survive the effects of a shipboard fire is the main obstacle to more extensive use and there are no resin systems which entirely meet military standards. The committee notes that hybrid (organic-inorganic) POSS polymers have been demonstrated that meet the fire retardance standard of Military Specification 2031, but have not yet been qualified for use on board ships.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62123N for applied research in the design, fabrication, testing, and qualification of POSS composites for shipboard use by the Navy.

*Formable aligned carbon thermosets*

The budget request contained $52.2 million in PE 62236N for warfighter sustainment applied research, but included no funds for formable aligned carbon thermosets (FACTS).

The committee notes that composite materials used in aircraft construction have been demonstrated to save weight and operation and maintenance costs. However, production using existing composite products and composite lay-up procedures is expensive, with costs several times that of conventional metal structures. FACTS, a new product, employs stretch broken fibers to give the material plasticity akin to metals and makes it much easier to form parts. The new product is expected to significantly increase the percentage of the airframe that can be fabricated from composites, to reduce the cost of the composite structure, permit the use of more efficient designs, and significantly lower the weight of the airframe. Congress added $1.0 million for FACTS applied research in the fiscal year 2003 budget.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 62236N to continue the development and demonstration of FACTS product technology.

*Global Hawk maritime demonstration*

The budget request contained $101.4 million in PE 35205N for endurance-unmanned vehicles, for the Global Hawk maritime demonstration (GHMD).

The committee notes that the GHMD is a program to determine what a high altitude endurance UAV (HAEUAV) can contribute to the Navy maritime surveillance mission. However, the committee also notes that the Air Force's Global Hawk program is an established program that is addressing many of the developments that the Navy is considering. In particular, the Air Force is addressing survivability suites and towed decoys. The committee cannot justify funding for duplicative efforts for the identical purpose by the Navy and Air Force, and encourages close cooperation.

The committee supports joint experimentation efforts between the Navy and the Air Force in their Global Hawk programs for all applications and missions, to include survivability.

The committee recommends $93.0 million in PE 35205N, a decrease of $8.4 million.

*High performance electric brush*

The budget request contained $52.7 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine system development.

The committee notes that advanced high performance metal fiber brushes have demonstrated the capability to significantly enhance performance and reduce maintenance costs in a variety of naval motors and generators. The technology reduces environmental hazards associated with carbon brushes, improves operating efficiency and personal safety, and significantly reduces equipment failures. Advanced metal fiber brush technology is also a key element in the development of superconducting direct current homopolar motor technology for ship propulsion that is discussed elsewhere in this report.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.7 million in PE 63561N to accelerate the development and installation of high performance electric brush technology in electric motors and motor-generators for Navy submarines and other systems.

*High temperature superconducting AC synchronous ship propulsion motor*

The budget request contained $55.8 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology development, including $34.2 million for advanced development of surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and electrical systems.

The committee notes that development of component technologies for the all electric warship is one of the major goals of the Navy's science and technology program. To this end the Navy has pursued the development of several different technologies for ship main propulsion electric motors, including permanent magnet motors, high temperature superconducting alternating current (AC) synchronous motor technology, and low temperature superconducting direct current homopolar motor technology. The committee notes that permanent magnet motor technology is more mature and represents a potential near-term candidate for a ship main propulsion motor. However, the committee also notes that superconducting motor technology presents a number of advantages with respect to size and power density that, if realized, would make that technology potentially advantageous for certain applications.

The Navy recently awarded a contract for development and demonstration of high temperature, superconducting AC synchronous motor technology in a 36.5 megawatt propulsion motor and drive system that would be designed to be compatible with Navy electric warship concepts and performance requirements. The committee understands that the Navy's budget request includes $10.0 million for this project in fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommends an increase of $15.8 million in PE 63123N to provide a total of $25.8 million in fiscal year 2004 to continue the development of the AC synchronous High Temperature Superconducting motor.

*IMPRINT*

The budget request contained $54.8 million in PE 63236N for warfighter sustainment advanced technology development, including $6.9 million for manpower, personnel, and human factor advanced technology development. No funds were requested to continue adaptation for Navy uses of non-Navy methodologies, such as the Army's MANPRINT program.

The committee believes that the use of the IMPRINT methodology will improve Navy modeling tools that optimize the classification of sailors to jobs and thereby improve job performance and satisfaction. In the long run, the committee also believes that improvements in performance and job satisfaction will result in improvements in total ownerships costs of Navy systems.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63236N to continue the development and integration of Navy manpower and personnel classification tools.

*Integrated Maritime Picture System of Systems*

The budget request contained $69.2 million in PE 63235N for common operational picture advanced technology development.

The committee notes ongoing activities in the Navy and in the other military departments to improve situational awareness and develop an integrated common operational picture for air, land, and sea commanders and their staffs. The committee also notes that the emphasis on increasing force protection for the fleet both in port and at sea will require the integration of information about sea ports, harbors, anchorages, and the maritime operational environment in an integrated maritime operational picture.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63235N for advanced development of an integrated maritime common operational picture that will include both force protection and seaport security information and systems.

*Integrated radar optical surveillance and sighting system*

The budget request contained $40.9 million in PE 64755N for ship self defense (detect and control) system development and demonstration.

The committee notes that, in view of the current world situation and the worldwide deployment of United States naval forces, protection of high value surface assets has become highly important. Current shipboard force protection measures are conduced by use of roving patrols and watch standers armed with small caliber crew-served weapons and short-range visual aids. Besides being labor intensive, current force protection measures using small caliber weapons have been shown to be ineffective against small boat threats and short-range visual aids do not provide adequate detection and safe stand-off ranges for the user.

The committee is aware that the Navy regards the Integrated Radar Optical Sighting and Surveillance System (IROS3) as a capable solution for shipboard force protection while a ship is alongside the pier, at anchorage, or transiting congested and restricted waters ways. IROS3 integrates commercial off-the-shelf systems in a non-proprietary, network architecture to provide a digital radar picture, electro-optical sensor, non-lethal deterrence, and remote engagement by small arms and minor caliber guns. In addition to

providing a capability to detect and classify asymmetric surface threats, maintain 360-degree situational awareness around the ship, and effectively engage small close-in threats, IROS3 will also enhance the capability for surface warfare, navigation, maritime intercept operations and related naval missions. In fiscal year 2002, $4.5 million was provided in Defense Emergency Response Funds for IROS3 and the Chief of Naval Operations fiscal year 2004 unfunded requirements list includes IROS3 as the Navy's #11 priority for funding.

The committee recommends $56.9 million in PE 64755N, an increase of $16.0 million to complete system development, integration, and test and evaluation of the IROS3 system.

*Joint integrated satellite communications technology (JIST)*

The budget request contain $379.5 million in PE 33109N for the Navy's Satellite Communications (SPACE) program, including $585,000 for fleet satellite communications.

The Joint Integrated Satellite Communications (SATCOM) Technology (JIST) is a web-based satellite communications planning and management technology that utilizes the Department of Defense's existing internet protocol router to expand the flexibility and efficiency of military satellite communications across a broad spectrum of radio frequencies. The committee believes that developmental systems like JIST, based on common standards, are key to increased satellite communications efficiency and maximizing the utilization of available spectrum resources across legacy and follow-on satellite communications systems.

The committee recommends $389.5 million in PE 33109N, an increase of $10.0 million to continue the JIST program for development of a uniform web-based architecture for SATCOM mission planning and resource allocations.

*Joint warfare experiments*

The budget request contained $13.7 million in PE 63757N for Joint Warfare Experiments, all of which is programmed to create a software support facility for delivery and maintenance of Block I of the Joint Simulation System (JSIMS).

The committee notes that JSIMS was considered to be the next generation modeling and simulation tool to support training for combatant commanders, their components, joint task force staffs, other joint organizations, Department of Defense agencies and the military services. JSIMS and all partner programs have been revised to discontinue development in fiscal year 2003 and the program is to be closed out.

The committee recommends no funding in PE 63757N for JSIMS software support, a decrease of $13.7 million.

*Joint warfare experimentation program*

The budget request contained $151.1 million in PE 63727N for the Joint Warfare Experimentation Program Experiments.

The Combatant Commander, U.S. Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) is chartered "as the Executive Agent for conducting joint warfighting concept development and experimentation within the Department of Defense." The Joint Warfare Experimentation Program implements this transformation mission through a process of

discovery, innovation, concept development, and experimentation to provide for optimal joint future force capabilities.

The committee has closely monitored the progress in and strongly supports the Joint Warfare Experimentation Program. The committee notes that military service and joint experiments leading up to the major exercise Millenium Challenge 2002 and the exercise itself developed and confirmed a number of operational concepts and changes to military service and joint doctrine that had immediate application in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The committee notes, however, that funding for this joint program is reflected in the budget as an element of the Navy's science and technology program. The amount budgeted for the Joint Warfare Experimentation Program has increased significantly in the last two years and has now reached a point that it creates a false impression of the budget in the Navy science and technology account for support of Navy missions. The committee recommends that the program element for the Joint Warfare Experimentation Program be transferred to a Defense-wide Account.

Accordingly, the committee recommends no funding in PE 63727N for the Joint Warfare Experimentation Program and $151.1 million in a new Defense-wide program element, PE 63xxxD8Z, for the program.

*Knowledge projection for fleet maintenance*

The budget request contained $1.0 billion in PE 64300N for DD(X) multi-mission destroyer system development and demonstration, but included no funds to continue the "Knowledge Projection for Fleet Maintenance" project.

Congress provided $2.5 million in fiscal year 2002 and $1.5 million in fiscal year 2003 to support a collaborative program for development of a new system to remotely monitor Navy ships and enable off-board technical experts to assist ship's crew on-board technicians in ship maintenance and repair. The committee believes that the successful development and implementation of this approach to knowledge-based system diagnosis and repair could be increasingly important as the Navy makes the transition to ships with reduced numbers of personnel and as electronic equipment and other ships systems continue to become more complex.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64300N to complete development and demonstration of the "Knowledge Projection for Fleet Maintenance" project.

*Littoral combat ship*

The budget request contained $158.0 million in PE 63581N for Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) advanced component development and prototypes.

The Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) is a planned new Navy surface combatant for fighting in heavily contested littoral waters, and would be the smallest member of the Navy's DD(X) family of next generation surface combatants. The committee notes that prior to announcing the DD(X) family in November 2001, the Navy had no plans to acquire a smaller combatant like the LCS. The primary intended missions of the LCS are countering enemy mines, submarines, and fast attack craft (i.e. "swarm boats") in heavily contested littoral waters. Secondary missions include intelligence, sur-

veillance, and reconnaissance; homeland defense/maritime intercept; special operations forces support; and logistic support for movement of personnel and supplies. LCS would be the first Navy ship to separate capability from hull form, and modular mission payloads and open-system architecture are intended to be used to configure the LCS for particular missions. LCS will displace 2,000 to 3,000 tons—about the size of a Coast Guard cutter or a corvette, have a reduced crew size of 15 to 50 "core" crewmembers, and have a maximum speed of 40 to 50 knots.

The budget request indicates a total funding requirement of $4.1 billion in the fiscal year 2004-fiscal year 2009 Future Years Defense Program to accelerate development and construction of nine LCS. The desired cost of each ship with a representative mission module payload is estimated to be no more than $220 million. The Navy plans a spiral development acquisition strategy that will support construction of multiple flights of focused mission LCS with progressive capability improvements. The Navy wants to procure a total of 30 to 60 LCS toward its goal of achieving an overall fleet of 375 ships.

Prior to announcing the LCS program, the Navy did not conduct a formal analysis of alternatives to demonstrate that a ship like the LCS would be more cost-effective for performing the stated missions than potential alternative approaches. In the statement of managers (H. Rept. 107–772) that accompanied the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), the conferees raised a number of issues with respect to development of LCS: meeting the requirements of a major defense acquisition milestone decision for initiation of concept and technology development; the acquisition strategy for development of the ship; development, integration and evaluation of the mission module packages that would be employed on the ship; and the program acquisition strategy. The Navy's February 2003 report that was submitted in response to the legislation was a brief, summary document that provided little detail with regard to the analysis performed by the Navy in developing the requirement and the concept for LCS. The committee expects that the Secretary of the Navy will address more completely the issues raised in the statement of managers prior to proceeding to an Acquisition Program Initiation decision in mid-fiscal year 2004.

The committee recommends an authorization of $158.0 million in PE 63581N to continue LCS development.

*Littoral combat ship mission module development*

The budget request contained $158.1 million in PE 63581N for Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) advanced component development and prototyping.

The committee notes unfunded requirements in the Navy's budget request for development risk reduction of anti-submarine warfare (ASW), anti-surface warfare (SUW), and mine warfare (MIW) mission modules for the LCS class ships.

In the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 4546 (H. Rept. 107–772), the conferees expressed concern that the Navy's strategy for the LCS does not clearly identify the plan and funding for development and evaluation of the mission modules upon which the operational capability of the LCS will

depend. The conferees expressed the belief that the strategy for LCS development must provide for the identification, transition, and integration of the component technologies and subsystems to be included in the several mission modules and for the evaluation of each mission module as a system before its deployment on the LCS.

The committee notes that additional funds for development risk reduction for LCS mission modules would permit more mature entry of mission module technologies into the spiral development process, and would facilitate early identification and mitigation of programmatic risks associated with incorporation and integration of these systems into the basic ship design. The committee understands that the additional funds would specifically support interface and SUW, ASW, and MIW mission module development, experimentation, testing, and adaptation of the modules for incorporation into LCS Flight 0 ships. The additional funds would also support mission module experimentation and testing focused on use of offboard vehicles and Flight I mission module concept development for LCS Flight I ships.

The committee recommends an increase of $35.0 million in PE 63581N for LCS mission module development.

*Littoral support craft-experimental*

The budget request contained $55.8 million in PE 63123N for force projection advanced technology development, including $5.0 million to continue the development and construction of the Littoral Support Craft—Experimental (LSC–X).

LSC–X is an Office of Naval Research program for development and demonstration of technologies for a small, fast, experimental ship designed to operate in the littorals. Designed to carry a variety of mission modules, the ship will serve as a test bed for new technologies and new operational concepts that would provide enhanced capabilities for anti-submarine warfare, mine countermeasures, and other operations in the littoral. The Navy has issued a contract for construction of the ship, which according to the Navy's plan should be ready for initial sea trials in the summer of 2004.

The Secretary of the Navy submitted a report, dated August 6, 2002, that provides the Navy's plan for the development of the LSC–X. Since that report was prepared, the design for the LSC–X has matured and the size of the ship has grown, as has the expected cost to complete construction of the ship.

In the committee report on H.R. 4546 (H. Rept. 107–436), the committee expressed the view that a littoral support craft demonstrator such as the LCS–X design could be an effective experimental test bed for many of the technologies that might be chosen for use on a littoral combat ship. In the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 4546 (H. Rept. 107–772), the conferees directed the Secretary of the Navy to develop LSC–X as a complete system, including such combat, communications and weapons systems interfaces as may be required to demonstrate technologies and modular payloads, such as the affordable weapon system, that might be considered for the Littoral Combat Ship program. The conferees also directed the Secretary to update his report on the LSC–X development plan, identify any funding required

for the LSC–X program, and submit the updated report with the budget request for fiscal year 2004. The Secretary's report has not been received by the committee.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 63123N to continue the program for development and construction of the LSC–X as a complete system as directed in the conference report referenced above.

*Low acoustic signature motor/propulsor*

The budget request contained $62.6 million in PE 62747N for undersea warfare applied research.

The committee notes that the low acoustic signature motor/propulsor for electrically powered undersea vehicles (LAMPREY) plans to demonstrate an integrated motor-propulsor and power converter with extremely low acoustic signature for undersea vehicles. When integrated with an already developed, high power lithium-ion battery system, the LAMPREY program will represent a new propulsion system for an upgraded MK–48 Advanced Capability torpedo. The LAMPREY test vehicle will also represent a 1/20th-scale submarine and will provide valuable data for a larger scale version of the propulsion system that could ultimately be used in Virginia class submarines. The committee believes that a successful LAMPREY program would yield a propulsion system that provides a means of upgrading the existing torpedo inventory to a safer, lower cost electric propulsion system, improved torpedo stealth and reduced acoustic interference, and a small scale demonstrator for an advanced electric propulsion/integrated propulsor configuration for future submarines. Congress provided $2.1 million in fiscal year 2003 for the LAMPREY program.

The committee recommends $65.1 million in PE 62747N, an increase of $2.5 million to continue development and demonstration of the low acoustic signature motor/propulsor.

*Low-power mega-performance unmanned aerial vehicle processing engines*

The budget request contained $173.5 million in PE 63114N for power projection advanced technology, but included no funding for low-power mega-performance unmanned aerial vehicle processing engines.

The committee supports development of improved signal processing capability for unmanned aerial vehicles to support precision targeting and other missions.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million in PE 63114N for low-power mega-performance unmanned aerial vehicle processing engines.

*Low probability of intercept surveillance radar demonstration*

The budget request contained $45.5 million in PE 63271N for force protection advanced technology development.

The committee notes that the ability to detect small targets in a cluttered sea environment in the littoral is a major problem in military operations in the littoral and in coastal surveillance operations. The application of low probability of intercept radars capable of covert detection of small threat ships operating in the sea clutter and against the background of the land radar clutter en-

hances the capability for both detection and intercept of such threats in defensive operations and for avoidance of such threats in covert offensive operations.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63271N for demonstration and evaluation of the use of advanced low probability of intercept, surveillance radars in littoral operational and coastal surveillance environments.

*Manned reconnaissance aircraft replacement*

The committee is aware that the military services are each facing requirements to replace existing manned reconnaissance aircraft, to include Army Guard Rail Common Sensor and Aerial Reconnaissance Low systems, the Navy Orion and the Air Force Rivet Joint. The committee is concerned that the services not only validate their future manned reconnaissance requirements, but also that these requirements be harmonized throughout the Department of Defense to prevent unnecessary duplication and assure interoperability, and take into consideration projected ground, unmanned and space-based capabilities.

The committee believes that this broad coordination and validation must be completed prior to selection of appropriate platforms by each service. The committee recognizes that platform selection is important, but believes that such a decision cannot properly be made until the required capability of that platform has been determined. While platform commonality is desirable, the committee recognizes that due to differences in mission requirements that may not be practicable or preferable across services. The committee understands that more important than selecting a single aircraft is selecting the proper aircraft to meet the mission requirements for each service.

The committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense to ensure that acquisition of future manned reconnaissance aircraft is based on a well defined mission capability the particular platform must meet, rather than a desire to use a particular type of aircraft, and then fitting the mission to it.

*Marine mammal research program*

The budget request contained $52.2 million in PE 62236N for warfighter sustainment applied research.

The committee notes continuing public concern about the effect of sound on the behavior and well-being of marine mammals and continues to support research in marine mammal behavior and the effects of sound on marine mammals. Fatal whale strandings over the past several years have been assumed to be the result of the introduction of loud sounds into the ocean, and have led to restrictions on scientific research and naval test and training activities that inject such acoustic signatures into the ocean environment. The committee also notes that limited data is available on the effects of such noise and that there is a need for greater understanding of the effects of human-generated and naturally-generated sounds on marine mammals.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $2.2 million in PE 62236N to continue the program for research in marine mammal behavior and the effects of sound on the behavior of marine mammals.

*Metrology*

The budget request contained $50.1 million in PE 64215N for standards development, including $1.3 million for calibration standards development. The budget request supports Navy lead-service responsibilities in the Department of Defense Joint Services metrology research and development program.

The Department of Defense's metrology research and development program develops new measurement standards and capabilities to support the development, test, evaluation, and maintenance of emerging military systems. The committee notes that continuing shortfalls in the metrology budgets of all the military departments have led to the erosion of critical calibration standards development and measurement services to the detriment of the development and support of new weapons systems. The committee is aware that while recent efforts to improve research and development funding are helping, a backlog of $22.0 million in projects exists for fiscal year 2004 and is expected to increase in fiscal year 2005 unless additional funding is made available.

The committee recommends $56.1 million in PE 64215N, an increase of $6.0 million for the Navy's metrology research and development program.

*Mobile expandable shelters*

The budget request contained $56.4 million in PE 63640M for Marine Corps advanced technology demonstrations (ATD), but included no funds for mobile expandable rooms.

The committee is aware of the need for highly mobile structures to support military operations including use as tactical shelters, emergency medical treatment clinics, food service facilities, and command centers.

The committee recommends an increase of $500,000 in PE 63640M to demonstrate expandable portable shelters.

*Modeling and simulation of surgical procedures for battlefield trauma*

The budget request contained $11.4 million in PE 63729N for warfighter protection advanced technology development.

The committee notes continuing advances in the use of modeling and simulation for the development of advanced surgical procedures for battle trauma and the utility of such simulations for the training of field medical personnel.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million in PE 63729N to continue the program for development of new protocols for modeling surgical procedures applicable to battlefield trauma.

*Multi-mission maritime aircraft*

The budget request contained $76.2 million in PE 65500N for multi-mission maritime aircraft (MMA) replacement systems for the aging P–3/EP–3 aircraft.

The committee is aware that the Navy intends to pursue only the P–3 variant replacement system within MMA, and does not intend to continue the EP–3 replacement initiative within the line. Therefore, the committee understands that funding for the special reconnaissance technology insertion, replacements, and test articles for the EP–3 mission is no longer required.

The committee recommends $58.7 million in PE 65500N, a decrease of $17.5 million for the MMA program.

*Naval architecture and engineering*

The budget request contained $70.7 million in PE 61103N for University Research Initiatives.

The committee notes increased interest by the Navy in smaller, high-speed ships, such as the Littoral Combat Ship, for operations in the world's littoral regions. The Coast Guard also has requirements for such vessels for coastal security and drug intercept operations. At the same time that Navy interest in such ships is increasing, the numbers of naval architects and naval engineers being trained by the nation's colleges and universities with maritime engineering programs is decreasing and some institutions of higher learning are considering deleting such programs from their curricula. The committee believes that unless these trends are reversed, it is inevitable that U.S. Naval ships will eventually lag in both innovation and technical development. The committee is aware that the root causes of this phenomenon are complex and include the loss of career opportunities and university curricula in naval architecture and engineering. The committee believes there has been little focus on integrating all the engineering disciplines associated with shipbuilding, such as composite materials, hull design, propulsion systems, ship systems integration and automation. The committee also believes there is an urgent need for undergraduate and graduate instruction in the various disciplines that have contributed to the nation's preeminence in maritime systems, including naval architecture, hydrodynamics, and ocean engineering. The committee notes that the National Research Council recently issued a report on the status of this nation's facilities in the area of naval hydromechanics that called for significant national investment directed at improving U.S. capabilities in naval hydromechanics, and also called for "a more active collaborative relationship between university and (Navy) center researchers. . . ."

To address these issues, the committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 61103N for a grant for improvements in high-speed hydrodynamic research capabilities and university research programs in naval architecture, hydrodynamics, and ocean engineering.

*Naval collaboration tool set*

The budget request contained $30.6 million in PE 65013N for Navy information technology development.

The committee notes the development and application of network centric information systems and collaboration tools that use basic internet worldwide web technology and commercial-off-the-shelf computer and software products to enable operational commanders and their staffs to rapidly share battlespace information and situational awareness, thereby achieving greater mission effectiveness and speed of command and control. The ongoing application of information sharing and collaboration tools creates the opportunity for the Navy to capitalize on the experience gained in prototype web-based information systems now being used in the fleet in various warfare areas and develop a "best of breed," web-based set of collaboration tools that will enhance the ability of naval com-

manders and their staffs to operate in a common, integrated data environment. Congress provided $5.6 million in fiscal year 2003 to accelerate the development of naval collaboration tools that can be used in all naval warfare areas and domains.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 65013N to continue the program for development of a common collaboration toolset that will be useable across all Navy warfare areas and domains.

*Naval fires network tactical dissemination module*

The budget request contained $63.4 million for land attack technology advanced component and prototype development, including $14.7 million for the Naval Fires Network (NFN).

The Naval Fires Network is a system that will automate, coordinate, and correlate, in real time, the processing of multiple tactical data streams from various surveillance and intelligence sources to provide time-critical fire control solutions for advanced weapon systems and sensors, and will provide the Navy an ability to quickly target and retarget precisions weapons, thereby greatly enhancing their effectiveness and lethality. The tactical dissemination module will provide the capability for transmitting target data directly from the NFN to the weapon system chosen to engage the target. As a part of the tactical dissemination module development and integration with NFN, concept of operations and operational deployment tactics are also being developed.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63795N to continue the development of the NFN tactical dissemination module.

*Navy circuit breaker electronic trip unit second source*

The budget request contained $20.4 million in PE 63513N for shipboard system component development.

The committee notes the development of circuit breakers with communicating electronic trip units and the planned use of such "smart circuit breakers" on the next-generation CVN-X aircraft carrier and perhaps on the DD(X) multi-mission destroyer as well.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63513N to develop and qualify a second source for Navy circuit breaker electronic trip units.

*Navy information technology research and development*

The budget request contained $78.7 million for PE 65014N to support the development of the Defense Integrated Military Human Resource System (DIMHRS).

The committee is seriously concerned about the lack of management oversight of this program. DIMHRS is already fifteen months behind schedule and a contract has not been awarded. Thus, when this information technology system begins initial operating capacity, the program will be two years behind schedule.

The committee recommends $50.7 million for PE 65014N, a decrease of $28.0 million.

*Nonlinear dynamics stochastic resonance*

The budget request contained $11.1 million in PE 63254N for anti-submarine warfare (ASW) systems development, including the

continued development and evaluation of nonlinear dynamics and stochastic resonance (NDSR) for acoustic, magnetic, and other ASW sensor and signal processing applications.

The committee notes the continuing progress in the application of nonlinear dynamics science and technology to nonacoustic shallow water ASW and the potential for greatly improved ASW system performance as a result of significantly increased electromagnetic detection ranges, enhanced sonar target discrimination, and improved signal processing.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63254N to continue development and evaluation of nonlinear dynamics and stochastic resonance for acoustic, magnetic, and other ASW sensor and signal processing applications.

*Offshore mobile basing*

The budget contained no funding for conceptual studies to examine the operational viability, costs and technological feasibility for mobile basing concepts.

The committee believes that based on real world lessons learned from both Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, maritime sea basing that removes dependence on host country willingness to allow U.S. forces to access host country facilities is a growing option that deserves consideration.

Accordingly, the committee authorizes an additional $10.0 million in PE 63123N for the purposes of examining concepts such as the Rapidly Deployable Inter-modal Facility for potential development by the Department.

*Open architecture wireless sensors*

The budget request contained $30.6 million in PE 65013N for information technology system development and demonstration.

The committee notes that the applications of wireless networking have achieved significant cost reductions and benefits to the U.S. Navy in ship building through the use of wearable computers, personal data assistants, and wireless communications devices that enable supervisors, engineers, technicians, and construction workers to coordinate their activities more efficiently. The committee believes that the future insertion of wireless network applications through the shipboard environment and the converging of multiple networks into a single ship-wide network could facilitate significant improvements in ship operations, damage control, maintenance, and other activities.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 65013N for development and demonstration of open architecture wireless sensors and their applications to improvements in ship operations, maintenance and monitoring of ship systems, damage control, and other activities.

*Organ transfer technology*

The budget request contained $11.4 million in PE 63729N for warfighter protection advanced technology development. No funds were requested for continuation of the organ transfer technology program.

The committee continues to note progress in the development of immune therapies by investigators at the Naval Medical Research

Center that have been shown to prevent the rejection of tissue and organ transplants without the need for continuous use of immunosuppressive drugs. In fiscal year 2001 the Chief of Naval Research initiated a program to capitalize on these newly developed methods of treatment and Congress has provided a total of $8.0 million in support of the clinical trials program since fiscal year 2001.

The committee notes the continuing progress in the clinical trial program. The committee believes that the ability to transplant massive tissue segments without rejection could revolutionize the treatment of combat casualties who suffer significant tissue loss or organ damage from blast, missile fragments or burns.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63729N to continue the organ transfer technology clinical trials program.

*Project M*

The budget request contained $55.8 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology development.

The committee notes the progress in the Office of Naval Research (ONR) program to evaluate the ability of Project M technology to mitigate the high shock and vibration experienced by the Navy SEALS Mark V patrol craft crew and passengers in high-speed special operations. Project M is an active noise and vibration cancellation system that was developed in the Navy's advanced submarine technology program. Proof-of-principle laboratory tests using advanced six degree-of-freedom simulators developed in the program have demonstrated the clear ability of the technology to reduce Mark V patrol craft shock loading and vertical acceleration to acceptable levels and reduce the potential for crew and passenger injury that would otherwise occur. The committee believes that the technology is ready for transition from the science and technology base and should be considered favorably by the Navy and by the Special Operations Command for implementation in the Mark V patrol craft and in other systems in which the acceleration levels and shock loading that would be experienced by passengers and crew are dangerously high.

The committee also notes the application of Project M technology to reduce the magnetic signature ("degauss") of electric propulsion motors. As the Navy places increased emphasis on the introduction of the "electric" ship and the use of electric motors for ship propulsion, reduction of the magnetic signature of the ship as a defense against magnetic-influence mines, particularly in littoral operations, will become increasingly important. Project M technology has been demonstrated in the laboratory to reduce the pronounced magnetic signature present in a relatively large (1,000 horsepower) electric motor to the magnetic intensity of the earth's magnetic field with the result that the motor's magnetic signature disappears into the background of the earth's magnetic field. The committee strongly recommends that the Navy consider the exploitation of the Project M technology for magnetic signature reduction in new construction ships such as the DD(X) destroyer and the Littoral Combat Ship.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63123N to continue the development and demonstration of Project M technology. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, in

coordination with the Commander, Special Operations Command, to report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2004, plans for transition of Project M shock reduction technology to potential operational use. The committee also directs the Secretary to report Department of the Navy plans for further development, evaluation, and exploitation of Project M technology for magnetic signature reduction.

*Quad hull security caisson technical demonstration*

The budget request contained $55.8 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology development.

The committee notes that many strategic ports in the United States have military pre-positioned ships, sensitive land-based resources, and facilities that are highly vulnerable to waterside terrorist attacks. In high volume, higher threat locations where Navy and other strategic ships share the port in close proximity to commercial containers, international tankers, and other watercraft, and in ports with international commercial shipping, Navy and military strategic ships may require the use of additional protective measures that could minimize the potential for damage to the ships and their crews. The committee is aware of initial studies and analysis of the ability of caisson security barriers to provide robust and economical protection against attack, both above and below the waterline of the protected ship.

The committee recommends an increase of $16.0 million in PE 63123N to initiate a program for development and evaluation of caisson security barriers for ship and port protection.

*Rapid deployment fortification wall live-fire testing*

The budget request contained $56.4 million in PE 63640M for Marine Corps advanced technology demonstration (ATD), but included no funds for rapid deployment fortification wall live-fire testing.

The committee is aware that the rapid deployment fortification wall, if proven in live-fire testing, offers significantly faster means to provide force protection compared to sand bagging.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 63640M for rapid fortification wall.

*Reduction of catapult post-retraction exhaust discharge*

The budget request contained $54.8 million in PE 63236N for warfighter sustainment advanced technology development.

The committee notes that, prior to an aircraft carrier catapult launching stroke, lubricating oil is applied to the catapult cylinder. Over the course of multiple launchings the circulation of oil and water through the water brake cylinder and tanks leads to the formation of an oil layer in the water brake tank, which must be skimmed off and discharged overboard periodically. The committee believes that today's technology allows for the use of dry lubricants on sliding mechanisms that have the potential to reduce the overall discharge of lubricants into the sea, while at the same time improving catapult system performance and reducing maintenance requirements. The committee recommends that the Secretary of the Navy establish a project to analyze failure modes in existing aircraft carrier systems and the potential for replacement of current

petroleum based lubricants with dry lubricants that might be more environmentally safe. The committee also believes that this project should be accompanied by the development of a wireless system that would permit real-time monitoring of catapult performance.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63236N for reduction of catapult post-retraction exhaust discharge and development of a real-time catapult performance monitoring system.

*Remote ocean surveillance system*

The budget request contained $45.5 million in PE 63271N for radio frequency systems advanced technology development.

The committee notes developments in high contrast, high resolution multi-spectral sensors and image processing technology that indicate potential capabilities for detection of objects in the ocean in real time, at various depths, and with relatively high search rates. Realization and employment of these technologies in littoral areas, estuaries, and ports would provide the capability for a remote ocean surveillance system for mine detection and avoidance, force protection, and identification and dissemination of information on surface/sub-surface threat to ports and harbors.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63271N to initiate a proof-of-concept demonstration of multi-spectral sensor and image processing technology for a remote ocean surveillance system.

*Shadow 200 system components for the Marine Corps*

The budget request contained $56.5 million in PE 35204N for tactical unmanned aerial vehicles but included no funds for Shadow 200 system components for the Marine Corps.

The committee is aware that operation and maintenance of Marine Corps Pioneer unmanned aerial vehicle systems could be greatly enhanced if upgraded with certain Shadow 200 components.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.5 million in PE 35204N for Shadow 200 vehicle control system software and ground data terminals for the Marine Corps.

*Shipboard fire protection*

The budget included $114.1 million in PE 62114N for applied research, in part, to support the protection of naval shipboard assets and expeditionary forces ashore. Shipboard and ashore fires threaten sailors and valuable assets. Current thermal imaging technology suffers thermal bloom and inhibits firefighters attempting to rescue personnel and contain fires. Technology exists that offers promise of providing non-thermal light detection and ranging technology that provides both the visualization of victims that are obscured by the glare and thermal bloom of fire and their surroundings (steps, obstructions, missing floors, fallen objects, etc.). The same technologies could provide operational utility by providing the ability to visualize targets through flame and smoke obscured battlefields.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62114N for applied research into promising non-thermal imaging technologies, to include firelidar, for military and civilian firefighting and operational applications.

*Silver Fox unmanned aerial vehicle*

The budget request contained $114.1 million in PE 62114N for power projection applied research, and included no funds for the Silver Fox unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV).

The committee is aware that the Office of Naval Research accelerated development of the Silver Fox UAV to support urgent military requirements. The committee notes that early reports indicate that Silver Fox has been very effective in the combat environment.

The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 62114N for development and initial fielding of the Silver Fox.

*Station-keeping ocean environment sensors*

The budget request contained $48.8 million in PE 62435N for ocean warfighting environment applied research, including $8.1 million for applied research in battlespace environment sensors and data.

The committee notes the capability to observe the ocean environment at a known location over an extended period of time contributes significantly to understanding the ocean temperature, currents, wave height, sound levels, and other physical phenomena at that location and the impact of those phenomena on the global environment. However, such capabilities today are primarily dependent upon the use of moored sensors or sensors emplaced on the ocean floor.

The committee believes that geolocation technologies such as the global positioning system when combined with station-keeping and intra-sensor communications technologies, could provide the capability for establishing individual or fields of long-term "station-keeping" ocean environment sensors that would sense and maintain their location and could significantly improve our knowledge of the ocean environment in the area where the sensors were emplaced. When applied to undersea warfare sensors, such station-keeping technologies could provide the capability for rapidly emplacing a floating field of "smart" sensors to observe the undersea environment in an area, including the presence of submarines and other undersea vehicles, and maintain the position of the individual sensors and the sensor field in the area over an extended period of time without the need to lay or anchor such a field on the ocean floor.

The committee believes that there is a range of technologies that could be considered to enable the capability for such station-keeping sensors and sensors fields, including some that might rely upon local environmental effects (such as wind, solar energy, of temperature differentials) for their motive power, miniaturized geolocation technologies, and technologies for sensor data storage, transmission, and intra-field communication.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 62435N to establish a program to assess the feasibility of such station-keeping sensors and their potential application to oceanographic research and enhanced undersea warfighting capabilities.

*Submarine payloads and sensors*

The budget request contained $52.7 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine system development.

The committee notes that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency/Navy submarine payloads and sensors program resulted in the development of a number of innovative but realistic payload, sensor, and platform concepts that could enable a revolutionary expansion of capabilities and allow the submarine to play a more decisive role in Joint Force operations, especially in the ability to exert greater influence over events on shore. The concepts provide a potential roadmap to the future through successive implementations that would use the Virginia class nuclear attack submarine as a baseline point of departure. The SSGN conversion of the SSBN ballistic missile submarine would provide additional volume that could also be used for significant payload increases. Congress provided $3.5 million in fiscal year 2003 for follow-on studies and demonstration of advanced submarine payload, sensors, and employment concepts, some of which were demonstrated in the Navy's GIANT SHADOW exercise. The committee is aware that increased funding in fiscal year 2004 would be used for at sea demonstrations of these transformational concepts and to begin development of those new payloads that would provide the most value to the joint warfighter.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in PE 63561N for submarine payloads and sensors.

*Submarine sonar improvements*

The budget request contained $80.8 million in PE 64503N for submarine sonar improvements system development and demonstration, including $29.1 million for continuation of the acoustic rapid commercial-of-the-shelf insertion (A–RCI) program.

The A–RCI program upgrades current sonar systems with open architecture commercial-off-the-shelf computer technology that uses advanced processing builds (APB) and multipurpose processor (MPP) middleware developed under a small business innovative research (SBIR) Phase III program to provide continued upgrades as technology develops. The committee notes the significant improvements in sonar system capabilities that have resulted from the application of MPP/APB technology to Navy submarine sonar systems. The committee has strongly supported the Navy's selection of the MPP as the cornerstone for sonar upgrades for existing submarines the development of advanced MPP signal processing technology and advanced processing builds and the integration of these capabilities in submarine, airborne, surface sonar, and undersea surveillance systems. The committee believes that the Navy's funding of the MPP/APB process as part of its core anti-submarine warfare research and development program demonstrates the Navy's commitment to transformation of its anti-submarine warfare capabilities.

The committee recommends $80.8 million in PE 64503N, including $29.1 million for continued development of the MPP/APB SBIR Phase III program for submarine sonar improvements.

*Superconducting DC homopolar motor*

The budget request contained $55.8 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology development, including $34.2 million for advanced development of surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and electrical systems. No funds were requested

to continue the program for development and demonstration of a superconducting direct current homopolar motor.

As noted elsewhere in this report, development of component technologies for the all electric warship is one of the major goals of the Navy's science and technology program. To this end the Navy has pursued the development of several different technologies for ship main propulsion electric motors. The committee notes that superconducting motor technology presents a number of advantages with respect to size and power density that make that technology potentially advantageous for certain applications. The committee also notes that low temperature superconducting direct current (DC) homopolar motor technology has the potential technical advantages of being smaller, lighter, and quieter than alternating current (AC) electric motors that, if realized, would make the superconducting DC homopolar motor a potentially more suitable alternate for use in submarines or in other ship applications where these attributes are desired.

The committee notes the progress that has been made in the Office of Naval Research project for development of superconducting DC homopolar motor technology, and recommends that the Navy continue to extend the technology to design, development, demonstration, and evaluation of a full-scale motor ship main propulsion motor.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63123N to continue the development of Superconducting DC Homopolar motor technology.

*Surface Navy integrated undersea tactical technology—mine warfare trainer*

The budget request contained $140.7 million in PE 63502N for surface and shallow water mine counter measures advanced component development and prototypes.

The committee notes the critical role played by sonar and mine warfare systems operators' proficiency in distinguishing between mines and mine-like objects and in distinguishing between different types of mines. The Surface Navy Integrated Undersea Tactical Technology—Mine Warfare (SNIUTT–MIW) trainer is a comprehensive training demonstration test-bed that is designed to address recognized deficiencies in the sonar operator's proficiency. SNIUTT–MIW leverages and integrates the capabilities of existing surface combatant and aircraft carrier mine and sonar systems and the lessons learned from those systems to provide a common, coordinated baseline training system capability that is not currently available in the Navy mine and undersea warfare force. Congress provided $3.8 million in fiscal year 2003 for development of a test-bed demonstration to enhance mine warfare operator training and performance.

The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 63502N to continue development and evaluation of the SNIUTT-MIW test bed undersea warfare systems trainer.

*Theater undersea warfare initiative*

The budget request contained $59.0 million in PE 62235N for common picture applied research. No funds were requested to continue the Theater Undersea Warfare Initiative.

The committee notes that Congress added $8.5 million in fiscal year 2003 for the Theater Undersea Warfare Initiative, which seeks to enhance the Navy's network centric capability for maritime patrol aircraft (MPA) and provide a near real-time, collaborative communication, command and control capability for MPA operations in the theater. The current program focuses on research, development and test of prototype sensor data fusion and automation technology for MPA, improved bandwidth utilization, and incorporation of electro-optical/infrared, radar, magnetic, and other onboard digital sensor data. The committee understands that upon completion of the initiative, the capabilities developed and demonstrated in the project will transition into the common undersea picture program of record.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62235N to complete the Theater Undersea Warfare Initiative and provide MPA a beyond-line-of-sight, secure digital communications, command and control capability with increased capability for sensor data fusion and automation.

*Unmanned aerial vehicle joint operational test bed system*

The budget request contained $56.5 million in PE 35204N for tactical unmanned aerial vehicles, but included no funding for the Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) joint operational test bed system (JOTBS).

The committee is aware that UAV interoperability is fundamental to optimal joint operations. The Joint Forces Command UAV JOTBS was established to further development of various service UAV's to ensure interoperability under realistic conditions, and the committee strongly supports this mission.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 35204N for the JFCOM JOTBS.

*Unmanned aerial vehicles concept of operations*

The budget request contained $7.1 million in PE 63261N for tactical airborne reconnaissance unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) concept of operations studies for the Navy.

The committee notes that both the Navy's broad area maritime surveillance (BAMS) and Global Hawk maritime demonstration system (GHMD) programs contain funding for concept of operations and interoperability studies. The Navy has covered the course for UAV concept of operations through the years, and naval UAV integration has shown scant benefit from such efforts. The committee believes that the funding is better applied within the UAV programs themselves.

The committee supports the requirement for UAV integration into the naval environment but believes that this program is duplicative of other Navy efforts.

The committee recommends no funds in PE 63261N, a decrease of $7.1 million.

*Vacuum electronics*

The budget request contained $44.0 million in PE 62271N for radio frequency systems applied research, including $4.5 million for applied research in radio frequency vacuum electronics power amplifiers.

The committee report on H.R. 1402 (H. Rept. 106–162) noted the committee's support for a robust vacuum electronics research and development program in the Department of Defense and other federal agencies. The committee endorses the criticality of support for both vacuum electronics and solid-state power technologies and recommendations for increased funding in the tri-service vacuum electronics program and for advanced wide bandgap semiconductor technology development.

The committee expects the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) through the Director of Defense Research and Engineering to ensure a balanced investment strategy for vacuum electronics and solid state power technologies that will meet Department of Defense requirements for current and future systems that use radio frequency power electronics.

The committee recommends an increase of $9.5 million in PE 62271N for applied research in vacuum electronics.

*Virginia class multi-mission module*

The budget request contained $112.4 million in PE 64558N for Virginia class submarine design development system development and demonstration.

The committee notes the experience gained in the development, design, and implementation of multi-mission capabilities in the USS Jimmy Carter (SSN–23). The committee believes that the modular design of the Virginia class submarine lends itself to the evaluation of multi-mission module concepts for that submarine that could be considered for insertion in selected hull numbers of the class to increase payload capacity, capability for technology insertion, and adaptability to new missions.

The committee recommends $122.4 million in PE 64558N, an increase of $10.0 million for the evaluation of modular payload concepts and multi-mission modules for Virginia class submarine variants that would increase payload capacity and mission capability.

*Wide band gap semiconductor power electronics*

The budget request contained $32.1 million in PE 62712E and $3.5 million in PE 62271N for applied research in wide band gap semiconductor electronics. Section 212 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) required the Secretary of Defense to carry out a cooperative program to develop and demonstrate advanced technologies and concepts for future Navy radar systems and other applications with particular emphasis on development of high frequency and high power wide band gap semiconductor materials and devices.

The committee continues to place a high priority on the development of the technology for advanced wide band gap semiconductor materials and devices for future naval radar and other applications. The December 2000 Special Technology Review on Radio Frequency Applications for Wide Band Gap Technology by the Office of the under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) recommended an increased science and technology investment in wide band gap materials, devices, circuits, and packaging that would total approximately $30.0 million per year over a five-year period, beginning in fiscal year 2002, in order to develop the

technologies necessary to field advanced radar systems in time to meet the Navy's and the Department's requirements in 2015.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62271N for wide band gap semiconductor power electronics applied research.

## AIR FORCE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, & EVALUATION

### Overview

The budget request contained $20,336.3 million for Air Force research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $20,548.9 million, an increase of $212.6 million to the budget request.

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE** | | | | | |
| | | **BASIC RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0601102F | 1 | Defense Research Sciences | 204,754 | 5,000 | | | 209,754 |
| | | Chabot Space and Science Center | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0601103F | 2 | University Research Initiatives | 105,224 | | | | 105,224 |
| 0601108F | 3 | High Energy Laser Research Initiatives | 12,063 | | | | 12,063 |
| | | **TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH** | **322,041** | **5,000** | **5,000** | **0** | **327,041** |
| | | **APPLIED RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0602102F | 4 | Materials | 68,657 | 7,500 | | | 76,157 |
| | | Nanomaterials | | | 5,500 | | |
| | | Composite Fire Safety Consortium | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0602201F | 5 | Aerospace Vehicle Technologies | 65,662 | | | | 65,662 |
| 0602202F | 6 | Human Effectiveness Applied Research | 66,795 | 2,000 | | | 68,795 |
| | | Flexible Display and Integrated Communications Development | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0602203F | 7 | Aerospace Propulsion | 101,575 | 4,000 | | | 105,575 |
| | | Integrated High Payoff Rocket Propulsion Technology program | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0602204F | 8 | Aerospace Sensors | 75,577 | 2,000 | | | 77,577 |
| | | Advanced FT-IR Gas Analysis | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0602500F | 9 | Multi-disciplinary Space Technology | 90,526 | | | | 90,526 |
| 0602601F | 10 | Space Technology | 83,240 | 4,000 | | | 87,240 |
| | | Hardening Technologies for Satellite Protection | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0602602F | 11 | Conventional Munitions | 46,455 | | | | 46,455 |
| 0602605F | 12 | Directed Energy Technology | 35,359 | | | | 35,359 |
| 0602702F | 13 | Command Control and Communications | 71,674 | 15,500 | | | 87,174 |
| | | Central Measurement Intelligence Office | | | 2,500 | | |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | MASINT Battlelab | | | 5,000 | | |
| | | MASINT Warfighter Visualization Tools | | | 8,000 | | |
| 0602805F | 14 | Dual Use Science and Technology Program | 10,586 | | | | 10,586 |
| 0602890F | 15 | High Energy Laser Research | 41,854 | | | | 41,854 |
| | | **TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH** | **757,960** | **35,000** | **35,000** | **0** | **792,960** |
| | | **ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0603112F | 16 | Advanced Materials for Weapon Systems | 33,079 | 10,000 | | | 43,079 |
| | | Hybrid Bearings | | | 3,000 | | |
| | | Metals Affordability Initiative | | | 7,000 | | |
| 0603203F | 17 | Advanced Aerospace Sensors | 36,550 | 3,500 | | | 40,050 |
| | | National Operational Signature Production and Research Capability | | | 3,500 | | |
| 0603205F | 18 | Flight Vehicle Technology | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603211F | 19 | Aerospace Technology Dev/Demo | 73,416 | 3,000 | | | 76,416 |
| | | 3D Bias Woven Preforms | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0603216F | 20 | Aerospace Propulsion and Power Technology | 114,726 | | | | 114,726 |
| 0603231F | 21 | Crew Systems and Personnel Protection Technology | 34,487 | 2,000 | | | 36,487 |
| | | Laser Eye Protection | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0603270F | 22 | Electronic Combat Technology | 28,496 | 4,800 | | | 33,296 |
| | | Advanced Threat Alert Receiver/Lightweight Modular Support Jammer | | | 4,800 | | |
| 0603311F | 23 | Ballistic Missile Technology | 0 | 10,000 | | | 10,000 |
| | | Ballistic Missile Technology Program | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0603333F | 24 | Unmanned Air Vehicle Dev/Demo | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603401F | 25 | Advanced Spacecraft Technology | 72,114 | 1,900 | | | 74,014 |
| | | SLV Thermal Protection Technology | | | 1,900 | | |
| 0603436F | 26 | Transformational Wideband MILSATCOM | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603444F | 27 | Maui Space Surveillance System (MSSS) | 6,323 | 10,000 | | | 16,323 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | High Accuracy Network Determination System (HANDS) | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0603500F | 28 | Multi-disciplinary Advanced Development Space Technology | 62,610 | | | | 62,610 |
| 0603601F | 29 | Conventional Weapons Technology | 30,516 | | | | 30,516 |
| 0603605F | 30 | Advanced Weapons Technology | 27,024 | 3,500 | | | 30,524 |
| | | Laserspark Countermeasure Program | | | 3,500 | | |
| 0603723F | 31 | Environmental Engineering Technology | 0 | 3,000 | | | 3,000 |
| | | Environmental Studies | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0603755F | 32 | High Performance Computing Modernization Program | 185,282 | 16,200 | | | 201,482 |
| | | SMDC Simulation Center Computer Upgrade | | | 16,200 | | |
| 0603789F | 33 | C3I Advanced Development | 31,538 | 6,500 | | | 38,038 |
| | | All-Source Fusion and Effects Based Operation for C2 Constellation | | | 4,500 | | |
| | | Fusion SIGINT Enhancements for Network-Centric Intelligence | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0603801F | 34 | Special Programs | 369,483 | | | | 369,483 |
| 0603850F | 35 | Integrated Broadcast Service | 8,537 | | | | 8,537 |
| 0603924F | 36 | High Energy Laser Advanced Technology Program | 10,910 | | | | 10,910 |
| 0207423F | 37 | Advanced Communications Systems | 12,053 | | | | 12,053 |
| 0401840F | 38 | AMC Command and Control System | 6,046 | | | | 6,046 |
| 0804757F | 39 | Joint National Training Center | 2,940 | | | | 2,940 |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | **1,146,130** | **74,400** | **74,400** | **0** | **1,220,530** |
| | | **ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | | | | | |
| 0603260F | 40 | Intelligence Advanced Development | 4,513 | | | | 4,513 |
| 0603287F | 41 | Physical Security Equipment | 24,483 | 3,000 | | | 27,483 |
| | | Enhanced Techniques for Detection of Explosives | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0603421F | 42 | NAVSTAR Global Positioning System III | 0 | 45,000 | | | 45,000 |
| | | Program Increase | | | 45,000 | | |
| 0603430F | 43 | Advanced EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE) | 778,078 | 60,000 | | | 838,078 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Risk Reduction & Spare Parts for the First Two Satellites | | | 60,000 | | |
| 0603432F | 44 | Polar MILSATCOM (SPACE) | 5,580 | | | | 5,580 |
| 0603434F | 45 | National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite Sys (SPACE) | 267,716 | | | | 267,716 |
| 0603438F | 46 | Space Control Technology | 14,714 | | | | 14,714 |
| 0603742F | 47 | Combat Identification Technology | 16,575 | | | | 16,575 |
| 0603790F | 48 | NATO Research and Development | 3,888 | | | | 3,888 |
| 0603791F | 49 | International Space Cooperative R&D | 545 | | | | 545 |
| 0603845F | 50 | Advanced Wideband System (AWS) | 439,277 | (80,000) | | | 359,277 |
| | | Program Reduction | | | | (80,000) | |
| 0603850F | 51 | Integrated Broadcast Service | 16,466 | | | | 16,466 |
| 0603851F | 52 | Intercontinental Ballistic Missile | 67,632 | | | | 67,632 |
| 0603854F | 53 | Wideband Gapfiller System RDT&E (Space) | 36,686 | | | | 36,686 |
| 0603856F | 54 | Air Force/National Program Cooperation (AFNPC) | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603858F | 55 | Space-Based Radar | 274,104 | | | | 274,104 |
| 0603859F | 56 | Pollution Prevention | 2,318 | | | | 2,318 |
| 0603860F | 57 | Joint Precision Approach and Landing Systems | 13,847 | | | | 13,847 |
| 0604327F | 58 | Hard and Deeply Buried Target Defeat System (HDBTDS) Program | 12,633 | | | | 12,633 |
| 0604731F | 59 | Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle (UCAV) | 161,269 | | | | 161,269 |
| 0604855F | 60 | Operationally Responsive Launch | 24,440 | 12,000 | | | 36,440 |
| | | Program Increase | | | 12,000 | | |
| 0604856F | 61 | Common Aero Vehicle (CAV) | 12,220 | 12,000 | 12,000 | | 24,220 |
| 0603xxxF | XX | Next Generation Bomber | | 100,000 | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | **2,176,984** | **152,000** | **232,000** | **(80,000)** | **2,328,984** |
| | | **SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | | | | | |
| 0603840F | 62 | Global Broadcast Service (GBS) | 38,147 | | | | 38,147 |
| 0604012F | 63 | Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System (JHMCS) | 843 | | | | 843 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0604222F | 64 | Nuclear Weapons Support | 13,396 | | | | 13,396 |
| 0604226F | 65 | B-1B | 88,703 | | | | 88,703 |
| 0604233F | 66 | Specialized Undergraduate Flight Training | 3,267 | | | | 3,267 |
| 0604239F | 67 | F-22 | 620,740 | | | | 620,740 |
| 0604240F | 68 | B-2 Advanced Technology Bomber | 152,084 | 33,500 | | | 185,584 |
| | | Aft deck design | | | 3,900 | | |
| | | EHF SATCOM | | | 29,600 | | |
| 0604251F | 69 | Space-Based Radar | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604270F | 70 | EW Development | 74,034 | 12,600 | | | 86,634 |
| | | Precision Location and Identification Technology Program | | | 12,600 | | |
| 0604280F | 71 | Joint Tactical Radio | 48,814 | | | | 48,814 |
| 0604287F | 72 | Physical Security Equipment | 7,261 | | | | 7,261 |
| 0604329F | 73 | Small Diameter Bomb (SDB) | 126,447 | | | | 126,447 |
| 0604421F | 74 | Counterspace Systems | 82,565 | | | | 82,565 |
| 0604435F | 75 | Interim Polar | 13,740 | | | | 13,740 |
| 0604441F | 76 | Space Based Infrared System (SBIRS) High EMD | 617,229 | 15,000 | | | 632,229 |
| | | Program increase | | | 15,000 | | |
| 0604479F | 77 | Milstar LDR/MDR Satellite Communications (SPACE) | 1,383 | | | | 1,383 |
| 0604600F | 78 | Munitions Dispenser Development | 15,849 | | | | 15,849 |
| 0604602F | 79 | Armament/Ordnance Development | 8,419 | | | | 8,419 |
| 0604604F | 80 | Submunitions | 4,717 | | | | 4,717 |
| 0604617F | 81 | Agile Combat Support | 5,574 | | | | 5,574 |
| 0604618F | 82 | Joint Direct Attack Munition | 34,061 | | | | 34,061 |
| 0604706F | 83 | Life Support Systems | 269 | | | | 269 |
| 0604731F | 84 | Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle (UCAV) | 14,675 | | | | 14,675 |
| 0604735F | 85 | Combat Training Ranges | 20,383 | | | | 20,383 |
| 0604740F | 86 | Integrated Command & Control Applications (IC2A) | 239 | 5,000 | | | 5,239 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Distributed Mission Interoperability Toolkit | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0604750F | 87 | Intelligence Equipment | 1,320 | | | | 1,320 |
| 0604754F | 88 | Tactical Data Link Infrastructure | 14,675 | | | | 14,675 |
| 0604762F | 89 | Common Low Observables Verification System (CLOVerS) | 7,000 | | | | 7,000 |
| 0604779F | 90 | Tactical Data Link Interoperability | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604800F | 91 | Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) | 2,194,087 | | | | 2,194,087 |
| 0604851F | 92 | Intercontinental Ballistic Missile | 184,193 | | | | 184,193 |
| 0604853F | 93 | Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program (SPACE) | 8,000 | | | | 8,000 |
| 0605011F | 94 | RDT&E for Aging Aircraft | 24,063 | | | | 24,063 |
| 0207249F | 95 | Precision Attack Systems Procurement | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0207256F | 96 | Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle Joint Program Office | 4,892 | | | | 4,892 |
| 0207434F | 97 | Link-16 Support and Sustainment | 58,783 | | | | 58,783 |
| 0207701F | 98 | Full Combat Mission Training | 6,946 | | | | 6,946 |
| 0305176F | 99 | Combat Survivor Evader Locator | 14,684 | 7,700 | | | 22,384 |
| | | Program increase | | | 7,700 | | |
| 0401318F | 100 | CV-22 | 65,703 | | | | 65,703 |
| | | **TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | **4,577,185** | **73,800** | **73,800** | **0** | **4,650,985** |
| | | **RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | | | | | |
| 0604256F | 101 | Threat Simulator Development | 36,595 | | | | 36,595 |
| 0604759F | 102 | Major T&E Investment | 50,215 | | | | 50,215 |
| 0605101F | 103 | RAND Project Air Force | 24,586 | | | | 24,586 |
| 0605306F | 104 | Ranch Hand II Epidemiology Study | 4,692 | | | | 4,692 |
| 0605502F | 105 | Small Business Innovation Research | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0605712F | 106 | Initial Operational Test & Evaluation | 34,646 | | | | 34,646 |
| 0605807F | 107 | Test and Evaluation Support | 336,720 | | | | 336,720 |
| 0605860F | 108 | Rocket Systems Launch Program (SPACE) | 9,673 | | | | 9,673 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0605864F | 109 | Space Test Program (STP) | 42,909 | | | | 42,909 |
| 0605976F | 110 | Facilities Restoration and Modernization - Test and Evaluation Support | 33,940 | | | | 33,940 |
| 0605978F | 111 | Facilities Sustainment - Test and Evaluation Support | 15,770 | | | | 15,770 |
| 0804731F | 112 | Cyber Crime Center | 318 | | | | 318 |
| 0909900F | 113 | Financing for Expired Account Adjustments | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0909980F | 114 | Judgment Fund Reimbursement | 36,434 | | | | 36,434 |
| 1001004F | 115 | International Activities | 3,867 | | | | 3,867 |
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | **630,365** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **630,365** |
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0604240F | 116 | B-2 Advanced Technology Bomber | 24,691 | (24,691) | | | 0 |
| | | Air Force Requested Transfer to APAF-23 | | | | (24,691) | |
| 0605024F | 117 | Anti-Tamper Technology Executive Agency | 7,855 | | | | 7,855 |
| 0101113F | 118 | B-52 Squadrons | 28,649 | | | | 28,649 |
| 0101120F | 119 | Advanced Cruise Missile | 13,364 | | | | 13,364 |
| 0101122F | 120 | Air-Launched Cruise Missile (ALCM) | 29,804 | | | | 29,804 |
| 0101313F | 121 | Strat War Planning System - USSTRATCOM | 1,748 | | | | 1,748 |
| 0101815F | 122 | Advanced Strategic Programs | 6,100 | | | | 6,100 |
| 0102326F | 123 | Region/Sector Operation Control Center Modernization Program | 22,573 | | | | 22,573 |
| 0203761F | 124 | Warfighter Rapid Acquisition Process (WRAP) Rapid Transition Fund | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0207028F | 125 | Joint Expeditionary Force Experiment | 51,367 | | | | 51,367 |
| 0207131F | 126 | A-10 Squadrons | 29,729 | | | | 29,729 |
| 0207133F | 127 | F-16 Squadrons | 87,478 | 20,000 | | | 107,478 |
| | | AN/APG-68(V)9 Radar upgrade | | | 10,000 | | |
| | | Block 40/42 AN/APX-113 Integration for ANG | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0207134F | 128 | F-15E Squadrons | 112,085 | 16,500 | | | 128,585 |
| | | F-15C/D Radar Block Upgrade | | | 16,500 | | |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0207136F | 129 | Manned Destructive Suppression | 20,633 | | | | 20,633 |
| 0207138F | 130 | F-22 Squadrons | 315,784 | | | | 315,784 |
| 0207141F | 131 | F-117A Squadrons | 14,752 | | | | 14,752 |
| 0207161F | 132 | Tactical AIM Missiles | 375 | | | | 375 |
| 0207163F | 133 | Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM) | 32,429 | | | | 32,429 |
| 0207224F | 134 | Combat Rescue and Recovery | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0207247F | 135 | AF TENCAP | 10,479 | 3,000 | | | 13,479 |
| | | Global Positioning System-Jammer Detection and Location System (GPS) | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0207248F | 136 | Special Evaluation Program | 164,239 | | | | 164,239 |
| 0207253F | 137 | Compass Call | 3,790 | | | | 3,790 |
| 0207268F | 138 | Aircraft Engine Component Improvement Program | 180,112 | | | | 180,112 |
| 0207277F | 139 | Eagle Vision | 1,880 | | | | 1,880 |
| 0207325F | 140 | Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile (JASSM) | 31,216 | | | | 31,216 |
| 0207410F | 141 | Aerospace Operations Center (AOC) | 27,887 | | | | 27,887 |
| 0207412F | 142 | Battle Control Sys-Modular | 16,083 | | | | 16,083 |
| 0207417F | 143 | Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) | 270,397 | | | | 270,397 |
| 0207423F | 144 | Advanced Communications Systems | 12,312 | | | | 12,312 |
| 0207424F | 145 | Evaluation and Analysis Program | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0207433F | 146 | Advanced Program Technology | 263,392 | | | | 263,392 |
| 0207438F | 147 | Theater Battle Management (TBM) C4I | 31,647 | | | | 31,647 |
| 0207445F | 148 | Fighter Tactical Data Link | 42,877 | | | | 42,877 |
| 0207446F | 149 | Bomber Tactical Data Link | 12,959 | | | | 12,959 |
| 0207448F | 150 | C2ISR Tactical Data Link | 26,927 | | | | 26,927 |
| 0207449F | 151 | MC2C (Multi-sensor Command and Control Constellation) | 363,630 | | | | 363,630 |
| 0207581F | 152 | Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (Joint STARS) | 58,431 | | | | 58,431 |
| 0207590F | 153 | Seek Eagle | 19,587 | | | | 19,587 |
| 0207591F | 154 | Advanced Program Evaluation | 425,486 | | | | 425,486 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0207601F | 155 | USAF Modeling and Simulation | 8,483 | | | | 8,483 |
| 0207605F | 156 | Wargaming and Simulation Centers | 6,262 | | | | 6,262 |
| 0208006F | 157 | Mission Planning Systems | 62,348 | (23,000) | | | 39,348 |
| | | Air Force Mission Planning System Program Reduction | | | | (23,000) | |
| 0208021F | 158 | Information Warfare Support | 12,091 | | | | 12,091 |
| 0208160F | 159 | Technical Evaluation System | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0208161F | 160 | Special Evaluation System | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0301310F | 161 | National Air Intelligence Center | | | | | 0 |
| 0301314F | 162 | COBRA BALL | | | | | 0 |
| 0301315F | 163 | Missile and Space Technical Collection | | | | | 0 |
| 0301324F | 164 | FOREST GREEN | | | | | 0 |
| 0301398F | 165 | Management Headquarters GDIP | | | | | 0 |
| 0302015F | 166 | E-4B National Airborne Operations Center (NAOC) | 44,377 | | | | 44,377 |
| 0303110F | 167 | Defense Satellite Communications System (SPACE) | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0303112F | 168 | Air Force Communications (AIRCOM) | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0303131F | 169 | Minimum Essential Emergency Communications Network (MEECN) | 10,716 | | | | 10,716 |
| 0303140F | 170 | Information Systems Security Program | 37,667 | | | | 37,667 |
| 0303141F | 171 | Global Combat Support System | 17,473 | | | | 17,473 |
| 0303150F | 172 | Global Command and Control System | 3,547 | | | | 3,547 |
| 0303401F | 173 | Communications Security (COMSEC) | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0303601F | 174 | MILSATCOM Terminals | 173,831 | | | | 173,831 |
| 0304111F | 175 | Special Activities | | | | | 0 |
| 0304311F | 176 | Selected Activities | 107,800 | | | | 107,800 |
| 0305099F | 177 | Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) | 7,164 | | | | 7,164 |
| 0305110F | 178 | Satellite Control Network (SPACE) | 18,603 | 3,000 | | | 21,603 |
| | | Civil Reserve Space Service | | | 3,000 | | |
| 0305111F | 179 | Weather Service | 16,317 | 4,400 | | | 20,717 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | NPOESS Support Initiative | | | 4,400 | | |
| 0305114F | 180 | Air Traffic Control, Approach, and Landing System (ATCALS) | 10,622 | | | | 10,622 |
| 0305128F | 181 | Security and Investigative Activities | 474 | | | | 474 |
| 0305142F | 182 | Applied Technology and Integration | | | | | 0 |
| 0305144F | 183 | Titan Space Launch Vehicles (SPACE) | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0305148F | 184 | Tactical Measurement and Signature Intelligence (MASINT) | 7,510 | | | | 7,510 |
| 0305159F | 185 | Defense Reconnaissance Support Activities (SPACE) | 232,287 | | | | 232,287 |
| 0305160F | 186 | Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (SPACE) | 918 | | | | 918 |
| 0305164F | 187 | NAVSTAR Global Positioning System (User Equipment) (SPACE) | 100,589 | | | | 100,589 |
| 0305165F | 188 | NAVSTAR Global Positioning System (Space and Control Segments) | 146,468 | | | | 146,468 |
| 0305172F | 189 | Combined Advanced Applications | | | | | 0 |
| 0305174F | 190 | Space Warfare Center | 404 | | | | 404 |
| 0305182F | 191 | Spacelift Range System (SPACE) | 63,210 | | | | 63,210 |
| 0305202F | 192 | Dragon U-2 (JMIP) | 52,518 | | | | 52,518 |
| 0305205F | 193 | Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicles | 398,631 | 4,600 | | | 403,231 |
| | | Global Hawk Advanced Imagery Architecture | | | 4,600 | | |
| 0305206F | 194 | Airborne Reconnaissance Systems | 77,823 | 8,800 | | | 86,623 |
| | | F-16 Theater Airborne Reconnaissance System | | | 6,800 | | |
| | | Ultra Wideband Laser Communications for ISR | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0305207F | 195 | Manned Reconnaissance Systems | 14,726 | | | | 14,726 |
| 0305208F | 196 | Distributed Common Ground Systems | 27,107 | | | | 27,107 |
| 0305906F | 197 | Integrated C2-Northcom | 57,933 | | | | 57,933 |
| 0305910F | 198 | SPACETRACK (SPACE) | 118,234 | 20,000 | | | 138,234 |
| | | Air Force Space Fence | | | 20,000 | | |
| 0305911F | 199 | Defense Support Program (SPACE) | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0305913F | 200 | NUDET Detection System (SPACE) | 35,834 | (9,200) | | | 26,634 |
| | | Nuclear Detonation Detection System Program Reduction | | | | (9,200) | |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0305917F | 201 | Space Architect | 12,589 | | | | 12,589 |
| 0308601F | 202 | Modeling and Simulation Support | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0308699F | 203 | Shared Early Warning (SEW) | 3,254 | | | | 3,254 |
| 0401115F | 204 | C-130 Airlift Squadron | 105,381 | | | | 105,381 |
| 0401119F | 205 | C-5 Airlift Squadrons | 356,570 | | | | 356,570 |
| 0401130F | 206 | C-17 Aircraft | 184,089 | | | | 184,089 |
| 0401132F | 207 | C-130J Program | 13,551 | | | | 13,551 |
| 0401134F | 208 | Large Aircraft IR Countermeasures (LAIRCM) | 45,946 | | | | 45,946 |
| 0401218F | 209 | KC-135s | 1,473 | | | | 1,473 |
| 0401219F | 210 | KC-10s | 2,306 | | | | 2,306 |
| 0401839F | 211 | Air Mobility Tactical Data Link | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0702207F | 212 | Depot Maintenance (Non-IF) | 1,406 | | | | 1,406 |
| 0708011F | 213 | Industrial Preparedness | 39,396 | 7,000 | | | 46,396 |
| | | Metals Affordability Initiative | | | 7,000 | | |
| 0708012F | 214 | Logistics Support Activities | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0708026F | 215 | Productivity, Reliability, Availability, Maintain. Prog Ofc (PRAMPO) | 0 | 7,000 | | | 7,000 |
| | | Aircraft Turbine Engine Sustainment | | | 7,000 | | |
| 0708611F | 216 | Support Systems Development | 54,034 | 5,000 | | | 59,034 |
| | | Low Emission/Efficient Hybrid Aviation Refueling Truck Propulsion | | | 5,000 | | |
| 0708612F | 217 | Computer Resources Support Improvement Program (CRSIP) | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0901212F | 218 | Service-Wide Support (Not Otherwise Accounted For) | 4,392 | | | | 4,392 |
| 0901218F | 219 | Civilian Compensation Program | 7,130 | | | | 7,130 |
| 0901538F | 220 | Financial Management Information Systems Development | 13,464 | | | | 13,464 |
| XXXXXXX | 999 | Classified | 5,245,898 | 30,000 | 30,000 | | 5,275,898 |
| | | **TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | **10,725,593** | **72,409** | **129,300** | **(56,891)** | **10,798,002** |
| | xxx | Information Technology Reduction | | (200,000) | | (200,000) | (200,000) |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **TOTAL. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE** | **20,336,258** | **212,609**<br>0 | **549,500** | **(336,891)** | **20,548,867** |

Items of Special Interest

*3D Bias Woven Preforms*

The budget request contained no funding for 3D Bias Woven performs.

The committee believes that fiber weaving technology incorporating +/−45 degree fibers in 3D composite fiber reinforcements for use in aircraft structural joints could increase joint strength and damage tolerance, enabling incorporation of low cost composite structures technology to highly loaded joint applications.

The committee recommends an authorization of $34.1 million in PE 63211F, an increase of $3.0 million for three dimensional bias woven performs phase III.

*Advanced extremely high frequency MILSATCOM*

The budget request contained $778.1 million in PE 63430F for advanced extremely high frequency (AEHF) MILSATCOM (SPACE).

The committee is aware of the increased importance of satellite communications for the warfighter and the increased capability AEHF would provide. The committee notes that additional funding is required for program risk reduction and spare parts for the first two satellites.

The committee recommends $838.1 million in PE 63430F, an increase of $60.0 million for AEHF.

*Advanced spacecraft technology*

The budget request contained $72.1 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology, but included no funds for small launch vehicle thermal protection technology.

The committee notes that thermal protection system (TPS) technology risk reduction activities such as subscale component and flight demonstration are a significant part of the critical path to development of low cost small launch vehicles (SLV) for Department of Defense spacelift. The committee is aware that small satellite technology has been hindered by the lack of affordable and reliable spacelift.

The committee recommends $74.0 million in PE 63401F, an increase of $1.9 million for SLV thermal protection technology.

*Advanced Threat Alert Receiver (ATAR)/Lightweight Modular Support Jammer (LMSJ)*

The budget request contained $28.5 million in PE 63270F for electronic combat technology, including $2.8 million for ATAR/LMSJ.

ATAR will provide scalable, open architecture, affordable digital receiver technology to multiple electronic warfare platforms. LMSJ will provide next-generation digital technique generators and solid state power module technology in a scalable, open architecture for electronic jammers. Several new platforms are being envisioned as a follow-on replacement to the EA–6, requiring acceleration of ATAR/LMSJ technology to ensure the delivery of a brass board, conduct risk reduction research, and generate high fidelity threat emitter environments.

The committee recommends $33.3 million in PE 63270F, an increase of $4.8 million for ATAR/LMSJ.

*Advanced wideband system*

The budget request contained $439.3 million in PE 63845F for the advanced wideband system (AWS).

The committee notes that the transformational communications system (TCS) architecture within which AWS use is envisioned is still being developed. The committee further notes that underlying systems engineering for AWS faces significant challenges and much of the AWS technology base is very immature.

While the committee supports the goal of TCS, the committee believes that a slower program start for AWS will be beneficial to allow maturation of TCS architecture and AWS technology.

The committee recommends $359.3 million in PE 63845F, a decrease of $80.0 million for AWS.

*Aircraft turbine engine sustainment*

The budget request included no funding in PE 78026F for the productivity, reliability availability, maintainability (PRAM) program for aircraft turbine engine sustainment.

The committee believes that investments in technologies for nondestructive inspection of aircraft engines show the potential of saving millions of dollars.

The committee recommends $7.0 million in PE 78026F, an increase of $7.0 million for the PRAM program.

*Air Force information technology research and development*

The budget request contained $62.3 million for PE 28006F to support the Air Force Mission Planning Systems and an unspecified amount to support information technology (IT) research and development.

The committee is concerned about excessive and unjustified growth in the Air Force's research, development, testing, and evaluation expenditures for IT programs. While the committee supports innovative research into emerging technologies that will support combat and business systems modernization, the committee is nonetheless concerned that the Mission Planning Systems research and development expenditures increased four fold in one year, and notes similar increases in other IT programs.

The committee recommends $39.3 million for PE 28006F, a decrease of $23.0 million.

*Air Force space fence*

The budget request contained $118.2 million in PE 35910F for SPACETRACK, but included no funds to upgrade the Air Force space fence.

The committee notes that responsibility for the legacy Navy fence developed in the 1950's has recently been transferred to the Air Force. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to continue to fully operate the fence and the alternate space control center through fiscal year 2004. The committee also directs the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a thorough evaluation of options during fiscal year 2004 to upgrade or replace the existing fence in the near future in order to better meet the critical space situational

awareness requirements. This evaluation should study options for applying different technologies as well as different basing concepts and locations.

The committee supports the requirement for improved space control and recommends $138.2 million in PE 35910F, an increase of $20.0 million for Air Force space fence.

*Ballistic missile technology program*

The budget request contained no funds in PE 63311F for the ballistic missile technology program.

The committee is aware that the ballistic missile technology program supports development of critical technologies related to advanced guidance, range safety instrumentation and common guidance sensors.

The committee recommends $10.0 million in PE 63311F for the ballistic missile technology program.

*Central measurement intelligence office*

The budget request contained $71.7 million in PE 62702F for command, control and communications, but included no funds for laser intelligence or passive coherent location.

The committee is aware that the central measurement and signature intelligence (MASINT) office (CMO) supports two initiatives: the first at the National Air Intelligence Center (NAIC) to establish a laser intelligence effort on current and emerging laser technologies, and the second to accelerate development of passive coherent location (PCL) capability to include:

(1) Augmentation of the national airspace,

(2) Provide expansion to deployable integrated air defenses, and

(3) Further evaluate the capabilities that PCL will provide the war fighter.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62702F to establish a laser intelligence effort on current and emerging laser technologies, and to accelerate development of passive coherent location (PCL).

*Civil reserve space service*

The budget request contained $18.6 million in PE 35110F for satellite control network (space), but included no funding for civil reserve space service.

The committee recommends $21.6 million in PE 35110F, an increase of $3.0 million for civil reserve space service.

*Common aero vehicle*

The budget request contained $12.2 million in PE 64856F for Common Aero Vehicle (CAV).

The committee notes that the CAV program is a joint Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency-Air Force program to develop an on demand conventional prompt global strike capability. The committee is aware that CAV could appear to be a non-conventional launch and directs the Secretary of Defense to develop and provide a concept of operations for CAV that precludes any misperception of CAV launch intent to the congressional defense

committees, prior to conducting any developmental launches of CAV and no later than March 31, 2004.

The committee recommends $24.2 million in PE 64856F, an increase of $12.0 million for CAV.

*Distributed common ground system*

The budget request contained a total of $65.0 million in PE 35208F and other program elements for distributed common ground system (DCGS).

The committee is aware that the Navy, Air Force and Army had embarked on a collaborative effort to develop and acquire a joint, interoperable DCGS by providing requirements to the Air Force for incorporation into its DCGS Block 10.2. The committee believes that though service applications and subsystems may vary as a consequence of differing missions and employment concepts, a joint architectural framework and common data management system is necessary to ensure a transparent exchange of information and to achieve service interoperability.

The committee applauds this unified approach, but is concerned that the Navy has recently withdrawn from this initiative. The committee believes that it is imperative that the services act together in their approach to DCGS, and that separate service standards are inherently wrong.

Therefore, the committee approves the request, but directs the Secretary of Defense to stipulate a single architectural standard for the DCGS program that meets the ASD (C3I) requirements and maintains a common, open, non-proprietary standard. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report the status of establishing a single DCGS standard to the congressional defense and intelligence committees no later than January 31, 2004.

*Distributed mission interoperability toolkit (DMIT) program*

The budget request contained $239,000 in PE 64740F for development of integrated command and control applications, but included no funds for the DMIT program.

The DMIT is a suite of software tools that enables interoperability among and between air mission command, control, communication, computer and intelligence (C4I) systems and mission simulator models. The committee understands that DMIT program leverages best practices from the commercial sector including the use of open architectures, existing and emerging web standards, and state-of-the-art technologies to provide a more efficient translation of air mission tasks from C4I systems into a format compatible with mission simulator formats; and notes that the Congress appropriated an increase of $4.0 million in fiscal year 2003 for this purpose.

The committee recommends $5.2 million in PE 64740F, an increase of $5.0 million for continuation of the DMIT program.

*Enhanced techniques for detection of explosives*

The budget request contained $24.5 million in PE 63287F for physical security equipment advanced component development and prototyping.

Detection of explosives is a major concern in today's post cold war environment, both from the standpoint of the war on terrorism

and with respect to the detection of land mines and unexploded ordnance on the world's battlefields. The committee believes that a multi-disciplinary approach to research and development in advanced technologies for the detection of explosives, improvised explosive devices, landmines, and unexploded ordnance could result in the development of new and novel approaches for using existing explosive detection technologies and to the development of new, more effective technologies.

The committee recommends $27.5 million in PE 63287F, an increase of $3.0 million for enhanced techniques for detection of explosives.

*F–15 C/D radar block upgrade*

The budget request contained $112.1 million in PE 27134F for development of new capabilities for the F–15 series aircraft, but included no funds for the F–15C/D radar block upgrade program.

The F–15C/D radar block upgrade program, which began in fiscal year 2002, develops the next-generation active electronically scanned array (AESA) radar for F–15C/D aircraft. The committee understands that the AESA radar will provide improved F–15C/D radar performance, including a new capability to detect and engage cruise missiles.

The committee recommends $128.6 million in PE 27134F, an increase of $16.5 million for continuation of pre-production development on the F–15C/D radar block upgrade program.

*F–16 squadrons*

The budget request contained $87.5 million in PE 27133F for development of new capabilities for the F–16 series aircraft, but included no funds for the AN/APG–68(V)9 radar upgrade program or for F–16 block 40/42 AN/APX–113 integration.

The AN/APG–68(V)9 radar upgrade program will provide improved performance and savings compared to the F–16's existing AN/APG–68(V)5 radar. The committee understands that the AN/APG–68(V)9's increased reliability features combined with newer, more available digital parts will significantly decrease annual operations and support costs. Additionally, the committee understands that the AN/APG–68(V)9 will provide the F–16 with high-resolution synthetic aperture radar maps that will allow the employment of precision-guided munitions in all-weather conditions, and that this upgrade is strongly supported by the Air Force's Air Combat Command. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for the AN/APG–68(V)9 radar upgrade program.

The AN/APX–113 is an advanced electronic identification system used at long ranges to determine whether aircraft are friendly or enemy. If the data received from the AN/APX–113 notifies the pilot that the aircraft is enemy, then the pilot can engage the enemy aircraft with beyond-visual-range anti-aircraft missiles. The committee notes that most F–16 block 40/42 aircraft belong to the Air National Guard (ANG) and participate in homeland defense combat air patrol (CAP) missions, and that Congress appropriated $2.0 million in fiscal year to begin F–16 block 40/42 AN/APX–113 integration to improve the ANG's capabilities to accomplish the CAP mission. The committee understands that an additional $10.0 mil-

lion will complete F–16 block 40/42 AN/APX–113 integration in fiscal year 2004, and recommends that amount for this purpose.

In total, the committee recommends $107.5 million in PE 27133F, an increase of $20.0 million.

*F–16 theater airborne reconnaissance system (TARS)*

The budget request contained $77.8 million in PE 35206F for airborne reconnaissance systems, but included no funds for the TARS pre-planned product improvement (P3I) program.

The two ANG F–16 units equipped with TARS pods provide a responsive under-the-weather reconnaissance capability to support intelligence and targeting requirements of military users. The TARS P3I program will develop an upgrade to the TARS pods providing a data link system upgrade that will connect with the joint force air component commander's command and control ( JFACC C2) structure. The TARS P3I will also develop a synthetic aperture radar to enable night and all-weather reconnaissance capability.

The committee believes that night and all-weather reconnaissance operations and the ability to data link to the JFACC C2 structure are essential to identify and engage time-critical targets.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.8 in PE 35206F for the TARS P3I.

*Flexible display and integrated communications devices*

The budget request included $33.8 million in project 7184 in PE 62202F for crew system interface and biodynamics.

Integration of ground targeting cueing through data link to combat aircraft to reduce the "target-to-shooter" time-line is critical to improving close air support, target identification, and designation and to reduce "blue-on-blue" casualties. Flexible displays and integrated communications devices are key to realizing this capability.

The committee authorizes an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62202F for integration of leading-edge global positioning, communications components, voice messaging, displays, and related technologies to provide flexible display and integrated communications devices.

*Force protection and survivability for deployed forces*

The budget request included $838,000 in PE 62102F for development of cost effective technologies for deployed forces.

The important and growing use of composite materials, especially graphite composites in aircraft, motor vehicles, mass transit and marine applications creates new and often unrecognized hazards for firefighters and the general public. Firefighting research has not placed sufficient emphasis on this issue.

The committee recommends an additional $2.0 million in PE 62102F for the Composite Fire Safety Initiative Consortium to develop a better understanding of composite combustion processes and provide civilian and military firefighters with the technologies needed to assure rapid and safe extinguishment of composite fire materials.

*Fusion SIGINT enhancements for network-centric intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance*

The budget request contained $31.5 million in PE 63789F for Command, Control, Communication, and Intelligence (C3I) advanced development but included no funds for fusion signals intelligence (SIGINT) enhancements for network-centric intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR).

The committee is aware of the requirement for automated, intelligent sensor data and intelligence information fusion to implement network centric ISR.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63789F for fusion SIGINT enhancements for network-centric ISR.

*Global Hawk advanced imagery architecture*

The budget request contained $398.6 million in PE 35205F for endurance unmanned aerial vehicles, and included $357.6 million for Global Hawk, but included no funds for Global Hawk advanced imagery architecture.

The committee is aware that Global Hawk is a significant user of communication bandwidth. The committee notes that Global Hawk provides both synthetic aperture radar and electro-optical infrared data and that the Global Hawk advanced imagery architecture is to enable effective bandwidth utilization to support multiplatform, collaborative intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance operations.

The committee recommends $403.2 million in PE 35205F, an increase of $4.6 million to develop, integrate, test and fly the advanced imagery architecture on Global Hawk.

*Hardening technologies for satellite protection*

The budget request contained $83.2 million in PE 62601F for space technologies, but included no funds for hardening technologies for satellite protection (HTSP).

The committee is aware that disruption or denial of Department of Defense (DOD) data over unprotected space systems could severely impact DOD operations. The committee believes that protection parameters need to be defined and low cost satellite hardening technology solutions need to be developed and implemented for next generation satellites. The committee is aware that the objectives of HTSP are to ensure that all satellites carrying DOD data can operate in expected threat environments.

The committee recommends $87.2 million in PE 62601F, an increase of $4.0 million for HTSP.

*High Accuracy network determination system*

The budget request contained $6.3 million in PE 63444F for the Maui space surveillance system, but included no funds for the high accuracy network determination system (HANDS).

The committee is aware that HANDS offers the potential to increase the accuracy of orbit determinations of space objects using relatively low-cost optical sensing systems.

The committee recommends $16.3 million in PE 63444F, an increase of $10.0 million for HANDS.

*Hybrid bearings*

The budget request included $10.0 million in PE 63112F for materials transition within the advanced materials for weapons systems program.

The committee is aware of hybrid metal and composite bearing technology that may provide for aerospace applications for significantly increased turbine engine durability, wear resistance, and fracture toughness at high speeds and temperatures.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63112F for hybrid bearings.

*Integrated broadcast service*

The budget request contained $8.5 million in PE 63850F for the integrated broadcast service (IBS).

The committee has been supportive of the IBS program since its inception, and notes the significant progress made in the spiral-development of the IBS information management element (IME). The Air Force Test and Evaluation Center found the IME to be potentially operationally effective and suitable for network dissemination of time-critical threat warnings, supporting the Department of Defense network-centric warfare objective.

The committee supports regional deployments of the IME's to combatant commands starting in fiscal year 2004 and recommends the budget request for IBS.

*Integrated High Payoff Rocket Propulsion Technology (IHPRPT) program*

The budget request included $14.3 million in PE 62203F for the Air Force for the Integrated High Payoff Rocket Propulsion Technology (IHPRPT) program. While the Navy has previously funded the IHPRPT program as part of a coordinated technology program within the department, NASA, and industry, no funds were included in the fiscal year 2004 request.

The committee believes that critical propellant, nozzle, case, and thrust vector technologies require continued emphasis to provide increased capability to the warfighter and recommends an additional $3.0 million each in PE 62114N and PE 63114N and an additional $4.0 million in PE 62203F for IHPRPT.

*Link 16 weapon data terminal*

The committee notes that precision guided munitions (PGMs) have revolutionized the strike capabilities of weapon delivery platforms, and that today's global positioning satellite and inertial navigation system (GPS/INS)-guided weapons, such as the joint stand-off weapon (JSOW) and joint direct attack munition (JDAM), can very accurately engage fixed targets. However, the committee also notes that the JSOW and JDAM do not have the capability to be retargeted inflight or to engage mobile targets, and understands that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency has recently completed a successful test integrating a Link-16 weapon data terminal to a GPS/INS-guided PGM demonstrating that a PGM could receive target position updates after launch over the Link-16 network to engage a mobile target.

The committee believes that the capability to couple the PGM with the Link 16 network to engage mobile targets is a trans-

formational capability, and strongly urges the Department of Defense to continue this development.

*Low emission/efficient hybrid aviation refueling truck propulsion*

The budget request contained $54.0 million in PE 78611F for support systems development, but included no funds for low emission/efficient hybrid fuel truck propulsion.

The committee is aware that existing Air Force aviation refueling trucks operate over short distances in a manner that causes high fuel use, high emissions and decreased engine life. The committee notes that a heavy-duty hybrid drive technology has been developed for aviation refueling trucks.

The committee recommends $59.0 million, an increase of $5.0 million in PE 78611F for the continued refinement in simulation and modeling of low emission/efficient hybrid aviation refueling truck propulsion.

*Metals affordability*

The budget request included $1.2 million in PE 62102F for the metals affordability initiative.

The committee is aware that a government-industry collaboration provides significant improvements in the manufacturing of specialty metals for aerospace applications.

The committee fully supports the metals affordability initiative and recommends $15.2 million, an increase of $14 million, including $7.0 million each in program elements 63112F and 78011F. An additional $4.0 million is authorized in PE 78011S for continued development of high quality titanium reduction processes, such as the Armstrong process, to produce titanium that will support modern fabrication techniques.

*Nanomaterials*

The budget request included $38.9 million in PE 62102F for materials applied research for structures, propulsion, and subsystems.

Nanostructured materials are superior to conventional materials and allow for inexpensive manufacturing for uses in sensors, stealth and microelectronics. The committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million in PE 62102F for nanomaterials research.

*National operational signature production and research capability*

The budget request contained $36.6 million in PE 63203F for advanced aerospace sensors, but included no funds for the national operational signature production and research capability.

The committee supports this effort to enhance identification of friend, foe, and neutral parties.

The committee recommends $40.1 million in PE 63203F, an increase of $3.5 million for the national operational signature production and research capability.

*NAVSTAR Global positioning system III*

The budget request contained no funds for NAVSTAR global positioning system (GPS) III in PE 63421F.

The committee notes that GPS has demonstrated its increased importance to modern warfare during the campaign in Iraq. The committee is also aware that GPS has also become essential for ci-

vilian uses. The committee is informed that a new GPS III will provide significantly better anti-jam capability for the military, improved civil capabilities, and offer reduced lifecycle costs. The committee strongly supports fielding an improved GPS.

The committee recommends $45.0 million in PE 63421F, an increase of $45.0 million, to accelerate start of GPS III development and launch.

*Next generation bomber program*

The budget request contained no funds for a next generation bomber program.

The committee understands that the Air Force future years defense program (FYDP) includes science and technology funding for basic and applied bomber research in fiscal year 2006 to identify investments required to initiate a next generation bomber development program in the 2012 to 2015 timeframe, and notes that prior to 2012, the Air Force plans to upgrade its current bomber force to provide improved capabilities. The committee also notes that most of the Air Force's bomber fleet consists of 94 B–52 aircraft which are approximately 41 years old, and believes that beginning a bomber development program in fiscal year 2012, when the B–52 fleet is approximately fifty years old, would be too late to assure a sufficient bomber force structure to meet future requirements for long-range strike aircraft in light of the prospect that future basing for shorter range aircraft may not be assured.

Consequently, the committee recommends $100.0 million in a new program element, PE 63XXXF, to begin a next generation bomber program, and expects that the Department of the Air Force will include funding in its FYDP to develop and procure a next generation bomber well prior to the 2012 to 2015 timeframe.

*Nuclear detonation detection system*

The budget request contained $35.8 million in PE 35913F for the nuclear detonation detection (NUDET) system (space) integrated correlation and display system (ICADS).

The committee notes that responsibility for the development of the sensor, analysis payload and ground segments integration to the NDS payload is funded elsewhere, and that the Air Force contribution is limited to the ICADS ground segment. The committee believes that the increase above the original cost estimate is unjustified.

The committee supports the requirement for development and production of the ground terminal, and believes that the development can be completed within the original cost estimate.

The committee recommends $26.6 million in PE 35913F, a decrease of $9.2 million for Air Force ICADS ground segment development.

*Operationally responsive launch*

The budget request contained $24.4 million in PE 64855F for an operationally responsive launch system.

The committee strongly supports operationally responsive launch and its objective of developing an affordable simple, reliable time responsive launch system. The committee is aware that the Air

Force mission needs statement for operationally responsive spacelift was issued in December 2001.

The committee recommends $36.4 million in PE 64855F, an increase of $12.0 million for an operationally responsive launch to expedite development of this important capability to meet the defined mission need.

*Precision location and identification (PLAID) technology program*

The budget request contained $74.0 million in PE 64270F for electronic warfare (EW) development, but included no funds for the PLAID technology program.

The PLAID technology program will improve aircrew situational awareness by providing accurate ground emitter location and unambiguous identification for existing radar warning receivers. The committee understands that additional funds are required in fiscal year 2004 to mature the PLAID hardware and software to a production-ready state, and that, upon completion of the PLAID technology program, the PLAID upgrade may be installed on more that 5,190 Air Force aircraft. The committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included the PLAID technology program among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2004.

Consequently, the committee recommends $86.6 million in PE 64270F, an increase of $12.6 million for the PLAID technology program.

*Space based radar*

The budget request contained $274.1 million in PE 63858F for space based radar.

The committee is aware that the space based radar (SBR) radar system will provide persistent, near real-time high resolution surveillance deep into enemy territory and denied areas critical to the military and the intelligence community. The committee is aware that situational awareness will be dramatically improved by integrating the SBR output with products from other military sensors such as Joint STARS surveillance aircraft and unmanned aerial vehicles.

The committee recommends the budget request.

## DEFENSE-WIDE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, & EVALUATION

### Overview

The budget request contained $17,974.3 million for Defense-wide research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $18,174.4 million, an increase of $200.1 million to the budget request.

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DEFENSEWIDE** | | | | | |
| | | **BASIC RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0601101D8Z | 1 | In-House Laboratory Independent Research | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0601101E | 2 | Defense Research Sciences | 151,029 | 7,000 | | | 158,029 |
| | | Advanced Micro/Nano-Electromechanical Systems Technology | | | 5,000 | | |
| | | Integrated Nano- and Micro-manufacturing Technology | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0601103D8Z | 3 | University Research Initiatives | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0601105D8Z | 4 | Force Health Protection | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0601108D8Z | 5 | High Energy Laser Research Initiatives | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0601111D8Z | 6 | Government/Industry Cosponsorship of University Research | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0601114D8Z | 7 | Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0601384BP | 8 | Chemical and Biological Defense Program | 35,831 | | | | 35,831 |
| | | **TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH** | **186,860** | **7,000** | **7,000** | **0** | **193,860** |
| | | **APPLIED RESEARCH** | | | | | |
| 0602227D8Z | 9 | Medical Free Electron Laser | 9,494 | 10,000 | | | 19,494 |
| | | Program Increase | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0602228D8Z | 10 | Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) Science | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0602234D8Z | 11 | Lincoln Laboratory Research Program | 27,231 | | | | 27,231 |
| 0602301E | 12 | Computing Systems and Communications Technology | 404,859 | | | | 404,859 |
| 0602302E | 13 | Embedded Software and Pervasive Computing | 13,318 | | | | 13,318 |
| 0602383E | 14 | Biological Warfare Defense | 137,254 | 12,000 | | | 149,254 |
| | | Asymmetric Protocols for Biological Defense | | | 12,000 | | |
| 0602384BP | 15 | Chemical and Biological Defense Program | 106,451 | 25,000 | | | 131,451 |
| | | Chemical Biological Defense Applied Research Initiative | | | 25,000 | | |
| 0602702E | 16 | Tactical Technology | 250,558 | | | | 250,558 |
| 0602712E | 17 | Materials and Electronics Technology | 465,544 | | | | 465,544 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0602715BR | 18 | Nuclear Sustainment & Counterproliferation Technologies | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0602716BR | 19 | WMD Defeat Technology | 183,178 | 10,000 | | | 193,178 |
| | | Nuclear Weapons Effects | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0602717BR | 20 | Strategic Defense Technologies | 116,049 | | | | 116,049 |
| 0602787D8Z | 21 | Medical Technology | 9,213 | | | | 9,213 |
| 0602890D8Z | 22 | High Energy Laser Research | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 1160401BB | 23 | Special Operations Technology Development | 9,715 | | | | 9,715 |
| 1160407BB | 24 | SOF Medical Technology Development | 1,961 | | | | 1,961 |
| | | **TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH** | **1,734,825** | **57,000** | **57,000** | **0** | **1,791,825** |
| | | **ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0603002D8Z | 25 | Medical Advanced Technology | 5,028 | 7,100 | | | 12,128 |
| | | Anti-Radiation Drug Development | | | 7,100 | | |
| 0603104D8Z | 26 | Explosives Demilitarization Technology | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603121D8Z | 27 | SO/LIC Advanced Development | 31,300 | | | | 31,300 |
| 0603122D8Z | 28 | Combating Terrorism Technology Support | 60,526 | 14,800 | | | 75,326 |
| | | Facial Recognition Access Control Technology | | | 3,000 | | |
| | | Chemical Biological Electrostatic Decontamination System | | | 4,800 | | |
| | | Blast Mitigation Analysis | | | 5,000 | | |
| | | Magnetic Quadrupole Resonance Explosive Detection | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0603160BR | 29 | Counterproliferation Advanced Development Technologies | 76,277 | | | | 76,277 |
| 0603175C | 30 | Ballistic Missile Defense Technology | 240,820 | (55,800) | | | 185,020 |
| | | Program Reduction | | | | (55,800) | |
| | | Silicon Carbide Wide Bandgap Technology | | | [5,500] | | |
| | | Silicon Brain Architecture | | | [2,000] | | |
| 0603225D8Z | 31 | Joint DoD-DoE Munitions Technology Development | 25,011 | | | | 25,011 |
| 0603232D8Z | 32 | Automatic Target Recognition | 0 | | | | 0 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603285E | 33 | Advanced Aerospace Systems | 323,730 | 10,000 | | | 333,730 |
| | | Suborbital Space Launch Operations Improvement | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0603384BP | 34 | Chemical and Biological Defense Program - Advanced Development | 103,725 | 25,000 | | | 128,725 |
| | | Chemical Biological Defense Advanced Technology Demonstration Initiative | | | 25,000 | | |
| 0603704D8Z | 35 | Special Technical Support | 11,693 | | | | 11,693 |
| 0603711BR | 36 | Arms Control Technology | 4,807 | | | | 4,807 |
| 0603712S | 37 | Generic Logistics R&D Technology Demonstrations | 22,359 | 1,000 | | | 23,359 |
| | | Connectory for Rapid Identification of Technology Sources | | | 1,000 | | |
| 0603716D8Z | 38 | Strategic Environmental Research Program | 47,068 | | | | 47,068 |
| 0603727D8Z | 39 | Joint Warfighting Program | 9,685 | | | | 9,685 |
| 0603728D8Z | 40 | Agile Port Demonstration | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603739E | 41 | Advanced Electronics Technologies | 174,150 | | | | 174,150 |
| 0603750D8Z | 42 | Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations | 213,361 | | | | 213,361 |
| 0603752D8Z | 43 | Commercial Technology Insertion Program | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603755D8Z | 44 | High Performance Computing Modernization Program | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603760E | 45 | Command, Control and Communications Systems | 242,738 | | | | 242,738 |
| 0603762E | 46 | Sensor and Guidance Technology | 342,914 | | | | 342,914 |
| 0603763E | 47 | Marine Technology | 13,898 | | | | 13,898 |
| 0603764E | 48 | Land Warfare Technology / FCS | 82,387 | | | | 82,387 |
| 0603765E | 49 | Classified DARPA Programs | 210,532 | | | | 210,532 |
| 0603766E | 50 | Network-Centric Warfare Technology | 95,654 | | | | 95,654 |
| 0603769D8Z | 51 | Distributed Learning Advanced Technology Development | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603781D8Z | 52 | Software Engineering Institute | 22,652 | | | | 22,652 |
| 0603805S | 53 | Dual Use Application Programs | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603826D8Z | 54 | Quick Reaction Special Projects/Challenge Program | 74,385 | | | | 74,385 |
| 0603832D8Z | 55 | Joint Wargaming Simulation Management Office | 44,887 | | | | 44,887 |
| 0603924D8Z | 56 | High Energy Laser Advanced Technology Program | 0 | | | | 0 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603942D8Z | 57 | Technology Link | 2,000 | | | | 2,000 |
| 0603943D8Z | 58 | Air-to-Air Technology | 2,000 | (2,000) | | | 0 |
| | | Program reduction | | | | (2,000) | |
| 0605160D8Z | 59 | Counterproliferation Support | 1,882 | | | | 1,882 |
| 0605803SE | 60 | R&D in Support of DoD Enlistment, Testing and Evaluation | 13,757 | | | | 13,757 |
| 1160402BB | 61 | Special Operations Advanced Technology Development | 67,017 | 11,500 | | | 78,517 |
| | | Multi-Band Multi-Mission Radio | | | 10,000 | | |
| | | Computer Assisted Medical Diagnosis | | | 1,500 | | |
| 63xxxD8Z | 61a | Joint Experimentation | | 151,058 | | | 151,058 |
| | | Joint Experimentation (Transfer from PE 63727N) | | | 151,058 | | |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT** | **2,566,243** | **162,658** | **220,458** | **(57,800)** | **2,728,901** |
| | | **ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | | | | | |
| 0603228D8Z | 62 | Physical Security Equipment | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603709D8Z | 63 | Joint Robotics Program | 11,515 | | | | 11,515 |
| 0603714D8Z | 64 | Advanced Sensor Applications Program | 16,718 | 18,500 | | | 35,218 |
| | | Advanced Solid-state Dye Laser | | | 6,500 | | |
| | | Multi-wavelength Surface Scanning Biologics Sensor | | | 2,000 | | |
| | | Advanced Sensor Applications Program Classified Program Increase | | | 10,000 | | |
| 0603736D8Z | 65 | CALS Initiative | 4,000 | | | | 4,000 |
| 0603851D8Z | 66 | Environmental Security Technical Certification Program | 35,594 | | | | 35,594 |
| 0603869C | 67 | Meads Concepts | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603879C | 68 | Advanced Concepts, Evaluations And Systems | 151,696 | | | | 151,696 |
| 0603880C | 69 | Ballistic Missile Defense System Segment | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603881C | 70 | Ballistic Missile Defense Terminal Defense Segment | 810,440 | 313,259 | | | 1,123,699 |
| | | MEADS Transfer | | | 276,259 | | |
| | | THAAD | | | 37,000 | | |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603882C | 71 | Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Defense Segment | 3,613,266 | 29,900 | | | 3,643,166 |
| | | Aegis | | | 7,000 | | |
| | | Sea-Based X-Band Radar (SBX) | | | 22,900 | | |
| | | Common RF Scene Generation Capability | | | [4,800] | | |
| 0603883C | 72 | Ballistic Missile Defense Boost Defense Segment | 626,264 | | | | 626,264 |
| 0603884BP | 73 | Chemical and Biological Defense Program | 162,142 | 15,000 | | | 177,142 |
| | | Primate Biomedical Laboratory Test and Evaluation Capability | | | 15,000 | | |
| 0603884C | 74 | Ballistic Missile Defense Sensors | 438,242 | | | | 438,242 |
| 0603886C | 75 | Ballistic Missile Defense System Interceptor | 301,052 | (150,000) | | | 151,052 |
| | | System Interceptor Program reduction | | | | (150,000) | |
| 0603888C | 76 | Ballistic Missile Defense Test & Targets | 611,522 | | | | 611,522 |
| 0603889C | 77 | Ballistic Missile Defense Products | 343,644 | (31,100) | | | 312,544 |
| | | Products Program reduction | | | | (31,100) | |
| 0603890C | 78 | Ballistic Missile Defense Systems Core | 483,996 | (45,000) | | | 438,996 |
| | | System Core Program reduction | | | | (45,000) | |
| | | Wide Bandwidth Technology | | | [9,500] | | |
| | | Ballistic Missile Launch Canister Design and Manufacturing Improvements | | | [5,000] | | |
| 0603910D8Z | 79 | Strategic Capability Modernization | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0603920D8Z | 80 | Humanitarian Demining | 13,299 | | | | 13,299 |
| 0603923D8Z | 81 | Coalition Warfare | 5,906 | | | | 5,906 |
| 0604722D8Z | 82 | Joint Service Education and Training Systems Development | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0303191D8Z | 83 | Joint Electromagnetic Technology (JET) Program | 6,362 | | | | 6,362 |
| | | **TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES** | **7,635,658** | **150,559** | **376,659** | **(226,100)** | **7,786,217** |
| | | **SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | | | | | |
| 0604384BP | 84 | Chemical and Biological Defense Program | 148,017 | | | | 148,017 |
| 0604618D8Z | 85 | MANPADS Defense Program | 25,000 | (22,000) | | | 3,000 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Program reduction | | | | (22,000) | |
| 0604709D8Z | 86 | Joint Robotics Program | 13,597 | 12,500 | | | 26,097 |
| | | Packbot Tactical Mobile Robot | | | 12,500 | | |
| 0604764K | 87 | Advanced IT Services Joint Program Office (AITS-JPO) | 18,910 | | | | 18,910 |
| 0604771D8Z | 88 | Common Joint Tactical Information | 10,633 | | | | 10,633 |
| 0604861C | 89 | Theater High-Altitude Area Defense System - TMD | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604865C | 90 | Patriot PAC-3 Theater Missile Defense Acquisition | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604867C | 91 | Navy Area Theater Missile Defense | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0605013BL | 92 | Information Technology Development | 10,539 | (10,539) | | | 0 |
| | | Rapid Acquisition Incentives | | | | (10,539) | |
| 0605013D8Z | 93 | Software Development | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0605015BL | 94 | Information Technology Development-Standard Procurement System (SPS) | 5,195 | | | | 5,195 |
| 0605016D8Z | 95 | Financial Management Modernization Program | 84,688 | | | | 84,688 |
| 0303129K | 96 | Defense Message System | 10,170 | (10,170) | | | 0 |
| | | Program reduction | | | | (10,170) | |
| 0303140K | 97 | Information Systems Security Program | 5,987 | | | | 5,987 |
| 0303141K | 98 | Global Combat Support System | 17,259 | | | | 17,259 |
| 0305840K | 99 | Electronic Commerce | 6,028 | | | | 6,028 |
| 0305840S | 100 | Electronic Commerce | 2,360 | | | | 2,360 |
| | | **TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION** | **358,383** | **(30,209)** | **12,500** | **(42,709)** | **328,174** |
| | | **RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | | | | | |
| 0603757D8Z | 101 | Training Transformation (T2) | 2,951 | | | | 2,951 |
| 0603858D8Z | 102 | Unexploded Ordnance Detection and Clearance | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0604774D8Z | 103 | Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS) | 18,575 | | | | 18,575 |
| 0604943D8Z | 104 | Thermal Vicar | 7,157 | | | | 7,157 |
| 0605104D8Z | 105 | Technical Studies, Support and Analysis | 30,204 | 2,000 | | | 32,204 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | National Defense University Sponsored Research Program | | | 2,000 | | |
| 0605110BR | 106 | Critical Technology Support | 1,858 | | | | 1,858 |
| 0605114D8Z | 107 | BLACK LIGHT | 19,675 | | | | 19,675 |
| 0605114E | 108 | BLACK LIGHT | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0605116D8Z | 109 | General Support to C3I | 24,638 | | | | 24,638 |
| 0605117D8Z | 110 | Foreign Material Acquisition and Exploitation | 33,916 | | | | 33,916 |
| 0605123D8Z | 111 | Export License Control | 8,837 | (3,000) | | | 5,837 |
| | | Program reduction - IT | | | | (3,000) | |
| 0605124D8Z | 112 | Defense Travel System | 31,806 | | | | 31,806 |
| 0605126J | 113 | Joint Theater Air and Missile Defense Organization | 87,250 | | | | 87,250 |
| 0605128D8Z | 114 | Classified Program USD(P) | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0605130D8Z | 115 | Foreign Comparative Testing | 34,873 | | | | 34,873 |
| 0605384BP | 116 | Chemical and Biological Defense Program | 39,345 | | | | 39,345 |
| 0605502C | 117 | Small Business Innovative Research - MDA | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0605502E | 118 | Small Business Innovative Research | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0605710D8Z | 119 | Classified Programs - C3I | 20,556 | | | | 20,556 |
| 0605790D8Z | 120 | Small Business Innovation Research/Challenge Administration | 2,026 | | | | 2,026 |
| 0605798S | 121 | Defense Technology Analysis | 5,209 | | | | 5,209 |
| 0605799D8Z | 122 | Force Transformation | 19,675 | | | | 19,675 |
| 0605801K | 123 | Defense Technical Information Services (DTIC) | 44,162 | | | | 44,162 |
| 0605803SE | 124 | R&D in Support of DoD Enlistment, Testing and Evaluation | 8,858 | | | | 8,858 |
| 0605804D8Z | 125 | Development Test and Evaluation | 8,938 | | | | 8,938 |
| 0605898E | 126 | Management Headquarters (Research and Development) DARPA | 45,002 | | | | 45,002 |
| 0901585C | 127 | Pentagon Reservation | 14,481 | | | | 14,481 |
| 0901598C | 128 | Management Headquarters - MDA | 93,441 | | | | 93,441 |
| 0901598D8W | 129 | IT Software Dev Initiatives | 8,605 | | | | 8,605 |
| 0909999E | 130 | Financing for Cancelled Account Adjustments | 0 | | | | 0 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT** | **612,038** | **(1,000)** | **2,000** | **(3,000)** | **611,038** |
| | | **OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| 0604805D8Z | 131 | Commercial Operations and Support Savings Initiative | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0605127T | 132 | Partnership for Peace (PfP) Information Management System | 1,934 | | | | 1,934 |
| 0605601D8Z | 133 | RDT&E Transformational Programs | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0607384BP | 134 | Chemical and Biological Defense (Operational Systems Development) | 3,442 | | | | 3,442 |
| 0208043J | 135 | ISLAND SUN | 1,469 | | | | 1,469 |
| 0208045K | 136 | C4I Interoperability | 42,415 | | | | 42,415 |
| 0208052J | 137 | Joint Analytical Model Improvement Program | 7,254 | | | | 7,254 |
| 0300205R | 138 | Information Technology Systems | 550 | | | | 550 |
| 0301011G | 139 | Cryptologic Activities | | | | | 0 |
| 0301301L | 140 | General Defense Intelligence Program | | | | | 0 |
| 0301398L | 141 | Management Headquarters GDIP, DIA | | | | | 0 |
| 0302016K | 142 | National Military Command System-Wide Support | 1,133 | | | | 1,133 |
| 0302019K | 143 | Defense Info Infrastructure Engineering and Integration | 2,460 | | | | 2,460 |
| 0303126K | 144 | Long Haul Communications (DCS) | 1,401 | | | | 1,401 |
| 0303127K | 145 | Support of the National Communications System | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0303131K | 146 | Minimum Essential Emergency Communications Network (MEECN) | 7,198 | | | | 7,198 |
| 0303140D8Z | 147 | Information Systems Security Program | 14,790 | | | | 14,790 |
| 0303140G | 148 | Information Systems Security Program | 476,657 | 750 | | | 477,407 |
| | | Program Increase | | | 750 | | |
| 0303149J | 149 | C4I for the Warrior | 4,199 | | | | 4,199 |
| 0303149K | 150 | C4I for the Warrior | 37,100 | | | | 37,100 |
| 0303150K | 151 | Global Command and Control System | 49,991 | (17,000) | | | 32,991 |
| | | Program reduction - IT | | | | (17,000) | |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0303153K | 152 | Joint Spectrum Center | 18,850 | | | | 18,850 |
| 0303165K | 153 | Defense Collaboration Tool Suite (DCTS) | 14,915 | | | | 14,915 |
| 0303170K | 154 | Net-Centric Enterprise Services (NCES) | 40,830 | (40,830) | | | 0 |
| | | Program reduction - IT | | | | (40,830) | |
| 0303610K | 155 | Teleport Program | 10,462 | | | | 10,462 |
| 0304210BB | 156 | Special Applications for Contingencies | 24,587 | | | | 24,587 |
| 0304345BQ | 157 | National Imagery and Mapping Program | | | | | 0 |
| 0305102BQ | 158 | Defense Imagery and Mapping Program | 161,873 | 12,200 | | | 174,073 |
| | | GeoSAR | | | 12,200 | | |
| 0305125D8Z | 159 | Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) | 2,051 | | | | 2,051 |
| 0305127BZ | 160 | Foreign Counterintelligence Activities | | | | | 0 |
| 0305127V | 161 | Foreign Counterintelligence Activities | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0305146BZ | 162 | Defense Joint Counterintelligence Program (JMIP) | 82,266 | | | | 82,266 |
| 0305146D8Z | 163 | Defense Joint Counterintelligence Program (JMIP) | 30,757 | 7,500 | | | 38,257 |
| | | Defense Joint Counterintelligence Program Deception Program | | | 7,500 | | |
| 0305190D8Z | 164 | C3I Intelligence Programs | 132,094 | | | | 132,094 |
| 0305191D8Z | 165 | Technology Development | 249,152 | (22,500) | | | 226,652 |
| | | Program reduction | | | | (22,500) | |
| 0305193L | 166 | Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO) | | | | | 0 |
| 0305202G | 167 | Dragon U-2 (JMIP) | 2,747 | | | | 2,747 |
| 0305206G | 168 | Airborne Reconnaissance Systems | 12,184 | | | | 12,184 |
| 0305207G | 169 | Manned Reconnaissance Systems | 4,424 | | | | 4,424 |
| 0305208BQ | 170 | Distributed Common Ground Systems | | | | | 0 |
| 0305208G | 171 | Distributed Common Ground Systems | | | | | 0 |
| 0305208L | 172 | Distributed Common Ground Systems | 979 | | | | 979 |
| 0305883L | 173 | Hard and Deeply Buried Target (HDBT) Intel Support | | | | | 0 |
| 0305884L | 174 | Intelligence Planning and Review Activities | | | | | 0 |

## Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0305885G | 175 | Tactical Cryptologic Activities | 112,691 | | | | 112,691 |
| 0305889G | 176 | Counterdrug Intelligence Support | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0305917D8Z | 177 | National Security Space Architect (NSSA) | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 0708011S | 178 | Manufacturing Technology | 16,163 | 4,000 | | | 20,163 |
| | | Titanium Reduction Processes | | | 4,000 | | |
| 0708012S | 179 | Logistics Support Activities | 35,781 | | | | 35,781 |
| 0902298J | 180 | Management Headquarters (JCS) | 18,943 | | | | 18,943 |
| 1001018D8Z | 181 | NATO Joint STARS | 24,721 | | | | 24,721 |
| 1160279BB | 182 | Small Business Innovative Research/Small Bus Tech Transfer Pilot Prog | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 1160401BB | 183 | Special Operations Technology Development | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 1160402BB | 184 | Special Operations Advanced Technology Development | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 1160404BB | 185 | Special Operations Tactical Systems Development | 255,981 | 10,000 | | | 265,981 |
| | | Advanced Target Identification Capability for AC-130U Gunship | | | 6,500 | | |
| | | Cobra Blue Force Tracking | | | 3,500 | | |
| 1160405BB | 186 | Special Operations Intelligence Systems Development | 16,726 | | | | 16,726 |
| 1160407BB | 187 | SOF Medical Technology Development | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 1160408BB | 188 | SOF Operational Enhancements | 64,430 | | | | 64,430 |
| XXXXXXX | 999 | Classified | 2,894,650 | | | | 2,894,650 |
| | | **TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT** | **4,880,250** | **(45,880)** | **34,450** | **(80,330)** | **4,834,370** |
| | xxx | Information Technology Reduction | | (100,000) | | (100,000) | (100,000) |
| | | **TOTAL, RDT&E, DEFENSE-WIDE** | **17,974,257** | **200,128** | **710,067** | **(509,939)** | **18,174,385** |

## Items of Special Interest

*Advanced Micro/Nano-Electromechanical Systems Technology*

The budget request contained $151.0 million in PE 61101E for defense research sciences, including $18.7 million for basic research in electronic sciences.

The committee notes the phenomenal progress in microelectronic innovation that has characterized the last decade in the exploration and demonstration of micro electromechanical machines, electronic and optoelectronic devices, circuits and processing concepts. Research areas include new electronic and optoelectronic devices and circuit concepts, operation of devices at higher frequency and lower power, development of innovative optical and electronic technologies for interconnecting modules in high performance systems, electronically controlled micro-instruments that offer the possibility of nanometer-scale probing, sensing and manipulation for ultra-high density information storage "on-a-chip," for nanometer-scale patterning, and for molecular level analysis and synthesis.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 61101E for basic research in advanced micro- and non-electromechanical systems technology.

*Advanced sensor applications program*

The budget request contained $16.7 million in PE 63714D8Z for the advanced sensor applications program (ASAP). The committee is concerned that promising projects executed by the Navy's PMA264 program office are appreciably under funded for special programs under development.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63714D8Z for ASAP.

Additional details are contained in the classified annex to this report.

*Advanced solid-state dye laser*

The budget request contained $16.7 million in PE 63714D8Z for the advanced sensor applications program.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.5 million to continue development and demonstration of advanced solid-state dye laser technology.

*Advanced target identification capability for AC–130U gunships*

The budget request contained $256.0 million for special operations tactical systems development, but included no funding for the advanced target identification capability for AC–130U gunships. This enhancement to the gunship radar will enable the crew to make accurate and near instantaneous identification of friendly and enemy vehicles on the battlefield. To complete the project, funding is needed to collect data during flight tests on military ranges, develop the recognition algorithms, and integrate the algorithms into the gunship radar system.

The committee recommends $262.5 million in PE 1160404BB, an increase of $6.5 million.

*Air to air technology*

The budget request included a new program, air to air technology, in PE 63943D8Z. The purposes for which this authorization is requested is redundant to the over $68.0 million authorization requested for foreign material acquisition and exploitation and foreign comparative testing.

The committee recommends no funding for this program, a reduction of $2.0 million to the budget request.

*Anti-radiation drug development and trials program*

The budget request contained $5.0 million in PE 63002D8Z for medical advanced technology development.

The medical advanced technology development program supports applied research by the Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute (AFRRI) for advanced development of biomedical strategies to prevent, treat, and assess health consequences from exposure to ionizing radiation. The program addresses critical gaps in the ability to effectively prevent, assess, and treat the spectrum of injuries induced by ionizing radiation and capitalizes on discoveries in basic research and from academia and industry to identify, develop, and advance medical countermeasures into and through pre-clinical studies toward newly licensed products. Additionally, AFRRI supports accredited defense-wide training programs for medical personnel and provides advice and guidance to the Joint Staff and combatant commanders for operational contingencies. Because national laboratories operated by the Department of Energy no longer support advanced research relevant to military medical radiobiology, AFRRI is currently the only national resource carrying out this mission.

The committee notes progress in the development of an advanced radioprotectant ("anti-radiation") drug (5-androstenediol) that shows great promise and the initiation in fiscal year 2003 of preclinical safety and toxicity assessment and small and large animal trials. Fiscal year 2004 plans include extension of the work to preclinical trials in nonhuman primates and submission of investigational new drug applications to the Food and Drug Administration.

The committee recommends $12.1 million in PE 63002D8Z, an increase of $7.1 million to continue the program for development and trials of radioprotectant drugs by the Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute.

The committee also understands that the lack of operations and maintenance funding for the AFRRI physical plant (a 108,000 square foot DOD research facility) and indirect support activities critically reduces the amount of the research, development, test and evaluation funds available for direct research activities. The committee directs the Director of Defense Research and Engineering to address this shortcoming in the execution of the fiscal year 2004 budget and in future budget requests.

*Asymmetric protocols for biological defense*

The budget request contained $137.3 million in PE 62383E for biological warfare defense applied research.

A military or terrorist scenario in which aerosolized biological agents such as anthrax spores or smallpox virus are used would almost certainly result in mass casualties. Weaponized forms of the

agents offer significant challenges to medical treatment that are not found in naturally occurring forms. While antibiotics are the only approved method for treating anthrax, the recent bioterrorist anthrax attack in Washington showed that antibiotics are unfortunately not adequate to provide full treatment against inhalation anthrax. The committee also notes that there are a number of biological agents that could, with appropriate development and weaponization, be used in biological warfare, or in a terrorist attack and developing specific protection against all possible biological agents presents a significant challenge. As a result, the committee believes there is a need for therapeutics that would provide broad spectrum protection against a range of possible biological agents and that would also work in concert with other methods of treatment.

The committee notes research in therapeutics that shows good results from laboratory testing in mice against pox virus and against anthrax and appears to have the potential for providing broad spectrum protection. Other tests have involved therapeutics that may reinforce the innate immunity of the host. The committee believes that the results of the research to date are promising and the research should continue.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million in PE 62383E to continue research in asymmetric protocols that would provide broad spectrum protection for biological defense.

*Ballistic missile defense*

The committee supports the budget request of $9.1 billion for ballistic missile defense. However, the committee has made some adjustments within the budget request to transfer funds from longer-term, less well defined efforts to increase support for programs with nearer-term benefit to the warfighter.

*Technology and advanced concepts*

The budget request contained $240.8 million in PE 63175C for ballistic missile defense (BMD) technology and $151.7 million in new PE 63879C for Advanced Concepts, Evaluations, and Systems. Taken together, the fiscal year 2004 request for crosscutting technology and concepts development represents an increase of $241.4 million over the comparable fiscal year 2004 request.

The committee notes that the budget request is significantly above the fiscal year 2004 projection in the fiscal year 2003 budget request, without detailed justification for the increase. The committee believes that a portion of this increase should be used to fund nearer term projects.

The committee recommends $185.0 million in PE 63175C for technology, a decrease of $55.8 million.

Within funds available for BMD technology in PE 63175C, the committee recommends $5.5 million for silicon carbide wide bandgap semiconductor development for advanced power electronics, communications and sensor applications, and $2.0 million for "silicon brain architecture" development to condense circuitry for target signature comparison and recognition applications.

*Terminal defense segment*

The budget request contained $810.4 million in PE 63881C for the ballistic missile defense terminal defense segment; the committee recommends $1,123.7 million.

The committee recommends an increase of $276.3 million as a result of transferring the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) program from the Army to the Missile Defense Agency. MEADS is discussed elsewhere in the committee report.

The committee notes that the theater high altitude area defense (THAAD) program is proceeding at a slower pace than other elements of the ballistic missile defense system, and that despite a recent redesign that requires flight testing, tests are still scheduled at large intervals. The committee is further aware an opportunity exists to compress the testing schedule while adding a flight test and reducing program risk. The committee recommends an increase of $37.0 million for THAAD to accelerate testing.

The budget request for the terminal defense segment contained $64.8 million for the Arrow program. The Arrow anti-tactical ballistic missile defense system has been under development since 1988 under an agreement between the governments of the United States and Israel. The committee has supported this development program, and continues to support the evolution of the system to counter more challenging threats under the Arrow System Improvement Program. The committee has also supported procurement of three Arrow batteries, funding for the last of which was completed in fiscal year 2002. Most recently, Congress has provided in fiscal year 2003 funds for co-production of Arrow in the United States. All told, more than $2.0 billion has been invested in Arrow, arguably most by the United States either through direct appropriations or military assistance grants to the government of Israel. The committee has reservations about recent interest shown by Israel in the sale of Arrow to third parties. In the more general context of international cooperative missile defense programs, the committee has concerns regarding how such sales comport with the obligations of the United States under international treaties and agreements, the possibility of technology transfers that might assist foreign offensive missile programs, and the rights of the United States to share in revenue generated through third party sales. The committee urges the administration to give serious consideration to policy development in this area prior to approving third party sales of missile defense technologies co-developed by the United States.

*Midcourse defense segment*

The budget request contained $3,613.3 million in PE 63882C for the ballistic missile defense (BMD) midcourse defense segment. This PE provides funding for key elements of the President's program to begin fielding an initial defensive operational capability in fiscal year 2004, including the block 2004 ground-based midcourse defense test bed and the block 2004 Aegis ballistic missile defense element. The committee supports the intent of the Department of Defense to make use of the inherent capability of the BMD system test bed to provide a limited defense, but urges the Department to focus this asset on the developmental and operational testing that will lead to effective defenses over the long term.

The committee is aware that a need exists for additional funding for Aegis ballistic missile defense radar improvements such as an additional receive antenna to enable two-way communications with in-flight missiles and to allow for off-board cueing. This capability is now being tested using a partial installation of the S-band phased array antenna system (SPAAS) on USS Lake Erie, but a complete installation is not funded.

The committee also notes that the sea-based X-band radar (SBX) will enter testing with a minimal number of transmit/receive modules. In order to promote more realistic testing, the committee recommends funding for additional transmit/receive modules and software development.

The committee recommends $3,643.2 million in PE 63882C, an increase of $7.0 million for Aegis to complete the four-panel SPAAS array and four-corner distributed controller installation on USS Lake Erie, and an increase of $22.9 million for ground based missile defense SBX.

The Aegis BMD program is upgrading the Aegis SPY–1 radar system with a common signal processor to track both air and ballistic missile threats. The committee recommends, from within funds available for the midcourse defense segment, $4.8 million for development of a common radio frequency scene generation capability to support the common signal processor program.

*System interceptor*

The budget request contained $301.1 million in PE 63886C for system interceptor.

The committee notes that the budget request includes a new start program, the ballistic missile defense (BMD) system interceptor, intended to develop a new family of ground-based, sea-based and space-based interceptors. The committee notes that testing and development of the first generation of defensive missiles has barely begun, and observes that the requested amount is quite substantial for a program that has not yet gone through concept definition.

The committee recommends $151.1 million in PE 63886C for concept definition and technology development, a decrease of $150.0 million.

*Systems core segment*

The budget request contained $484.0 million for ballistic missile defense system core activities in PE 63890C.

The committee notes that funding for the national team is not detailed in a way that allows an understanding of what projects the national team works on, why its funding requirement has grown, or offers ways to measure performance. Therefore, the committee believes that funding for the national team should be held to the fiscal year 2003 level.

The committee recommends $439.0 million in PE 63890C for systems core, a decrease of $45.0 million.

From within funds available for command and control, battle management and communications, the committee recommends $9.5 million for wide bandwidth technology for development and demonstration of secure, high bandwidth satellite communications in support of the Pacific ballistic missile defense test bed.

The committee notes the advantages of canisterized launch systems to ground maneuver forces and recommends, from within funds available for producibility and manufacturing technology, $5.0 million for domestic industrial base development for the manufacture of modern composite missile canisters.

*Products*

The budget request contained $343.6 million in PE 63889C for products.

The committee notes that proposed funding for the joint national integration center and missile defense national team has increased significantly without clear justification. The committee believes that a portion of the additional funding can be used more effectively for other projects.

The committee recommends $312.5 million in PE 63889C, a decrease of $31.1 million.

*Ballistic missile defense testing*

On December 17, 2002, President Bush directed the Secretary of Defense to proceed with fielding an initial set of missile defense capabilities. These capabilities included using the testbed for the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS) in an operational role, should events warrant, including up to 20 ground-based and up to 20 sea-based defensive missiles.

The committee understands the Department's intent to make use of the inherent defensive capability of the BMDS testbed. The committee is concerned, however, about the use of test assets in an operational role. The committee appreciates the different objectives of developmental and operational testing, and notes that other Department programs have recently experienced significant setbacks by conducting such testing concurrently.

The committee strongly urges the Department to ensure that assets used in an operational defense role undergo the full and rigorous testing required by law, prior to being placed in an operational status.

*Ballistic missile defense reporting requirements*

The language in the committee report on H.R. 4546 (H. Rept. 107–436) urged the Department of Defense to include budgetary and developmental baseline reports for the various block components of the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS). This language became the basis for Section 221 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, (Public Law 107–314), requiring performance goals and development baselines for each block component of the BMDS and budget justification materials that relate to these goals and baselines.

The committee believes that the Department has made a good-faith effort to comply with Section 221. The committee is encouraged by the sharp improvement in the budget justification materials, and believes that the fiscal year 2004 submission contains much more information on BMDS performance goals and development baselines than was provided in the previous two budget submissions. While the committee commends the Department for the improvement in the justification materials, it notes several shortcomings that should be addressed in future years.

The most serious shortcoming was the lack of system performance goals in the classified "Systems Capability Statement" for several block 2004 BMD elements, notably Ground-Based Midcourse (GMD) and Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (Aegis BMD). While some specific subcomponent performance goals were provided, the overall performance goals for GMD and Aegis BMD were difficult to understand. The 2004 block performance goals for the Airborne Laser (ABL) in the "Systems Capability Statement" were much closer to what the committee is seeking, as were the performance goals in the "BMDS Statement of Goals" submitted to the committee with the Missile Defense Agency's January 27, 2003 briefing to the Joint Requirements Oversight Council. The committee urges the Missile Defense Agency to use these examples as a model for specifying the system performance goals for all other program blocks under development.

In addition, neither the development baselines in the classified "Systems Capability Statement" nor the budget justification materials adequately summarized the testing objectives for the systems under development.

The committee also notes that the budget proposals and justification materials for activities of the missile defense national team (MDNT) contained much less detail than other activities within the MDA, and hopes that future budgets will offer a better understanding of how MDNT resources are expended.

The committee is generally pleased with the compliance with Section 221, but urges the Department to pay special attention to these areas of concern.

*Blast mitigation and analysis technology*

The budget request contained $60.5 million in PE 63122D8Z for the combating terrorism technology support program.

The committee notes the continuing threat posed to military and civilian personnel, buildings, and other infrastructure by the terrorist use of conventional and improvised explosives. Congress provided an additional $3.5 million in fiscal year 2003 for blast mitigation testing, including the development of new materials for protecting buildings and other infrastructure and new testing techniques and technologies for the qualification of new structural designs.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63122D8Z to continue the program for development and evaluation of blast mitigation and analysis technology.

*Chemical/biological defense research, development, test and evaluation program*

The budget request contained a total of $599.0 million for chemical/biological defense research, development, test, and evaluation, including $35.8 million in PE 61384BP for basic research, $106.5 million in PE 62384BP for applied research, $103.7 million in PE 63384BP for advanced technology development, $162.1 million in PE 63884BP for demonstration/validation, $148.1 million for engineering and manufacturing development, and $39.3 million in PE 65384BP for RDT&E management support. The budget request also contained $137.3 million in PE 62383E for the Defense Ad-

vanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) biological defense research program.

The committee notes that the changing chemical and biological threat, both to U.S. armed forces on the world's battlefields and to U.S. homeland security, places more emphasis on the need for responsive technology options that could address the threat; the ability to quickly assess, develop, and demonstrate the technology; and then, the ability to rapidly insert or deploy the technology in fielded systems. The committee also notes the wealth of new concepts and technologies of varying levels of maturity that emerge annually from the nation's science and technology base and the recommendations that the committee receives for exploitation of particular technologies to improve the capabilities of U.S. forces or to address homeland security issue issues. The committee recommends the establishment in the chemical biological defense program of two initiatives, one in the applied research category and one in the advanced technology development category, that would provide the opportunity for emerging technologies and concepts to compete for funding on the basis of technical merit and on the contribution that the technology could, if implemented, make to the chemical biological defense capabilities of the armed forces and to homeland defense. During its review of the fiscal year 2004 budget request the committee has received proposals for establishment of a number of projects that the committee recommends be considered for possible funding under the appropriate initiative.

*Chemical biological defense applied research initiative*

The committee recommends that the projects and technologies to be considered for funding under the applied research initiative include, but are not limited to the following:

(1) Air contaminant monitoring technology
(2) Automated liquid phase detectors for toxic compounds
(3) Biological detection system technology
(4) Chemical biological regenerative air filters
(5) Chemical biological protective garment technology
(6) Engineering pathogen identification and countermeasures
(7) Multivalent Ebola, Marburg fiolovirus vaccine technology
(8) Rapid anti-body based biological countermeasures
(9) Rapid decontamination system for nerve agents
(10) Rapid vaccine development technology

The committee recommends $131.5 million in PE 62384BP, an increase of $25.0 million for the chemical biological defense applied research initiative.

*Chemical biological defense advanced technology development initiative*

The committee recommends that the projects and technologies to be considered for funding under the advanced technology development initiative include, but not be limited the following:

(1) Biological defense gene knockout technology
(2) Decontamination using atmospheric plasmas
(3) Hand-held biological agent detectors
(4) High intensity pulsed radiation for defeat of chemical and biological agents

(5) Immunochemical biological/chemical threat agent detectors

(6) Non-toxic, non-corrosive chemical biological decontamination

(7) Polymer based biological micro-lectromechanical machines

(8) Transportable collective protection shelters

(9) Low cost biological particle sensors

The committee recommends $128.7 million in PE 63384BP, an increase of $25.0 million for the chemical biological defense applied research initiative.

*Chemical biological electrostatic decontamination system*

The budget request contained $60.5 million in PE 63122D8Z for the Combating Terrorism Technology Support program. No funds were included to continue the development and demonstration of the chemical biological electrostatic decontamination system.

The committee notes that the electrostatic decontamination system uses a photosensitive, electrostatically charged mist, which when sprayed onto a contaminated surface and illuminated with ultraviolet light destroys the chemical or biological agents that are present. Successful development and demonstration of the system could result in a field expedient decontamination capability that would be less dependent on water and would not require the deployment of post-decontamination waste disposal equipment. Congress added $6.3 million in fiscal year 2003 that is being used to complete laboratory and field tests of the technology. The committee notes the progress made to date in the program and recommends continued development and evaluation of the technology for potential transition to a fielded system.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.8 million in PE 63122D8Z to continue development and evaluation of the electrostatic decontamination system.

*Cobra blue force tracking*

The budget request contained $256.0 million in PE 116404BB for special operations advanced technology development, but included no funding for Cobra blue force tracking.

The committee notes that Special Operations Command (SOCOM) has acquired several thousand blue force tracking transmitters that enable real-time tracking of friendly forces throughout the world. The committee is aware that a second generation prototype mini-blue force tracking receiver is being developed to reduce size and weight by half and improve performance.

The committee supports improved blue force tracking and recommends an increase of $3.5 million for the mini-blue force tracking receiver.

*Connectory for rapid identification of technology sources*

The budget request contained $22.4 million for generic logistics research and development demonstrations, but included no funding for the connectory of rapid identification of technology sources for the Department of Defense. The connectory pilot would provide the Department with one stop access to the industrial technology base,

permitting rapid identification of promising sources of new, creative technical solutions.

The committee recommends $23.4 million in PE 63712S, an increase of $1.0 million. Department of Defense information technology research and development.

*Department of Defense information technology research and development*

The committee is highly concerned about how defense-wide information technology (IT) systems are managed. In particular, two IT systems are of the committee's concern. The Defense Message System is severely behind schedule, has not met user requirements, and has just projected an additional amount of $5.0 billion over the original cost of $9.0 billion. The other is a command and control system that should already be accessible by all of the military services, but is not, and therefore, the Department of Defense is requesting funding to accomplish that objective. In light of these IT issues, the committee recommends a reduction of $81.4 million for these and other programs.

*Defense science and technology funding*

The budget request contained $10.2 billion for the Department of Defense science and technology program, including all defense-wide and military service funding for basic research, applied research, and advanced development. The request included $1.8 billion for the Army, $1.7 billion for the Navy, $2.2 billion for the Air Force, and $4.5 billion for Defense Agency science and technology [including $2.9 billion for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)]. The committee recommends $10.9 billion for the Department of Defense science and technology program, an increase of $661.9 million to the budget request. The committee's recommendation includes $2.0 billion for the Army (an increase of $241.5 million), $1.8 billion for the Navy (an increase of $79.4 million), $2.3 billion for the Air Force (an increase of $114.4 million), and $4.7 billion for Defense Agency science and technology, an increase of $226.7 million (including $2.9 billion for DARPA, an increase of $226.7 million).

The committee views defense science and technology investment as critical to maintaining U.S. military technological superiority in the face of growing and changing threats to U.S. national security interests around the world. The committee notes that the budget request at a level of 2.7 percent of the total DOD budget does not meet the goal of 3 percent established by the 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review.

The committee notes that the military departments are responsible for approximately 56 percent of the defense science and technology budget (Army 17 percent, Navy 17 percent, and Air Force 22 percent) and Defense Agencies account for 44 percent, including 29 percent in DARPA. Defense agencies focus on science and technology specific to the particular agency or, in the case of DARPA on national-level problems, operational dominance, and exploitation of high-risk, high-payoff technologies. The military departments' science and technology programs focus on the development and transition of more mature technologies into future weapons sys-

tems that are key to the ability of the military departments to achieve their transformation objectives.

*Advanced concept technology demonstrations and technology transition*

The committee notes that the Department continues to explore innovative and transformational concepts associated with the need to rapidly develop and field new technological capabilities. Advanced concept technology demonstrations are low-to-moderate risk capability demonstration and evaluation programs in which the material developer and a warfighting sponsor jointly explore applications of the technology and the military utility of a proposed capability prior to commitment to a major acquisition program. The committee notes that since the commencement of the program in 1994, a total of 115 unclassified ACTD's have been initiated; forty-five of these were completed as of the end of fiscal year 2002, resulting in 120 distinct products. Of this number, eight entered engineering and manufacturing development; thirty-three transitioned to acquisition; forty-five have integrated with current operational software systems, such as the Global Command and Control System and the Global Combat Support System; and thirty-six hardware-based solutions have previously been or currently are operationally deployed.

The committee also notes and commends the manner in which the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Advanced Systems and Concepts) in coordination with the military services' science and technology executives have, in addition to the ACTD program, integrated a number of innovative programs for the transition of new and innovative technologies across the product and process life cycle of defense weapon and materiel systems.

*Devolvement*

As a part of its realignment of the fiscal year 2004 budget, the Department of Defense devolved responsibility for fifteen RDT&E programs and one procurement program from the Office of the Secretary of Defense to the military departments. Programs totaling $543.0 million were transferred to the military services. The University Research Initiative (URI) was split among the services (Army $72.0 million, Navy $71.0 million, and Air Force $105.0 million). The Army received science and technology programs totaling $115.0 million (URI, Force Health Protection, Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and Explosive Demilitarization Technology); the Navy received programs totaling $73.0 million (URI and In-House Laboratory Independent Research); and the Air Force received programs totaling $355.3 million (URI, High Energy Laser Program, and High Performance Computer Modernization). In the Department's view devolvement will improve efficiency because it will expedite the flow of funds and improve program execution. Transferring the programs will also permit the Office of the Secretary to achieve internal staff and budget goals. The committee notes, however, that the transfer artificially inflates the fiscal year 2004 science and technology budgets of the military departments compared to fiscal year 2003. The committee plans to monitor closely the execution of the fiscal year 2003 budget for the devolved

programs by the military departments and the oversight provided to the devolved programs by the Director, Defense Research and Engineering.

*Navy science and technology program*

The budget request provides $1.7 billion for the Navy's science and technology program, $316.0 million less than last year's appropriated level. The amount is 1.5 percent of the total Department of the Navy budget and only half of the Defense Department's goal that the science and technology program represents three percent of total obligation authority. If funding for the Joint Forces Command experimentation program (which is contained in the Navy's science and technology account) and for the University Research Initiative (transferred from the OSD science and technology account in this year's budget request) is deducted, the Navy's core science and technology program is reduced to $1.48 billion, $460.0 million less than last year's appropriated level, 1.3 percent of the total Department of the Navy budget, and the lowest in total and percentage funding of the military departments. The budget request represents the second straight year of a significant reduction in the Navy's science and technology program. The committee is particularly concerned about this trend and its impact on the availability of new technologies that will ensure the superiority of the future Navy and Marine Corps, and directs the Secretary of the Navy to give particular attention to Department of Defense science and technology funding level goals and objectives for the Navy's science and technology program.

*Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency*

Although the committee is pleased with the overall progress in the defense science and technology program, the committee continues to be disturbed by the continuing growth in the budget of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency in comparison to the science and technology accounts of the military departments. Since the beginning of the decade the DARPA budget has increased over 50 percent ($1.0 billion) to a total of $2.9 billion in the fiscal year 2004 budget request. The rate of increase far exceeds the proportionate increase in the science and technology accounts of the military departments. The committee's concern is directed not at the content of the DARPA program, which is at the core of the technological superiority of U.S. armed forces, but at the disproportionate growth in the DARPA budget. The imbalance that growth represents in the distribution of science and technology funds between the defense-wide science and technology accounts and those of the military departments will undoubtedly affect the ability of the military departments to achieve their transformation goals. To address these concerns the committee continues to encourage the establishment of memoranda of agreement and cooperative programs between DARPA and the military departments in support of service transformation goals

*Facial recognition access control technology*

The budget request contained $60.5 million in PE 63122D8Z for the Combating Terrorism Technology Support program. No funds were requested for the development of facial recognition technology.

The committee notes the surveillance and force protection benefits that would result from the ability to identify an individual in a crowd, who might be a terrorist, by the ability to automatically recognize that individual by comparison of the individual's facial features to data contained in a facial recognition library. The committee notes the progress that has been made in the development of facial recognition technology, but also notes that further work is required in the areas of image quality and automatic recognition performance for the technology to be truly useful.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63122D8Z to continue the program for development of facial recognition technology.

*Integrated nano- and micro-manufacturing technology*

The budget request contained $151.0 million in PE 61101E for Defense Research Sciences.

The committee notes on-going basic research in novel nanotechnologies that, when combined with innovative micromanufacturing materials and processes, could result in the ability to produce microsystems and nanosystems for a broad range of military and civilian applications.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 61101E to continue basic research in integrated nano- and micromanufacturing technology.

*Magnetic Quadrupole Resonance Explosives Detection*

The budget request contained $60.5 million in PE 63122D8Z for the Combating Terrorism Technology Support program.

The committee notes the development, demonstration, and employment of scanning explosives detection systems that use nuclear quadrupole resonance technology to detect the presence of explosives in luggage and mail with a greatly enhanced detection probability and reduced false alarm rate.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63122D8Z to accelerate the development and evaluation of magnetic quadrupole resonance technology for screening personnel and luggage for the presence of explosives and to extend the applications of the technology to the screening of cargo and vehicles.

*Man Portable Air Defense System (MANPADS) Defense Program*

The budget request included $25.0 million for the man portable air defense system defense program in PE 64618D8Z. An authorization request in fiscal year 2005 is projected at more than $500 million in research and development and procurement. No DOD validated scope of work exists for the fiscal year 2004 request and the Department was unable to provide any substantive basis for the fiscal year 2005 projected request.

The committee recommends an authorization of $3.0 million for fiscal year 2004, a decrease of $22.0 million.

*Medical free electron laser*

The budget request contained $9.5 million in PE 62227D8Z for medical free electron laser applied research.

The committee notes that the medical free electron laser program seeks to develop advanced, laser-based applications for military

medicine and related materials research. Because free electron lasers provide unique pulse features and tunable wavelength characteristics that are unavailable in other laser devices, their use broadens the experimental options for the development of new laser-based medical technologies. The program is a merit-based, peer-reviewed, competitively awarded research program, the majority of which is focused on developing advanced procedures for rapid diagnosis and treatment of battlefield related medical problems.

The committee recommends $19.5 million in PE 62227D8Z for medical free electron laser applied research, an increase of $10.0 million.

*Multi-wavelength surface scanning biologics sensor*

The budget request contained $16.7 million in PE 63714D8Z for the advanced sensor applications program.

The committee notes on-going research in the use of multi-wavelength excitation spectral technology for the detection and identification of biologic agents that are not discernible with conventional sensors and understands that successful demonstration of this technology could provide a significant improvement in the scanning and screening of potentially contaminated locations. Congress added $1.0 million in fiscal year 2003 to continue previously funded work on the technology and support evaluation of a laboratory test bed system with a wide range of simulate and target pathogens and environmental backgrounds.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63714D8Z for development of a prototype multi-wavelength surface scanning biologics sensor and evaluate the performance of the prototype under various background conditions.

*National Defense University sponsored research program*

The budget request contained $30.2 million in PE 65104D8Z for Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) technical studies, support, and analysis.

The committee notes that the National Defense University (NDU), supported by funding provided by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, has established a pilot research and analysis program focused on defense policy issues that have a significant technology component. The objective of this program is to examine the links between technology and national security policy by supporting research at civilian institutions of higher learning and by building relationships between these institutions and NDU. In fiscal year 2002, Congress funded a separate, but related pilot program for NDU to develop a pilot program "to find practical ways in which the defense information technology community can gain a mutual understanding of defense needs and industry capabilities and identify opportunities to integrate information technology innovations into the U.S. military strategy. The results of these programs provides national security policy decision makers with analyses necessary to make informed decisions on policy and the implications of technology on national security. The committee notes with pleasure the results of the programs to date.

The committee recommends $32.2 million in PE 65104D8Z, an increase of $2.0 million to continue National Defense University sponsored research and related programs. The committee encour-

ages the Director of Defense Research and Engineering to provide sustained funding for these programs as an integral part of the OSD technical studies, support, and analysis program.

*Nuclear weapons effects*

The budget request contained $183.2 million in PE 62716BR for applied research in weapon of mass destruction defeat technology, including $16.6 million for nuclear phenomenology and nuclear weapons effects.

The committee notes that the budget for nuclear weapons effects applied research has declined dramatically since the early 1990's and the decline in the budget has been accompanied by a decline in the capability for and expertise in analysis of nuclear weapons effects. The current program uses a combination of computer analysis, simulation and protection technology to address key issues regarding the survivability of critical U.S. systems in a potential nuclear environment, including missile defense interceptors, satellite electronics, and warfighting command, control, communications and intelligence (C3I) systems and facilities. The committee believes that the United States' nuclear weapons effects analysis capability needs to be revitalized to address emerging 21st Century threats to U.S. territories and interests, such as the potential for terrorist use of radiological dispersion devices (so called "dirty bombs") or crude nuclear weapons in an urban environment; the potential effect of electromagnetic pulse generated by a nuclear weapon on C3I and other electronic systems; and analysis of requirements for defense of critical assets. The committee understands that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency plan has realigned the limited funding available for nuclear weapons effects applied research in fiscal year 2003 and in the fiscal year 2004 budget request and plans to increase funding in the area in the fiscal year 2005 program objective memorandum.

The committee recommends $193.2 million in PE 62716BR, an increase of $10.0 million for nuclear weapons effects applied research.

*"PackBot" tactical mobile robot*

The budget request contained $13.6 million in PE 64709D8Z for the joint robotics program, but included no funding for the PackBot, Tactical Mobile Robot. The committee is aware that the PackBot robot has proven itself in both by use in disaster and by Army and Special Forces in combat for a variety of purposes. The committee supports further development to refine the PackBot and provide additional sensors based on operational experience, and to rapidly procure 50 PackBots for Army and SOCOM use.

The committee recommends $26.1 million in PE 64709D8Z, an increase of $12.5 million for "PackBot."

*Primate biomedical laboratory test and evaluation capability*

The budget request contained $162.1 million in PE 63884BP for chemical biological defense, including $68.0 million for medical biological defense and $4.8 million for medical chemical defense.

The medical biological and medical chemical defense programs fund advanced component development and prototyping for vaccines, drugs, and diagnostic medical devices that are directed

against biological warfare agents (including bacteria, viruses, and toxins of biological origin) and countermeasures for chemical agents (including life support equipment, diagnostic equipment, pretreatment and therapeutic drugs, and individual/casualty decontamination compounds). Fielding of vaccines, prophylactics and therapeutic drugs requires Food and Drug Administration approval, supported by multiple long term studies of investigational new drugs that require testing in animal models of successively higher orders (culminating in testing in primates), before testing on human subjects can be conducted and the drug approved for use.

The committee notes that there currently exists a national shortage of primate facilities required to develop realistic animal models for biological threat agents, which have the biocontainment level required for testing of vaccines, drugs, and therapeutics against the biological warfare threat that could be encountered on the battlefield and against the biological agents that could be used in a biological terrorism event.

In view of the increased priority given to the Department of Defense's biological defense program and the time required to establish such a facility under conventional military construction procedures, the committee believes that the Department of Defense should establish in the public sector a strategically located primate laboratory test and evaluation facility that could support medical biological countermeasures research and development and other medical research activities by the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute for Infectious Diseases (USAMRID), and also respond to other Federal needs. The committee anticipates that a cooperative research and development agreement would be established between the facility and USAMRID to guide the research activities of the primate biomedical laboratory. The committee also believes that such a facility could also support other Department of Defense medical research missions, in addition to those included in the chemical and biological defense program.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $177.1 million in PE 63884BP, an increase of $15.0 million to establish a secure, high-containment primate biomedical laboratory for support of Department of Defense chemical-biological defense and medical programs.

*Re-defined Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence) role*

The committee is aware that because the Under Secretary of Defense (Intelligence) has been established to manage and oversee intelligence within the Department of Defense, the role of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence) (ASD (C3I)) role is being re-defined.

The committee notes the increasing importance of network centric warfare, and believes that establishing an overarching architecture including space-based, airborne and surface transformational communications is the foundation for future warfare.

The committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense to emphasize responsibilities for creating and maintaining the new infrastructure necessary to transform warfare operations when re-defining the role of ASD (C3I). The committee notes the success of the recent campaign based on time-critical strike and notes that despite recent successes, results of lessons that can be learned

should be included in the transformation communication system architecture.

*Special Operations Advanced Technology Development*

The budget request contained $67.0 million for special operations advanced technology development, but included no funding for the multi-band multi-mission radio and no funding for the special operations medical diagnostic system. The radio, which will be the primary mission radio for special operations forces tactical units, reduces the communications gear requirement for forward operating units by replacing multiple manpack radios. The committee believes that the multi-band multi-mission radio will substantially increase special forces small unit communications capability and should receive continued funding. Similarly, the special operations forces medical diagnostic system shows great promise in quickly diagnosing medical emergencies for deployed troops. The recommended funding will enable the Special Operations Command to further refine the operational requirements for this system.

The committee recommends $78.5 million in PE 1160402BB, an increase of $10.0 million for the multi-band multi-mission radio and an increase of $1.5 million for the medical diagnostic system.

*Support to homeland security*

The budget contained $476.7 million in PE 33140G for the information security systems program (ISSP), but included no funds for support to the Department of Homeland Security.

The committee is aware that according to National Security Policy 42, the National Security Agency (NSA) is the executive agent for information assurance services and products to the federal government. The committee recognizes that providing a secure infrastructure outside the federal government was not a great concern until the events of September 11, 2001, demonstrated that a secure infrastructure between federal and local officials (first responders-including law enforcement, medical, rescue) is necessary to provide the free exchange of communications to help in preventing future terrorist activities. The committee notes that National Security Agency requires additional personnel and funding to develop an appropriate secure infrastructure for homeland defense.

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence to work with the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide NSA the resources to develop a crypto product line to support homeland security.

*Technology development*

The budget request contained $249.2 million in PE 35191D8Z for technology development for classified projects.

The committee believes that funding is in excess of requirements. Further details are in the classified annex to this report.

The committee recommends $226.7 million in PE 35191D8Z for technology development, a decrease of $22.5 million for technology development.

*Unmanned aerial vehicle acquisition management*

The committee has reviewed the Department of Defense (DOD) unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) roadmap and sees significant

progress since the previous version. However, a recent committee hearing disclosed that within the office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology), the Director, Unmanned Aerial Vehicles has not been given sufficient authority to ensure that the military services comply with the provisions approved UAV roadmap.

The committee believes that having a good UAV roadmap is essential to most effectively fielding complementary, non-redundant, fully jointly interoperable UAV capabilities and that the Secretary of Defense should ensure that only approved UAV systems are acquired.

## OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

### Overview

The budget request contained $286.7 million for Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense.

The committee recommends $286.7 million, no change to the budget request.

**Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element Number | R-1 Line | PROGRAM TITLE | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE** | | | | | |
| 0603941D8Z | 1 | Test & Evaluation Science & Technology | 12,804 | | | | 12,804 |
| 0604940D8Z | 2 | Central Test and Evaluation Investment Development (CTEIP) | 123,215 | | | | 123,215 |
| 0605118D8Z | 3 | Operational Test and Evaluation | 37,323 | | | | 37,323 |
| 0605131D8Z | 4 | Live Fire Testing | 10,074 | | | | 10,074 |
| 0605804D8Z | 5 | Development Test and Evaluation | 103,245 | | | | 103,245 |
| | | **TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE** | **286,661** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **286,661** |

# LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

### Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would establish the amounts authorized to be appropriated for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2004.

### Section 202—Amount for Defense Science and Technology

This section would establish the amounts authorized to be appropriated for Defense Science and Technology, including basic research, applied research, and advanced technology development for fiscal year 2004.

## SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

### Section 211—Collaborative Program for Development of Electromagnetic Gun Technology

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish and carry out a collaborative program among the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency for evaluation and demonstration of advanced technologies and concepts for advanced gun systems that use electromagnetic propulsion for direct and indirect fire applications.

For the past 20 years, the Department of Defense (principally the Army) has been conducting research and developing technology for the use of electromagnetic propulsion in advanced gun systems that would capitalize on the significantly higher velocity, longer range, greater lethality, and reduced ammunition weight and volume that would be achievable with such guns compared to those that use conventional explosive charges. Once proven, electromagnetic guns (EMG) could provide multi-role, survivable weapon systems capable of growing to meet a range of future threats in line-of-sight (direct fire) and non-line-of-sight and beyond-line-of-sight (indirect fire) applications. Recently, the Navy has also developed linear electric motor (rail gun) technologies for advanced catapult systems for new aircraft carriers.

The committee is aware of Army interest in developing EMG technology for the Future Combat System, in the Marine Corps for using EMG technology to increase the lethality of its legacy M1A1 120mm gun tank, and in the Navy for very long-range ship-to-shore fire support from an EMG on an all-electric ship.

The committee notes the results of a recent independent review team's technical assessment on the Army's EMG program which concluded that the major Army investment in electromagnetic launchers, projectiles, pulsed power supplies, and other EMG technologies are showing significant and noteworthy progress. Much of the enabling technology has reached a technology maturity or readiness level (TRL) of 3 to 4 (A TRL of 6 is the maturity level generally regarded as necessary for initiation of a system development program that should result in a successful acquisition program.)

The assessment team concluded that continued work is needed to mature EMG technology and to establish the viability of EMG technology for potential military applications, including ground combat vehicle main armament, air defense, long-range ship-to-shore fire support, and precision air-to-ground standoff weapons. The team recommended stable program funding and a continuing research and development program that would support initiation of a full-scale advanced technology demonstration in the fiscal year 2006 time-frame, leading to a Milestone B acquisition decision in fiscal year 2011.

The committee further notes that the justification books submitted with the budget request indicate a Department of the Army investment in its EMG program of $127.9 million through fiscal year 2009 and a Department of the Navy investment of $ $85.6 million. The Army's fiscal year 2004 budget includes $31.0 million for EMG technology research and development. No funds were requested for the Navy's program in fiscal year 2004. Elsewhere in this report, the committee has recommended an increase of $7.6 million for the Navy program and an increase of $2.1 million in the Army program.

In view of the interest of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps in the development and application of EMG technology, the committee believes that a collaborative program should be established among the military departments and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency for the development of common enabling technologies and their exploitation to meet service operational requirements. The committee believes that such a program should build upon military service and agency strengths with DARPA taking on those high risk/high payoff technologies such as advanced projectiles and projectile guidance and control and each military department taking the lead in those areas for which they have the most experience and/or expertise. The committee also believes that industry could and should play a significant role in the program. The committee expects that each military department would define and execute its own focused maturation and demonstration program, incorporating the products of the most promising common technology maturation efforts.

Section 212—Authority to Select Civilian Employees of Department of Defense as Director of Department of Defense Test Resource Management Center

This section would amend section 196(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code (section 231 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, Public Law 107–314) to provide that, in addition to a commissioned officer of the armed forces serving on active duty, the Secretary of Defense may also consider for possible selection as Director of the Department of Defense Test Resource Center a senior civilian official or employees of the Department of Defense who have substantial experience in the field of test and evaluation. The committee believes that limiting the selection of the Director to active duty commissioned officers is unduly restrictive and does not make use of the test and evaluation experience that is also available among the Department's senior civilian officials or employees.

Section 213—Joint Tactical Radio System

This section would establish an independent joint tactical radio system (JTRS) joint program office (JPO) under rotating military service leadership. It would also centralize program funding and place all JTRS cluster development under JPO control. In addition, the JPO would ensure a joint JTRS concept of operations.

Section 214—Future Combat Systems

This section would require the budget request for projects within the Armored Systems Modernization Program within the Department of the Army to be displayed in separate program elements. Further, this section would preclude authorization of appropriations until the Secretary of Defense provides to the congressional defense committees more detailed justification for the $1.7 billion program.

Section 215—Army Program to Pursue Technologies Leading to the Enhanced Production of Titanium by the United States

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to assess promising technologies leading to the enhanced production of titanium by the United States and select on a competitive basis the most viable technologies. The Secretary of the Army would be required to serve as the executive agent in this effort.

The budget request contained $39.5 million for weapons and munitions technologies in PE 62624A for improved weapon and munitions technologies to enable combat superiority for the objective force, but no funds were included to enhance U.S. industrial capabilities to produce low cost titanium alloys.

The titanium extraction mining and process engineering research (TEMPER) initiative is intended to enhance U.S. industrial capabilities for the efficient production of inexpensive titanium for systems designed as part of the Army's Objective Force.

The committee is aware that light weight materials used to increase survivability and reduce system weight are expensive to produce. The committee notes that new production methods have become available within industry and recommends that the Secretary of Defense develop an integrated plan to improve related technologies in a centralized manner.

The committee recommends $47.5 million in PE 62624A, an increase of $8.0 million for the Secretary of the Army to lead an effort to assess and select the most viable methods to produce titanium through the TEMPER initiative.

Section 216—Extension of Reporting Requirement for RAH–66 Comanche Aircraft Program

This section would extend the requirement for the Secretary of the Army to provide a quarterly report through fiscal year 2004 to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives regarding the progress of the restructured RAH–66 Comanche aircraft program.

Section 217—Future Fleet Architecture Studies

Although total Navy capability is increasingly a product of sensors and networking technology rather than individual platforms, the Navy at its most fundamental level, will continue to be built around ships of various kinds and sizes, along with its supporting aircraft. For example, the Navy force structure set forth in the 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review can be defined as one built around 12 large-deck aircraft carriers of approximately 100,000 tons displacement each, 116 major surface combatants displacing 4,000 to 9,500 tons each, 55 nuclear-powered attack submarines and 36 amphibious support ships organized into 12 amphibious ready groups with a combined lift capability of 2.5 Marine Expeditionary Brigades. Together with associated mine warfare, combat logistics and support ships, this force structure would total about 310 ships. Additionally, this force structure includes 11 carrier air wings, additional surface-combatant-based helicopters, and land-based maritime patrol aircraft.

This basic combination of ships and aircraft represents the Navy's platform architecture. Given the long lead times needed to design and build ships and aircraft, their long operational life cycles, and the relatively low annual rates (relative to the existing inventory) at which new ships and aircraft can be procured, the Navy's overall platform architecture tends to evolve gradually over time.

The committee is concerned that the Navy's current vision of its future platform architecture may be, to a great extent, determined by inertia and momentum. As an example, the committee understands that the decision on establishment of the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program was made prior to an analysis of alternatives for the mission. The committee believes that new technologies and operational concepts, including network-centric operations, and emerging threats, including asymmetric threats, could result in a Navy platform architecture that is significantly different than envisioned today. The committee is also concerned that the Navy, while considering emerging threats, evolving technologies, and new operational concepts, in determining its future platform architecture, may be too tradition-bound and thereby limit the opportunities available to leverage technologies and operational concepts.

While the fiscal year 2004 future years defense plan assumes operational concepts and associated hardware that represent departures in some respects from today's architecture, the committee is concerned that in other respects, the Navy's current planning for the future may be excessively bounded by the features of its current platform architecture. The committee is also concerned that, as a result, the Navy's future overall platform architecture may turn out in many respects to be too much of a linear descendent of today's architecture. While such a fleet would no doubt be more capable than today's fleet, it may not be the most capable fleet that could be produced for a given level of resources, or the most appropriate fleet for addressing tomorrow's threats.

Numerous proposals have been put forth in recent years, including sea-based platforms of sizes and kinds that are significantly different from those that make up today's overall fleet platform architecture. These include, to name only a few examples, small sur-

face combatants and aircraft carriers; UAV/UCAV carriers; high speed surface combatants and amphibious ships; ships that combine the features of today's surface combatants and amphibious ships; and mobile sea bases based on oil platform technology. Proposals like these, if pursued, could lead to a wide variety of potential future overall fleet platform architectures. The committee is concerned that the Navy has not sufficiently explored the universe of possibilities for what this architecture might look like, and thus cannot speak to Congress about them in sufficient detail. The committee is also concerned that no one entity, either inside or outside the Navy, is necessarily best positioned to know which alternative architecture might be the most promising, and that the understanding of the issue would benefit from a variety of informed views.

Accordingly, the committee has recommended a provision (section 215) directing the Secretary of Defense to commission a collection of eight independent studies on future overall fleet platform architectures. Each study would be funded at a cost of up to $200,000, and be completed in both classified and unclassified versions, as required.

Four of the studies would be performed by qualified analytical organizations external to the Navy, such as the RAND Corporation, the Institute for Defense Analysis, the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, and the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Analysis. One of the studies would be done by an in-house Navy organization, such as the Ship & Force Architecture Concepts program office within the Naval Sea Systems Command. And three of the studies would be done by defense firms or teams of defense firms, so as to take advantage of the knowledge and creativity in the private sector.

The study efforts shall be "fire walled" from one another to ensure eight independent analyses. In performing the studies, participants would take into account the National Security Strategy of the United States, potential future threats to the United States and to U.S. Naval forces, the traditional roles and missions of the U.S. Naval forces, alternative roles and missions, and the role of evolving technology on future naval forces. Participants, while cognizant of today's overall fleet platform architecture, would not let the current features of the architecture constrain in any way their analysis. The goal is to achieve a "clean sheet" vision of potential platform architectures for the future—to provide possible answers to the question: What would the ideal Navy of the future look like in terms of overall fleet platform architecture if we didn't have to bound our thinking by the features of today's architecture?

Each of the eight studies would present one or two possible overall platform architectures, which shall be described in terms of the numbers, kinds, and sizes of ships involved, numbers and types of associated manned and unmanned platforms, and the basic capabilities of these ships and platforms. The studies shall also include other top-level information needed to understand the architecture in basic form, and the analysis that led to the architecture.

### SUBTITLE C—BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

#### Section 221—Ballistic Missile Defense System

This section would amend subsection (a) of section 223 of title 10, United States Code to allow the President flexibility in designating program elements for the Missile Defense Agency. The section would make conforming changes, including those to related reporting requirements, and other technical amendments.

## TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

### READINESS OVERVIEW

The fiscal year 2004 budget request for operation and maintenance of $117.0 billion represents an overall increase across the Department of Defense of $1.4 billion (1.3 percent) over spending levels authorized and appropriated for fiscal year 2003. Of the $117.0 billion request, $3.4 billion is attributable to price increases for general and fuel inflation, civilian pay raises, depot maintenance rates, contracts, and working capital fund activities to name only a few. In short, these price increases directly relate to maintaining the same level of effort from fiscal year 2003. The committee is concerned that these price increases, some as high as 18 percent, are eroding the ability of the services to fund their core readiness programs. The budget request lists a total of $1.9 billion in program reductions from fiscal year 2003. Accordingly, while the increase in funding for readiness accounts is $1.4 billion, that increase does not compensate the price growth. In fact, some important readiness programs have had programmatic reductions just to fund these pricing increases. In summary, the overall level of funding for operation and maintenance in the budget, existing operational tempo, and the chiefs of the military departments' unfunded requirements for fiscal year 2004, indicates that the services' readiness will be adversely affected as they attempt to reconstitute the force following recent contingencies.

The Department's budget request is a peacetime budget that takes substantial risk in the operation and maintenance arena. This risk will become most evident as military forces returning from wartime operations are faced with significant challenges in Navy shipyard capacity, Army spare parts availability, and Air Force and Marine Corps depot funding limitations. In this budget important areas including facility sustainment, renovation and modernization, depot maintenance programs, and repair parts continue to be funded at levels that will make it difficult to sustain readiness in the services in the short and long term. Also, in hearings held this year to review the state of military readiness, testimony was received that strongly suggests that the aging weapons systems across the services and the funding necessary to sustain these systems has not been fully recognized in recent budget requests. Frequent and lengthy deployments associated with the current operational tempo have exacerbated the impact of under-funding on readiness for over a decade. The likelihood of future continued deployment requirements, coupled with large post-war ship and aircraft maintenance workload, portends greater readiness risk

than the Department has acknowledged or accommodated in the fiscal year 2004 budget request.

As an example of this risk, the Department's budget request for the Army places execution of the tank miles goal in jeopardy due to under-funding for consumable repair parts by $156 million. Also, Army aviation is unable to execute 14.5 hours per crew, per month due to grounded aircraft and spare parts shortages. More broadly, the Army's management and funding of spare parts is an example of a decade of neglect that has created an urgent requirement to replenish these stocks. A more prudent approach toward resolving the parts shortages would be a long-term, disciplined approach that includes routinely adequate funding, rather than a $1.5 billion, two-year remedy. The committee notes the Army's current effort to address the repair parts shortage but cautions that consistent funding, rather than precipitous funding changes and poorly implemented policy changes, are more likely to produce the desired return on investment.

The budget request for the Navy is lower than the Navy's own required estimate by nearly $1.0 billion. In the first quarter of fiscal year 2003 the Navy exceeded its 54.0 steaming days per quarter funding level by nearly 10 days. By the end of the current year that average is expected to climb even further due to the midyear deployment of 207 of the Navy's 306 ships. This level of operational tempo adds to the maintenance challenges associated with many depot availability deferments. The Navy also faces readiness challenges due to the length and frequency of deployments, the modest size of the 306 ship fleet relative to global security requirements, the age of many of its aircraft, and the disruption of the planned maintenance schedule for ships and aircraft. The surge in operations in fiscal year 2003 can be expected to generate a large post-surge ship and aircraft workload. Despite this fact, however, the Navy has reduced its shipyard depot maintenance accounts by $600.0 million in fiscal 2004 while increasing funding for the Navy flying hour program by only $115.0 million over fiscal year 2003 levels, principally for spare parts rather than flying hours. Clearly, the Navy has under-resourced its actual requirements in view of current and projected operational tempo.

Over the last decade, readiness rates for Air Force major combat units have dropped from an average of 91 percent to a low of 65 percent. While readiness rates have since climbed to an average of 70 percent, the committee heard testimony that increased spare parts funding, fleet modernization and process improvements were necessary to achieve even this modest improvement. Although the achievement of more appropriate readiness rates will take even higher levels of resources, the Air Force has significantly under-funded depot maintenance accounts, and has identified $516.0 million for its depots as its number one unfunded requirement.

The Marine Corps' budget request for fiscal year 2004 would fund only 67 percent of depot maintenance requirements. Even a critical requirement such as initial issue equipment has been identified by the Marine Corps as a high priority unfunded requirement.

Adequate resourcing of the Department's training infrastructure continues to lag behind requirements in the fiscal year 2004 budget request. While the results of such under-funding may not become

fully apparent for some time, the erosion of infrastructure undermines the quality of training and degrades mission performance and readiness. The Department's $179.9 million investment the Joint National Training Center and training transformation may provide innovative training opportunities, including more joint inter-service training, and address some infrastructure and instrumentation limitations by leveraging training resources. However, existing training facilities across the Department are not adequately resourced in this budget request.

A final area of note continues to be encroachment of training areas and ranges of the Department caused by environmental restrictions. While the Department has sought to work within the existing restrictions, there is a steady detriment in the quality and realism of many training activities. In some cases, training activities are curtailed, rescheduled or cancelled due to environmental issues, with considerable fiscal and readiness impacts. The Department and the services have done much to bring attention to the scope of the problem. The committee will continue to examine encroachment concerns and will make further adjustments to provide the Department and the services relief, as warranted.

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Department of the Army** | | | | | |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY | 24,965,342 | 85,245 | 489,750 | (404,505) | 25,050,587 |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE | 1,952,009 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 0 | 1,954,009 |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD | 4,211,331 | (17,000) | 23,000 | (40,000) | 4,194,331 |
| **Total Department of the Army** | **31,128,682** | **70,245** | **514,750** | **(444,505)** | **31,198,927** |
| **Department of the Navy** | | | | | |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY | 28,287,690 | (385,900) | 249,500 | (635,400) | 27,901,790 |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS | 3,406,656 | 111,100 | 111,100 | 0 | 3,517,756 |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE | 1,171,921 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,171,921 |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE | 173,952 | 25,500 | 25,500 | 0 | 199,452 |
| PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total Department of the Navy** | **33,040,219** | **(249,300)** | **386,100** | **(635,400)** | **32,790,919** |
| **Department of the Air Force** | | | | | |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE | 27,793,931 | (2,359,471) | 419,666 | (2,779,137) | 25,434,460 |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE | 2,179,188 | (9,000) | 0 | (9,000) | 2,170,188 |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD | 4,402,646 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 0 | 4,404,646 |
| **Total Department of the Air Force** | **34,375,765** | **(2,366,471)** | **421,666** | **(2,788,137)** | **32,009,294** |
| **Defense-Wide** | | | | | |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE | **16,570,847** | **(436,800)** | **57,300** | **(494,100)** | **16,134,047** |
| **Transfer Accounts and Miscellaneous** | | | | | |
| TRANSFER ACCOUNTS | 1,323,178 | 50,000 | 100,000 | (50,000) | 1,373,178 |
| MISCELLANEOUS | 520,133 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 520,133 |
| **Total Miscellaneous** | **1,843,311** | **50,000** | **100,000** | **(50,000)** | **1,893,311** |
| **TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:** | **116,958,824** | **(2,932,326)** | **1,479,816** | **(4,412,142)** | **114,026,498** |

## OTHER PROGRAMS AND REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **OTHER PROGRAMS (Formerly in the O&M Title)** | | | | | |
| Defense Health Program, O&M | 14,876,887 | 46,554 | 53,150 | (6,596) | 14,923,441 |
| Restore Assumed Savings | | 45,000 | 45,000 | | |
| Marshall Island Diabetes Program | | 2,000 | 2,000 | | |
| Army Choices Program | | 150 | 150 | | |
| Accelerate Active Duty Chiropratic Care Program | | 6,000 | 6,000 | | |
| South West Asia Contingency Operations | | (6,596) | | (6,596) | |
| Defense Health Program, R&D | 65,796 | 0 | | | 65,796 |
| Defense Health Program, Procurement | 327,826 | 0 | | | 327,826 |
| **Subtotal Defense Health Program** | **15,270,509** | **46,554** | **53,150** | **(6,596)** | **15,317,063** |
| Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, O&M | 1,199,168 | 50,000 | 50,000 | | 1,249,168 |
| Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, RDTE | 251,881 | 0 | | | 251,881 |
| Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Construction | 119,815 | (119,815) | | (119,815) | 0 |
| Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Procurement | 79,212 | 0 | | | 79,212 |
| **Subtotal Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction** | **1,650,076** | (69,815) | 50,000 | (119,815) | **1,580,261** |
| Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities | 817,371 | 0 | | | 817,371 |
| Office of the Inspector General | 162,449 | 0 | | | 162,449 |
| **Total Other Programs** | **17,900,405** | **(23,261)** | **103,150** | **(126,411)** | **17,877,144** |
| **Revolving and Management Funds** | | | | | |
| Defense Working Capital Funds | 632,261 | 0 | | | 632,261 |
| Defense Working Capital Funds - DeCA | 1,089,246 | 0 | | | 1,089,246 |
| National Defense Sealift Fund | 1,062,762 | 40,000 | 40,000 | | 1,102,762 |
| Armed Forces Retirement Home | 65,279 | 0 | | | 65,279 |
| Other | 45,000 | (45,000) | | (45,000) | 0 |
| **Total** | **2,894,548** | **(5,000)** | **40,000** | **(45,000)** | **2,889,548** |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Operation and Maintenance, Army** | | | | | |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| **LAND FORCES** | **3,915,023** | **256,800** | **327,250** | **(70,450)** | **4,171,823** |
| DIVISIONS | 1,506,922 | 323,250 | | | 1,830,172 |
| Consumable Parts | | | 90,000 | | |
| Hydration on the Move (Camelbak) | | | 2,000 | | |
| Depot Maintenance | | | 231,250 | | |
| CORPS COMBAT FORCES | 478,563 | | | | 478,563 |
| CORPS SUPPORT FORCES | 383,755 | | | | 383,755 |
| ECHELON ABOVE CORPS SUPPORT FORCES | 467,026 | | | | 467,026 |
| LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,078,757 | (66,450) | | | 1,012,307 |
| Fuel Reduction | | | | (20,450) | |
| Working Capital Fund Cash Reduction | | | | (50,000) | |
| Controlled Humidity Preservation (CHP) Program | | | 4,000 | | |
| **LAND FORCES READINESS** | **3,065,299** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **3,065,299** |
| FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,568,900 | | | | 1,568,900 |
| LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 488,918 | | | | 488,918 |
| LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 1,007,481 | | | | 1,007,481 |
| **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | **5,636,789** | **(200,400)** | **0** | **(200,400)** | **5,436,389** |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 2,651,539 | | | | 2,651,539 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 1,094,309 | | | | 1,094,309 |
| MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS | 243,033 | | | | 243,033 |
| UNIFIED COMMANDS | 85,115 | | | | 85,115 |
| MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES | 1,562,793 | (200,400) | | | 1,362,393 |
| Contingency Operations, Southwest Asia | | | | (200,400) | |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TOTAL, BA 01:OPERATING FORCES** | **12,617,111** | **56,400** | **327,250** | **(270,850)** | **12,673,511** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION** | | | | | |
| **MOBILITY OPERATIONS** | **538,846** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **538,846** |
| STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION | 378,432 | | | | 378,432 |
| ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS | 145,728 | | | | 145,728 |
| INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 7,753 | | | | 7,753 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 6,933 | | | | 6,933 |
| **TOTAL, BA 02:MOBILIZATION** | **538,846** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **538,846** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | | | |
| **ACCESSION TRAINING** | **507,406** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **507,406** |
| OFFICER ACQUISITION | 89,853 | | | | 89,853 |
| RECRUIT TRAINING | 22,977 | | | | 22,977 |
| ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING | 39,106 | | | | 39,106 |
| SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS | 214,264 | | | | 214,264 |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 80,110 | | | | 80,110 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 61,096 | | | | 61,096 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING** | **2,638,407** | **154,500** | **154,500** | **0** | **2,792,907** |
| SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 306,272 | 6,500 | | | 312,772 |
| U.S. Army Engineer School | | | 4,000 | | |
| Army Defense Language Institute | | | 2,500 | | |
| FLIGHT TRAINING | 499,040 | 148,000 | | | 647,040 |
| Flight School XXI | | | 148,000 | | |
| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 142,038 | | | | 142,038 |
| TRAINING SUPPORT | 478,903 | | | | 478,903 |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 819,604 | | | | 819,604 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 392,550 | | | | 392,550 |
| **RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING** | **1,238,822** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **1,238,822** |
| RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 468,035 | | | | 468,035 |
| EXAMINING | 83,269 | | | | 83,269 |
| OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 226,011 | | | | 226,011 |
| CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 92,536 | | | | 92,536 |
| JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS | 129,978 | | | | 129,978 |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 238,993 | | | | 238,993 |
| **TOTAL, BA 03:TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **4,384,635** | **154,500** | **154,500** | **0** | **4,539,135** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| **SECURITY PROGRAMS** | **591,622** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **591,622** |
| SECURITY PROGRAMS | 591,622 | | | | 591,622 |
| **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS** | **2,542,275** | **4,000** | **4,000** | **0** | **2,546,275** |
| SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 661,551 | 4,000 | | | 665,551 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Military Vehicle Tires | | | 2,000 | | |
| Military Vehicle Batteries | | | 2,000 | | |
| CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES | 491,835 | | | | 491,835 |
| LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 1,058,760 | | | | 1,058,760 |
| AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT | 330,129 | | | | 330,129 |
| **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | **4,024,999** | **(61,655)** | **4,000** | **(65,655)** | **3,963,344** |
| ADMINISTRATION | 664,135 | 3,000 | | | 667,135 |
| Red Cross Notification Grant | | | 3,000 | | |
| SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 623,102 | | | | 623,102 |
| MANPOWER MANAGEMENT | 210,202 | | | | 210,202 |
| OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 198,716 | 1,000 | | | 199,716 |
| Center for Military History - Vietnam Historical Perspectives | | | 1,000 | | |
| OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT | 707,558 | | | | 707,558 |
| ARMY CLAIMS | 116,691 | | | | 116,691 |
| REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT | 50,173 | | | | 50,173 |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,194,134 | | | | 1,194,134 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 260,288 | | | | 260,288 |
| COMMISSARY OPERATIONS | 0 | | | | 0 |
| Other Support Services | | (7,119) | | (7,119) | (7,119) |
| Administration | | (7,936) | | (7,936) | (7,936) |
| Civilian Personnel Underexecution | | (26,600) | | (26,600) | (26,600) |
| Army Knowledge Management | | (24,000) | | (24,000) | (24,000) |
| **SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS** | **265,854** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **265,854** |
| INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS | 207,125 | | | | 207,125 |
| MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS | 58,729 | | | | 58,729 |
| EXPANSION OF NATO | 0 | | | | 0 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Information Technology Reduction | | (68,000) | | (68,000) | (68,000) |
| **TOTAL, BA 04:ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **7,424,750** | **(125,655)** | **8,000** | **(133,655)** | **7,299,095** |
| **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army** | **24,965,342** | **85,245** | **489,750** | **(404,505)** | **25,050,587** |
| **Operation and Maintenance, Navy** | | | | | |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| **AIR OPERATIONS** | **5,498,214** | **(32,300)** | **172,500** | **(204,800)** | **5,465,914** |
| MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 3,262,507 | 172,500 | | | 3,435,007 |
| Flight Operations | | | 172,500 | | |
| FLEET AIR TRAINING | 1,025,326 | | | | 1,025,326 |
| INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | 73,961 | | | | 73,961 |
| AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT | 105,559 | | | | 105,559 |
| AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 980,136 | | | | 980,136 |
| AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 50,725 | | | | 50,725 |
| Fuel | | (122,700) | | (122,700) | (122,700) |
| Contingency Operations, Southwest Asia | | (76,100) | | (76,100) | (76,100) |
| NMCI | | (6,000) | | (6,000) | (6,000) |
| **SHIP OPERATIONS** | **7,755,262** | **30,000** | **76,000** | **(46,000)** | **7,785,262** |
| MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 2,485,605 | | | | 2,485,605 |
| SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING | 614,525 | | | | 614,525 |
| INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE /1 | 0 | | | | 0 |
| SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE /1 | 3,567,545 | 76,000 | | | 3,643,545 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Depot Maintenance - LHA midlife and AOE-1 sustainment | | | 76,000 | | |
| SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,087,587 | | | | 1,087,587 |
| NMCI | | (46,000) | | (46,000) | (46,000) |
| **COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT** | **2,071,893** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **2,071,893** |
| COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 377,493 | | | | 377,493 |
| ELECTRONIC WARFARE | 15,574 | | | | 15,574 |
| SPACE SYSTEMS & SURVEILLANCE | 125,107 | | | | 125,107 |
| WARFARE TACTICS | 235,237 | | | | 235,237 |
| OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY & OCEANOGRAPHY | 257,475 | | | | 257,475 |
| COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 892,241 | | | | 892,241 |
| EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 166,033 | | | | 166,033 |
| DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 2,733 | | | | 2,733 |
| **WEAPONS SUPPORT** | **1,468,031** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **1,468,031** |
| CRUISE MISSILE | 151,456 | | | | 151,456 |
| FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE | 806,058 | | | | 806,058 |
| IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 44,092 | | | | 44,092 |
| WEAPONS MAINTENANCE | 466,425 | | | | 466,425 |
| | | | | | 0 |
| **WORKING CAPITAL FUND SUPPORT** | **(447,755)** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **(447,755)** |
| NWCF SUPPORT /2 | (447,755) | | | | (447,755) |
| **BASE SUPPORT** | **3,689,057** | **(25,000)** | **0** | **(25,000)** | **3,664,057** |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 1,079,723 | | | | 1,079,723 |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 2,609,334 | | | | 2,609,334 |
| NMCI | | (25,000) | | (25,000) | (25,000) |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TOTAL, BA 01:OPERATING FORCES** | **20,034,702** | **(27,300)** | **248,500** | **(275,800)** | **20,007,402** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION** | | | | | |
| **READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES** | **506,690** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **506,690** |
| SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE | 506,690 | | | | 506,690 |
| **ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS** | **175,344** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **175,344** |
| AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS | 8,217 | | | | 8,217 |
| SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS | 167,127 | | | | 167,127 |
| **MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS** | **45,200** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **45,200** |
| FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM | 25,361 | | | | 25,361 |
| INDUSTRIAL READINESS | 1,702 | | | | 1,702 |
| COAST GUARD SUPPORT | 18,137 | | | | 18,137 |
| **TOTAL, BA 02:MOBILIZATION** | **727,234** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **727,234** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | | | |
| **ACCESSION TRAINING** | **216,503** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **216,503** |
| OFFICER ACQUISITION | 116,022 | | | | 116,022 |
| RECRUIT TRAINING | 8,693 | | | | 8,693 |
| RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS | 91,788 | | | | 91,788 |
| **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | **1,218,965** | **(15,000)** | **0** | **(15,000)** | **1,203,965** |
| SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 363,006 | | | | 363,006 |
| FLIGHT TRAINING | 441,982 | | | | 441,982 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 113,134 | | | | 113,134 |
| TRAINING SUPPORT | 300,843 | (15,000) | | (15,000) | 285,843 |
| **RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION** | **461,353** | **1,000** | **1,000** | **0** | **462,353** |
| RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 251,507 | 1,000 | | | 252,507 |
| Naval Sea Cadets Corps | | | 1,000 | | |
| OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 98,885 | | | | 98,885 |
| CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 70,628 | | | | 70,628 |
| JUNIOR ROTC | 40,333 | | | | 40,333 |
| **BASE SUPPORT** | **575,370** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **575,370** |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 201,993 | | | | 201,993 |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 373,377 | | | | 373,377 |
| **TOTAL, BA 03:TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **2,472,191** | **(14,000)** | **1,000** | **(15,000)** | **2,458,191** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | **1,873,323** | **(127,600)** | **0** | **(127,600)** | **1,745,723** |
| ADMINISTRATION | 698,422 | (10,000) | | (10,000) | 688,422 |
| EXTERNAL RELATIONS | 4,026 | | | | 4,026 |
| CIVILIAN MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT | 104,963 | | | | 104,963 |
| MILITARY MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT | 221,170 | (41,600) | | | 179,570 |
| Navy Personnel, Navy Military Personnel System | | | | (4,300) | |
| Navy Reserve Integrated Management | | | | (2,300) | |
| Navy Military Personnel Distribution System | | | | (5,000) | |
| Other Navy Military Manpower/Personnel | | | | (30,000) | |
| OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 212,060 | | | | 212,060 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 632,682 | | | | 632,682 |
| MEDICAL ACTIVITIES | 0 | | | | 0 |
| NMCI | | (76,000) | | (76,000) | (76,000) |
| **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT** | **2,016,737** | **(17,000)** | **0** | **(17,000)** | **1,999,737** |
| SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 193,045 | | | | 193,045 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS | 0 | | | | 0 |
| PLANNING, ENGINEERING & DESIGN | 301,365 | (10,000) | | (10,000) | 291,365 |
| ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | 905,432 | | | | 905,432 |
| AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 447,639 | | | | 447,639 |
| HULL, MECHANICAL & ELECTRICAL SUPPORT | 62,927 | | | | 62,927 |
| COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS | 40,093 | | | | 40,093 |
| SPACE & ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS | 66,236 | | | | 66,236 |
| COMMISSARY OPERATIONS | 0 | | | | 0 |
| NMCI | | (7,000) | | (7,000) | (7,000) |
| **SECURITY PROGRAMS** | **801,509** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **801,509** |
| SECURITY PROGRAMS | 801,509 | | | | 801,509 |
| **SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS** | **10,542** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **10,542** |
| INTERNATIONAL HDQTRS & AGENCIES | 10,542 | | | | 10,542 |
| **BASE SUPPORT** | **351,452** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **351,452** |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 98,108 | | | | 98,108 |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 253,344 | | | | 253,344 |
| **CANCELLED ACCOUNTS** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** |
| CANCELLED ACCOUNT | 0 | | | | 0 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **PROBLEM DISBURSEMENTS** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PROBLEM DISBURSEMENTS | 0 | | | | 0 |
| JUDGEMENT FUND | 0 | | | | 0 |
| Information Technology Reduction | | (200,000) | | (200,000) | (200,000) |
| **TOTAL, BA 04:ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **5,053,563** | **(344,600)** | **0** | **(344,600)** | **4,708,963** |
| **Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy** | **28,287,690** | **(385,900)** | **249,500** | **(635,400)** | **27,901,790** |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps** | | | | | |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| **EXPEDITIONARY FORCES** | 2,421,141 | 111,100 | 111,100 | 0 | 2,532,241 |
| OPERATIONAL FORCES | 588,653 | 24,200 | | | 612,853 |
| Hydration on the Move (Camelbak) | | | 2,000 | | |
| Deployable Virtual Training Environment | | | 2,500 | | |
| Individual First Aid Kit | | | 6,200 | | |
| U.S. Joint Maritime BEQ Facility | | | 600 | | |
| Restrictive Use Easements | | | 5,800 | | |
| Mairne Air Command and Control Sustainment | | | 1,100 | | |
| Corrosion Control and Coating Program | | | 6,000 | | |
| FIELD LOGISTICS | 320,108 | | | | 320,108 |
| DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 101,439 | 86,900 | | | 188,339 |
| Depot Maintenance | | | 35,900 | | |
| Initial Issue | | | 51,000 | | |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 912,934 | | | | 912,934 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 498,007 | | | | 498,007 |
| **USMC PREPOSITIONING** | 81,031 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81,031 |
| MARITIME PREPOSITIONING | 76,996 | | | | 76,996 |
| NORWAY PREPOSITIONING | 4,035 | | | | 4,035 |
| **TOTAL, BA 01:OPERATING FORCES** | **2,502,172** | **111,100** | **111,100** | **0** | **2,613,272** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | | | |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ACCESSION TRAINING** | 10,590 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,590 |
| RECRUIT TRAINING | 10,242 | | | | 10,242 |
| OFFICER ACQUISITION | 348 | | | | 348 |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 0 | | | | 0 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 0 | | | | 0 |
| **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | 173,555 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173,555 |
| SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING | 41,514 | | | | 41,514 |
| FLIGHT TRAINING | 171 | | | | 171 |
| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 8,863 | | | | 8,863 |
| TRAINING SUPPORT | 123,007 | | | | 123,007 |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 0 | | | | 0 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 0 | | | | 0 |
| **RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION** | 163,973 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163,973 |
| RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 115,167 | | | | 115,167 |
| OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 35,606 | | | | 35,606 |
| JUNIOR ROTC | 13,200 | | | | 13,200 |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 0 | | | | 0 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 0 | | | | 0 |
| **BASE SUPPORT** | 229,144 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 229,144 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 78,073 | | | | 78,073 |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 151,071 | | | | 151,071 |
| **TOTAL, BA 03:TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **577,262** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **577,262** |

**BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES**

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | 327,222 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 327,222 |
| SPECIAL SUPPORT | 229,485 | | | | 229,485 |
| SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 35,733 | | | | 35,733 |
| ADMINISTRATION | 39,377 | | | | 39,377 |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 18,991 | | | | 18,991 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 3,636 | | | | 3,636 |
| COMMISSARY OPERATIONS | 0 | | | | 0 |
| **CANCELLED ACCOUNT** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CANCELLED ACCOUNT | 0 | | | | 0 |
| **TOTAL, BA 04:ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **327,222** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **327,222** |
| **Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps** | **3,406,656** | **111,100** | **111,100** | **0** | **3,517,756** |
| **Operation and Maintenance, Air Force** | | | | | |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| **AIR OPERATIONS** | 11,769,514 | (838,834) | 419,666 | (1,258,500) | 10,930,680 |
| PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 3,496,496 | | | | 3,496,496 |
| PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS | 331,972 | | | | 331,972 |
| COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES | 332,062 | | | | 332,062 |
| AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING | 1,243,900 | | | | 1,243,900 |
| DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 1,817,063 | 419,666 | | | 2,236,729 |
| Depot Maintenance Equipment | | | 329,666 | | |
| Depot level reparables (spares) for flying hour program | | | 90,000 | | |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 1,350,589 | | | | 1,350,589 |
| BASE SUPPORT | 2,260,913 | (300,000) | | (300,000) | 1,960,913 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 936,519 | | | | 936,519 |
| Fuel | | (224,950) | | (224,950) | (224,950) |
| Contingency Operations, Southeast Asia | | (707,550) | | (707,550) | (707,550) |
| Working Capital Fund-Cash | | (26,000) | | (26,000) | (26,000) |
| **COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS** | **2,233,718** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **2,233,718** |
| GLOBAL C3I & EARLY WARNING | 976,608 | | | | 976,608 |
| NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT | 187,202 | | | | 187,202 |
| OTHER COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT PROGRAMS | 597,331 | | | | 597,331 |
| JCS EXERCISES | 35,543 | | | | 35,543 |
| MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS | 213,088 | | | | 213,088 |
| TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE AND SPECIAL ACTIVITIES | 223,946 | | | | 223,946 |
| **SPACE OPERATIONS** | **1,647,523** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **1,647,523** |
| LAUNCH FACILITIES | 321,829 | | | | 321,829 |
| LAUNCH VEHICLES | 67,232 | | | | 67,232 |
| SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS | 242,294 | | | | 242,294 |
| SATELLITE SYSTEMS | 57,046 | | | | 57,046 |
| OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS | 243,778 | | | | 243,778 |
| BASE SUPPORT | 566,936 | | | | 566,936 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 148,408 | | | | 148,408 |
| **TOTAL, BA 01:OPERATING FORCES** | **15,650,755** | **(838,834)** | **419,666** | **(1,258,500)** | **14,811,921** |

**BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION**

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **MOBILITY OPERATIONS** | **3,453,330** | **(945,476)** | **0** | **(945,476)** | **2,507,854** |
| AIRLIFT OPERATIONS | 2,167,958 | (945,476) | | | 1,222,482 |
| Working Capital Fund-Transportation | | | | (945,476) | |
| AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I | 36,758 | | | | 36,758 |
| MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS | 172,134 | | | | 172,134 |
| DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 361,521 | | | | 361,521 |
| PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA | 0 | | | | 0 |
| BASE SUPPORT | 514,123 | | | | 514,123 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 200,836 | | | | 200,836 |
| **TOTAL, BA 02:MOBILIZATION** | **3,453,330** | **(945,476)** | **0** | **(945,476)** | **2,507,854** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | | | |
| **ACCESSION TRAINING** | **300,480** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **300,480** |
| OFFICER ACQUISITION | 67,763 | | | | 67,763 |
| RECRUIT TRAINING | 6,112 | | | | 6,112 |
| RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC) | 82,586 | | | | 82,586 |
| BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY) | 68,682 | | | | 68,682 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION (ACADEMIES O | 75,337 | | | | 75,337 |
| **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | **1,952,044** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **1,952,044** |
| SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 324,067 | | | | 324,067 |
| FLIGHT TRAINING | 675,173 | | | | 675,173 |
| PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 154,978 | | | | 154,978 |
| TRAINING SUPPORT | 92,652 | | | | 92,652 |
| DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 8,461 | | | | 8,461 |
| BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING) | 529,663 | | | | 529,663 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, AND MODERNIZATION | 167,050 | | | | 167,050 |
| **RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION** | **445,206** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **445,206** |
| RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 150,744 | | | | 150,744 |
| EXAMINING | 3,103 | | | | 3,103 |
| OFF DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 114,240 | | | | 114,240 |
| CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 133,706 | | | | 133,706 |
| JUNIOR ROTC | 43,413 | | | | 43,413 |
| **TOTAL, BA 03:TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **2,697,730** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **2,697,730** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS** | **3,069,280** | **(344,350)** | **0** | **(344,350)** | **2,724,930** |
| LOGISTICS OPERATIONS | 965,075 | | | | 965,075 |
| TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 409,392 | | | | 409,392 |
| SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 240,064 | | | | 240,064 |
| DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 130,930 | | | | 130,930 |
| BASE SUPPORT | 1,082,612 | | | | 1,082,612 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 241,207 | | | | 241,207 |
| Supply Management | | (344,350) | | (344,350) | (344,350) |
| **SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **1,996,527** | **(30,811)** | **0** | **(30,811)** | **1,965,716** |
| ADMINISTRATION | 234,370 | | | | 234,370 |
| SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 347,528 | | | | 347,528 |
| PERSONNEL PROGRAMS | 213,901 | (10,000) | | | 203,901 |
| PCS Moves | | | | (10,000) | |
| RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES | 121,063 | | | | 121,063 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ARMS CONTROL | 33,640 | | | | 33,640 |
| OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES | 679,177 | | | | 679,177 |
| OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 34,655 | (20,811) | | (20,811) | 13,844 |
| CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION | 21,432 | | | | 21,432 |
| BASE SUPPORT | 299,750 | | | | 299,750 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 11,011 | | | | 11,011 |
| COMMISSARY OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 0 | | | | |
| **SECURITY PROGRAMS** | **907,694** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **907,694** |
| SECURITY PROGRAMS | 907,694 | | | | 907,694 |
| **SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS** | **18,615** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **18,615** |
| INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT | 18,615 | | | | 18,615 |
| Information Technology Reduction | | (200,000) | | (200,000) | (200,000) |
| **TOTAL, BA 04:ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **5,992,116** | **(575,161)** | **0** | **(575,161)** | **5,416,955** |
| **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force** | **27,793,931** | **(2,359,471)** | **419,666** | **(2,779,137)** | **25,434,460** |
| **Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide** | | | | | |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF | 420,036 | 3,400 | | | 423,436 |
| CJCS Exercise Program | | | 3,400 | | |
| SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND | 1,851,533 | | | | 1,851,533 |
| Fuel | | (40,900) | | (40,900) | (40,900) |
| Contingency Operations, Southwest Asia | | (58,100) | | (58,100) | (58,100) |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:** | **2,271,569** | **(95,600)** | **3,400** | **(99,000)** | **2,175,969** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION** | | | | | |
| DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY | 49,991 | | | | 49,991 |
| **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:** | **49,991** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **49,991** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | | | |
| AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE | 14,005 | | | | 14,005 |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 3,058 | | | | 3,058 |
| DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY | 101,695 | | | | 101,695 |
| DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY | 5,517 | | | | 5,517 |
| DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE | 0 | | | | 0 |
| DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCESACTIVITY | 35,262 | | | | 35,262 |
| DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE | 7,173 | | | | 7,173 |
| DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY | 4,796 | | | | 4,796 |
| SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND | 92,646 | | | | 92,646 |
| **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:** | **264,152** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **264,152** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE | 105,261 | | | | 105,261 |
| CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS | 99,030 | 41,000 | | | 140,030 |
| National Guard Youth Challenge | | | 6,000 | | 0 |
| Supplementary Department of Defense Impact Aid | | | 35,000 | | 0 |
| CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 6,788,178 | | | | 6,788,178 |
| DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY | 359,011 | | | | 359,011 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY | 1,008,908 | | | | 1,008,908 |
| DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE | 1,659 | | | | 1,659 |
| DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY | 276,802 | | | | 276,802 |
| DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY | 1,129,876 | (10,600) | | (10,600) | 1,119,276 |
| DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY | 259,713 | (5,700) | | | 254,013 |
| Defense Logistics Agency (CTMA) | | | 10,000 | | |
| Defense Logistics Agency (DPAO) | | | | (15,700) | |
| DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY | 17,757 | | | | 17,757 |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION | 1,698,075 | | | | 1,698,075 |
| DEFENSE POW /MISSING PERSONS OFFICE | 15,800 | | | | 15,800 |
| DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY | 284,767 | (200,000) | | (200,000) | 84,767 |
| DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE | 200,054 | | | | 200,054 |
| DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY | 291,246 | 1,400 | 1,400 | | 292,646 |
| OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT | 14,105 | | | | 14,105 |
| OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE | 712,567 | (19,800) | | | 692,767 |
| Contract of Support Service | | | | (13,000) | |
| Long Range Planning | | | | (6,800) | |
| SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND | 61,932 | | | | 61,932 |
| SPECIAL ACTIVITIES | 0 | | | | 0 |
| JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF | 234,498 | | | | 234,498 |
| WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES | 405,500 | | | | 405,500 |
| DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION | 20,396 | | | | 20,396 |
| Sikes Act Extension | | 1,500 | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| NIMA, Archive and Dissemination Systems | | (10,000) | | (10,000) | (10,000) |
| NIMA, Production and Information Systems Support | | (10,000) | | (10,000) | (10,000) |
| Defense Health Program (TRICARE) | | (25,000) | | (25,000) | (25,000) |
| Defense Security Service Case Control Management | | (4,000) | | (4,000) | (4,000) |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Information Technology Reduction | | (100,000) | | (100,000) | (100,000) |
| **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:** | **13,985,135** | **(341,200)** | **53,900** | **(395,100)** | **13,643,935** |
| **Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide** | **16,570,847** | **(436,800)** | **57,300** | **(494,100)** | **16,134,047** |
| **Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve** | | | | | |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| **LAND FORCES** | **962,490** | **2,000** | **2,000** | **0** | **964,490** |
| DIVISION FORCES | 14,791 | 2,000 | | | 16,791 |
| Army Reserve Cold Weaher Clothing (ECWCS) | | | 2,000 | | |
| CORPS COMBAT FORCES | 35,798 | | | | 35,798 |
| CORPS SUPPORT FORCES | 309,462 | | | | 309,462 |
| ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES | 135,342 | | | | 135,342 |
| LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 467,097 | | | | 467,097 |
| **LAND FORCES READINESS** | **244,813** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **244,813** |
| FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 122,020 | | | | 122,020 |
| LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS | 59,846 | | | | 59,846 |
| DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 62,947 | | | | 62,947 |
| **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | **509,343** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **509,343** |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 323,592 | | | | 323,592 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 182,079 | | | | 182,079 |
| ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | 3,672 | | | | 3,672 |

Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TOTAL, BA 01:OPERATING FORCES** | **1,716,646** | **2,000** | **2,000** | **0** | **1,718,646** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| **ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **235,363** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **235,363** |
| ADMINISTRATION | 47,714 | | | | 47,714 |
| SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 37,862 | | | | 37,862 |
| PERSONNEL/FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION | 47,092 | | | | 47,092 |
| RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 102,695 | | | | 102,695 |
| **TOTAL, BA 04:ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **235,363** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **235,363** |
| **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve** | **1,952,009** | **2,000** | **2,000** | **0** | **1,954,009** |
| **Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve** | | | | | |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| **RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS** | **574,870** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **574,870** |
| MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 417,743 | | | | 417,743 |
| INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | 16,464 | | | | 16,464 |
| AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT | 2,166 | | | | 2,166 |
| AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 138,135 | | | | 138,135 |
| AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 362 | | | | 362 |
| **RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS** | **154,765** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **154,765** |
| MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 67,211 | | | | 67,211 |
| SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING | 537 | | | | 537 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | 0 | | | | 0 |
| SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 83,577 | | | | 83,577 |
| SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 3,440 | | | | 3,440 |
| **RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT** | **65,347** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **65,347** |
| COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 65,347 | | | | 65,347 |
| **RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT** | **5,544** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **5,544** |
| WEAPONS MAINTENANCE | 5,544 | | | | 5,544 |
| **BASE SUPPORT** | **193,038** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **193,038** |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 61,929 | | | | 61,929 |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 131,109 | | | | 131,109 |
| **TOTAL, BA 01:OPERATING FORCES** | **993,564** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **993,564** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| **ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **178,357** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **178,357** |
| ADMINISTRATION | 12,560 | | | | 12,560 |
| CIVILIAN MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT | 2,269 | | | | 2,269 |
| MILITARY MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT | 36,276 | | | | 36,276 |
| SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 120,733 | | | | 120,733 |
| COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS | 5,665 | | | | 5,665 |
| OTHER SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT | 854 | | | | 854 |
| **CANCELLED ACCOUNTS** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** |
| CANCELLED ACCOUNTS | 0 | | | | 0 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TOTAL, BA 04:ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **178,357** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **178,357** |
| **Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve** | **1,171,921** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **1,171,921** |
| **Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve** | | | | | |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| **MISSION FORCES** | **139,836** | **25,500** | **25,500** | **0** | **165,336** |
| OPERATING FORCES | 61,261 | 13,200 | | | 74,461 |
| Initial Issue | | | 13,200 | | |
| DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 10,231 | 12,300 | | | 22,531 |
| Depot Level Maintenance | | | 7,300 | | |
| Cartridge, 5.56 Ball M855, Lead Free Shot | | | 5,000 | | |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 33,621 | | | | 33,621 |
| TRAINING SUPPORT | 25,953 | | | | 25,953 |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 8,770 | | | | 8,770 |
| **TOTAL, BA 01:OPERATING FORCES** | **139,836** | **25,500** | **25,500** | **0** | **165,336** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| **ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **34,116** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **34,116** |
| SPECIAL SUPPORT | 8,956 | | | | 8,956 |
| SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 578 | | | | 578 |
| ADMINISTRATION | 9,721 | | | | 9,721 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 6,701 | | | | 6,701 |
| RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 8,160 | | | | 8,160 |
| Information Technology O&M | 8,775 | | | | 8,775 |
| Back-Out Information Technololgy O&M | (8,775) | | | | (8,775) |
| **TOTAL, BA 04:ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **34,116** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **34,116** |
| **Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve** | **173,952** | **25,500** | **25,500** | **0** | **199,452** |
| **Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve** | | | | | |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| **AIR OPERATIONS** | **2,074,372** | **(9,000)** | **0** | **(9,000)** | **2,065,372** |
| PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 1,351,819 | | | | 1,351,819 |
| MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 69,058 | | | | 69,058 |
| DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 319,109 | | | | 319,109 |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 61,783 | (9,000) | | | 52,783 |
| Base Infrastructure | | | | (9,000) | |
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 272,603 | | | | 272,603 |
| **TOTAL, BA 01:OPERATING FORCES** | **2,074,372** | **(9,000)** | **0** | **(9,000)** | **2,065,372** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| **ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **104,816** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **104,816** |
| ADMINISTRATION | 59,138 | | | | 59,138 |
| MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 24,253 | | | | 24,253 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 14,162 | | | | 14,162 |
| OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 6,642 | | | | 6,642 |
| AUDIOVISUAL | 621 | | | | 621 |
| **TOTAL, BA 04:ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **104,816** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **104,816** |
| **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve** | **2,179,188** | **(9,000)** | **0** | **(9,000)** | **2,170,188** |
| **Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard** | | | | | |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| **LAND FORCES** | **2,249,313** | **2,000** | **2,000** | **0** | **2,251,313** |
| DIVISIONS | 669,748 | 2,000 | | | 671,748 |
| ARNG Cold Weather Clothing (ECWCS) | | | 2,000 | | 0 |
| CORPS COMBAT FORCES | 651,273 | | | | 651,273 |
| CORPS SUPPORT FORCES | 343,180 | | | | 343,180 |
| ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES | 563,199 | | | | 563,199 |
| LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 21,913 | | | | 21,913 |
| **LAND FORCES READINESS** | **428,945** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **428,945** |
| FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 128,036 | | | | 128,036 |
| LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 106,760 | | | | 106,760 |
| LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 194,149 | | | | 194,149 |
| **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | **1,268,585** | **(40,000)** | **0** | **(40,000)** | **1,228,585** |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 448,167 | (40,000) | | | 408,167 |
| GuardNet | | | | (40,000) | |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 380,226 | | | | 380,226 |
| MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS | 398,017 | | | | 398,017 |
| MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES | 42,175 | | | | 42,175 |
| **TOTAL, BA 01:OPERATING FORCES** | **3,946,843** | **(38,000)** | **2,000** | **(40,000)** | **3,908,843** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| **ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **264,488** | **21,000** | **21,000** | **0** | **285,488** |
| STAFF MANAGEMENT | 102,752 | 16,000 | | | 118,752 |
| Military Technicians | | | 16,000 | | |
| INFORMATION MANAGEMENT | 13,529 | 5,000 | | | 18,529 |
| Nationwide dedicated fiber optic network | | | 5,000 | | |
| PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION | 51,667 | | | | 51,667 |
| RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 96,540 | | | | 96,540 |
| **TOTAL, BA 04:ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **264,488** | **21,000** | **21,000** | **0** | **285,488** |
| **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard** | **4,211,331** | **(17,000)** | **23,000** | **(40,000)** | **4,194,331** |
| **Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard** | | | | | |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | | | |
| **AIR OPERATIONS** | **4,366,395** | **2,000** | **2,000** | **0** | **4,368,395** |
| AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS | 2,842,931 | | | | 2,842,931 |
| MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 336,979 | | | | 336,979 |
| BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 410,627 | | | | 410,627 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 154,798 | | | | 154,798 |
| DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 621,060 | 2,000 | | | 623,060 |
| ANG Cold Weather Clothing (ECWCS) | | | 2,000 | | 0 |
| **TOTAL, BA 01:OPERATING FORCES** | **4,366,395** | **2,000** | **2,000** | **0** | **4,368,395** |
| **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | | | |
| **SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **36,251** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **36,251** |
| ADMINISTRATION | 26,547 | | | | 26,547 |
| RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 9,704 | | | | 9,704 |
| **TOTAL, BA 04:ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **36,251** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **36,251** |
| **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard** | **4,402,646** | **2,000** | **2,000** | **0** | **4,404,646** |
| ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY /4 | 396,018 | | | | 396,018 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY | 256,153 | | | | 256,153 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE | 384,307 | | | | 384,307 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE | 24,081 | | | | 24,081 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES | 212,619 | | | | 212,619 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES | | | | | 0 |
| United States Industrial Base Capabilities Fund | | 100,000 | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| OVERSEAS CONTINGENCIES | 50,000 | (50,000) | | (50,000) | 0 |
| **TOTAL, O&M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS** | **1,323,178** | **50,000** | **100,000** | **(50,000)** | **1,373,178** |
| U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES | 10,333 | | | | 10,333 |

**Title III - OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account / Budget Activity / Sub-activity Group | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS | 0 | | | | 0 |
| OVERSEAS MILITARY INVESTMENT RECOVERY | | | | | 0 |
| DISPOSAL OF DOD PROPERTY | | | | | 0 |
| OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AFFAIRS | 59,000 | | | | 59,000 |
| PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND | 0 | | | | 0 |
| EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE | 0 | | | | 0 |
| FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION | 450,800 | | | | 450,800 |
| QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS | 0 | | | | 0 |
| OPPLAN 34A-35 P.O.W. | 0 | | | | 0 |
| COUNTER-TERRORISM/WMD DEFENSE | 0 | | | | 0 |
| **TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS** | **520,133** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **520,133** |
| **TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:** | **116,958,824** | **(2,932,326)** | **1,479,816** | **(4,412,142)** | **114,026,498** |

# ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

## BUDGET REQUEST ADJUSTMENTS—READINESS

The committee recommends the following adjustments to the fiscal year 2004 amended budget request:

[In millions of dollars]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Department of the Army Adjustments: | | |
| BA–1 | Hydration on the Move (Camelbak) | 2.0 |
| BA–1 | Controlled Humidity Preservation (CHP) Program | 4.0 |
| BA–1 | Consumable Parts | 90.0 |
| BA–1 | Depot Maintenance | 231.3 |
| BA–3 | U.S. Army Engineer School | 4.0 |
| BA–3 | Army's Defense Language Institute | 2.5 |
| BA–3 | Flight School XXI | 148.0 |
| BA–4 | Military Vehicle Tires | 2.0 |
| BA–4 | Army Military Vehicle Batteries | 2.0 |
| BA–4 | American Red Cross | 3.0 |
| BA–1 | Fuel | (20.5) |
| BA–1 | Working Capital Fund—Cash | (50.0) |
| BA–1 | Contingency Operations, Southwest Asia | (200.4) |
| BA–4 | Administration | (7.9) |
| BA–4 | Other Support Services | (7.1) |
| BA–4 | Civilian Personnel Underexecution | (26.6) |
| | Army National Guard Cold Weather Clothing (ECWCS) | 2.0 |
| | Army Reserve Cold Weather Clothing (ECWCS) | 2.0 |
| Department of the Navy Adjustments: | | |
| BA–1 | Ship Depot Maintenance | 76.0 |
| BA–1 | Flight Operations | 172.5 |
| BA–1 | Fuel | (122.7) |
| BA–1 | Contingency operations, Southwest Asia | (76.1) |
| BA–3 | Training Support | (15.0) |
| BA–4 | Administration | (10.0) |
| BA–4 | Planning, Engineering, and Design | (10.0) |
| United States Marine Corps Adjustments: | | |
| BA–1 | Hydration on the Move (Camelbak) | 2.0 |
| BA–1 | Depot Maintenance | 35.9 |
| BA–1 | Initial Issue | 51.0 |
| BA–1 | U.S. Joint Maritime BEQ Facility | 0.6 |
| BA–1 | Deployable Virtual Training Environment | 2.5 |
| BA–1 | Individual First Aid Kit | 6.2 |
| BA–1 | Restrictive Use Easements | 5.8 |
| BA–1 | Air Command and Control Sustainment | 1.1 |
| BA–1 | Corrosion Control and Prevention Program | 6.0 |
| BA–1 | USMC Reserve—Depot Level Maintenance | 7.3 |
| BA–1 | USMC Reserve—Initial Issue | 13.2 |
| BA–1 | USMC Reserve—Cartridge, 5.56 Ball M855 | 5.0 |
| Department of the Air Force Adjustments: | | |
| BA–1 | Depot Maintenance | 329.7 |
| BA–1 | Flying Hour Spares | 90.0 |
| BA–1 | Base Operations Support | (300.0) |
| BA–1 | Working Capital Fund—Cash | (26.0) |
| BA–1 | Fuel | (225.0) |
| BA–1 | Supply Management | (344.4) |
| BA–1 | Working Capital Fund—Transportation | (946.3) |
| BA–1 | Contingency Operations, Southeast Asia | (707.6) |
| BA–4 | Civilian PCS | (20.8) |
| BA–4 | Early Outs | (10.0) |
| BA–1 | Air National Guard Cold Weather Clothing (ECWCS) | 2.0 |
| Defense-wide Activities Adjustments: | | |
| BA–4 | Defense Logistics Agency (CTMA) | 10.0 |
| BA–1 | Fuel | (40.9) |
| BA–1 | Contingency Operations, Southwest Asia | (58.1) |
| BA–4 | Defense Logistics Agency (DPAO) | (15.7) |
| BA–4 | Office of Secretary of Defense, Contract of Support Service | (13.0) |
| BA–4 | Office of Secretary of Defense, Long-range planning | (6.8) |
| BA–4 | Defense Information Systems Agency | (10.6) |

| | |
|---|---|
| BA–4 Defense Security Cooperation Agency | (200.0) |
| Transfer Accounts and Miscellaneous: | |
| Overseas Contingencies | (50.0) |

## BUDGET REQUEST DISPLAY ISSUES—READINESS

### Base Operating Support

Base operating support is a vital aspect of community support affecting the ability of installations to support resident missions and execute quality of life programs affecting service members and their families. Each of the services has established installation management structures to implement overarching strategies and programs designed to achieve service-wide efficiencies. The services are encouraged to continue their efforts to find efficiencies in base operating support functions through standardization and adoption of "best practices." The committee notes that funding for base operating support in fiscal year 2004 decreases in all but one service. The committee urges the Department to ensure that all the services focus their installation management structures on achieving additional efficiencies. The committee recommends a decrease of $300.0 million to the proposed budget in order to fund other higher priority requirements.

### Civilian Career Program Relocations—Air Force

The committee does not support a 52 percent increase in civilian career program relocations. The proposed increase is to fund real estate expenses associated with the government's purchase of homes that government employees are not able to sell as a result of accepting a position of employment in a different geographical location. The committee notes that this is an optional entitlement used in recruiting government employees. The budget material presented states there will be 1,375 projected civilian relocations in FY 2004. Accordingly, the committee recommends a reduction of $10.0 million to the proposed budget and recommends funding other higher priority programs.

### Civilian Personnel Budget—Army

The General Accounting Office has projected that the Army has overstated the cost for civilian personnel by $26.6 million. The projections are based on the Department's February 28, 2003 civilian personnel staffing report. The committee, therefore, recommends a reduction of $26.6 million to the proposed budget.

### Civilian Separation Incentives—Air Force

The committee is concerned that the Air Force is requesting additional funds for civilian separations. Section 4436 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484) authorizes the use of civilian separation incentives. The committee notes the source of the payments shall be paid by an agency out of any funds or appropriations available for salaries and expenses of such agency. The committee recommends that the Air Force fund this program with prudent management of civilian under execution. Accordingly, the committee recommends a reduction of $20.8 million to the proposed budget.

### Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities—Defense Logistics Agency

It is vital for depot level activities to have access to modern and advanced manufacturing capabilities. The Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities program is designed to allow depot level activities to participate in manufacturing technology demonstration projects with the leading United States manufacturers. The committee recommends the addition of $10.0 million for the Defense Logistics Agency to continue this program.

### Consumable Repair Parts—Army

The committee recommends an increase of $90 million to the proposed budget in order for the Army to fund adequately the Army's projected orders for consumable repair parts. The Army projected an increase growth in consumable repair parts when they updated the annual average for fiscal year 2004 budget. The Army updates this average each year based on the actual demand data from the three previous years. However, the Army made a decision to suppress the demand identified and instead used a ten year average to project demands for the operating tempo model. The committee is concerned that the Army is assuming unnecessary risk.

The committee notes that the Army has made significant improvements in the execution of ground operational tempo combined arms training strategy mile requirements in fiscal year 2001 and fiscal year 2002. The committee recommends, at a minimum, that the Army continue to use a three-year moving average to project consumable repair part demands for its ground operational tempo requirements.

### Contingency Operations Funding—Southwest Asia

The proposed budget includes a funding request for contingency operations in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Southwest Asia. Recent operations in Iraq have obviated the requirement for such funds for Southwest Asia. The committee, therefore, recommends a reduction in the following accounts.

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Army Operations | (200.4) |
| Navy Operations | (76.1) |
| Air Force Operations | (707.6) |
| Defense-Wide Operations | (58.1) |

### Defense Information Systems Agency

The budget request proposed an additional $10.6 million for the Defense Information Systems Agency for increased backbone fiber in support of the war effort. This cost, incurred in fiscal year 2003, should not be included in the budget request for the upcoming fiscal year. The committee, therefore, recommends a reduction of $10.6 million to the Defense Information Systems Agency budget request.

### Defense Policy Analysis Office

In fiscal year 2003, the Defense Logistics Agency received the mission of the Defense Policy Analysis Office, which is to "review,

analyze, and assess DLA support and serve policies, plans, concepts, procedures, and operations to provide the most efficient, cost-effective, and responsive support to Department of Defense components and other federal departments and agencies." The mission of this office is also to "address the development of DOD support policies, plans, concepts, procedures, and operations as requested by supported organizations." The committee believes that the described functions are inherent functions of management and headquarters and that a unique office is not necessary. The committee recommends a reduction of $15.7 million in this program.

## Depot Funding

The depot accounts of the Army, Navy and Air Force are under-resourced in the fiscal year 2004 budget request despite the likelihood that depot workload will increase as equipment returns from the recent war with Iraq. At or near the top of each service's unfunded requirements list are important depot funding items. The committee is disappointed that the Department has submitted a budget that allows these critical components of readiness to lack the requisite resources. The committee, therefore, recommends the following increases to the proposed budget.

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Army Depots | 231.3 |
| Navy Depots | 76.0 |
| Air Force Depots | 329.7 |
| United States Marine Corps | 35.9 |
| United States Marine Corps, Reserve | 7.3 |

*Army*

The committee notes that the Army continues to have funding shortfalls in depot maintenance which directly impacts near-term readiness. The committee recommends an additional $231.2 million to maintain organic and contractor critical industrial base skills necessary to perform depot maintenance.

*Air Force*

The committee notes that the Secretary of the Air Force has at the top of the unfunded priority list a requirement for an additional $516.0 million in depot equipment maintenance. The committee does not consider it acceptable to take such a risk with depot maintenance. The committee notes that in fiscal year 2003 the Air Force funded its depot maintenance requirement at 73 percent, but midway through this fiscal year was forced to transfer $227 million out of its flying hour program into the depot maintenance program. The committee believes it is more appropriate to adequately fund depot maintenance at the beginning of the fiscal year. The committee believes that it is appropriate to reduce program growth and program funding for base operating support in order to minimize the size of the depot maintenance unfunded requirement. The committee recommends a reduction of $300 million to the Air Force base operating support program and recommends an increase of $329.7 million to the Air Force depot maintenance program.

The committee expects the additional funding for depot maintenance to fund the most critical shortfalls, such as aircraft and en-

gines. The committee notes that without this additional funding the Air Force would defer depot maintenance on 42 aircraft and 76 engines. The committee also notes that the fiscal year 2002 aircraft breakage rates were unusual. The committee is concerned that the fiscal year 2004 projections are erroneously based on this data. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $90 million for flying hour spare parts.

*Navy*

The proposed budget requests a reduction of $600 million in the Navy's ship depot maintenance account. The Chief of Naval Operations, however, asserts that this reduced level of funding will adequately fund ship depot maintenance accounts. Nevertheless, there are particular classes of ships that the Chief of Naval Operations has identified as critical programs that are not funded in fiscal year 2004.

First, the LHA 1 class of ships requires additional funding to support midlife depot maintenance program to ensure that the ships can attain their estimated service life of 35 years. The LHA plays a vital and unique role. Troops, vehicles, and equipment can all land simultaneously on the LHA, as the ship has aviation and landing components. The committee recommends an additional $33 million to fund the LHA midlife depot maintenance program.

Second, the AOE–1 class of ships, also known as fast combat support ships, have a service life of 35 years. The average age of this ship is beyond 35 years. The committee recognizes that these ships, which have high operational tempo, will need to be utilized for several more years. Chief of Naval Operations has also identified depot maintenance for this class of ships as a critical program not funded in fiscal year 2004. The committee recommends an additional $43 million to fund depot maintenance for the AOE–1 class of ships.

In addition the committee notes that the Navy has not adequately funded flight operations to allow the fleet to train to the prescribed level of training. Accordingly, the committee expects that $90 million will be applied to flight operations.

*Marine Corps*

The proposed budget would only fund 67 percent of the Marine Corps' depot maintenance requirement. The committee does not consider this acceptable. The committee recommends an additional $35.9 million and 7.3 million to fund the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve depot maintenance programs respectively.

Fuel Costs—Defense Logistics Agency

In preparing the fiscal year 2004 budget request, the Department projected fuel costs that have since trended downwards. The General Accounting Office believes that the projected fuel shortfall due to price fluctuation for fiscal years 2003 and 2004 would be $825.6 million. The committee notes that the fiscal year 2003 supplemental appropriation will provide funds that exceed the fuel costs now anticipated for both fiscal years. In addition, the committee understands the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) set aside $541.7 million of their accumulated operating result in fiscal year 2004. These funds were to pay the difference between the rate DLA will

charge the Department's customers and the price it costs to purchase the fuel. In light of the supplemental appropriations available to fund fuel in fiscal years 2003 and 2004, along with the excess funds in DLA's working capital account, the committee recommends the following reductions and directs that the Defense Logistics Agency reimburse the customers listed below by December 31, 2003.

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Army Operations | (20.5) |
| Navy Operations | (122.7) |
| Air Force Operations | (225.0) |
| Defense-wide Operations | (40.9) |

## Initial Issue Equipment—Marine Corps

The Commandant of the Marine Corps has an unfunded requirement for initial issue equipment. Under this category of equipment are load bearing equipment, all purpose environmental clothing systems, outer tactical vests, small arms protective inserts, light weight helmets, tents, command posts, and camouflage systems. The committee recommends an additional $51.0 million for the Marine Corps and $13.2 million Marine Corps Reserve to fund this requirement.

## Office of Secretary of Defense, Contracts and Other Support Services

The budget request proposes an additional $59.6 million in program growth for contracts and other support services. A significant portion of this growth, $23.0 million, would fund Joint Public Affairs Task Force and Defense News Network. The committee does not believe DOD has adequately explained or justified this request, particularly the need to develop a Defense News Network. The committee, therefore, recommends a reduction of $13.0 million for this program.

## Overseas Contingency Operations Fund

The Department has budgeted $50.0 million in the Overseas Contingency Operation Fund to finance unanticipated costs for contingency operations. The committee expects that these unforeseen costs will be requested in either the annual omnibus reprogramming request or supplemental requests in fiscal year 2004. Accordingly, the committee recommends a reduction in this account by $50.0 million.

## Supply Management Activity Group—Air Force

The committee notes that the Air Force supply management activity group is projected to have a positive accumulated operating result of $668.7 million in fiscal year 2004. The budget material presented no rationale to justify maintaining such profit levels. Specifically, page six of the Air Force Working Capital Fund budget exhibit reads, "Our cash on hand at the end of FY 2002 was $1,323.3 million, which was considerably higher than our FY 03 PB projected ending balance of $810 million." The fiscal year 2004 cash requirement, as outlined in the budget material, is between $756–989 million, which equates to seven to ten days of operating cash.

The committee was informed that the ending cash balance on March 31, 2003 was $800 million. The committee is concerned that these funds are not being returned to the customer in the form of lower rates. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction in the proposed budget of $344.4 million and directs the Secretary of the Air Force to use the excess accumulated operating results to offset this price adjustment.

### Transportation Working Capital Fund-Air Force

In fiscal year 2002, the transportation working capital fund experienced $680 million of positive operating results from increased customer orders from Operation Enduring Freedom. Similarly, significantly higher customer orders have been recorded as a result of Operation Iraq Freedom. The committee projects that the combination of these two operations will continue to generate positive operating results. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction in the proposed budget by $1.3 billion and directs the Secretary of the Air Force to use the excess accumulated operating results to offset this price adjustment.

### Working Capital Fund Cash Management

The committee notes that the working capital funds serve a vital role in providing financial transaction flexibility for critical defense customer support activities. When working capital funds produce an annual operating result involving a surplus, consideration should be given to adjusting customer rates in future years. Working capital funds that do not appropriately return surplus funds to the supported departments, commands, and agencies through rate-change mechanisms artificially inflate the cost of support and deprive the supported units of limited resources. The committee, therefore, recommends a reduction in the proposed budget, as identified below, and directs that the excess cash balances in those working capital funds be returned to the respective service to offset this pricing adjustment. In addition, the committee has reduced funds where there is cash in excess of the ten-day level.

| | |
|---|---|
| Army Working Capital Fund (Excess Cash) | (50.0) |
| Air Force Working Capital Fund (Excess Cash) | (26.0) |
| Air Force Working Capital Fund Supply Management | (344.4) |
| Air Force Working Capital Fund Transportation | (946.3) |

## BUDGET REQUEST—OTHER MATTERS

### Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction

The budget request contained $1,530.3 million in Other Defense Accounts for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, including $1,199.2 million for operations and maintenance, $251.9 million for research, development, test, and evaluation and $79.2 million for procurement. The budget request also contained $119.8 million in military construction for the chemical agents and munitions destruction program.

The committee recommends $251.9 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction research, development, test and evaluation, and $79.2 million for Chemical agents and Munitions Destruction procurement. The committee also recommends $1,249.2 million

for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction operations and maintenance, including an increase of $50.0 million for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program. Elsewhere in this report the committee recommends $119.8 million, the budget request, for military construction for the chemical agents and munitions destruction program.

The committee notes the following activities with respect to the chemical demilitarization program:

(1) To date, more than 8,000 tons of chemical agent, over 25 percent of the total U.S. stockpile, has been safely destroyed in operational demilitarization facilities at Johnston Atoll Chemical Agent Disposal System and Tooele Chemical Agent Disposal Facility, Utah, using the baseline incineration process. Stockpile demilitarization operations at the Johnston Atoll facility have been completed and shutdown of that facility is all but completed. A major safety review of Tooele operations, which was precipitated by the exposure of a maintenance worker to a nerve agent last year, has been completed and live agent destruction operations at that facility have been resumed.

(2) Construction of demilitarization faculties at Anniston Chemical Agent Disposal Facility, Alabama, and Umatilla Chemical Agent Disposal Facility, Oregon, has been completed and systematization operations required to test the facilities prior to beginning live agent destruction operations are in progress. Construction of the facility at Pine Bluff Chemical Agent Disposal Facility, Arkansas, is nearing completion.

(3) Actions are underway to accelerate the disposal of bulk mustard agent at Aberdeen Chemical Agent Neutralization Facility, Maryland, and of bulk VX nerve agent at the Newport Chemical Agent Neutralization Facility, Indiana. Live agent neutralization operations have begun at Aberdeen.

(4) Decisions have been made regarding the use of alternate technologies developed under the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment program (chemical neutralization of the agent) for the stockpiles stored at Pueblo, Colorado and Lexington-Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky.

(5) The resolution of disagreements between the Army, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and local authorities over chemical stockpile emergency preparedness measures in Anniston, Alabama, could delay the start of chemical agent destruction operations at that site.

The fiscal year 2004 budget request supports the following major efforts under the chemical demilitarization program:

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Closure of Johnston Atoll | 77.3 |
| Ongoing demilitarization operations at Tooele | 165.7 |
| Ongoing demilitarization operations at Anniston | 143.2 |
| Ongoing demilitarization operations at Umatilla | 143.7 |
| Start-up of demilitarization operations at Pine Bluff | 132.9 |
| Final operations and closure at Aberdeen | 117.0 |
| Complete operations at Newport | 144.0 |
| Continued construction at Pueblo | 122.8 |
| Chemical stockpile emergency preparedness program | 132.6 |
| Non-stockpile chemical materiel destruction program | 176.0 |
| Construction | 119.8 |

The committee is aware of unfunded requirements of $54.1 million for the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program for additional enhancements to the ability of state and local governments to respond to a chemical accident or incident at chemical stockpile storage sites in Arkansas, Oregon, and Alabama. To address these requirements the committee has recommended an increase of $50.0 million to the budget request.

The committee also notes that the program has undergone a major management reorganization to consolidate both demilitarization and chemical site storage operations under a single head who reports to both the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) and the Commander, Army Materiel Command. The committee believes that the new management structure will provide the capability to better integrate the activities of each chemical stockpile storage site and the chemical demilitarization facility located at that site. The new organization will also significantly improve coordination of the plans and activities of the chemical stockpile disposal program and the assembled chemical weapons assessment program.

The committee notes further that the program is funded in a new Appropriation Title "054 Other Defense Programs" that is separate from that of the Army or any of the other military departments, thereby meeting the guidance in section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99–145).

### Defense and Security Cooperation with Poland, Bulgaria, and Romania

The committee recognizes the diplomatic, political, and military support provided by Poland, Bulgaria, and Romania leading up to, and during, Operation Iraqi Freedom. Their leadership in supporting efforts to end Saddam Hussein's threat to international security demonstrates their value as emerging allies and their commitment to preserving international peace. Given their commitment to a democratic, peaceful, and secure world, and their demonstrated willingness to take substantive action to support it, the committee believes it is important to expand defense and security cooperation with these countries. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $3.4 million for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff exercise program to fund, where appropriate, exercise-related minor construction in Poland, Bulgaria, and Romania.

### Expansion of Export Control Database

The committee recommends an additional $1.4 million to the Defense Threat Reduction Agency in order to strengthen and expand the existing federal effort to help foreign governments improve their export control performance through an export control database currently used by some 16 countries in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. The committee recommends the funds be used to continue existing subscriptions of the export control database for foreign countries, supply the database to additional countries, provide education and training for its use, enhance the quality and utility of the database by expanding its coverage of weapons of mass destruction information focusing more on terrorism threats, produce a secure intranet version of the database to en-

courage countries to share information more readily, and perform related research and public education initiatives on export control policy.

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ISSUES

### Overview

The committee believes that information technology (IT) is critical to Department of Defense transformation in the 21st century. The first sentence of the Department's recently published Transformation Planning Guidance states, "the United States is transitioning from an industrial-based military to an information-age military." Our combat forces in Iraq used information dominance to devastating advantage over enemy units. The committee strongly supports the Department's efforts to continue to expand that advantage and also supports several promising technological programs to that end.

The committee is concerned, however, that the Department has not maintained sufficient scrutiny over its IT program as a whole. For example, the committee has received testimony that there are a multitude of legacy systems in the Department seemingly invulnerable to displacement by the more comprehensive architecture of modern systems that the Department is building. However, the Department continues to spend monies for development modernization of these legacy systems while simultaneously investing in future capabilities such as information and communication systems. Furthermore, the Department has difficulty explaining to the committee exactly how IT funding is expended each year—or what project, for what purpose, and what the rationale is for the expenditure.

The Department has made a strong case for information dominance, supported by a dynamic, interconnected backbone of networks, computers, satellites, communications, and other information and communications devices.

Against pressure from legitimate commercial users, the committee has supported maintaining the Department's bandwidth needs, and continues to support the Department's continued emphasis on information dominance through robust funding. At the same time, the committee expects the Department to exercise strong oversight of these programs and to strictly scrutinize legacy programs and swiftly terminate them if new systems are replacing them. Additionally, the committee strongly believes the Department and military department Chief Information Officers should have more responsibility and accountability towards programs and systems under their jurisdiction and review.

In this regard, the committee has proposed legislation that will increase the level of scrutiny exercised by the Department's Chief Information Officers, and recommends a series of reductions in apparently redundant IT programs and those that have failed to meet performance standards. The committee supports real transformation—transformation that not only develops innovative solutions, but also has the discipline to abandon techniques and procedures that have not resulted in cost-effectiveness nor having met performance deadlines.

## Budget Displays

Elsewhere in this report, the committee expressed serious concerns with the accuracy and clarity of the Department of Defense's budget displays and documentation. In that regard, the committee is particularly dissatisfied with the information technology (IT) budget submission display in light of the requirements imposed by section 351 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314).

As technology evolves and matures, complex IT systems have become an ever more important element of Department of Defense transformation and expenditures. Therefore, the committee believes that both the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Congress should have a comprehensive budget explanation of IT expenditures.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to supplement future budget submission displays of IT programs with a summary spreadsheet for each military service or defense agency that lists each IT program, proposed expenditures by appropriation, budget authority and line number, the program element number, whether the program is in developmental modernization or current services, whether the program is an IT system or a national security system, and the budget requests from the two previous fiscal years, the present fiscal year, and the next fiscal year.

## General Reductions

The committee notes that the Army's budget request contained $31.1 billion for operations and maintenance, including information technology (IT) programs and systems; the Navy's budget request contained $33.0 billion; the Air Force's budget request was for $34.4, and defense-wide request contained $16.6 billion.

While the committee supports transformational initiatives that modernize IT systems and programs, the committee has serious concerns about the lack of management and proper oversight into many of the IT programs and systems at the various military departments and defense-wide. Therefore, the committee recommends a total reduction of $568.0 million for all information technology activities in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and defense-wide operations and maintenance accounts as noted in the table below:

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Army | 68.0 |
| Navy | 200.0 |
| Air Force | 200.0 |
| Defense-Wide | 100.0 |

## Global Information Grid Bandwidth Expansion

The committee believes that the Department of Defense should move to a fully integrated information technology architecture, and that the Global Information Grid Bandwidth Expansion (GIG–BE) is a critical part of that effort. However, the committee is troubled by the manner in which the procurement is presently conducted. The committee notes that the Department is requesting $386.1 million to fund this high priority modernization effort in fiscal year 2004. The committee understands that the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA), which is administering the project, intends

to establish system requirements that are inconsistent with industry standards, may favor antiquated legacy systems, may potentially have a bias for non-domestic providers, and may be suboptimal. To cite two examples, the committee has been informed that DISA may establish non-industry standard environmental requirements regarding operations in humid environments, and that DISA's proposed power level requirements are a generation behind current technology. The committee is deeply concerned that DISA would deliberately set a lower power level requirement that would work against the very reason for building the GIG–BE—essentially, the ability to handle greater bandwidth. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the system requirements for the GIG–BE to ensure that the requirements contemplated are open and fair, and reflect current technological and industry standards to meet the Department's future bandwidth needs.

## Information Technology Specific Reductions

The Department of Defense's budget request for information technology (IT) includes both IT and national security systems (NSS). The committee supports the Department's goal of protecting the U.S. homeland and critical bases of operations, projecting and sustaining power in other theaters, denying our enemies sanctuary, leveraging IT, improving and protecting information operations, and enhancing space operations. In addition, the committee supports the Department's initiative to attain these objectives by implementing network-centric activities and programs. However, the committee is highly concerned that the Department does not have proper oversight and accountability for these systems and programs. Therefore, multiple systems exist that perform the same or similar tasks, new systems are not given realistic schedules to meet identified requirements, and IT investments are not given enough scrutiny to determine if costs justify the project.

While the committee commends the Department for attempting to phase-out its legacy systems and modernize by creating joint-IT systems that would serve more than one agency or military department, the committee is concerned about the growth in the operations and maintenance budget with particular programs—specially since the Department is in the midst of planning for new IT systems that would perform the same functions with new capabilities. The committee strongly believes that the Department must exercise dynamic leadership and fiscal oversight into all IT programs, systems, and policies. Therefore, the committee recommends reductions in the following programs:

[In millions of dollars]

| | |
|---|---|
| Army Knowledge Management | 20.0 |
| Army Guardnet | 40.0 |
| Navy Military Manpower/Personnel Systems | 4.3 |
| Navy Reserve Integrated Military Personnel Management | 2.3 |
| Navy Military Personnel Distribution System | 5.0 |
| Other Navy Military Manpower/Personnel | 30.0 |
| Navy Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI) | 160.0 |
| Air Force Reserve Base Level Communications | 9.0 |
| National Imagery and Mapping Agency, Archive and Dissemination Systems | 10.0 |
| National Imagery and Mapping Agency, Production Information Systems Support | 10.0 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Defense Health Programs | 25.0 |
| Defense Security Service Case Control Management | 4.0 |

### Nationwide Dedicated Fiber Optic Network (NDFON)

The budget request contained no funding for the Nationwide Dedicated Fiber Optic Network (NDFON) for the national guard.

While some policy questions regarding the precise role of the national guard for homeland defense and homeland security missions remain unresolved, there is no doubt that national guard armories throughout the nation must be serviced with a robust communications backbone to allow rapid, coordinated responses to potential incidents.

Since the committee understands that NDFON will fit into the architecture of the Global Information Grid, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in operation and maintenance for the Army National Guard to complete engineering studies for the NDFON program.

## OTHER ISSUES

### Budget Justification Exhibit Materials

The committee notes that the quality of the budget exhibits differ widely from one service to another despite the existence of guidelines and regulations that prescribe requirements for the preparation of budget materials. In addition, the committee understands that all budget materials are due to the committee within 30 days of the budget request. This year, in all but the case of one service, three services and the Office of the Secretary of Defense submitted budget materials well beyond 60 days after the submission of the budget request. It is also important to note that the Office of the Secretary of Defense's Operation and Maintenance Overview was the last exhibit delivered to the committee on April 24, 2003. The committee directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to provide a complete list of all budget exhibits and their expected delivery dates to the committee by December 15, 2003.

With regard to the Department's operation and maintenance overview, the committee notes that parts of this overview are redundant. Specifically, the appropriation highlights should be a summary of the key changes of each service instead of a simple listing of every change in the budget. The detailed changes are already listed in each of the budget exhibits provided by the services. The committee encourages the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to use the overview exhibit to convey overarching trends that outline program changes for each of the services.

The committee directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the service's assistant secretaries of financial management to include in the submitted budget justification material the baseline costs of programs where program change is identified and explained. To assess the merit of program growth, the committee must have not only an explanation for the changes but the ability to review and evaluate the significance and relativity of the highlighted changes.

The committee notes that the performance criteria and evaluation summaries provided in the budget exhibits often fail at providing measurable performance metrics. In many cases, this part

of the budget exhibit has become a simple accounting report of the number of systems currently being used. The committee directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the service's assistant secretaries of financial management to review performance criteria in their respective operations and maintenance budget exhibits and ensure that measurable metrics are developed for the fiscal year 2005 budget. Specifically, the committee requests that summary analysis is provided explaining each criterion and how the service is performing against that criterion. Furthermore, the committee directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the service's assistant secretaries of financial management to provide a report that outlines the current performance criteria and the proposed changes by subactivity group to the committee by September 12, 2003.

The committee is concerned that the reporting of civilian personnel budgets continues to be either overstated or understated in the budget exhibits. Accordingly, the committee directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the service's assistant secretaries of financial management to develop and include in the fiscal year 2005 budget exhibits an average salary cost for each subactivity group as a component of the personnel summary.

The committee is troubled by the continued growth in the other costs and other contracts' line items in the service's summary of price and growth exhibit. The committee directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the service's assistant secretaries of financial management to provide a detailed listing of all the component costs of these two existing line items to the committee by October 21, 2003. The committee also notes some services do not list the foreign currency costs associated with each of the subactivity group budget exhibits. The committee directs the Department's assistant secretaries of financial management to ensure that these costs are correctly displayed in the fiscal year 2005 budget exhibits.

The committee notes that there is not uniformity among the service's summary of increases and decreases. The committee directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the service's assistant secretaries of financial management to ensure each specific program change is listed by the required category for the summary of increases and decreases in the fiscal year 2005 budget exhibits.

Finally, the committee directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the service's assistant secretaries of financial management to ensure that program transfers from one subactivity group to another or transfers from one appropriation to another be listed in the transfer portion of reconciliation of increases and decreases section for each subactivity group. Currently, many of these transfers are included in program changes and artificially influence the reconciliation of program increases or decreases.

## Cash Management

The Navy Working Capital Fund budget justification material shows that the Navy plans to transfer $448 million from the working capital fund to the operation and maintenance account in fiscal year 2004. The Navy plans on using this excess cash to finance the operation and maintenance requirements. Funding defense ac-

counts from excess working capital fund cash removes direct congressional oversight and decision-making. Furthermore, the Navy does not state what it plans on using the $448 million for in its budget. This is not a new issue. This committee raised similar concerns 10 years ago when it discussed this issue in its fiscal year 1993 committee report.

The committee also noted that the Army, Navy, and Air Force working capital fund budget justification materials provide information on cash management. This information includes beginning cash balances, disbursements, collections, transfers, and ending cash balances. This information enables the committee to perform its oversight responsibilities. However, the DOD-wide working capital fund does not provide any information on cash management even though the DOD-wide working capital fund incurs about $25 billion of expenses each year. The committee directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to provide a cash management exhibit in the fiscal year 2005 defense-wide working capital fund budget justification material similar to the format provided by the Army, Navy, and Air Force. In addition, the committee requests the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the service's assistant secretaries of financial management update their respective cash management budget exhibits by November 3, 2003 to reflect the status as of the end of fiscal year 2003.

### Depot Maintenance Long-Term Strategy

The committee understands that the Department of Defense has taken initial steps to develop a long term public sector depot maintenance strategic plan. This initiative is critical and the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to continue its review. This review should include an evaluation of future workload, to include workload projections through fiscal year 2009, and how the Department of Defense shall maintain a core logistics capability to perform the workload. The review should also contain a workforce revitalization plan in light of the size of the retirement-eligible workforce.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit this report no later than November 1, 2004, to the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

The Comptroller General shall evaluate this report and provide comments and analysis to the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services no later than 90 days after the Secretary of Defense submits the report.

### Expansion of Export Control Database

The committee recommends an increase of $1.4 million to the Defense Threat Reduction Agency for the expansion of an export control database. The funds should be used to strengthen and expand the existing federal effort to help foreign governments improve their export control performance through an export control database currently used by some 16 countries in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

Specifically, the increase of funds should be made available to continue existing subscriptions of the export control database for foreign countries through 2006, supply the database to additional

countries and provide education and training for its use, and perform related research and public education initiatives on export control policy. It would also enhance the quality and utility of the database by expanding its coverage of weapons of mass destruction information, focusing more on terrorism threats, and producing a secure intranet version of the database to encourage countries to share information more readily.

### Facility Sustainment, Renovation and Modernization

The Department of Defense (DOD) has established a goal of funding facility sustainment at 93 percent of the requirements. However, in order to achieve this level of facility sustainment resourcing, the services have decremented renovation and modernization programs dramatically. Throughout DOD, existing facilities and infrastructure continue to fail to meet applicable industry standards for recapitalization. This practice exacerbates mission and quality of life deficiencies in the short-term and creates a more extensive backlog of required facility maintenance in the long-term. Moreover, the committee has concerns about the Defense Facilities Strategic Plan currently being used by DOD. In a recent General Accounting Office report on defense infrastructure (February 2003), several concerns were highlighted ranging from the lack of consistency in the services' information on facilities, to the wide latitude the services have to assess facility conditions, to the funding controls placed on the resources allocated for facility sustainment, renovation and modernization. Given the importance of this effort, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on how DOD intends to address the issues outlined in the General Accounting Office report no later than the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 2004.

### Foreign Currency Accounts

The committee encourages the Department to use more realistic foreign currency rate projections in future budgets as year of execution challenges are known to exist that have had an unfavorable impact on service budgets. The committee directs the Office of Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to submit a report by October 1, 2004, outlining the procedure and process used to establish the annual foreign currency rates.

### Maintaining the Strategic Domestic Beryllium Supply

The committee is aware that the domestic supply of the strategic and critical metal beryllium is in danger of being depleted. Metallic beryllium is used extensively in DOD weapons systems, DOE strategic nuclear applications and several critical civilian applications. Moreover, the only domestic producer of metal beryllium has closed its primary metal production plant because of obsolescence. Therefore, the committee directs that the DOD conduct an in-depth study of the beryllium supply issue and make recommendations regarding how future access to beryllium could be assured. The study should include recommendations regarding how industry might modernize capacities for the primary production of beryllium and consider innovative means to partner with industry to solve this

critical issue. Recommendations may include, but not be limited to, use of funding under the Defense Production Act, Title III, and judicious use of the National Defense Stockpile. The Department will submit a report containing the conclusions and recommendations of the study to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 1, 2004.

### Ship Intermediate and Depot Maintenance Funding

The Navy intends to stop distinguishing between intermediate and depot maintenance costs in the budget materials. The committee believes it is important to understand the costs associated with each type of work and, therefore, directs the Secretary of Navy to continue to distinguish the costs associated with intermediate maintenance and depot maintenance for ships and to continue to maintain separate sub-activity groups in the budget justification material.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

### Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding

This section would authorize $114.0 billion in operations and maintenance funding for the Armed Forces and other activities of the Department of Defense.

### Section 302—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize $2.8 billion for working capital funds of the Department of Defense.

### Section 303—Other Department of Defense Programs

This section would authorize $15.3 billion for the Defense Health Program, of which $14.9 billion is for operations and maintenance funding; $65.8 million is for research, development, test and evaluation funding, and $327.8 million is for procurement.

This section would also authorize $1.58 billion for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, of which $1.25 billion is for operations and maintenance funding, $251.9 million is for research, development, test, and evaluation funding, and $79.2 million is for procurement funding. Funding for military construction related to this program is authorized in defense-wide military construction.

This section would also authorize $817.4 million for the defense-wide drug interdiction and counter-drug activities.

This section would also authorize $162.4 million for the Defense Inspector General.

### SUBTITLE B—ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

### Section 311—Reauthorization and Modification of Title I of Sikes Act

This section would amend section 670f of title 16, United States Code, to reauthorize section 108 of the Sikes Act, (Public Law 86–797), by striking "fiscal years 1998 through 2003" and in each place it appears inserting "fiscal years 2004 through 2008." This section

expresses the Sense of Congress regarding the Department's practice of outsourcing the functions of natural resource managers on its military installations. This section further requires creation of a five-year pilot program for invasive species management for military installations on Guam.

Section 312—Authorization for Defense Participation in Wetland Mitigation Banks

This section would amend Chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, to permit the secretaries of the military departments to participate in wetland mitigation banking programs and consolidated user sites ("in-lieu-fee" programs) as an alternative to creating a wetland for mitigation on federal property for construction projects.

Section 313—Inclusion of Environmental Response Equipment and Services in Navy Definitions of Salvage Facilities and Salvage Services

This section would amend sections 7361 and 7363 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the Secretary of the Navy's authority to provide salvage facilities and to assert claims for salvage services encompassing environmental response equipment and activities.

Section 314—Clarification of Department of Defense Response to Environmental Emergencies

This section would amend sections 402, 404 and 2561(a) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the discretionary authority of the Secretary of Defense to respond to environmental emergencies by providing humanitarian assistance, including the authority to transport supplies or provide assistance intended for use to respond to or mitigate the effects of an event such as an oil spill that threatens serious harm to the environment.

Section 315—Requirements for Restoration Advisory Boards and Exemption from Federal Advisory Committee Act

This section would amend section 2705(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code, to amend the regulations relating to the establishment, characteristics, composition, and funding of Restoration Advisory Boards and to exempt Restoration Advisory Boards from application of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, (5 U.S.C. App.).

Section 316—Report Regarding Impact of Civilian Community Encroachment and Certain Legal Requirements on Military Installations and Ranges

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to study and provide a one-time report to Congress regarding the impact of civilian community encroachment on the readiness requirements and normal operations at military installations that are required to maintain safety buffer zones or safety arcs as part of their functional mission activities. The report would also include results of a study on the impact on activities at military installations and operational ranges, if any, due to compliance by the Department with State Implementation Plans for air quality under section 110

of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7410), the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901), and the Comprehensive Environmental Restoration, Compensation and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601).

Section 317—Military Readiness and Conservation of Protected Species

This section would amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Public Law 93–205) at section 1533 of title 16 United States Code, to provide that the Secretary of the Interior, after making a determination that a species is endangered or threatened, would make future designations or revise existing designations of critical habitat to the maximum extent necessary. This section would prohibit further designations of critical habitat for endangered species in areas for which an Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan has been prepared under section 101 of the Sikes Act (Public Law 86–797). This section would also require regulatory agencies to consider national security concerns in addition to economic impact prior to designating future areas of critical habitat. This section would not annul existing critical habitat designations, but it would permit the Secretary of the Interior to exercise discretion to revise existing critical habitat designations on military installations. No existing critical habitat can be revised, however, if such action would result in the extinction of an endangered or threatened species.

Section 318—Military Readiness and Marine Mammal Protection

This section would amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (Public Law 92–522) at sections 1362 and 1371 of title 16 United States Code, by clarifying the definition of "harassment." The new definition would provide greater clarity and notice regarding the application of the Marine Mammal Protection Act to Department of Defense activities, especially military readiness activities.

The new definition reflects the position of the National Research Council (NRC). In a report published in 2000, the NRC stated that there was no valid reason for regulating minor changes in behavior having no significant impact on the viability of the marine mammal stock. Rather, regulation of marine mammal behavior should be focused on minimizing injury and biologically significant disruptions to behavior critical to survival and reproduction.

The new definition follows the NRC report by requiring that Level A harassment, related to injury, involve "any act that injures or has the significant potential to injure" a marine mammal. Likewise, for Level B harassment, related to changes in behavior, the new definition would cover an action that "disturbs or is likely to disturb" a marine mammal by causing disruptions of biologically important behaviors related to survival and reproduction "to a point where such behavioral patterns are abandoned or significantly altered."

This section creates an exemption that would allow the Secretary of Defense, after conferring with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, or both, as appropriate, to exempt the Department of Defense's military readiness activities from the requirements of the Marine Mammal Protection Act when necessary

for national defense for up to two years with renewable two-year periods of exemption.

This section cures deficiencies that currently exist when the 'small take' authorization provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act are applied to military readiness and other activities. This section eliminates the "specified geographic regions" and "small numbers" requirements and would focus impact determinations on a scientifically based "negligible impacts" standard. The underlying rulemaking process would still analyze the impacts and scope of military readiness and other activities.

The committee believes that the deletion of "specified geographical regions" and "small numbers" requirements from the Marine Mammal Protection Act affect the current regulatory definition of "specified activity," set forth in 50 CFR 216.103, and would require revision to ensure consistency with the Marine Mammal Protection Act as amended.

This section also amends the requirements of the Marine Mammal Protection Act concerning public notice for the 'small take' authorization process. For military readiness activities only, public notice will be limited to the Federal Register. In referring to military readiness activities, the committee means those activities as defined in section 315(f) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), see also title 16 United States Code 703 note. A requirement for public notice in local papers could compromise national security and thus would be eliminated. References in the section to military readiness activities "authorized by the Secretary of Defense" do not require a specific authorization of each activity by the Secretary of Defense and do not prohibit the Secretary of Defense from delegating such authority. Finally, none of these changes requires the public disclosure of classified information under any circumstances.

### Section 319—Limitation on Department of Defense Responsibility for Civilian Water Consumption Impacts Related to Fort Huachuca, Arizona

This section would amend section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536) in the case of Fort Huachuca, Arizona. Novel application of the Endangered Species Act is having unintended consequences on Fort Huachuca's readiness and training activities due to efforts of third parties to hold the installation accountable for water usage in the surrounding community over which it has no authority and control. This section clarifies that the Secretary of the Army cannot be held responsible under the Endangered Species Act for water consumption that occurs outside of the Fort and is beyond the direct authority and control of the Secretary of the Army.

This section specifies that the Secretary of the Army may voluntarily undertake efforts to mitigate water consumption related to Fort Huachuca.

### Section 320—Construction of Wetland Crossings, Camp Shelby Combined Arms Maneuver Area, Camp Shelby, Mississippi

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to use operation and maintenance funds to construct wetlands crossings

at Camp Shelby, Mississippi. Although current law permits the use of up to $750,000 in operation and maintenance funds for military construction activities, the cost of providing sufficient crossing sites at Camp Shelby to ensure that training is conducted with the spirit and intent of environmental laws would exceed this statutory cap.

## SUBTITLE C—WORKPLACE AND DEPOT ISSUES

### Section 321—Exclusion of Certain Expenditures from Percentage Limitation on Contracting for Performance of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair Workloads

Currently, section 2474(f) of title 10, United States Code, excludes work performed by non-federal personnel at Department of Defense maintenance and repair depots from the percentage limitations (50/50) on contracting for depot-level maintenance by the private sector. The exclusion applies for the duration of all public-private partnership depot maintenance contracts that are signed before the end of fiscal year 2006. This section would remove the date limitation. The committee believes that the date limitation impedes the ability of both the public and the private sectors to achieve fully the benefits of public-private partnerships.

### Section 322—High-Performing Organization Business Process Reengineering Pilot Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to implement a pilot program whereby Department of Defense organizations are incentivized to follow a business process re-engineering initiative in order to become a high performing organization. Under the pilot program, functions within an organization that are part of a BPR, shall not undergo a public-private competition during the design and implementation phase of the BPR. After a BPR is completed, those functions shall not undergo a public-private competition for a period of five years.

Business process redesign, or business process re-engineering, (BPR) is an organization's analysis and redesign of existing business processes to achieve improvements in performance measures. Business processes may include: developing a new product, repairing aircraft engines, processing and paying a vendor. The committee believes that a BPR is more than downsizing, automating, or realigning, rather, it is fundamental reshaping of the way work is done by a given organization. Within the Department of Defense, therefore, a BPR would require an analysis of core and non-core functions. The committee notes that significant obstacles, including lack of sustained commitment and leadership, lack of incentive, unrealistic scope and expectations, and resistance to change, may hinder or cause to fail numerous attempts at a BPR. The committee is aware that Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division, underwent a successful BPR; and the committee recommends that this facility be considered for the pilot program.

Section 323—Delayed Implementation of Office of Revised Management and Budget Circular A–76 by Department of Defense Pending Report

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the new Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 and then wait for a period of 45 days before implementing the Circular.

Section 324—Naval Aviation Depots Multi-Trades Demonstration Project

This section would require the Secretary of Navy to conduct a demonstration project to evaluate the benefits of promoting workers who perform multiple trades. Wage grade journeymen at any of the three naval aviation depots can qualify to learn an additional trade and be rewarded with a one-grade promotion. The section explains that the worker must use the new trades at least 25 percent of the time during the worker's work week.

SUBTITLE D—INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Section 331—Performance-based and Results-based Management Requirements for Chief Information Officers of Department of Defense

This section would amend section 2223(b) of title 10, United States Code, to give the Chief Information Officers (CIO) of the Department of Defense (DOD), military departments, defense agencies, and field activities more responsibility and accountability to review their individual agency's information technology (IT) programs, projects, and systems. The committee expects CIOs throughout the Department to have more input and oversight into their respective agency's IT programs and policies, focusing on results and ensuring that IT investments make their agencies more innovative, efficient, and responsive.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 341—Cataloging and Standardization for Defense Supply Management

This section would amend the current method the Secretary of Defense follows in the cataloging and coding, for identification purposes, of supply items. Pursuant to chapter 145 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense cataloged supply items with a national stock number (NSN). An NSN is a Department of Defense unique combination of letters and numbers used to identify a supply part. Commercial practices, however, dictate that the Secretary of Defense should adopt commercially accepted universal codes for such supply items, rather than dictating a DOD unique code. The committee recognizes that this is a change to long existing practice within the Department and therefore recommends a thorough transition and training plan be developed and disseminated to all appropriate organizations before making such changes. The committee also encourages the Secretary of Defense to work closely with industry in the adoption of universal supply codes.

This section would amend section 2451 of title 10, United States Code, and repeal sections 2452, 2453, and 2455 of title 10, United States Code, in order to provide the Secretary of Defense a considerable level of flexibility in the adoption of commercially available and universally accepted codes for supply items.

Section 342—Space-Available Transportation for Dependents of Members Assigned to Overseas Duty Locations for Continuous Period in Excess of One Year.

This provision would authorize the dependents of service members who are assigned overseas for a continuous period in excess of one year, to use space-available transportation to travel between the overseas duty location and the United States and return, or between the overseas duty location and another overseas location and return.

Section 343—Preservation of Military Weather Reconnaissance Mission

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from transferring, discontinuing, or disestablishing the weather reconnaissance mission, currently performed within the Air Force Reserve, unless another organization has the ability to perform that mission as it is currently performed.

## TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

### Overview

The committee's military personnel recommendations build not only on the emerging lessons learned from both the global war on terrorism and the war with Iraq, known as Operation Iraqi Freedom, but also on long-standing committee concerns about the inadequacy of military manpower for the missions assigned to both the active and reserve components.

The inadequacy of military manpower, especially active component strengths, is highlighted in a number of areas. For example, since 1995, the peacetime demands of the national military strategy have exceeded the ability of the active components to such an extent that reserve component personnel, in numbers equivalent to 33,000 full-time active duty personnel, are required to be ordered to active duty annually.

As a further indicator of active duty manpower inadequacy, the military services ended fiscal year 2002 with 24,500 personnel in excess of the strengths requested by the Department of Defense and authorized by Congress. More recently, at the time of the budget submission for fiscal year 2004, the services were projecting they would end fiscal year 2003 with active component strengths that exceeded authorized levels by 28,000, some 2 percent to 7.1 percent above authorized levels, depending on the service.

The global war on terrorism has expanded existing manpower requirements and added a host of new ones, especially those related to homeland security. To meet those requirements, the services mobilized more than 100,000 reservists, many on short notice for up

to one year, with thousands required to serve for up to two years because the active component lacks the qualified manpower. In light of the global war on terrorism and changes to the national security strategy, each of the military services undertook efforts to quantify total force (active, national guard and reserve) requirements. Each service found significant manpower shortfalls. The Army estimated the shortfall to be at least 41,000 and as much as 123,000. The Air Force estimated a shortfall ranging from 31,000 to 52,000. The Marine Corps estimated its shortfall to be about 15,000, and the Navy identified a shortfall of about 4,500.

Notwithstanding the unequivocal evidence of manpower shortfalls, the Secretary of Defense has promulgated a so-called "net-zero" policy. This policy holds that military end strength should not increase beyond the fiscal year 2002 authorized levels, and that any new military manpower requirements should be met by the conversion of military and civilian spaces in lower priority units and missions to fill higher priority requirements.

While the committee supports the Secretary's effort to require the services to re-examine their manpower requirements, the committee notes that any conversion of military spaces will be a costly multi-year effort, and that the fiscal year 2004 budget request provides little in the way of additional resources to the services for military manpower conversions. Furthermore, the committee understands that the services have identified high priority manning requirements that should be met quickly, including increases in special operating forces, intelligence, communications, military police, force protection personnel, and other skills important to conducting the global war on terrorism. However, the committee is disturbed to learn that rather than being provided additional resources to cover these high priority manpower requirements, the Army and Air Force were directed to fund new special operations force requirements from existing manpower and resource levels over the course of the six years of the future years' defense budgets. The committee also is surprised to learn that among the $831.0 million in unfunded military personnel requirements for fiscal year 2004 identified by the Chief of Naval Operations, were the costs of adding to the active components some 3,800 Naval Coastal Warfare unit personnel who are now in the Naval Reserve.

Given all this, the committee believes that it is imperative to now begin addressing known manpower shortfalls. To that end, the committee's recommendation would increase active component end strength by 6,240 above the requested levels.

## ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Military Manpower Reductions

In light of the committee's belief that there are unequivocal shortfalls in military manpower, the committee is disturbed to see the Navy's proposal in the budget request to begin reducing active end strength in fiscal year 2004 in direct contravention of the statutory end strength floors. The committee's recommendations contained in this title reject the Navy proposal and reaffirm the committee's long-held belief in the need for a larger military force in all the military services. Given this, the committee is highly concerned that within the Department of Defense, consideration may

already be developing for the fiscal year 2005 budget request for further substantial reductions to active and reserve component military manpower, not only in the Navy, but also in the other military services. The basis for such considerations appear to be early lessons learned from recent combat operations in Afghanistan and Iraq that significant force structure reductions, with concurrent manpower reductions, can be made.

The committee believes that such conclusions are premature, if for no other reason than the certainty that both the ongoing Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and the continuing Operation Iraqi Freedom will require the commitment of tens of thousands of U.S. military personnel—some early estimates suggest more than 125,000 for Iraq alone—for the foreseeable future. Beyond that, the committee believes that dynamic, unpredictable challenges will present themselves in other regions of the world that will require the commitment of U.S. military resources. Thus, considering today's existing military force levels, with no certainty about the end of current requirements, and the near certainty of a growth in new requirements, the committee is forced to conclude that reductions to military manpower would ultimately damage the long-term ability of the military forces to meet the full range of missions assigned them by the national security strategy. For these reasons, the committee strongly urges the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to fully consult with the committee before undertaking any reductions to manpower levels authorized by Congress.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Subtitle A—Active Forces

### Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces

This section would authorize the following end strengths for active duty personnel of the armed forces as of September 30, 2004.

| Service | FY 2003 authorized and floor | FY 2004 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Request | Committee recommendation | FY 2004 request | FY 2003 authorized |
| Army | 480,000 | 480,000 | 482,375 | 2,375 | 2,375 |
| Navy | 375,700 | 373,800 | 375,700 | 1,900 | 0 |
| USMC | 175,000 | 175,000 | 175,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Air Force | 359,000 | 359,300 | 361,268 | 1,968 | 2,268 |
| DOD | 1,389,700 | 1,388,100 | 1,394,343 | 6,243 | 4,643 |

The Army increases reflect the committee's support for the results of a Total Army Analysis that identified more than 6,000 active Army requirements in special operations, chemical, signal, military police and other priority needs. The Navy increase reflects the committee's opposition to the fiscal year 2004 budget request that proposed to reduce Navy end strength 1,900 below the statutory floor, as well as the committee's belief that the Navy should begin aggressively addressing known shortfalls in active strength related to unfilled requirements for Naval Coastal Warfare units. The increased Air Force strength follows from the committee's support for growth in Air Force special operations forces and in high priority Air Force manpower needs in such specialties as airborne

refueling, combat control, airborne systems maintenance, loadmaster, flight engineer, security forces, aerial port logistics, intelligence exploitation and analysis, and firefighters. To support the increases in active end strengths, the committee recommends an additional $291.3 million for the military personnel accounts of the military services above the amounts requested in the budget.

### Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels

This section would establish new permanent minimum end strengths for active duty personnel of the Army, Navy and Air Force as of September 30, 2004. These minimum strengths reflect the committee recommendations for active end strength shown in section 401.

## SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES

### Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve

This section would authorize the following end strengths for selected reserve personnel, including the end strength for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves, as of September 30, 2004:

| Service | FY 2003 authorized | FY 2004 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Request | Committee recommendation | FY 2004 request | FY 2003 authorized |
| Army National Guard | 350,000 | 350,000 | 350,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Army Reserve | 205,000 | 205,000 | 205,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Naval Reserve | 87,800 | 85,900 | 85,900 | 0 | −1,900 |
| Marine Corps Reserve | 39,558 | 39,600 | 39,600 | 0 | 42 |
| Air National Guard | 106,600 | 107,000 | 107,000 | 0 | 400 |
| Air Force Reserve | 75,600 | 75,800 | 75,800 | 0 | 200 |
| DOD Total | 864,558 | 863,300 | 863,300 | 0 | −1,258 |
| Coast Guard Reserve | 9,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 0 | 1,000 |

### Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves

This section would authorize the following end strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves as of September 30, 2004:

| Service | FY 2003 authorized | FY 2004 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Request | Committee recommendation | FY 2004 request | FY 2003 authorized |
| Army National Guard | 24,562 | 25,386 | 25,386 | 0 | 824 |
| Army Reserve | 14,070 | 14,374 | 14,374 | 0 | 304 |
| Naval Reserve | 14,572 | 14,384 | 14,384 | 0 | −188 |
| Marine Corps Reserve | 2,261 | 2,261 | 2,261 | 0 | 0 |
| Air National Guard | 11,727 | 12,140 | 12,140 | 0 | 413 |
| Air Force Reserve | 1,498 | 1,660 | 1,660 | 0 | 162 |
| DOD Total | 68,690 | 70,205 | 70,205 | 0 | 1515 |

The committee recommendation would provide for a 2.2 percent growth in the strength of these full-time reservists above the levels authorized in fiscal year 2003.

### Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status)

This section would authorize the following end strengths for military technicians (dual status) as of September 30, 2004:

| Service | FY 2003 authorized | FY 2004 | | Change from | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Request | Committee recommendation | FY 2004 request | FY 2003 authorized |
| Army National Guard | 24,102 | 24,589 | 24,589 | 0 | 487 |
| Army Reserve | 6,599 | 6,699 | 7,844 | 1,145 | 1,245 |
| Air National Guard | 22,495 | 22,806 | 22,806 | 0 | 311 |
| Air Force Reserve | 9,911 | 9,991 | 9,991 | 0 | 80 |
| DOD Total | 63,107 | 64,085 | 65,230 | 1,145 | 2,123 |

The committee's recommendation would provide for a 3.4 percent growth in the strength of military technicians above the levels authorized in fiscal year 2003.

### Section 414—Fiscal Year 2004 Limitation on Non-Dual Status Technicians

This section would establish the maximum end strengths for the reserve components of the Army and Air Force for non-dual status technicians as of September 30, 2004.

### Section 415—Permanent Limitations on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians

This section would increase to 595 the permanent limit on the number of non-dual status military technicians who are allowed to be employed by the Army Reserve on or after October 1, 2007. It would also establish a separate permanent limit of 90 non-dual status technicians who are allowed to be employed by the Air Force Reserve on or after October 1, 2007. The committee recommends this increase from the current combined limit of 170 for both the Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve as a necessary follow-on to previous changes in law in the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), that revised the mandatory separation age for certain non-dual status technicians from 55 to 60.

## SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

### Section 421—Military Personnel

This section would authorize $98.94 billion to be appropriated for military personnel. This authorization of appropriations reflects both reductions and increases to the budget request for military personnel that are itemized below.

| *Total Force: Military Personnel* | *Amount (in millions)* |
|---|---|
| Army: Increase active end strength (2,375) | 117,967,000 |
| Army National Guard: Sustain AGR growth | 27,417,000 |
| Navy: Increase active end strength (1,900) | 98,000,000 |
| Air Force: Increase active end strength (1,968) | 75,300,000 |
| Army: End of certain SW Asia contingency operations | −74,200,000 |
| Navy: End of certain SW Asia contingency operations | −1,200,000 |
| Naval Reserve: End of certain SW Asia contingency operations | −800,000 |
| Marine Corps: End of certain SW Asia contingency operations | −500,000 |
| Air Force: End of certain SW Asia contingency operations | −241,984,000 |

| *Total Force: Military Personnel* | *Amount (in millions)* |
|---|---|
| Offset O&M increase for Army National Guard military technicians | −16,000,000 |
| Offset O&M increases in Defense Health Program | −1,554,000 |

### Section 422—Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize $65,279,000 to be appropriated for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home during fiscal year 2004.

## TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

### OVERVIEW

The committee recommendations contained in this title build on emerging lessons learned from not only the global war on terrorism, but also the war with Iraq. To that end, the committee recommends important changes to reserve component personnel policy, including a simplified, more flexible system for measuring a reservist's annual training requirements. The committee also recommends that the process for managing and compensating personnel experiencing extended or frequent deployments be restructured to make it a more useful and cost-effective tool.

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### Department of Defense Education Partnerships

The committee continues to believe that the use of web-based technology is essential to both the retention and recruitment of military personnel for the armed forces. The committee support for such web-based technology efforts is reflected in the statement of the managers in title V of the conference report for the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (H. Rept. 107–772). That report encouraged the Department of Defense to foster web-based technology partnerships with high schools and institutions of higher learning. In that context, the committee is especially pleased with the initiative of the United States Recruiting Command to work with a national consortium of high schools and institutions of higher education to facilitate the enrollment and transfer of students with full recognition of credits among two-year and four-year institutions of higher education. If implemented, the committee believes such a partnership may assist Army recruiting and retention, while enhancing higher education opportunities for Army personnel.

#### Department of Defense Overseas Schools Teacher Recruitment Incentives

The committee is concerned that United States citizens recruited from an overseas location to teach in Department of Defense (DOD) overseas schools are not provided the same allowances as American citizen teachers recruited in the United States. The committee is aware, based on the General Accounting Office report entitled, "DOD Overseas Schools—Compensation Adequate for Recruiting and Retaining Well-Qualified Teachers," as directed by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107), that differences can arise because allowances are used as

recruitment incentives. The committee also understands that both the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State share the authority for prescribing regulations governing allowances for the overseas teachers. To ensure that the recruitment incentives do not place United States citizens recruited overseas at an undue disadvantage compared to U.S. citizens recruited in the United States, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to review the allowances and recruitment incentive practices and report the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and House Committee on Armed Services no later than April 15, 2004.

### Electronic Voting Demonstration

The committee remains committed to ensuring that the 2004 electronic voting demonstration project authorized in section 1604 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) is robust, technologically advanced, and statistically significant. The committee strongly believes that electronic voting systems are the best way to overcome the long-standing problems associated with military absentee voting and guarantee military voting rights in the future. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to closely monitor preparation for the demonstration project and to commit the resources that are needed to make the project a success.

### Federal Write-In Absentee Ballot

The committee has noted that military commanders have not effectively emphasized the use of the Federal Write-In Absentee Ballot (FWAB) for military voters who have not received their local election ballots in a timely manner. The committee believes that military voters have been denied a valuable tool that can provide the opportunity to vote while assigned to the most austere locations when they otherwise would be denied the right to vote because of mail delays or administrative problems. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to initiate programs to educate commanders, service voting officials, service members, and their family members about the availability and appropriate use of the FWAB. For example, the committee believes that all deploying units should consider the timing of future elections and ensure that an adequate supply of Federal Write-In Absentee Ballots is available during the deployment.

### Joint Advertising and Market Research

The committee believes that the Department of Defense has an important corporate-level role to play in complementing the recruiting advertising programs of the individual services. In that light, the committee commends the Department's joint advertising and market research reinvention effort, believing the program will have a direct, positive long-term impact on the ability of the Department and the military services to recruit quality personnel. Reflecting its belief in the Department's joint advertising and market research effort, the committee worked to sustain funding for the program in the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314). The committee notes with dismay,

however, that the Department's budget request for fiscal year 2004 contains only minimal funding for the joint advertising and market research program, leaving a shortfall of some $41.5 million. Such a one-year reduction is not justified, and the committee strongly urges the Department to fully fund this important program through reprogramming at the earliest opportunity.

### Warrant Officer Appointments for the Army National Guard

The committee has noted that the Army National Guard has not been able to fill all warrant officer vacancies. The committee is concerned that many qualified senior noncommissioned officers within the Army National Guard are being overlooked for warrant officer appointments. The committee believes that the Army National Guard has adequate educational institutions and resources to prepare noncommissioned officers for appointment as warrant officers. However, the Army has only one appointment source for warrant officers and the capability of the Army National Guard to prepare noncommissioned officers for warrant officer appointment is not utilized. The committee recommends that the Secretary of the Army review the process for appointing warrant officers and consider authorizing the Army National Guard to make warrant officer appointments.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICER MATTERS

#### Section 501—Standardization of Qualifications for Appointment as Service Chief

This section would require that candidates for selection as the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps be chosen from the flag officers of the Navy or general officers of the Marine Corps. Current law specifies that candidates for the position of Chief of Naval Operations be chosen from among active duty officers who, among other qualifications, hold the grade of rear admiral (O–8) or above, and that candidates for the position of Commandant of the Marine Corps be chosen from among active duty officers in the grade of colonel (O–6) or above. The committee recommendation would make qualification criteria with respect to grade consistent across all four of the military services.

### SUBTITLE B—OTHER OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY MATTERS

#### Section 511—Repeal of Prohibition on Transfer Between Line of the Navy and Navy Staff Corps Applicable to Regular Navy Officers in Grades Above Lieutenant Commander

This section would repeal the prohibition against regular officers in the grade of captain and above from moving between the line of the Navy and the Navy staff corps.

### Section 512—Retention of Health Professions Officers to Fulfill Active-Duty Service Commitments Following Promotion Nonselection

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to retain officers serving in health professions until the end of their active duty service obligations, notwithstanding the requirement under law to discharge them on an earlier date due to nonselection for promotion. This section would allow the secretary to decline to retain an officer if retention of the officer is not in the best interests of the service.

### Section 513—Increased Flexibility for Voluntary Retirement for Military Officers

The amendment would authorize the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments greater flexibility in determining the grade in which active duty and reserve officers may be retired. Specifically, this section would:

(1) Make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Defense to reduce from three to two the number of years that must be served in grades above major, or lieutenant commander in the Navy, and below brigadier general, or rear admiral (lower half) in the Navy, before retiring in those grades.

(2) Require officers serving in grades above colonel, or captain in the Navy, to serve a minimum of one year time-in-grade before being allowed to retire in that grade.

(3) Replace the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to notify Congress that officers have performed satisfactorily in grades above major general, or rear admiral (upper half) in the Navy, before being allowed to retire in those grades with an authority for the secretary of the military department concerned to approve retirement of officers in those grades with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense.

## Subtitle C—Reserve Component Matters

### Section 521—Streamlined Process for Continuation of Officers on the Reserve Active-Status List

This section would remove the requirement for the secretary concerned to conduct a selection board to identify officers eligible for continuation on the reserve active-status list after being subject to separation or retirement due to nonselection for promotion, selection for early separation, or other reason.

### Section 522—Consideration of Reserve Officers for Position Vacancy Promotions in Time of War or National Emergency

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to consider reserve officers ordered to active duty in support of a contingency operation for vacancy promotions for a period of up to two years of active duty service.

### Section 523—Simplification of Determination of Annual Participation for Purposes of Ready Reserve Training Requirements

This section would restate (in terms of days of duty to be performed) the annual training requirement for all members of the ready reserve, which is comprised of members of the selected reserve and individual ready reserve. At present, the typical member of the selected reserve is required to perform the equivalent of 38 training days of duty in the form of 48 periods of inactive duty for training (traditionally performed at the rate of four periods over a weekend) and 14 days of annual training. Other reservists fulfill training and active duty requirements in at least 32 different categories of duty status. This section would provide one measure of annual participation—38 days per year.

### Section 524—Authority for Delegation of Required Secretarial Special Finding for Placement of Certain Retired Members in Ready Reserve

This section would allow the secretaries of the military departments to delegate determinations of whether retired members possess a skill so critical that they will be permitted to serve in a reserve component following retirement. However, this section would limit the delegation authority to no lower than the level of assistant secretary of the military service, or the level of lieutenant general or vice admiral in an armed force charged with responsibility for military personnel policy.

### Section 525—Authority To Provide Expenses of Army and Air Staff Personnel and National Guard Bureau Personnel Attending National Conventions of Certain Military Associations

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to fund the necessary expenses of regular members assigned to the National Guard Bureau or the Army General Staff or the Air Staff to attend the national convention of the Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the United States in the same manner as funding is provided to support attendance at the national conventions of the National Guard Association of the United States and the Adjutants General Association.

## SUBTITLE D—MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

### Section 531—Authority for the Marine Corps University to Award the Degree of Master of Operational Studies

This section would authorize the president of the Marine Corps University to confer the degree of master of operational studies upon graduates of the Command and Staff College's School of Advanced Warfighting who fulfill the requirements for that degree.

### Section 532—Expanded Educational Assistance Authority for Cadets and Midshipmen Receiving ROTC Scholarships

This section would authorize the secretary of the military department concerned to provide Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps scholarship students financial assistance in the form of room and board or other expenses required by the educational institution, so

long as the total amount of assistance does not exceed what the student would have otherwise received for tuition, fees, books, and laboratory expenses.

Section 533—Increase in Allocation of Scholarships Under Army Reserve ROTC Scholarship Program to Students at Military Junior Colleges

This section would expand from 10 to 17 the number of cadets attending each military junior college on a Reserve Officer Training Corps scholarship. Such cadets are required to serve in the reserve components upon graduation.

Section 534—Inclusion of Accrued Interest in Amounts that May be Repaid Under Selected Reserve Critical Specialties Education Loan Repayment Program

This section would clarify that the interest accrued on a student loan should be included in the loan amount used as the basis for calculating the annual payment to reserve members under the selected reserve education loan repayment program.

Section 535—Authority for Nonscholarship Senior ROTC Sophomores to Voluntarily Contract for and Receive Subsistence Allowance

This section would authorize the secretary of the military department concerned to enter into a service contract with a Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps student who is not on a scholarship for the purpose of making the student eligible to receive a monthly subsistence allowance.

Section 536—Appointments to Military Service Academies from Nominations Made by Delegates from Guam, Virgin Islands, and American Samoa

This section would increase from two to three the number of appointments to each of the military service academies that can be made as a result of nominations made by the Delegate in Congress from Guam and the Delegate in Congress from the Virgin Islands. It would also increase from one to two the number of appointments to each of the military service academies that can be made as a result of nominations made by the Delegate from American Samoa.

Section 537—Readmission to Service Academies of Certain Former Cadets and Midshipmen

This section would authorize the secretary of a military department to readmit a former cadet or midshipman to a service academy on the basis of a formal report by an inspector general in the Department of Defense, if that report found that while attending that service academy, the cadet or midshipman had suffered a reprisal or other injustice that led to the resignation from the service academy.

Section 538—Authorization for Naval Postgraduate School to Provide Instruction to Enlisted Members Participating in Certain Programs

This section would permit enlisted members of the armed services to receive instruction at the Naval Postgraduate School in connection with the information security scholarship program. This Department of Defense (DOD) program is conducted as part of an effort to recruit and retain DOD personnel who have the computer and network security skills to meet DOD information assurance requirements.

Section 539—Defense Task Force on Sexual Harassment and Violence at the Military Service Academies

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a task force to examine matters related to sexual harassment and violence at the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy. This section would require that the task force report findings and recommendations to the Secretary of Defense, and the secretaries of the Army and Navy, within 12 months of the initial meeting of the task force. Within 90 days of receiving the task force report, the Secretary of Defense would be required to provide the report, together with the Secretary's evaluation of the report, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. At the same time, the Secretary also would be required to provide to those committees an assessment of the effectiveness of the corrective actions being taken at the United States Air Force Academy as a result of various investigations conducted at that academy into matters involving sexual assault and harassment. Based on that report, the committee will be in a position to judge whether it should subsequently direct additional evaluation and assessment of the Air Force Academy.

SUBTITLE E—ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Section 541—Enhancements to High-Tempo Personnel Program

This section would restructure the program to manage service members subject to extended or frequent deployments. This section would require the deployment of members beyond 400 days out of the preceding 730 days to be approved, as a minimum, by a member of the Senior Executive Service or an officer serving in the grade of colonel, or in the case of the Navy, captain, when they have been selected for promotion and are serving in a billet authorized a general or flag officer. This section would also authorize a monthly payment of up to $1,000 to service members for each month during which the member is deployed for 191 or more consecutive days or for 401 days out of the preceding 730 days, or a reservist serves on active duty for more than 30 days during the second or subsequent mobilization for the same contingency operation.

Section 542—Enhanced Retention of Accumulated Leave for High-Deployment Members

This section would increase the accumulated leave that may be retained by a member serving at least 120 consecutive days in an area authorized payment of imminent danger pay, or similar assignment, from 90 to 120 days.

Section 543—Standardization of Time-in-Service Requirements for Voluntary Retirement of Members of the Navy and Marine Corps with Army and Air Force Requirements

This section would correct a minor disparity in the method for determining eligibility for retirement among the services by authorizing members of the Navy and Marine Corps to retire using the same years of service standard as used by the Army and Air Force. This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to determine the effective date of the correction in order to minimize implementation costs.

Section 544—Standardization of Statutory Authorities for Exemptions from Requirement for Access to Secondary Schools by Military Recruiters

This section would remove the authority for local educational agencies to vote to deny military recruiters access to secondary schools and student information and would bring the recruiter access policy established in section 503 of title 10, United States Code in line with the policy established in the No Child Left Behind Act (Public Law 107–110).

Section 545—Procedures for Consideration of Applications for Award of the Purple Heart Medal to Veterans Held as Prisoners of War Before April 25, 1962

This section would instruct the secretary concerned to consider the length of time between captivity and application and the duration of captivity when reviewing cases where individuals are seeking the award of the Purple Heart for periods when they were held as prisoners of war before April 25, 1962. This section would also require the secretary to provide information on prisoner of war camps to assist individuals in assembling applications.

Section 546—Authority for Reserve and Retired Regular Officers to Hold State and Local Elective Office Notwithstanding Call to Active Duty

This section would remove the restriction barring reservists or retirees serving on active duty for more than 270 days from holding elective office.

Section 547—Clarification of Offense Under the Uniform Code of Military Justice Relating to Drunken or Reckless Operation of a Vehicle, Aircraft or Vessel

This section would make a technical correction to section 911 of title 10 of the United States Code, clarifying that an alcohol concentration level in a person's blood or breath that was 0.10 grams

or more of alcohol per 100 milliliters of blood (or 210 liters of breath) is a punishable offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

### Section 548—Public Identification of Casualties No Sooner than 24 Hours After Notification of Next-of-Kin

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from publicly releasing the name or other personally identifying information about military personnel who become casualties until 24 hours after official notification of the service member's next-of-kin has taken place.

## SUBTITLE F—BENEFITS

### Section 551—Additional Classes of Individuals Eligible to Participate in the Federal Long-Term Care Insurance Program

This section would authorize reservists and federal civilian employees who have not reached the minimum age required to begin receiving a retired annuity and certain other civilian employees to be eligible for the Federal Long-Term Care Insurance Program.

### Section 552—Authority To Transport Remains of Retirees and Retiree Dependents Who Die in Military Treatment Facilities Outside the United States

This section would expand the authority of the secretary concerned to transport the remains of armed forces retirees and their dependents that die in military health care facilities from departure and destination locations within the United States to include locations overseas.

### Section 553—Eligibility for Dependents of Certain Mobilized Reservists Stationed Overseas to Attend Defense Dependents Schools Overseas

This section would expand the eligibility for space-available, tuition-free attendance at Department of Defense Dependents Schools (DODDS) overseas to the dependents of mobilized reservists who are called to active duty from a continental United States location and whose overseas tour is voluntarily or involuntarily extended beyond one year. The committee makes this recommendation to address a disparity in an admissions policy that now permits the dependents of reservists called to active duty from an overseas location to enroll in DODDS on a space-available, tuition-free basis, but denies such admission to reservists mobilized from the continental United States.

It is the committee's intent to ensure that the dependents of mobilized reservists who become eligible for attendance at DODDS overseas under this section be admitted at the earliest feasible date. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe final implementation regulations at the earliest opportunity for the dependents to begin schooling, but in no case later than the beginning of the school term closest to the date of enactment.

## SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 561—Extension of Requirement for Exemplary Conduct by Commanding Officers and Others in Authority to Include Civilians in Authority in the Department of Defense

This section would establish exemplary standards for all commanding officers and others in authority in the Department of Defense by broadening the scope of the statutory standards that now are individually codified for the Army, the Naval services, and the Air Force. The provision would also establish the standard for exemplary conduct for civilian leaders in the Department of Defense and the military departments.

### Section 562—Recognition of Military Families

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to implement and sustain programs, including appropriate annual ceremonies and events, to celebrate the contributions and sacrifices of military families in the active and reserve components. The committee believes that it would be appropriate for the Secretary to focus this effort annually by designating that ceremonies and events take place during a specific month.

### Section 563—Assistance to Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would provide $35.0 million for assistance to local educational agencies. The committee makes this recommendation in connection with its continuing strong support of the need to help local school districts with significant concentrations of military students.

### Section 564—Permanent Authority for Support for Certain Chaplain-Led Military Family Support Programs

This section would authorize the secretary of a military department to provide support services to active duty and reserve members and their immediate family members to facilitate their participation in chaplain-led programs designed to build and maintain strong families.

### Section 565—Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Joint Executive Committee

This section would expand the scope of responsibilities of the Department of Defense—Department of Veterans Affairs (DOD–VA) Health Executive Committee beyond health care matters to include collaborative efforts between the departments in matters of benefits and other areas as determined by the co-chairs. Reflecting these broader responsibilities, this section would rename the committee as the Department of Defense—Department of Veterans Affairs Joint Executive Committee. The committee believes the expanded responsibilities of the committee promote improved cooperation and greater flexibility by the DOD and VA in managing personnel and fiscal requirements of the collaborative endeavors of both departments.

### Section 566—Limitation on Aviation Force Structure Changes in the Department of the Navy

This section would preclude reductions in active and reserve component aviation force structure in the Navy until 90 days after the Secretary of the Navy provides the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services two reports. One report would clarify the details of the Navy's aviation force structure plan for fiscal years 2004 through 2009. The second report would provide the secretary's concept of operations for improving the integration and use of Naval Reserve units and personnel with active component forces in carrying out operational missions across the peacetime and wartime spectrum of naval operations during the period of 2004 through 2005.

### Section 567—Impact-Aid Eligibility for Heavily Impacted Local Educational Agencies Affected by Privatization of Military Housing

This section would clarify the eligibility for impact aid to schools whose student population was affected during the construction of military family housing by public-private partnerships.

### Section 568—Investigation into the 1991 Death of Marine Corps Colonel James E. Sabow

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to open a new investigation into the January 1991 death of Colonel James E. Sabow at the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, focusing the effort on determining the colonel's cause of death. The committee believes that previous investigations did not address a range of issues that could clarify whether murder, not suicide, caused Colonel Sabow's death. The committee has compiled a list of significant issues and questions that must be addressed as part of this new investigation, as well as witnesses that must be interviewed. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense, prior to beginning the new investigation, to consult with the committee to ensure that the new investigation fully and comprehensively addresses these matters.

## SUBTITLE H—DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

### Section 571—Travel and Transportation for Dependents Relocating for Reasons of Personal Safety

This section would allow travel and transportation allowances to dependents of uniformed service members who are victims of domestic violence and have agreed upon property division by written agreement or court order.

### Section 572—Commencement and Duration of Payment of Transitional Compensation

This section would allow transitional compensation to commence upon sentencing, except when a pretrial agreement includes a disapproval or suspension of a sentence. In such cases, transitional compensation will commence upon approval of the convening authority. It would also allow eligible individuals to receive transi-

tional compensation for 36 months, unless terminated earlier as required by law.

### Section 573—Flexibility in Eligibility for Transitional Compensation

This section would allow transitional compensation to certain dependents of a member or former member of the armed forces due to extenuating circumstances, as prescribed under regulations developed by the secretary concerned.

### Section 574—Types of Administrative Separations Triggering Coverage

This section would expand coverage to a service member on active duty for more than 30 days, who is voluntarily or involuntarily administratively separated.

### Section 575—On-Going Review Group

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to convene a working group within two years from the date of enactment to review and assess the progress of the Department of Defense in implementation of the recommendations of the Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence.

### Section 576—Resources for Department of Defense Implementation Organization

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the necessary resources in order to implement the recommendations of the Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence.

### Section 577—Fatality Reviews

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct multidisciplinary fatality reviews for each fatality that involves a member of the armed forces, a current or former dependent of a member, or a current or former intimate partner who has a child in common or has shared a common domicile with a member, and is suspected or known to have resulted from domestic violence or child abuse.

### Section 578—Sense of Congress

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should adopt the strategic plan proposed by the Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence. Furthermore, the service secretaries should establish and support a Victim Advocate Protocol for victims of domestic violence.

## TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

### OVERVIEW

The committee continues to support the fully funded and flexible compensation programs needed to recruit and retain a quality force in a wartime environment. Accordingly, the committee would in-

clude a pay raise that combines an across-the-board raise with targeted increases for mid-grade and senior noncommissioned officers, increases in pay and allowances for the warfighters, and additional incentives for mobilized reserve forces.

The committee remains committed to protecting military exchange and commissary benefits. Accordingly, the committee would include a series of provisions to clarify the requirement to operate resale activities and protect the level of benefit provided to service members and their families.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Survivor Benefit Program

The committee is deeply concerned that implementation of the Survivor Benefit Program (SBP) by the services has created certain inequities among eligible beneficiaries. Although Congress has enacted legislation designed to correct such inequities, many similarly situated survivors continue to receive disparate treatment under SBP. Specifically, the committee is aware that survivors of some seriously ill or injured service members who live long enough to be disability retired receive a better level of benefit than those where the member's death was instantaneous. The committee desires to correct such inequities. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review active duty SBP benefit levels awarded to survivors under different circumstances of death, the procedures used by the Department of Defense to operate the program, and the desired objectives of the program, and to propose legislation to ensure equitable treatment for the survivors of all members, regardless of the circumstances of death. The Secretary shall report his findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2004.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

#### Section 601—Increase in Basic Pay for Fiscal Year 2004

This section would increase basic pay for members of the armed forces by an average of 4.1 percent. This section would provide enhanced increases for mid-grade and senior noncommissioned officers and select warrant officers to enhance retention.

This raise would continue to fulfill Congress' commitment to increasing pay for the armed forces and would reduce the pay gap between military and private sector pay increases from 6.4 percent to 5.5 percent.

#### Section 602—Computation of Basic Pay Rate for Commissioned Officers with Prior Enlisted or Warrant Officer Service

This section would correct an inequity by authorizing mobilized reserve junior officers with extended prior enlisted or warrant officer service to be paid at the same increased rates of pay that they receive when serving in the active reserves.

Section 603—Special Subsistence Allowance Authorities for Members Assigned to High-Cost Duty Location or Under Other Unique and Unusual Circumstances

This section would authorize commanders to pay service members a supplemental allowance for subsistence to compensate for additional expenses encountered when assigned to high-cost and unique duty locations.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces

This section would extend the authority for the selected reserve reenlistment bonus, the selected reserve enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members of the selected reserve assigned to certain high priority units, the selected reserve affiliation bonus, the ready reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus, and the prior service enlistment bonus until December 31, 2004.

Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Certain Health Care Professionals

This section would extend the authority for the nurse officer candidate accession program, the accession bonus for registered nurses, the incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists, the special pay for selected reserve health care professionals in critically short wartime specialties, and the accession bonus for dental officers until December 31, 2004. The provision would also extend the authority for repayment of educational loans for certain health professionals who serve in the selected reserve until January 1, 2005.

Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers

This section would extend the authority for the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending the period of active service, nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus until December 31, 2004.

Section 614—One-Year Extension of Other Bonus and Special Pay Authorities

This section would extend the authority for the aviation officer retention bonus, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonus for active members, the retention bonus for members with critical military skills, and the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills until December 31, 2004.

Section 615—Computation of Hazardous Duty Incentive Pay for Demolition Duty and Parachute Jumping by Members of Reserve Components Entitled to Compensation Under Section 206 of Title 37

This section would authorize reservists to be paid hazardous duty pay at the same monthly rates paid to members serving on active duty for explosives demolition and parachute jumping duties

when they maintain the same qualification standards as required for active duty members.

Section 616–Availability of Hostile Fire and Imminent Danger Pay for Reserve Component Members on Inactive Duty

This section would authorize reservists to be paid hostile fire and imminent danger pay at the same monthly rate paid to members serving on active duty when serving in an inactive duty for training status at duty locations authorized the pay.

Section 617—Expansion of Overseas Tour Extension Incentive Program to Officers

This section would authorize officers to receive the same compensation or rest and recuperative leave benefits as granted to enlisted members who extend their overseas tours of duty at designated locations.

Section 618—Eligibility of Appointed Warrant Officers for Accession Bonus for New Officers in Critical Skills

This section would authorize individuals appointed in the grade of Warrant Officer (W1) to receive the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills.

Section 619—Incentive Pay for Duty on Ground in Antarctica or on Arctic Icepack

This section would authorize service members performing duty on the ground in the Antarctic or on the icepack in the Arctic to be paid an additional $5 for each day of that duty.

Section 620—Special Pay for Service as Member of Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team

This section would authorize members assigned by orders to duty as members of Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams to be paid a special pay of $150 per month.

Section 621—Incentive Bonus for Agreement to Serve in Critically Short Military Occupational Specialty

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to pay an incentive bonus of not more than $4,000 to certain enlisted members of the armed forces who agree to serve for not less than two years in a critically short military occupational specialty.

Section 622—Increase in Rate for Imminent Danger Pay and Family Separation Allowance Related to Service in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom

This section would increase the rate of imminent danger pay from $150 per month to $225 per month and the rate of family separation allowance from $100 per month to $250 per month paid to service members performing duty in the combat zones designated for Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. The increase in these pays would be effective October 1, 2003, and would expire on the date the President terminates the operation.

## SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

### Section 631—Shipment of Privately Owned Motor Vehicle Within Continental United States

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to pay a monetary allowance in lieu of transportation to service members who elect to arrange for transportation of a privately owned vehicle during a permanent change of station move between duty locations within the continental United States. The member would be responsible for any transportation costs in excess of the monetary allowance paid in lieu of transportation.

### Section 632—Payment or Reimbursement of Student Baggage Storage Costs for Dependent Children of Members Stationed Overseas

This section would expand the eligibility for dependent children of members stationed overseas to store student baggage to include storage at any point during the same fiscal year and not just at the time of the dependent student's annual trip to the member's overseas duty station.

### Section 633—Reimbursement for Lodging Expenses of Certain Reserve Component and Retired Members During Authorized Leave From Temporary Duty Location

The committee is troubled that mobilized reservists and recalled retirees serving on active duty for extended periods away from their homes are not authorized to be reimbursed for lodging costs during periods of leave when those costs are paid by the member on a monthly basis. Accordingly, this section would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to reimburse reservists and retirees serving on active duty at duty locations away from their homes the lesser of the lodging portion of the applicable per diem rate or the actual cost of lodging paid by the member for periods during which the member is in a leave status.

## SUBTITLE D—RETIRED PAY AND SURVIVORS BENEFITS

### Section 641—Funding for Special Compensation Authorities for Department of Defense Retirees

This section would require that payments made to retirees eligible for either the special compensation for the severely disabled or the special compensation for the combat disabled would be paid from the Military Retirement Trust Fund. These payments are now paid from the military services' personnel accounts. This section would also provide that any increase in the Department of Defense's annual accrual payment to the Military Retirement Trust Fund resulting from the payment of the two special compensations, or from concurrent receipt, should it be enacted, would be provided by a contribution from the United States Treasury.

## SUBTITLE E—COMMISSARY AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY BENEFITS

### Section 651—Expanded Commissary Access for Selected Reserve Members, Reserve Retirees Under Age 60, and Their Dependents

This section would authorize members of the selected reserve, reserve retirees qualified to receive retired pay, except that they are not age 60, and their dependents to use commissaries to the same extent as active duty members and their dependents.

### Section 652—Defense Commissary System and Exchange Stores System

The committee has noted the absence of a basic authority for the operation of commissaries and exchange stores and believes that such authority should be installed in the law. Accordingly, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to operate separate defense commissary and exchange store systems.

### Section 653—Limitations on Private Operation of Defense Commissary Store Functions

The committee is concerned that current law does not provide Congress sufficient oversight of initiatives to privatize commissary store functions. Accordingly, this section would clarify that only selected store functions may be considered for privatization and that the private operation of a store function may not take effect until the Secretary of Defense submits written notice of the proposed change to Congress and a period of 90 days of continuous session of Congress expires following the date on which the Secretary's notice is received.

### Section 654—Use of Appropriated Funds to Operate Defense Commissary System

The committee believes that the value of the commissary benefit to service members is derived from consistent appropriated funding support of commissary operations. Accordingly, this section would require the use of appropriated funding to support commissary operating expenses.

### Section 655—Recovery of Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality and Commissary Store Investments in Real Property at Military Installations Closed or Realigned

This section would authorize the use, without further appropriation, of funds resulting from the transfer or disposal (during base closures or realignments prior to 2005) of real property or facilities that had been acquired, constructed or improved with nonappropriated or commissary store funds. The committee makes this recommendation believing it to be fully consistent with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) governing the disposition of funds resulting from the transfer or disposal of nonappropriated or commissary store real property or facilities during the upcoming 2005 round of base closures and realignments.

### Section 656—Commissary Shelf-Stocking Pilot Program

The committee believes that the current practice of relying on vendors and brokers to provide a significant portion of commissary shelf stocking denies commissary managers effective control over an important element of cost. Accordingly, this section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program to stock shelves at three commissary stores using federal civilian employees or employees contracted by commissary managers. This section would require the Secretary to submit a plan to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services for the conduct of the pilot program not later than six months after the enactment of the bill and would authorize the Secretary to begin the pilot program 30 days after the plan was received by the committees.

The committee believes that the success of the pilot program relies on the Secretary of Defense requesting and the Office of Personnel Management approving a targeted civil service demonstration project under chapter 47 of title 5, United States Code. The committee does not favor the use of nonappropriated fund employees in commissaries and would not support the use of such employees to stock shelves during operation of the pilot program.

## SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 661—Repeal of Congressional Notification Requirement for Designation of Critical Military Skills for Retention Bonus

This section would repeal the requirement for the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Homeland Defense with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, to provide Congress 90 days advance notice before implementing a critical skills retention bonus.

# TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

## OVERVIEW

The committee recognizes the challenges faced by the Department of Defense in providing health care to a full range of beneficiaries at home and overseas, while caring for service members engaged in hostile operations. The committee is pleased that the Department's budget request for the Defense Health Program is based on appropriate inflation rates resulting in a realistic assessment of its requirements. Nonetheless, with the national phenomenon of escalating health care costs, the committee challenges the Department to aggressively explore innovative cost control methods.

In addition, the committee's recommendations address a number of concerns. For example, the committee believes that the Department has not fully demonstrated a commitment to carrying out force health protection and surveillance requirements that emerged from the lessons learned during the first Gulf War. The committee encourages the Department to ensure participation from the highest levels of leadership to ensure that operational commanders can track military units and individuals during operations; that per-

sonnel and medical systems provide complete documentation of health care encounters in medical records and that information systems for integrating every aspect of a service member's activity in theater (to include environmental data) and at home station are available.

Our Nation relies heavily on the reserve components to supplement the capabilities of our active duty forces as evidenced by the activation of thousands of reserve component personnel for operations in the Gulf. The committee is pleased with the Department's actions to enroll into TRICARE Prime the family members of reserve component service members who receive active duty orders for more than 30 days. Moreover, the committee continues to support and monitor the medical readiness efforts for the reserve components. However, the committee is concerned that many of the reserve component personnel do need significant medical and dental care to meet deployment standards once activated. To that end, the committee recommends new authority for the Department to provide pre-mobilization medical and dental screening and care to members of the Selected Reserve who are assigned to a unit that has been alerted or notified for mobilization in support of certain operations.

The committee recognizes the progress the Department has made toward selecting and establishing the next generation of TRICARE managed care support contracts. Yet, the Department faces the formidable task of awarding the contracts and executing a seamless transition to the new contracts that include a modified governance structure. The committee is encouraged by the efforts of the Department's transition team and implementation plan. The committee continues to expect the Department to provide ongoing, outreach programs regarding the full array of TRICARE programs to all categories of beneficiaries, beneficiary representative organizations, and health care providers.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Cost Containment in Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care System

The committee is concerned about the growing cost of health care for active and retired military personnel and their families. Given this concern, the committee remains interested in exploring cost containment measures which may have application in both the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs' health care systems. Therefore, the committee believes that both departments should be receptive to the examination and the controlled testing of innovative proposals for cost containment. Such innovative proposals could include the use of alternative treatment regimes, observation units, increased use of paramedics and other protocols that have proven effective at reducing cost while maintaining quality health care. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to consider establishing centers of excellence in both departments as a means of examining and testing innovative cost containment proposals and report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services the Secretary's plan for carrying out this directive.

## Force Health Protection and Surveillance

The committee remains strongly committed to the force health protection and surveillance of members of the armed forces. While the Department of Defense (DOD) and the military services have made notable strides since 1991 in improving the force health protection and surveillance system, the emerging results of oversight efforts by the General Accounting Office (GAO) indicate that much more remains to be done to overcome shortfalls in a system found lacking following the first Persian Gulf War. As service members return from a second conflict in the Persian Gulf, it is imperative that the Department has systems in place to avoid repeating the mistakes of the past.

In 1997, Congress established a number of program requirements. For example, the law requires the Secretary of Defense to institute a system of assessing the medical conditions of service members, including the use of pre- and post-deployment examinations, to provide for a centralized location of such records, to establish a quality assurance program to evaluate the system, and to create a mechanism for the tracking of members in a theatre of operations.

Ongoing reviews by the GAO indicate that while the services and the Department have made efforts to meet the intent of the law, especially in the promulgation of policy, the Department is not meeting the full requirement of the law and the military services are not effectively carrying out many of the Department's policies. For example, the GAO has found that many service members are not getting pre- and post-deployment health assessments. Centralized location of health care records remains a significant shortfall, and the required quality assurance program has yet to be established. Recent testimony by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs indicates that the Department is committed to resolving these issues. Yet, the committee remains concerned that the Department's focus on these issues will fade as the war with Iraq draws to a close.

Therefore, the committee, while awaiting the final report of the General Accounting Office, directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a quality control program to begin assessing implementation of the force health protection and surveillance program, and to provide a strategic implementation plan, including a timeline for full implementation of all policies and programs, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2004.

## Military-Civilian Education Programs Related to Sexual Health Decision-Making

The committee is aware of collaborative civil-military partnership education programs related to sexual health decision-making that demonstrate benefits through the reduction of unintended pregnancies and sexually transmitted infections among military personnel. The committee's support for such collaborative programs was demonstrated in the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 4546 (H. Rept. 107–772), which directed the Secretary of Defense to examine such collaborative programs and consider their use by the services. The committee continues to

be aware of on-going innovative, effective partnership education programs, particularly in the Army. As a measure of support for those efforts, and to further encourage the Secretary of Defense to examine civil-military partnership programs related to sexual health decision making, the committee recommends an increase in the funding for the Army medical department of $150,000.

### Population-Based Medical Research

The committee is encouraged by the collaboration of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to increase the capability to conduct population-based medical research and disease surveillance on the health of military personnel deployed in overseas conflicts both during and after their active military service. Such a capability was identified as essential after the first Gulf War. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue adapting existing information systems that leverage Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs capabilities to improve their population-based research.

### Study of Cost and Feasibility of TRICARE Eligibility for Adult Disabled Family Members

The committee is aware of beneficiary concerns that certain family members who are no longer eligible for TRICARE benefits and subsequently become incapacitated may have limited options for health care coverage. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of the cost and feasibility of providing TRICARE benefits to adult family members or adopted adult family members of active duty and retired military service members who became incapacitated after they were no longer eligible for TRICARE benefits. The study would include information on the number of families affected by current restrictions and the cost and feasibility of any recommendations for implementing the proposed change to TRICARE eligibility. The Secretary shall submit the report by March 31, 2004 to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

### Study of TRICARE Options for Puerto Rico

The committee is aware that the recent termination of the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program Demonstration may have had a greater impact on eligible beneficiaries in Puerto Rico compared with other demonstration sites because of the large percentage of participants in the program. The termination of the demonstration may have had a particular impact on military retirees under the age of 65 and their dependents, whose primary option is now TRICARE Standard. The committee is aware that it may be possible to expand TRICARE options for all beneficiaries who reside in Puerto Rico. The committee urges the Department of Defense to conduct a review of the current TRICARE options and access to health care services in Puerto Rico, including an analysis of the feasibility of providing TRICARE Prime and TRICARE Extra in Puerto Rico, as well as the costs to the federal government and the benefit to the military retiree.

### TRICARE Provider Participation

Over the past several years, the committee has heard from multiple sources not only that TRICARE beneficiaries are having increasing difficulty finding civilian health care providers who will accept them as patients, but also that civilian health care providers increasingly are leaving the TRICARE program or refusing to accept new TRICARE patients. In response, Congress, in the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), directed the Comptroller General to review the extent of and reasons for provider instability within the TRICARE network. Recently, a General Accounting Office (GAO) witness, testifying before the committee on GAO's preliminary findings, made it clear that data does not exist within the Department of Defense's (DOD) health care system, or within the data maintained by the TRICARE managed care support contractors, to objectively measure trends in provider participation or adequacy for network needs. Although the final report has yet to be completed, GAO's preliminary findings already raise serious concerns, especially since the Department has consistently reported that TRICARE provider networks are meeting contract standards. Therefore, the committee directs the Department to review and improve the current methodology used to ensure network adequacy. In addition, while the committee supports the Department's effort to provide greater responsibilities to local lead agents, it does not absolve the Department from ensuring that the managed care support contractors meet the reporting requirements of the contracts. The committee also directs the Department to systematically collect and evaluate beneficiary complaints to assist in determining whether there are systematic access problems.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 701—Revision of Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund To Permit More Accurate Actuarial Valuations

This section would give the Secretary of Defense more flexibility in calculating the required per-capita normal cost contributions to the Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund. Current law limits the Secretary of Defense to use only per-capita costs for the uniformed services, which include the Coast Guard, the U.S. Public Health Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Members of these non-DOD uniformed services have a higher per capita cost of health care than do DOD military personnel, and the requirement to use a "uniformed services" per-capita cost results in DOD's actuarial contribution being larger than necessary to fund the future cost of health care for Medicare-eligible military beneficiaries.

### Section 702—Transfer of Certain Members from Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee to Uniform Formulary Beneficiary Advisory Panel Under the Pharmacy Benefits Program

This section would realign the membership of the Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee and the Uniform Beneficiary Advisory

Panel to improve the ability of both to more effectively meet their statutory roles.

Section 703—Permanent Extension of Authority to Enter into Personal Services Contracts for the Performance of Health Care Responsibilities at Locations Other than Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would make permanent the authority for the Secretary of Defense to enter into personal services contracts to carry out health care responsibilities at locations other than medical treatment facilities, such as military entrance processing stations. The existing authority expires December 31, 2003.

Section 704—Plan for Providing Health Coverage Information to Members, Former Members and Dependents Eligible for Certain Health Benefits

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and submit to Congress by March 31, 2004, a plan to:

(1) Provide TRICARE Standard beneficiaries information concerning the extent of health care coverage under the benefit, the associated costs, sources of information for locating TRICARE-authorized providers, and methods to obtain assistance in resolving difficulties encountered with billing, eligibility, locating TRICARE-authorized providers, and collection actions;

(2) Ensure that beneficiaries receive assistance in locating a TRICARE-authorized provider;

(3) Institute a systematic approach to identify the number and location of TRICARE Standard eligible beneficiaries;

(4) Provide information to recruit and retain health care providers within TRICARE Standard; and

(5) Provide an implementation schedule for the plan to be executed with respect to any contract in the TRICARE program entered into after May 31, 2003.

The committee, based on testimony it has received and ongoing work of the General Accounting Office (as directed by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, Public Law 107–314), believes that an active outreach program by the Department of Defense to beneficiaries and health care providers would be helpful to improve access to care and beneficiary satisfaction with TRICARE Standard.

Section 705—Working Group on Military Health Care for Persons Reliant on Health Care Facilities at Military Installations to be Closed or Realigned

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a working group to provide input to the Secretary on the provision of health care to persons in the United States and overseas who rely on military health care facilities on installations that are selected for closure or realignment. The working group, which would include independent representatives from each TRICARE region, would:

(1) Provide input to the Secretary in developing the selection criteria and recommendations for the 2005 round of base closures;

(2) Assist the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission; and

(3) Provide a plan to the Secretary for the provision of health care to those persons affected by the closure or realignment of a military installation.

### Section 706—Acceleration of Implementation of Chiropractic Health Care for Members on Active Duty

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to accelerate the availability of chiropractic health care services and benefits through medical treatment facilities within the Defense Health Program (DHP) to members on active duty. The committee authorizes funds to be appropriated for the DHP above the budget request in the amount of $6.0 million for this purpose.

### Section 707—Medical and Dental Screening for Members of Selected Reserve Units Alerted for Mobilization

This section would allow the Department of Defense, to provide medical and dental screening and care for members of the selected reserve who are assigned to a unit that has been alerted or otherwise notified that the unit will be mobilized for an operational mission or a contingency operation, or during a national emergency, or in time of war.

# TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

## ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### MEDICAL EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

The committee is aware that the Director, Defense Logistics Agency, is considering using a group purchasing organization (GPO) to provide electronic access to GPO prices for medical equipment and supplies. These group purchase organizations use the leverage of their members' combined buying power as a means to purchase items at a discounted price. The committee recognizes the benefits of a GPO, but also recognizes the continued need for competition and the need to support small and small disadvantaged businesses. The committee therefore directs the Director, Defense Logistics Agency, to insure that small businesses receive special emphasis by retaining visibility of their medical equipment and supplies on national and/or regional pricing agreements within the electronic catalog/purchasing system. Further, any GPO selected to provide service will be required to foster small and small disadvantaged business participation within the portfolio of the organization, and the Defense Logistics Agency shall monitor this participation.

# LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—AMENDMENTS TO GENERAL CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES, PROCEDURES, AND LIMITATIONS

### Section 801—Extension of Authority To Carry Out Certain Prototype Projects

This section would extend authority for the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Secretary of a military department, or any other official designated by the Secretary of Defense, to carry out prototype projects under section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (P.L. 103–160) until September 30, 1998.

### Section 802—Elimination of Certain Subcontract Notification Requirements

This section would amend section 2306 of title 10, United States Code, by eliminating the requirement that contractors with a cost contract notify the agency before awarding a subcontract for a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or a fixed price subcontract greater than the simplified acquisition threshold or five percent of the estimated cost of the prime contract. The requirement would no longer apply in those instances where the Secretary of Defense approves the contractor's purchasing system.

### Section 803—Elimination of the Requirement to Furnish Written Assurances of Technical Data Conformity

This section would amend section 2320 of title 10, United States Code, by eliminating the requirement that contractors that provide technical data under a contract furnish written assurances that the data is complete, accurate, and satisfies the requirements of the contract. This section is not intended to diminish the contractor's obligation to provide technical data that meets contractor requirements or the Secretary of Defense's ability to enforce contractual obligations.

### Section 804—Limitation Period for Task and Delivery Order Contracts

This section would amend section 811 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (P.L. 107–314) in order to clarify the committee's intent to proscribe the period of time for which task and delivery order contracts can be awarded.

### Section 805—Additional Authorities Relating to Obtaining Personal Services

This section would amend section 129 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to award personal service contracts without application of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code. Personal service contracts can be awarded for experts and consultants, as well as for other work that is not considered of a consultant or expert nature. In this latter case contracts can be awarded for work to be performed outside the United States and for work to be performed inside the United States. In those in-

stances where work is to be performed inside the United States the contract must support special operations, intelligence and counter intelligence missions. The committee believes that personal service contracts should be awarded only when there are no Department of Defense officials available to perform the function. The committee also encourages the Department of Defense Inspector General to audit the use of this authority to ensure its appropriate use and application.

## SUBTITLE B—UNITED STATES DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE PROVISIONS

### PART I—CRITICAL ITEMS IDENTIFICATION AND DOMESTIC PRODUCTION CAPABILITIES IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

#### Section 811—Assessment of United States Defense Industrial Base Capabilities

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of each military department to establish a program to assess the ability of the United States industrial base to produce military systems necessary to support national security requirements.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of each military service to designate a person with the authority and responsibility to maintain an awareness of the degree to which the United States is dependent on foreign sources for military products, and pursue initiatives to bolster United States industrial base capabilities.

This section would further require the Secretary of Defense to collect data with respect to the procurement of covered military systems. The data collected would include information about the critical item or items included in that system, whether the items in question are from domestic or foreign sources, the identification of foreign contractors and the reason for the selection of that contractor, and the location of work to be completed by a U.S. contractor outside the United States. Based on this data collection, the Secretary of Defense would submit an assessment of his findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. This report would be required every two years, with the first report due on November 1, 2004, covering the fiscal years 2002 and 2003. This first report would provide critical baseline data for understanding the current strengths and vulnerabilities of the defense industrial base and for measuring the impact of initiatives undertaken through other sections in this subtitle.

The committee is concerned that the U.S. industrial base is becoming more dependent on foreign sources and that there are fewer indigenous capabilities available for the design and fabrication of critical components, systems, and materials used in military systems. The committee is aware that the U.S. needs to maintain sovereign capabilities to design, develop, test, integrate, and manufacture military systems in the quality and quantity necessary to support war time requirements.

### Section 812—Identification of Critical Items: Military System Breakout List

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to identify all items and components of military systems and to identify which of these are essential and critical to the U.S. industrial base. Essential items and components would be those essential for the proper functioning and performance of a military system or those involving a defense critical technology. Critical items would be those items already deemed essential that also pose high barriers to entry for the production of the item or component in question. This section would also require an annual report, beginning with November 1, 2004, that would compile the lists required under this section, including a list of items and components that are manufactured and produced outside the United States. The committee is concerned that the U.S. is becoming dependent on foreign sources for many essential and critical items and has limited means to assess risks related to this dependency.

The committee is also concerned by a lack of visibility by both industry and the Department of Defense of the sources of items or components typically provided by subcontractors. Such visibility is unavailable using current methods. The lists compiled through this section, however, can provide a first step to providing this information by first identifying those items and components that are essential and critical to the U.S. defense industrial base.

### Section 813—Procurement of Certain Critical Items from American Sources

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to purchase certain critical items only if they are entirely produced in the United States. For such critical items, there would have to be limited sources of production capability of the item in the United States. The section would provide an exception by which the Secretary could procure such an item from a foreign source if the Secretary determines in writing that the need for the item is of such an unusual and compelling urgency that the United States would be seriously injured unless the Department of Defense permitted to procure the item from sources outside the United States.

The committee is concerned that the United States military is becoming dependent on critical parts produced in foreign countries. Therefore the committee seeks to require the Secretary of Defense to bolster those parts of the defense industrial base that have limited production sources but that nonetheless produce critical items. The committee sees this effort as a step in the direction of revitalizing our defense industrial base and limiting U.S. dependence on foreign sources for critical military items.

### Section 814—Production Capabilities Improvement for Certain Critical Items Using Defense Industrial Base Capabilities Fund

This section would establish within the Department of the Treasury, the Defense Industrial Base Capabilities Fund that would be used to develop U.S. capabilities for the production of items, components, or materials that are determined to be critical to the operation and performance of military systems. The fund's activities would focus on items currently available only from foreign contrac-

tors and those available only from a limited number of United States contractors.

This section would authorize $100.0 million for the fund in fiscal year 2004. Prior to the obligation of any monies from the fund, the Secretary of Defense must submit to Congress his plans for executing this activity, including the priorities for which the Secretary will obligate funds; the criteria for determining to whom funds shall be obligated; and the mechanisms through which funds may be provided to the recipients.

The committee believes that it must aggressively seek to build the U.S. industrial base for critical items. The fund established in this section would provide the resources to revitalize portions of the United States industrial base and would provide the Department of Defense with a flexible mechanism for more directly assisting critical industries that are currently struggling.

## PART II—REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO SPECIFIC ITEMS

### Section 821—Domestic Source Limitation for Certain Additional Items

This section would expand the list of items in 10 U.S.C. 2534 that are currently required to be procured from a source within the National Technology and Industrial Base. This section would limit the conditions under which the Secretary of Defense could waive the domestic source requirements and would conform the waiver authority of this section of the U.S. Code with other provisions in this subtitle.

The committee recognizes that there are certain items required by the Department of Defense that should be purchased from domestic sources. The committee believes that the waiver authority in existing law is overly broad and should be limited to a more narrow set of conditions.

This section would redefine the term National Technology and Industrial Base to include only those contractors engaged in research, development, production, and maintenance activities conducted within the United States.

### Section 822—Requirements Relating To Buying Specialty Metals from American Sources

This section would define the requirements by which the Secretary of Defense could procure commercial items containing specialty metals. Under the terms of this section, the Secretary of Defense would be able to procure a commercial item containing specialty metals from a foreign source if the Secretary determines in writing that there is an unusual and compelling urgency to the Department of Defense's need for the item containing foreign metals or if the contractor in question agreed to purchase an equivalent amount from a United States source over an 18-month period beginning on the date of contract award.

The committee is aware of the difficulty of accounting for all of the specialty metal within an end item and requires the Secretary to establish a method for a prime contractor to account for specialty metal contained within an end item at an aggregate level.

The committee is aware of the need to protect and maintain United States capabilities to produce critical raw materials such as specialty metals resulting in product forms from a melt or smelt production process. The committee is aware that specialty metal ingots, vary in terms of grade, type, and form, and the measure of an equivalent amount may be fungible to interchange one product form for another to satisfy an obligation plus ten percent. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to publish a notice in the Federal Register on the method that the Department of Defense will use to measure an equivalent amount.

This section would also require the Secretary to notify the Senate Committees on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services when the Secretary applies the exception created here and wait 15 days before entering into a contract pursuant to this section. Finally, this section would provide that the new exception shall apply to any contract entered into before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

This section would clarify the term clothing by adding associated materials and components to the existing requirement.

### Section 823—Elimination of Unreliable Sources of Defense Items and Components

This section would identify foreign countries that restricted the provision or sale of military goods and services to the United States because of the U.S. policy toward, or military operations in, Iraq after September 12, 2002. On this date, President Bush addressed the United Nations Security Council and articulated the U.S. approach to dealing with the continued failure of Iraq to disarm itself of its weapons of mass destruction and to comply with 12 years of Security Council resolutions. This provision would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from procuring any items or components contained in military systems that are manufactured in these countries. This provision would apply to all contracts in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act or entered into subsequently. This provision would, however, allow the Secretary 24 months to bring all contracts into compliance with this section. Finally, this section would provide the Secretary with the authority to waive this section if failure to do so would seriously injure the United States.

The committee notes that many countries stood with the United States in requiring the disarmament of Iraq and in acting to liberate the Iraqi people. Several other countries did not and chose to express their disagreement with U.S. policy by prohibiting the sale of military goods and services to the United States. The committee believes that U.S. defense funds should not be used to contract with companies from these countries, unless the need for the item from that source is of an unusual and compelling need that would harm our interests.

### Section 824—Congressional Notification Required Before Exercising Exception to Requirement To Buy Specialty Metals from American Sources

This section would require the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the military department concerned to notify Congress and to publish in the Federal Register notice of the exception author-

ized within this subtitle and waits for 15 days before awarding the contract.

### Section 825—Repeal of Authority for Foreign Procurement of Para-Aramid Fibers and Yarns

This section would repeal section 807 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261), which authorized competition for para-aramid fibers and yarns between foreign and domestic sources in order to avoid a domestic sole source procurement.

### Section 826—Requirement for Major Defense Acquisition Programs to use Machine Tools Entirely Produced within the United States

This section would require that within four years the defense contractors fulfilling procurement contractors for major defense acquisition programs shall use only machine tools produced entirely within the United States.

## PART III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

### Section 831—Definitions

The committee provides definitions and clarifications for terms that are used within this subtitle.

# TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Commandant of the Coast Guard and the Joint Chiefs of Staff

The committee recognizes the important contribution the United States Coast Guard makes to our national security. In accomplishing its mission, the Coast Guard has extensive interaction with the Department of Defense (DOD), the Joint Staff, the Unified Commands, and the military services. Coast Guard units are apportioned for use in the Unified Command Plan (UCP) and Coast Guard flag officers command Joint Interagency Task Forces East and West that include DOD assets. Coast Guard personnel are assigned to the staffs of many of the unified commands and train with the four DOD military services at a variety of levels.

The committee notes the unique dual nature of the Coast Guard as a uniformed military service and law enforcement agency. It is this unique nature that makes it ideally suited for its role in homeland security and argues for even closer interaction between the Coast Guard and the Department of Defense. Currently, the Commandant of the Coast Guard acts as a consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff when matters affecting the Coast Guard are under consideration. The committee strongly believes that closer interaction between the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard is vital to our national security. It therefore strongly encourages the Joint Chiefs of Staff to even more closely consult and work with the Commandant of the Coast Guard on issues relating to the defense of our nation, both overseas and at home.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 901—Change in Title of Secretary of the Navy to Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps

This section would redesignate the title of the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps

### Section 902—Redesignation of National Imagery and Mapping Agency as National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency

This section would rename the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency and make conforming changes to existing statute.

### Section 903—Pilot Program for Provision of Space Surveillance Network Services to Non-United States Government Entities

This section would allow United States and foreign, governmental and non-governmental entities to purchase satellite tracking services from assets owned or controlled by the Department of Defense. The Department already tracks most earth orbiting objects. The provision would make that tracking information available for a fee, consistent with national security requirements as determined by the Secretary of Defense. Sales to foreign entities would also require the approval of the Secretary of State.

### Section 904—Clarification of Responsibility of Military Departments to Support Combatant Commands

This section would clarify the responsibility of the secretaries of the military departments. Current law only requires the secretaries to provide support to the combatant commands "to the maximum extent practical." This section would remove the phrase "to the maximum extent practical" in order to clarify that the war-fighting function of the combatant commands is the principal responsibility of the Department of Defense.

### Section 905—Biennial Review of National Military Strategy by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

This section would require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in conjunction with the Chiefs of the Armed Services and the commanders of the unified and specified commands to prepare a national military strategy that describes the threats to our national military objectives, and assesses the capabilities and adequacy of our forces and resources, basing and support necessary to achieve those objectives. It also requires an assessment of risk and the identification of the assumptions used in developing the assessment. A classified annex may be included, as necessary.

Section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404) and Section 118 of the National Defense Authorization Act for the Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–65) requires the President to prepare and provide Congress with a National Security Strategy and for the Secretary of Defense to submit a Quadrennial Defense Review to Congress every four years. However, there is no legal requirement for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide Congress with a national military strategy which would reflect the

collective military judgment to meet the requirements, goals and missions set forth in the President's National Security Strategy and the Secretary of Defense's Quadrennial Defense Review. Nevertheless, two national military strategy reports were issued in 1995 and 1997, thus establishing a precedent.

This provision would require submission of an initial report on the national military strategy not later than February 15, 2004, and every even numbered year thereafter. The provision also would request the Secretary of Defense to append his assessment of the report before submission to Congress.

This section would require a risk assessment, which in the years in which the National Military Strategy is submitted, would fulfill the requirement for an annual risk assessment under 10 U.S.C. 153(c). In all other years, the annual risk assessment would still be required as a stand-alone document.

The committee notes with concern the failure of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to produce the required annual assessment for the last two years. The Secretary of Defense submitted a letter to the committee on July 19, 2002, indicating that the risk assessment required by the time of the President's Fiscal Year 2002 budget request would not be submitted; and the 2003 assessment has not been submitted. The committee considers the annual risk assessment an important tool for assessing the adequacy of military capabilities to execute the National Security Strategy and the intent of the Quadrennial Defense Review, and strongly urges the Chairman to comply with this requirement by submitting the 2003 report as soon as possible.

### Section 906—Authority for Acceptance by Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies of Gifts and Donations from Non-foreign sources

This section would allow the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies to accept gifts from domestic sources. The center is currently allowed to accept gifts from foreign sources. This authority would allow the center to receive funds, research materials, and lecture and faculty services that would enhance the mission of the center and defray costs. The Army and Naval War Colleges, the Naval Postgraduate Schools, and the Military Academies are already authorized to receive gifts from domestic sources.

### Section 907—Repeal of Rotating Chairmanship of Economic Adjustment Committee

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to serve as the permanent chairman of the Economic Adjustment Committee.

### Section 908—Pilot Program for Improved Civilian Personnel Management

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a pilot program for Improved Civilian Personnel Management to assess the utility of an automated civilian personnel management program to provide needed improvements in the Department's current management performance. The committee is aware of the existence of automated workforce management systems for civilian personnel management that have, in other governmental entities, demonstrated the capacity to substantially reduce hiring cycle

times, lower labor costs, increase efficiency, improve performance management, and provide better management reporting. This section would authorize the Secretary to establish a pilot program at one regional civilian personnel center in each of the military departments using an automated civilian personnel management system with the objective of assessing the potential utility of the automated system to provide the desired improvements.

Section 909—Extension of Certain Authorities Applicable to the Pentagon Reservation to Include Designated Pentagon Continuity-of-Government Locations

This section would expand the current definition of Pentagon Reservation to include property at the Raven Rock Mountain Complex, and other parcels of land within a 100 mile radius of the District of Columbia, to the extent such property may be utilized as a facility relating to continuity of operations and continuity of government. The committee believes it is appropriate to consider this off-site facility an extension of the Pentagon and it is therefore appropriate to apply similar personnel and funding rules.

Section 910—Defense Acquisition Workforce Reductions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to institute a reduction in the size of the defense acquisition workforce by twenty-five percent over a period of five years.

Section 911—Required Force Structure

This section would establish force structure floors for the U.S. Army, Navy and Air Force at the levels outlined in the 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review. U.S. Marine Corps force structure of three active divisions and three active air wings is already established in section 5063 of title 10 United States Code. The Army would be required to maintain 10 active and eight National Guard divisions or their equivalents, one active armored cavalry regiment, one light cavalry regiment, 15 National Guard enhanced brigades and other such active or reserve component combat, combat support and combat service support formations as are required. The Navy would consist of a force of not less than 305 active vessels. This fleet would include not less than 12 aircraft carrier battle groups, 12 amphibious ready groups, 55 attack submarines, 108 active and 8 reserve surface combatants and other such active and reserve forces as are necessary to support the fleet. The Air Force would consist of not less than 46 active and 38 National Guard and Reserve fighter squadrons or their equivalents, 96 active combat-coded bomber aircraft, and other such active and reserve component formations as may be necessary to support the force.

The committee notes that the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, the global war on terrorism, the fall of the Taliban in Afghanistan, and the elimination of Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq have significantly altered the strategic landscape facing the United States. As such, the committee understands that the Department of Defense has undertaken a series of studies to understand the ramifications of these events and to develop a new force structure and global military posture. At the same time, the committee understands the Department's desire to accelerate the transformation

of the force to meet the challenges of the 21st century, as well as to adjust the location and number of military bases both overseas and in the United States. Given the fluid nature of the current security environment, the committee feels it would be premature for the Department to reduce or radically change the current military force structure and its related basing posture until these studies are complete and their findings have been examined. Therefore, the committee recommends that the force structure outlined in the 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review be maintained until the Congress can review the findings of the on-going studies in order to determine the proper force structure and global military posture needed to meet this new security environment.

# TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

#### Overview

The budget request contained $817.3 million for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, in addition to $159.9 million, for operational tempo which is included within the operating budgets of the military services. The budget is organized in fiscal year 2004 to address three broad national priorities: (1) demand reduction; (2) domestic support; and (3) international support.

The committee recommends an authorization for fiscal year 2004 Department of Defense counter-drug activities as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| FY04 Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Request | $817,300 |
| Demand Reduction | 116,000 |
| Domestic Support | 172,700 |
| International Support | 528,600 |
| Recommended Decreases: | |
| Intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance and tanker support | 2,000 |
| Ground based end game operations (infrastructure) | 3,500 |
| Airborne Reconnaissance Low (ARL) | 2,000 |
| Maritime patrol aircraft upgrades | 2,000 |
| Hemispheric radar system | 1,000 |
| Counter-drug Command Management System | 2,000 |
| Pacific command operations support | 1,200 |
| Recommended Increases | |
| Southwest Border Fence | 6,700 |
| Intelligence analysts and mobile training teams. | 5,000 |
| Counter-drug airborne intelligence systems | 2,000 |
| Recommendation | 817,300 |

#### Items of Special Interest

*Intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance and tanker support*

The budget request contained $4.6 million for KC –135 tanker operations in support of counter-drug Airborne Early Warning and Control System (AWACS) missions. Reductions in support activities are planned, in light of other worldwide commitments. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $2.0 million for this activity.

*Ground based end game operations*

The budget request contained $38.1 million for ground based end game operations (GBEGO). This program provides counter-drug training to develop or sustain operational capabilities, including the Colombian aviation training program. Infrastructure projects are also provided for in this activity. The committee notes that the prior year budget request for this activity was $29.8 million. The committee understands that certain infrastructure projects that were initially programmed in this year's budget request will not be started in the upcoming fiscal year. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $3.5 million for this activity.

*Airborne Reconnaissance Low*

The budget request contained $10.6 million for funding of the airborne reconnaissance low (ARL) program. This budget request for this activity in fiscal year 2003 was $10.9 million. The budget request for similar activities in fiscal year 2002 was only $6.3 million. The committee understands, as the result of better cost estimates, that the budget request of $10.6 million can be reduced without affecting the operation or the effectiveness of the program, and that similar revisions in the fiscal year 2003 budget for this activity are also being planned. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $2.0 million for this activity.

*Maritime patrol aircraft upgrades*

The budget request contained $7.7 million for maritime patrol aircraft (MPA) upgrades to the Navy's P–3 counter-narcotic operations radar upgrades.

This program plans to upgrade 10 of the current APS–115 on board these aircraft to the APG–66 pulse-doppler radar, however the committee understands that due to a technical problem within the identification friend or foe (IFF) interrogator, the APG–66 will not be ready for installation within the upcoming fiscal year. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $2.0 million for this activity.

*Hemispheric radar system*

The budget request contained $24.1 million for the hemispheric radar system. The committee is aware that three radar sites are proposed for closure and that the revised costs estimates for this project as well as others, are lower than initially expected. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $1.0 million for this activity.

*Counter-Drug Command and Management System*

The budget request contained $18.6 million for voice and date communications capabilities to support U.S. counter-drug operations in source and transit zones. The committee understands the importance of secure communications to counter-drug activities, but notes the redundancy of this system with others in the region that link embassies and other key players. The committee therefore recommends a decrease of $2.0 million for this activity.

*Pacific command operations support*

The budget request contained $2.4 million for services and training support to U.S. and participating nation law enforcement entities in Southeast and Southwest Asia. While the committee supports expanding counter-drug programs in the Pacific Command area of responsibility, the committee understands that this is not yet a mature program and looks forward to receiving future details. For fiscal year 2004, however, the committee recommends a decrease of $1.2 million for this activity.

*Southwest Border Fence*

As part of the San Diego 14–Mile Border Infrastructure System, the Southwest Border Fence has served as an invaluable counter-narcotics resource for United States Border Patrol agents since the project's inception in 1997. However, the border fence construction project is still under construction, and the area remains one of the nation's most heavily utilized drug smuggling corridors. Since 1998, the California National Guard and other military personnel have been responsible for fence construction and general support of the border infrastructure system. Completion of the border fence would constitute a cohesive barrier against vehicle and pedestrian narcotics trafficking and allow counter-drug assets to be redeployed in other areas. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $6.7 million for this purpose.

*Intelligence analysts and mobile training teams*

At the present time the United States Northern Command (USNORTHCOM) conducts over 200 intelligence analysts missions each year through Joint Task Force–6 located at Fort Bliss, Texas. These intelligence analysts support investigative law enforcement centers nationwide and their actions have resulted in law enforcement agencies seizing illicit drugs and cash, as well as making thousands of arrests. The mobile training teams help train federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies across the country on a wide variety of subjects. The committee is concerned that current funding levels will reduce the number of intelligence analyst missions that will be performed in fiscal year 2004. The committee believes this result is not acceptable. The committee also believes that the expansion of the mobile training teams will assist USNORTHCOM in its homeland defense mission. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for the intelligence analyst and mobile training team missions to be conducted by Joint Task Force–6.

*Counter-drug airborne intelligence systems*

The budget request contained $135.6 million to support operations and maintenance, personnel and procurement for the Defense Intelligence Counter-drug Program (DICP) for airborne and analysis support to Department of Defense (DOD) counter-drug operations.

The committee is well aware of the military role in the National Drug Control Strategy in countering transnational narcotic and narco-terrorist threats, but is also aware that these efforts are not adequately managed throughout the DOD. The committee believes that DICP surveillance aircraft, their tactical operations, and sup-

port personnel issues are often critically overlooked within this program. The committee notes that specifically, the Senior Scout and the P–3 Orion collection platforms are not well equipped to perform their missions effectively. The P–3 Orion has the endurance for the counter-narcotics mission profile, but has none of the collection gathering equipment on board to ensure its success. The Senior Scout has all of the equipment however no dedicated carrier to perform the mission. Furthermore, Senior Scout has a limited and finite number of trained reserve analysts to deploy during extended operations.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million to enable the Secretary of Defense to provide the Senior Scout mission with a permanent carrier. Additionally, the committee recommends that $500,000 of this increase be used to support an active/reserve joint component to the Senior Scout support element. This unit will be used to provide specialized airborne mission support personnel for extended operations. The committee remains concerned with the lack of investment in the Navy's maritime P–3 data transfer capabilities. Therefore the committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense develop a plan that will allow for the basing of tactical data link capabilities on board these aircraft in order to allow for improved imagery and data transfer within the operational theater, as well as the capability to reach back to locations outside the theater.

*Expanded use of National Guard counter-drug aircraft*

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) is considering utilizing

Air National Guard C–26 aircraft in support of a deployment in the United States Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) area of responsibility which could lead to operational deficiencies within their present tasking.

These C–26 aircraft currently perform aerial detection, intelligence, reconnaissance, and surveillance in support of federal, state and local law enforcement counter-drug activities operating within the United States. The aircraft and aircrews are based in 11 states and are available to carry out their mission on a 24–hour, seven days a week basis.

The committee recognizes the unique capabilities of the C–26 and its effectiveness in support of the war on drugs in the United States. The committee is concerned that the depletion of such air assets to SOUTHCOM may have a negative impact upon ongoing and future counter-narcotics investigations and operations conducted by federal, state and local law enforcement agencies within the United States.

The committee has questions about the suitability of the C–26 to successfully meet the performance criteria for the proposed mission in SOUTHCOM. The C–26 personnel and aircraft may be placed at great risk as a result of tactical and operational threats they will face in such a mission. Additionally, the committee believes that the possibility of a long-term deployment commitment to SOUTHCOM is likely.

Therefore the committee expects the Secretary of Defense to prepare an assessment that will address the following matters:

(1) The impact of the depletion of such assets performing aerial detection, intelligence, reconnaissance, and surveillance upon the federal, state and local law enforcement agencies currently supported by the National Guard C–26 aircraft.

(2) Suitability of C–26 aircrew and aircraft to perform missions outside of the contiguous United States, particularly in the SOUTHCOM area of responsibility.

(3) Adequacy of crew training, equipment and aircraft defensive systems to perform the proposed mission.

(4) Limitations of airframe performance with respect to tactical and operational threats faced in proposed area of operations.

(5) Potential use of alternative platforms to perform the proposed SOUTHCOM mission.

Accordingly, the committee also expects the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to address the issues raised in the assessment prior to establishing any deployments of the C–26 aircraft to the SOUTHCOM area of responsibility. A copy of the assessment and the plan should be submitted to the House Armed Services Committee as soon as feasible.

## GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

### Overview

The committee believes that the men and women who serve in the armed forces have made the world immeasurably safer for Americans and all the people of the world through their heroic actions of the last two years. Indeed, the Department of Defense has led the way in the global war on terrorism, achieving significant victories. While the Department of Homeland Security will have a leading role in defending the nation from terrorist activities, the committee believes the Department of Defense will continue to be the nation's most important asset in this war. In that regard, the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities has held a series of hearings, briefings, trips, and informal meetings in order to stimulate thinking and advance promising initiatives, and has heard several compelling ideas.

In general terms, the subcommittee has found, unsurprisingly, that America's best defense lies in keeping terrorists and their weapons far from our shores. Several policy initiatives have been suggested to advance that goal. Among them are insuring the Department has the means to thwart terrorists overseas through robust and integrated intelligence gathering and synthesizing activities and providing the forces and weapons necessary to use that intelligence at the right time. The committee supports a broad range of these ideas, which are discussed in more detail below.

*Effective use of the National Guard*

The committee believes that the national guard will continue to play a key role in the war on terrorism and be mobilized in both a federal and state capacity for missions ranging from overseas deployment for combat operations to responding to potential or actual terrorist events within the United States. On one hand, the committee has heard testimony urging modification of title 32 United States Code to permit the national guard to perform operational missions for homeland security under the control of the respective

state governor. Such a change, it is argued, not only facilitates state actions in homeland defense, but also avoids the limitations of the posse comitatus law prohibiting the use of federal troops for law enforcement purposes. On the other hand, the committee has heard the concern that allowing the national guard to conduct operational missions under title 32 status would not allow clear command relationships and responsibilities to function, and would not facilitate the establishment and accomplishment of consistent requirements among national guard units. The committee believes that legislation may be needed to address the situation, and directs the Secretary of Defense to examine, in consultation with the Chief, National Guard Bureau, the manner in which the national guard is called to active duty for homeland defense missions and recommend any changes he believes are necessary to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

*Integration of Departments of Defense and Homeland Security Activities*

The committee is encouraged by the rapid progress the Department of Homeland Security is making in assuming operational control of its disparate activities. The committee noted earlier and restates the importance of the Department of Defense in the homeland security effort, and encourages the departments to coordinate their activities as seamlessly as possible. Inevitably, there will be some duplication of effort until the best solutions are agreed upon, but the secretaries of these departments should coordinate as much as possible such important activities as border defense, use of actionable intelligence, plans for use of the national guard as a first responder, and development of vaccines and various other countermeasures that have been suggested to the committee.

*United States Northern Command*

The committee believes that the Northern Command (NORTHCOM) is another key component of the war on terrorism. In addition to the ongoing work of the command to establish relationships with first responders and the several states, the committee believes the command could play an important role in interdicting the importation of weapons of mass destruction. The command already has that mission for the defense of the nation from air attack, by virtue of its close relationship with the North American Aerospace Defense Command. While recognizing the need to maintain an effective defense against conventional maritime threats, the committee further believes that during the global war on terrorism, the threat of a weapon of mass destruction arriving unchecked at a U.S. port aboard a foreign vessel is a serious concern and, therefore, supports the development by NORTHCOM of a maritime defense strategy that will ensure the defeat of asymmetric terrorist threats at maximum distance from the United States coastline.

*United States Special Operations Command*

The Special Operations Command (SOCOM) is clearly a treasured national asset in the war on terrorism and our best asset in disrupting the enemy in foreign lands. This highly trained, but rel-

atively small force, has undertaken and brilliantly executed the difficult missions in both Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and Operation Iraqi Freedom. The committee fully supports the increases in SOCOM's budget and have recommended increases to several SOCOM unfunded requirements. While the committee understands that there are relatively few SOCOM operators and supports the proposed end strength increases, the committee concurs with SOCOM senior commanders that personnel standards must not be compromised in order to achieve a larger force.

The committee applauds the Secretary of Defense's decision to designate SOCOM as a supported command in some cases. The committee notes, however, that section 167 of title 10, United States Code, requires that SOCOM missions be carried out under the command of the respective combatant commander unless the President or Secretary of Defense directs that SOCOM undertakes the mission. The committee is concerned that the language of the statute may be too restrictive to permit the timely execution of selected missions and directs the Secretary of Defense to review the law and report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by February 1, 2004, whether any changes are necessary.

STRATEGIC FORCE STRUCTURE

The Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms of July 31, 1991 (the START Treaty) currently limits the United States and Russia to 6000 accountable strategic warheads.

As required by section 1041 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), the most recent Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) was submitted to Congress on January 8, 2002. The NPR describes a future deployed, strategic stockpile of 1700 to 2200 warheads in fiscal year 2012, with an intermediate objective of 3800 warheads in fiscal year 2007.

The Moscow Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reduction (the Moscow Treaty), signed by President Bush of the United States and President Putin of the Russian Federation on May 24, 2002, reaffirms the provisions of the START Treaty, and on ratification will commit the United States and Russia to a reduction of deployed, strategic stockpiles to 1700 to 2200 warheads by December 31, 2012. The United States Senate approved the Moscow Treaty on March 6, 2003, and its consideration by the Russian Federal Assembly is pending.

Section 1031 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) required the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to jointly prepare a force structure plan for nuclear weapons and delivery systems covering fiscal years 2003 to 2012. The section further required submission of a report on that plan to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2003. The committee has not received this report, and has recently been informed that it could take through the end of fiscal year 2003 to complete.

The committee finds it disturbing and unacceptable that the administration intends to commit to dramatic changes to the strategic

nuclear deterrent of the United States absent a clear path forward. The committee admonishes the Departments of Defense and Energy to move forward expeditiously in their planning processes.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

#### Section 1001—Transfer Authority

This section would provide fiscal year 2003 transfer authority to the Department of Defense for amounts up to $2.5 billion.

#### Section 1002—Authorization of Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2003

This section would authorize amounts enacted in the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Act, 2002 (Public Law 108–011) for the Department of Defense and for the national security activities of the Department of Energy.

This section would also authorize those defense items appropriated pursuant to any fiscal year 2003 emergency wartime supplemental appropriations legislation enacted during the first session of the 108th Congress.

#### Section 1003—Authority To Transfer Procurement Funds for a Major Defense Acquisition Program for Continued Development Work on that Program

This section would amend section 2114 of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Secretary of Defense additional flexibility to correct specific acquisition funding problems that occur during the transition phase of an acquisition program from development to production. Currently, there is no management flexibility to resolve last-minute development problems quickly before a program transitions into production. This section would allow the transfer of $20.0 million per acquisition program and up to $250.0 million for a single fiscal year from procurement appropriations to research, development, test and evaluation appropriations for the purpose of continuing development efforts. The section shall not apply with respect to funds appropriated for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2004.

#### Section 1004—Restoration of Authority to Enter into 12-month Leases at any Time During the Fiscal Year

This section would restore the authority of the Department of Defense to enter into 12-month leases at any time during the fiscal year.

#### Section 1005—Authority for Retention of Additional Amounts Realized from Energy Cost Savings

This section would allow the Department of Defense to obligate all funds representing energy cost savings, not just two-thirds of such funds, through the end of the fiscal year without additional authorization or appropriation.

### Section 1006—Repeal of Requirement for Two-Year Budget Cycle for the Department of Defense

This section would repeal the requirement for the Department to submit a two-year budget every other year. This requirement was established in Section 1405 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986 (Public Law 99–145; section 1105 of title 10 United States Code). The purpose of implementing a two-year budget cycle was to increase efficiencies in planning and management of Department funds. The Department has complied with submitting a two-year budget every other year, but continues to submit a budget request in the intervening year. As a result of real world events during the 1990s and the continuing global war on terrorism, the Department often significantly revised its budget request in the intervening year. This appreciably changes the programs outlined in the second year of a two-year budget. The committee realizes that if the Department continues to submit a budget every year, any efficiency gained in presenting a two-year budget is not realized. Accordingly, the committee recommends that the Department submit one-year budgets on an annual basis.

### Section 1007—Authority To Provide Reimbursement for Cellular Telephones When Used for Official Government Business

This section would allow the Department of Defense to reimburse individuals with a validated need for an official government cellular telephone using a flat rate or monthly stipend for such individuals' use of their personal cellular telephone.

## SUBTITLE B—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

### Section 1011—Repeal of Requirement Regarding Preservation of Surge Capability for Naval Surface Combatants

This section would repeal subsection (b) of section 7296 of title 10, United States Code, and would include associated clerical amendments.

### Section 1012—Enhancement of Authority Relating to Use for Experimental Purposes of Vessels Stricken from Naval Vessel Register

This section would allow a contractor or designated agent to sell equipment taken from a stricken vessel on behalf of the Navy and would authorize those funds to be returned to the Navy.

### Section 1013—Authorization for Transfer of Vessels Stricken From the Naval Vessel Register for Use as Artificial Reefs

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer vessels stricken from the Naval Vessel Register to States or other political entities of the United States for use as artificial reefs. This section would also authorize the Secretary of the Navy to tailor transfer agreements between the Navy and recipient, based upon the specific circumstances and characteristics of the vessel. Additionally, this section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide financial assistance for the transfer and preparation of vessels for reefing. Nothing in this section should be con-

strued as amending or repealing any existing environmental rules or regulations.

### Section 1014—Pilot Program for Sealift Ship Construction

This section would establish a pilot program administered by the Navy that would provide loan guarantee assistance to construct militarily useful sealift ships in the United States. Approval would be handled by the Department of Defense, and administered by the Department of Transportation.

## SUBTITLE C—REPORTS

### Section 1021—Repeal and Modification of Various Reporting Requirements Applicable to the Department of Defense

This section would repeal or modify a number of reporting requirements contained in title 10, United States Code, annual National Defense Authorization Acts, and other statutes.

### Section 1022—Department of Defense Report on the Conduct of Operation Iraqi Freedom

This section would require the Secretary of Department of Defense to provide a report to the Congress on the conduct of Operation Iraqi Freedom. On March 19, 2003, U.S. forces initiated operations in Iraq in order to overthrown the regime of Saddam Hussein. Major combat Operations ceased on April 14, 2003, with U.S. forces having defeated Iraqi military forces and removed the regime from power.

The lessons learned from this operation will have far reaching implications for U.S. military strategy, doctrine, equipment procurement and force structure in the years to come. The committee believes that Congress must have detailed information and analysis concerning operation Iraqi Freedom in order to apply the lessons learned to future defense funding and policy decisions. Therefore, the committee would require a report to Congress by June 15, 2004 on the conduct of Operation Iraqi Freedom. A preliminary report would be submitted by January 15, 2004.

### Section 1023—Report on Department of Defense Post-Conflict Activities in Iraq

This provision would require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress, within 90 days of the enactment of this Act, on the range of Department of Defense (DOD) civilian and military activities in post-conflict Iraq. The report should include explanations of the organizational structure by which the Defense Department has managed post-conflict activities in Iraq and the relationship of these institutions with other departments and agencies of the U.S. government and with intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations. The report should also describe the progress to date of U.S. efforts in the humanitarian, infrastructure, civil administration, and governance fields, as well as of the efforts to account for Iraq weapons of mass destruction programs and to provide security until Iraqi institutions can adequately take over this function. Finally, the report asks for the Secretary's assessment of DOD resources needed on an ongoing basis, including an estimate of total

expenditures expected, and of the scope of tasks remaining to be completed by U.S. government civilian employees in Iraq.

The committee recognizes that the effort to help rebuild and assist in the development of governing institutions in Iraq is a significant undertaking requiring a variety of resources. Uniquely among recent reconstruction efforts, the Department of Defense is providing overall direction of the U.S. government's effort to assist in Iraq's post-conflict transition. The committee therefore seeks to understand better how these efforts have been coordinated and how the Department has incorporated the expertise of other U.S. departments and agencies, as well as those of the intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations. The Secretary's assessment of the progress made to date and of the ongoing force and civilian support needs will allow Congress to make more informed decisions about future force and policy needs.

### Section 1024—Report on Development of Mechanisms to Better Connect Department of Defense Space Capabilities to the War Fighter

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on development of Department of Defense space-based capabilities for the war fighter.

## SUBTITLE D—PROCUREMENT OF DEFENSE BIOMEDICAL COUNTERMEASURES

This subtitle would authorize the Secretary of Defense to develop, procure, and prescribe conditions for use of available biomedical countermeasures to chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear agents that could cause military health emergencies affecting national security.

### Section 1031—Research and Development of Defense Bio-Medical Countermeasures

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish and carry out a program to accelerate the research and development of biomedical countermeasures, including therapeutics and vaccines, for protecting members of the Armed Forces from attack by chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear (CBRN) agents. The Secretary would be permitted to enter into interagency agreements and other collaborative programs with other Federal agencies and must also ensure that the activities of the Department of Defense are coordinated, complement, and do no unnecessarily duplicate those of the Department of Health and Human Services and of Homeland Security. The provision would authorize to the Secretary expedited authority for procurement of property and services in executing the program. The Secretary would also be authorized to acquire laboratories, other research facilities, and equipment that he determines are necessary to carry out the program. Streamlined personnel authority outside the civil service would be granted for hiring up to 30 personnel to carry out research and development under the program.

### Section 1032—Procurement of Defense Biomedical Countermeasures

This provision would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Sectaries of Health and Human Services and of Homeland Defense, to assess emerging threats of the use of CBRN agents, identify those agents for which biomedical countermeasures are need to protect the health of members of the Armed Forces, and those specific qualified countermeasures that should be procured for the DOD stockpile of biomedical countermeasures. Qualified biological countermeasures would include those already approved or licensed for use and those developmental products that could reasonably be expected to qualify for such approval within five years. The provision would also authorize for procurement of such qualified biological countermeasures the use of funds appropriated for the Department of Defense and available within the Secretary's transfer authority.

### Section 1033—Authorization for Use of Medical Products in Emergencies

This provision would define the conditions under which the Secretary of Defense cold declare a state of emergency regarding a military emergency involving a heightened risk to the Armed Forces of attach by a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear agent, and would permit the Secretary of Defense to authorize the use on members of the Armed Forces of a drug or device intended for use in an actual or potential emergency. Criteria for the authorization would include a joint determination that the agent can cause a serious or life-threatening disease or condition and it is reasonable to expect that the biological countermeasure may be effective or the benefits of using the countermeasure outweigh the risks of using the countermeasure, and there is no alternative available. The conditions under which the countermeasures could be used are identical to those current in effect under section 731(a) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 1999 for the use of investigational new drugs.

## SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 1041—Codification and Revision of Defense Counterintelligence Polygraph Program Authority

This section would remove existing limits on the number of polygraph examinations that the Department of Defense may administer in any fiscal year. Under the current program established in section 1121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (P.L. 100–180) and amended in section 1073(d)(5) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (P.L. 105–85), no more than 5,000 polygraph examinations may be conducted per fiscal year. Section 1041 would expand the categories of individuals who may be required to undergo polygraph examinations. These two categories include persons who are applying for positions within the Department and persons who are assigned or detailed to the Department. This section would also instruct the Secretary of Defense to institute a process to monitor responsible and effective application of polygraphs within the Depart-

ment of Defense. In lieu of the existing reporting requirement, this section would require the Secretary to make information on the use of polygraphs available to the congressional defense committees.

Section 1042—Codification and Revision of Limitation on Modification of Major Items of Equipment Scheduled for Retirement or Disposal

This section would revise existing reporting requirements on modifications to aircraft, weapons, vessels, and other items of equipment scheduled to be retired or disposed of within five years. This section would relieve the secretary of a military department from reporting on any modification for which the cost is less than $1.0 million.

Section 1043—Additional Definitions for Purposes of Title 10, United States Code

This section would define in section 101 of title 10 United States Code, the definitions of the terms "congressional defense committees" and "base closure law."

Section 1044—Inclusion of Annual Military Construction Authorization Request in Annual Defense Authorization Request

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to transmit to Congress the annual military construction authorization request as part of the annual defense authorization request, and that this request be transmitted within 30 days of the date the President transmits to Congress the budget request for that fiscal year.

Section 1045—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make a number of technical and clerical amendments to existing law of a non-substantive basis.

Section 1046—Authority to Provide Living Quarters for Certain Students in Cooperative and Summer Education Programs of the National Security Agency

This section would amend section 2195 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the National Security Agency to provide and pay for living quarters for qualifying students who are employed at the National Security Agency under a Student Educational Employment Program or a similar cooperative or summer education program.

Section 1047—Use of Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Funds to Support Activities of the Government of Colombia

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use funds available for drug interdiction and counter drug activities to provide assistance to the government of Columbia to support not only a unified campaign against narcotics trafficking, but to also support a unified campaign against activities by organizations designated as terrorist organizations.

Section 1048—Authority for Joint Task Forces To Provide Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counter-Terrorism Activities

This section would authorize those joint task forces (JTFs) of the Department of Defense that provide support to law enforcement agencies conducting counter-drug activities, namely JTFs 4, 5, and 6, to provide similar support to law enforcement agencies conducting counter-terrorism activities. Any support provided under this section must be consistent with all applicable laws and regulations, and the support may only be provided in the geographic area of responsibility of the joint task force. The committee notes that these JTFs have made critical contributions to the counter-drug mission and notes that their focus on drug flows into the United States could have great relevance to terrorist movements across our borders as well. The committee believes that Northern Command should make use of these capabilities as it develops counter-terrorism programs.

Section 1049—Use of National Driver Register for Personnel Security Investigations and Determinations

This section would authorize access to the National Driver Register by federal agencies for use in personnel security investigations and determinations and for use in personnel investigations with regard to federal employment. The National Driver Register is a cooperative system managed by the Secretary of Transportation under which the chief driver licensing official in each state provides driver licensing records to the Register. Access to the information is currently provided to multiple federal agencies.

Section 1050—Protection of Operational Files of the National Security Agency

This section would allow the Director of the National Security Agency, in coordination with the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, to exempt limited categories of sensitive National Security Agency files from the search, review, and disclosure provisions of the Freedom of Information Act, contained in section 552 of title 5 United States Code. This authority parallels the authority currently available to the Central Intelligence Agency, National Imagery Mapping Agency, and the National Reconnaissance Office.

Section 1051—Assistance for Study of Feasibility of Biennial International Air Trade Show in the United States and for Initial Implementation

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to select and provide assistance to a community in conducting a joint study to determine the feasibility of establishing an international air trade show in that community. The committee believes that international air trade shows are an important component of efforts to demonstrate the effectiveness of United States military equipment to other nations and seeks to increase the importance of U.S. based air trade shows in the conduct of international aerospace trade. This provision would also require that the Secretary make his selection through competitive procedures, while giving preference to

communities that already host an air show, such as Dayton, Ohio, and have demonstrated a history of supporting air shows with local resources.

### Section 1052—Continuation of Reasonable Access to Military Installations for Personal Commercial Solicitation

The committee has become aware of concerns from private sector insurance and financial planning companies that the Department of Defense intends to revise the Department's regulations on commercial solicitation on military installations to limit the access of service members to competitive insurance and financial planning services and unfairly restrict the ability of private sector companies to compete for the business of service members in these important areas. Accordingly, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Congress any amendments or other revisions, along with supporting rationale, relating to access to military installations for the purpose of conducting limited personal commercial solicitation. The amendment would further require that any changes may not be effective until 90 days have expired beginning on the date the Secretary submits the changes to the Congress.

### Section 1053—Commission on Nuclear Strategy of the United States

This section would establish a Commission on Nuclear Strategy of the United States to assess and make recommendations about current United States strategy as described by the Nuclear Posture Review and other planning documents, as well as possible alternative strategies that could be pursued over the next 20 years. The Commission would have broad purview to consider matters of policy, force structure, stockpile stewardship, and estimates of threats and force requirements, and would have the authority to hold hearings and take testimony.

The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, would appoint 12 members to serve on the Commission, and designate one of the commission members as chairman. The Commission would convene its first meeting not later than 60 days after the appointment of all its members. The Commission would report its findings to the Secretary of Defense and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives not later than 18 months after the date of its first meeting, and terminate 60 days after reporting. Not later than one year after the Commission reports, the Secretary would submit to Congress a report commenting on the Commission's findings and recommendations, and explaining what actions, if any, the Secretary intends to take with respect to each of those recommendations.

The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, would contract with a Federally Funded Research and Development Center to provide for the organization, management, and support of the Commission. The Commission would receive the cooperation of all agencies and departments of the United States government.

### Section 1054—Extension of Counterproliferation Program Review Committee

This section would amend section 1605(F) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 106–65) to extend the charter for the interagency Counter Proliferation Program Review Committee through September 30, 2008.

# TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL GENERALLY

### Section 1101—Modification of the Overtime Pay Cap

This section would amend section 5542(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, to ensure that Federal employees who are exempt from the Fair Labor Standards Act, and are paid above step five of grade 12, do not suffer a pay cut when they work overtime.

### Section 1102—Military Leave for Mobilized Federal Civilian Employees

This section would amend sections 6323, 5343(c)(4) and 5545(d) of title 5, United States Code, to assist mobilized Federal civilian employees, whose military pay is less than their Federal civilian salary, transition to military service by allowing them to receive 22 additional workdays of military leave.

### Section 1103—Common Occupational and Health Standards for Differential Payments as a Consequence of Exposure to Asbestos

This section would amend sections 5343 and 5545 of title 5, United States Code, to establish a common standard for payment of hazardous duty differential pay for reason of exposure to asbestos for prevailing rate and general schedule federal employees.

### Section 1104—Increase in Annual Student Loan Repayment Authority

This section would amend section 5379(b)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, to increase the annual amount that an agency can repay a highly qualified employee for a student loan from $6,000 to $10,000 per year without increasing the overall limit of $40,000.

### Section 1105—Authorization for Cabinet Secretaries, Secretaries of Military Departments, and Heads of Executive Agencies to be Paid on a Biweekly Basis

This section would amend section 5504 of title 5, United States Code, to permit Cabinet Secretaries, Secretaries of the military departments and heads of Executive agencies to be paid on the same biweekly basis as most Federal employees rather than on a monthly basis.

Section 1106—Senior Executive Service and Performance

This section would amend provisions of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to pay of senior executives. First, this section would remove the Senior Executive Service (SES) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation/Drug Enforcement Agency (FBI/DEA) SES from the list of employees eligible for locality pay. Second, the section would provide for a range of rates of basic pay for the SES, established according to OPM regulations. Each senior executive's pay would be set by the employing agency at one of the rates of the range on the basis of individual performance, contribution to agency performance, or both, as determined under a rigorous performance management system. The amendment would raise the maximum rate for Senior Executive Service positions from level IV to level III of the Executive Schedule. The provision would also provide for the adjustment of the applicable maximum to level II of the Executive Schedule for any agency that is certified as having a performance appraisal system that makes meaningful distinctions among senior executives, based on their relative performance as that system is both designed and applied. Finally, this section would provide a new standard for determining the applicability of one of the post-employment restrictions to those who are in the Senior Executive Service or equivalent positions in other pay systems. The restriction would apply to those individuals whose rate of basic pay exceeds 96 percent of the rate for level II of the Executive Schedule. Employees in positions currently described by section 207(c)(2)(A)(ii) would continue to be subject to this one-year, post-employment restriction upon leaving that senior position at any time during the two years following enactment of this Act. When that two-year period is complete, any such individual who is still an officer or employee in the executive branch in a position other than that described in clauses (i), (iii), and (iv) of section 207(c)(2)(A), will be a senior employee only if he or she meets the new salary threshold in clause (ii) of that section.

Section 1107—Design Elements of Pay-for-Performance Systems in Demonstration Projects

This section would provide specific elements to be incorporated into any pay-for-performance system established in a demonstration project under chapter 47, including adherence to merit principles, a fair, credible and transparent employee appraisal system, a link between the pay-for-performance system and the agency's strategic plan, adequate training, a means for ensuring employee feedback, and effective safeguards.

Section 1108—Federal Flexible Benefits Plan Administrative Costs

This section would prohibit agencies that provide or plan to provide flexible benefits plans for its employees from imposing any fees related to the program on its employees in order to defray the administrative costs associated with such option. This section would also require a number of reporting requirements associated with the benefits plans.

### Section 1109—Clarification to Hatch Act; Limitation on Disclosure of Certain Records

This section includes legislation introduced by Chairman Davis (H.R. 1509) that would clarify that a federal employee who voluntarily separates from the civil service shall not be subject to the enforcement provisions of the Hatch Act unless he or she re-enters the civil service.

### Section 1110—Employee Surveys

This section would authorize executive agencies to conduct annual surveys of their employees in order to assess: the leadership and management practices that contribute to agency performance; employee satisfaction with leadership policies and practices, work environment and rewards and recognition for professional accomplishment and personal contributions to achieving organization mission; opportunity for professional development and growth; and opportunity to contribute to achieving organizational mission. OPM would issue regulations prescribing survey questions to address these issues. Results of such surveys would be available to the public and posted on agency websites, unless the head of an agency determines that doing so would jeopardize or negatively impact national security.

## SUBTITLE B—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NATIONAL SECURITY PERSONNEL SYSTEM

### Section 1111—Department of Defense National Security Personnel System

This section would amend title 5 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 99 at the end of subpart I of part III. The new chapter would contain the following sections.

Section 9901 would provide definitions of various terms used throughout the new chapter.

Section 9902 would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a civilian human resources management system, based on the system created in section 841 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296) for the Department of Homeland Security, to enable the Department to fulfill its national security mission. This system would be merit-based. It also would protect veterans' preference and provide for collective bargaining at the national level in addition to local collective bargaining. In developing this system, the Director of the Office of Personnel and Management would serve as a strategic and collaborative partner. Consistent with the Secretary's broad authority to manage military personnel, the Secretary also would exercise broad authority to manage DOD civilian personnel, subject to the decision of the President, provided he certifies that such authority would be essential to the national security. This section would further:

(1) Provide for a collaborative process, based on the model established in the Homeland Security Act of 2002, (Public Law 107–296), for ensuring inclusion of employee representatives in the planning, development, and implementation of the human resources management system, while allowing the Secretary to conduct such collaboration at the national level;

(2) Require the establishment of an appeals process that provides that employees of the Department of Defense are entitled to fair treatment in any appeals they bring in decisions relating to their employment, which would include an independent review panel;

(3) Establish a program under which employees would be eligible for early retirement, offered separation pay to separate from the service voluntarily, or both, for purposes of reducing or restructuring the workforce;

(4) Require the system developed under this chapter to comply with provisions in current law relating to political activity, oath of office, access to criminal history records for national security and other purposes, the Ethics in Government Act, and Inspector General Act;

(5) Allow annuitants who become employed in the Department to retain their annuities;

(6) Cap DOD Senior Executive Service pay, allowances, differentials, bonuses, awards and other payments at no more than the Vice President's total annual compensation; and

(7) Authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive those provisions of title 5, United States Code, including chapters 71, 75, and 77, not specifically listed in the section as unwaivable.

Section 9903 would authorize the Department to hire highly qualified experts for up to five years, with the possibility of a one-year extension, and to prescribe the appropriate pay rates. It is consistent with the authority now available to the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and military departments for hiring scientists and engineers.

Section 9904 would authorize the Secretary of Defense to hire American citizens 55 years of age and older to work for the Department of Defense for up to two years, without a reduction in any annuity, pension, retirement pay, or similar payment, to fill needs that are not otherwise met by civilian employees.

Section 9905 would authorize DOD to align the allowances and benefits of certain employees outside the United States with those of the Foreign Service and the Central Intelligence Agency.

# TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

## OVERVIEW

As part of the global war on terrorism, the Department of Defense frequently finds itself working in cooperation with the military forces of other friendly nations. Title XII contains provisions that will streamline that cooperation and enhance United States national security.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training (ENJJPT) Program

Over the past decade, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has evolved and expanded to reflect the changes in the world. Four years ago, Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary

joined the other 16 member nations to enhance European regional security.

One important mission of NATO is to protect the alliance's air space. In the past 22 years, NATO partners have come together in the Euro-North Atlantic Treaty Organization Joint Jet Pilot Training (ENJJPT) program to provide flight training to over 250 student pilots and 120 instructor pilots annually. ENJJPT not only produces skilled pilots, but also strengthens the NATO alliance through common training, exercises, and routine operations. The benefits of such a program, that brings a large number of future leaders together from allied nations in a common endeavor that builds character and long-term professional bonds, as well as technical skills, is difficult to overstate.

The leadership of the Department of Defense should work within NATO to encourage and facilitate active participation in ENJJPT by newer NATO members.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 1201—Expansion of Authority to Provide Administrative Support and Services and Travel and Subsistence Expenses for Certain Foreign Liaison Officers

This section would remove a provision of existing law that limits the Secretary of Defense's ability to provide administrative support services to those foreign liaison officers from a nation involved in a coalition with the United States. The provision would also authorize the Secretary to pay the travel, subsistence, and similar personal expenses of a liaison officer from a developing nation in coalition with the United States. "Similar personal expenses" constitutes an expansion to the allowable expenses the Secretary may pay, but adds the requirement that the foreign liaison officer be from a coalition nation, effectively narrowing the class of eligible recipients.

### Section 1202—Recognition of Superior Noncombat Achievements or Performance by Members of Friendly Foreign Forces and Other Foreign Nationals

This section would authorize the Department of Defense to expend operations and maintenance funds to recognize superior noncombat achievements or performance by members of foreign forces and other foreign nationals that significantly enhance or support the National Security Strategy of the United States.

The committee understands that during Operation Enduring Freedom, U.S. military personnel were required to contact and gain the support of various foreign military and civilian personnel in the conduct of their missions. In many circumstances, the local customs of the various countries required U.S. military personnel to bestow gifts as recognition for the services or support that these foreign nationals provided. Failure to adhere to such customs could undermine mission accomplishment. Therefore, the committee believes that this authority will materially contribute to the ability of the armed forces to accomplish assigned missions.

### Section 1203—Expansion of Authority to Waive Charges for Costs of Attendance at George C. Marshall Center for Security Studies

The Secretary of Defense currently has the authority to waive reimbursement of costs for military officers and civilian officials from North Atlantic Cooperation Council (a component of NATO) and Partnership for Peace (PfP) countries participating in Marshall Center programs. The Secretary of Defense cannot currently waive reimbursement for poorer countries in the Balkans, however. The Department of Defense believes that increased participation by Balkan states in Marshall Center programs will serve U.S. security goals in the region. This provision would permit the Secretary to waive reimbursement costs for participants from states in Europe and the former Soviet Union, effectively making Balkan-state participants eligible to have their costs waived.

### Section 1204—Goods and Technologies Critical for Military Superiority

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a Goods and Technologies Critical for Military Superiority (GTCMS) list—a catalog of goods, materials, weapons systems technologies and developing critical technologies, and know-how that either could enhance a potential adversary's military capabilities or are critical to the United States maintaining its military superiority and qualitative advantage. The GTCMS list should include, but not be limited to, advanced conventional weapons, weapons of mass destruction, and traditional and untraditional delivery systems, and the means to manufacture them.

The Committee notes that the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy is best suited to compile the Goods and Technologies Critical for Military Superiority list given the breadth of this matter. The list should be comparable to the Commerce Control List and its different Categories, Groups, and Export Control Classification Numbers, and should use an updated version of the Militarily Critical Technologies List as a starting point. The list should be updated on a bimonthly basis, starting in June 2004, and be made available to the public on an official Department of Defense website. Classified versions of the list should be sent to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, as necessary.

### Section 1205—Report on Iraqi Acquisition of Advanced Weapons

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of how Iraq acquired weapons of mass destruction and associated delivery systems, to include unmanned aerial vehicles and cruise missiles, and advanced conventional arms in violation of multilateral and unilateral sanctions, arms control agreements, international weapons inspections and export control measures. From 1979, when International Atomic Energy Agency inspections in Iraq began, until the fall of the government of Saddam Hussein, Iraq obtained the materials, technology, and know-how for weapons of mass destruction and advanced conventional armaments both legally and illegally from entities outside of Iraq, including Iraqi citizens operating on foreign soil. The report should explain why nonproliferation processes failed to stop the spread of dangerous and

destabilizing weapons to Iraq, how Iraq circumvented multilateral technology control and inspections regimes after the first Gulf War, and how Iraq exploited limitations in export control processes around the world. The report should also address the illegal transfer of militarily useful goods to Iraq during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Section 1206—Authority for Check-Cashing and Currency Exchange Services To Be Provided to Foreign Military Members Participating in Certain Activities with United States Forces

This section would provide authority to foreign military personnel to obtain United States currency in exchanges for their negotiable instruments while on joint training or operations if the foreign nation has guaranteed payment and if the senior United States commander approves.

Section 1207—Requirements for Transfer to Foreign Countries of Certain Specified Types of Excess Aircraft

This section would amend section 2581 of title 10, United States Code, to expand transfer requirements for excess UH–1 Huey and AH–1 Cobra helicopters to include T–2 Buckeye aircraft and the T–37 Tweet aircraft.

Section 1208—Limitation on Number of United States Military Personnel in Colombia

This section would restrict funds available to the Department of Defense to support or maintain more than 500 U.S. military personnel in Colombia at any time. The provision would provide an exemption from the limitation for any members of the armed forces in Colombia for a period not to exceed 30 days to rescue or retrieve U.S. military or civilian Government personnel. The provision would also exempt military personnel assigned to the U.S. Embassy in Colombia as attachés, as part of the security assistance office, or the Marine Corps security contingent, as well as those participating in natural disaster relief efforts, those involved in nonoperational transit through Colombia, or making a port call. The provision would also provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to waive the military personnel limitation should the Secretary determine that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States and notify the congressional defense committees within 15 days.

## TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

### OVERVIEW

The budget request included $450.8 million for cooperative threat reduction (CTR) activities in fiscal year 2004, an increase of almost 9 percent over fiscal year 2003. The amount included $57.6 million for the elimination of strategic nuclear delivery systems in Russia; $48.0 million for nuclear weapons storage security in Russia; $23.2 million for strategic nuclear weapons transportation security; $3.9 million for strategic nuclear delivery systems elimination in

Ukraine; $54.2 million for biological weapons proliferation prevention throughout the former Soviet Union; $200.3 million for chemical weapons destruction in Russia; $39.4 million for weapons of mass destruction proliferation prevention programs outside of Russia, but within the former Soviet Union; $11.1 million for defense and military contacts; and $13.1 million for administrative costs.

The Committee recommends the budget request with two exceptions. First, it would increase funding for the elimination of strategic nuclear delivery systems in Russia by $28.8 million to $86.4 million. Second, it would decrease funding for chemical weapons destruction in Russia by $28.8 million, to $171.5 million.

The committee continues to support the original and overriding goal of the CTR program: to reduce the threat to the United States posed by the former Soviet Union's strategic weapons of mass destruction and their associated delivery systems. It notes significant progress in reaching that goal. However, it remains concerned that progress on eliminating strategic nuclear delivery vehicles has slowed. The fiscal year 2004 request for strategic nuclear weapons elimination in Russia represents a decrease of almost 18 percent from fiscal year 2003 and nearly 57 percent from fiscal year 2002. Similarly, the request for $3.9 million for strategic arms elimination in Ukraine represent a 39 percent reduction from fiscal year 2003 and a 92 percent reduction from fiscal year 2002. The committee recommends reversing these trends as they relate to Russia, which continues to possess inordinate numbers of Soviet-era strategic nuclear delivery systems. Therefore, it recommends increased funding for these efforts in order to keep them the top priority for the Cooperative Threat Reduction program.

While the committee has long supported the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, it has noted several problems that threaten the program's continued utility under the Department of Defense. These include a broadening of its mission from definable goals, such as the dismantlement of delivery systems, to more amorphous and undefined goals, such as eliminating environmental dangers; the Department's continued willingness to absorb costs that are more appropriate for taxpayers in the former Soviet Union; the continuing difficulty in determining whether programs are making measurable progress towards achieving definable goals; the lack of necessary transparency and access agreements; the challenge in ensuring that CTR funding does not inadvertently free up resources for strategic modernization by states of the former Soviet Union; frequent lapses in management that lead to wasteful spending; and, the tendency to pursue nonproliferation activities that are not critical to the Department's primary war-fighting missions or expertise and more appropriately belong with other government departments and agencies. Events over the last year have only heightened these concerns.

The facts surrounding the Liquid Propellant Disposition Project in Krasnoyarsk, Russia clearly demonstrate this waste and lack of cooperation. Russia asked for assistance, and the United States spent over $137.2 million to dispose of rocket fuel from old ballistic missiles. As a part of this effort, the United States built Russia a $106.0 million plant to convert the fuel into commercially-useful materials. However, according to the Department of Defense Inspector General, without telling the United States, the Russian

government turned most of the fuel over to its space program for commercial launches before the project was completed. The Russian government even helped reprocess the fuel inside of former fuel-production plants in order to make it safer for use in space launches. As a result, there is no fuel for the U.S.-funded plant to eliminate. Because the facility cannot be used for anything else, its value now is reduced to its scrap—valued roughly at $1.2 million.

Russia's duplicity, or—at best—negligence, in this episode signals a clear difference in views about the utility of some elements of the Cooperative Threat Reduction program between Russia and the United States and suggests that the two countries may have different goals for parts of the program. In fact, in January 2003, the President exercised authority established by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 to waive certification requirements contained in the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 and the FREEDOM Support Act for one year. The certification requirements make the President determine that a state of the former Soviet Union is committed to fulfilling six reasonable responsibilities before the U.S. Government may expend CTR funds in that country. In 2003, the President determined that Russia is not committed to two of the six requirements:

(1) Foregoing any military modernization program that exceeds legitimate defense requirements and foregoing the replacement of destroyed weapons of mass destruction; and,

(2) Complying with all relevant arms control agreements," including the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, to which Moscow is a party.

In the same Presidential Determination, the Administration found that "Russia continues a biological weapons program," and that Russia has "failed to fully declare its chemical weapon stockpiles and chemical weapon-related facilities." These facts show that Russia does not share U.S. nonproliferation intentions and goals for the CTR program.

The key element to the success of the Cooperative Threat Reduction programs is cooperation. As indicated by progress in dismantling strategic nuclear delivery systems that threatened the United States and that the successor states of the Soviet Union no longer wanted, success is possible when all participants share a common set of assumptions, interests, and clearly defined goals. When participants do not share the same assumptions, interests, or goals, as may be the case in CTR biological and chemical weapons destruction programs, success is impossible and resources committed to such efforts are wasted.

To avoid that outcome, the Committee recommends limitations and conditions on a few CTR programs as a means of assessing a CTR recipient's commitment to the goals of the program and its willingness to act in a truly cooperative fashion. First, it would prioritize those activities where the United States and Russia have historically demonstrated success due to shared goals, such as the elimination of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles. Second, it would limit those programs to which Russia's commitment is less than complete. In general, the Committee adopted principles of accountability, transparency, accessibility, and cooperation when drafting these provisions.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds

This section would specify the kinds of programs to be funded under this title and would make fiscal year 2004 Cooperative Threat Reduction program funds available for three years.

### Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would allocate fiscal year 2004 funding for various Cooperative Threat Reduction purposes and activities.

### Section 1303—Limitation on Use of Funds until Certain Permits Obtained

The committee notes that multi-million dollar demilitarization projects in the Russia Federation have been stalled or cancelled due to a failure to obtain in advance all necessary land-use permits. For example, the United States spent $94.6 million toward the construction of a solid rocket motor disposition facility near the city of Votkinsk, Russia before the Department learned that it could not obtain the necessary land-use permits to operate the facility. While the Administration believes Russia was forthcoming about problems at Votkinsk, the decision to proceed with construction in the absence of all necessary permits resulted in yet additional waste in the Cooperative Threat Reduction program. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to determine what permits will be needed and that the Russian government obtain and transmit copies of those permits to the Secretary of Defense before he obligates more than 35 percent of a project's total cost. This would enable the Department of Defense to spend those funds needed to enable it to obtain a permit, while limiting the potential for waste in the event that the permits are not forthcoming.

### Section 1304—Limitation on Use of Funds for Biological Research in the Former Soviet Union

This section would limit spending by the Department of Defense's cooperative biodefense research or bioattack early warning and preparedness to those sites to which the Department has sufficient access to (1) determine that no prohibited weapons research is being conducted; (2) determine the vulnerability of a site to illicit external or internal attempts to obtain dangerous pathogens; and, (3) implement security measures needed to prevent the diversion of dangerous pathogens from legitimate research. All told, these limitations apply to $32.2 million. Funds requested for the purposes of dismantling sites or improving safety and security at a site would be unaffected.

In March 2003, the General Accounting Office released a report entitled, "Weapons of Mass Destruction: Additional Russian Cooperation Needed to Facilitate U.S. Efforts to Improve Security at Russian Sites." The General Accounting Office determined that the United States lacked sufficient access to Russia's biological research facilities to secure those sites at which the United States and Russia had collaborative programs. It further noted that Russia routinely denied the United States access to those sites receiving funding from U.S. taxpayers, and that negotiations to secure

such access had stalled. As a result, the Department of Defense cannot be sure that its funding of Russian biological research facilities will not undermine U.S. security by creating circumstances in which U.S. resources support inappropriate activities or sustain activities vulnerable to inappropriate applications. The corrective measures contained in this section would help prevent those circumstances from arising and create incentives for Russia to grant U.S. access to those biological research facilities pursuing U.S. funding.

Section 1305—Authority and Funds for Nonproliferation and Disarmament

The Department of Defense (DOD) requested authority to obligate and expend up to $50.0 million of Cooperative Threat Reduction program funds, including prior fiscal year funds, outside the states of the former Soviet Union if the President determines such funds would help the United States resolve critical emerging proliferation threats or would otherwise allow the United States to take advantage of opportunities to achieve long-standing nonproliferation goals. While the committee supports nonproliferation efforts, there is concern that an expansion of DOD's Cooperative Threat Reduction program beyond the borders of the former Soviet Union will distract the Department from its primary, warfighting mission. Moreover, the committee notes that nonproliferation efforts have historically been a function of the Department of State, and that Congress expanded the authority of the State Department's Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund beyond the territory of the former Soviet Union. Therefore, rather than expanding a DOD program that would duplicate State Department efforts, this section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer $50.0 million of prior fiscal year Cooperative Threat Reduction funds to the Department of State Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund for disarmament and nonproliferation purposes outside of the former Soviet Union. The committee recommends that future growth in government-wide nonproliferation efforts occur among programs that the Department of State is already authorized to undertake.

Section 1306—Requirement for On-Site Managers

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to appoint an on-site manager to oversee Cooperation Threat Reduction projects involving a dismantlement, destruction, or storage facility or construction of a facility in the former Soviet Union whose total U.S. costs will exceed $25 million over the life of the project. The committee believes that the presence of a full-time U.S. manager on-site will prevent repeats of wasteful programs such as the Krasnoyarsk heptyl plant and Votkinsk solid rocket motor dismantlement facility, while giving the United States greater insight into a recipient partner's degree of cooperation and commitment to a CTR project. The section would apply to both existing and future facilities, but would not take effect until six months after enactment in order to give the Department of Defense sufficient time to identify the needed on-site managers.

To empower the on-site manager, increase transparency into Russia's contributions to cooperative threat reduction, and enhance

accountability in program execution, this section further lays out responsibilities for the on-site manager, who would be directed to work with partner governments to identify the steps and activities needed to successfully accomplish a nonproliferation goal, establish a schedule for completing those steps, and conduct meetings of assurance with participants in order to ensure that the necessary steps are completed on schedule. The on-site manager would further be directed to suspend U.S. participation in a project when a non-U.S. participant fails to meet its obligations, but the Secretary of Defense would retain the ability to direct a project to continue in the face of such failure.

### Section 1307—Provisions Relating to Funding for Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility in Russia

This section would extend for a period of one year the President's authority to waive existing certification requirements before obligating funds for the construction of the Shchuch'ye Chemical Weapons Deconstruction Facility in Russia. However, the need for such authority continues to raise concerns about Russia's commitment to fully disclosing and dismantling its chemical weapons stockpile and infrastructure. Ultimately, Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs undertaken in the absence of such a commitment will fail to improve the security of the American people. Therefore, the committee urges the Department of Defense to assess Russia's commitment to these goals, and, should it determine that Russia's commitment remains lacking, to restructure the program accordingly.

The committee further notes that the Russian Federation agreed to provide $25.0 million annually for the construction and operation of the chemical weapons deconstruction facility at Shchuch'ye, Russia, but that it has frequently failed to meet this goal. The United States and the Russian Federation initially planned to share the costs of the Shchuch'ye project, with the United States spending approximately $750.0 million to build and begin operations at the facility, with the Russian Federation spending approximately $240.0 million. The fiscal year 2004 budget requests $190.3 million for the Shchuch'ye project, with the Russian Federation expected to pay $25.0 million, a ratio of roughly 7.6 to 1. The committee believes this is unacceptable, particularly since building the Shchuch'ye facility is in the interests of Russia and its European neighbors. Therefore, the committee recommends a $28.8 million reduction of Shchuch'ye funding in order to bring authorized U.S. expenditures in fiscal year 2004 into line with the project's overall three to one funding ratio.

The committee notes that several countries recently committed to provide $10 billion in additional disarmament and nonproliferation resources. The committee applauds the President for securing these promises from other states with an interest in disarmament and nonproliferation, but is concerned by early signs that these countries may not meet their commitments. Accordingly, to create incentives for other states to contribute to nonproliferation and disarmament, the committee proposes a new funding mechanism for Shchuch'ye. This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to obligate $71.5 million of the $171.5 million authorized for Shchuch'ye immediately, and establish the remaining funds as a

two-for-one matching fund. This section would match every dollar Russia or another country contributed to Shchuch'ye with two dollars. Such a mechanism would increase the likelihood that other countries will step forward to meet their nonproliferation and disarmament promises, and limit the possibility that the American taxpayer will be left with paying the entire costs of a program designed to benefit the entire world.

# TITLE XIV—SERVICES ACQUISITION REFORM

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 1401—Short Title

This section would provide that this title may be cited as the "Services Acquisition Reform Act of 2003."

### Section 1402—Executive Agency Defined

This section would use the term "executive agency" as is defined in section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement of Policy Act (41 U.S.C. § 403).

## SUBTITLE A—ACQUISITION WORKFORCE AND TRAINING

### Section 1411—Definition of Acquisition

This section would amend section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 1U.S.C. § 403) by defining the term "acquisition." The new definition would encompass the entire spectrum of acquisition starting with the development of an agency's requirements through management and measurement of contract performance.

### Section 1412—Acquisition Workforce Training Fund

This section would amend section 37 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. § 433) to establish within the General Services Administration an acquisition workforce-training fund to be managed by the Federal Acquisition Institute (FAI). The fund is to be financed by depositing 5 percent of the fees collected by various executive agencies under their government-wide contracts. This will provide the funding needed by FAI to develop training resources needed to support new acquisition initiatives. The fund can only be used for sorely needed acquisition workforce training across the civilian government agencies. This provision does not apply to the Department of Defense.

### Section 1413—Acquisition Workforce Recruitment Program

This section would authorize the head of an agency to determine, for purposes of sections 3304, 5333, and 5753 of title 5, United States Code, that certain federal acquisition positions are in a "shortage category" in order to recruit and directly hire persons with high qualifications. Personnel actions under this section would be subject to Office of Personnel Management policies. In addition, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy would be required to submit to Congress a report by September 2007 con-

cerning the efficacy of the program and recommending whether the authority should be extended.

### Section 1414—Architectural and Engineering Acquisition Workforce

This section would require the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of General Services, and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, to develop and implement a plan to assure that the federal government maintains the necessary capability to contract effectively for the performance of architectural and engineering services. This section, however, is not intended to authorize the hiring of additional government employees.

## SUBTITLE B—ADAPTATION OF BUSINESS ACQUISITION PRACTICES

## PART I—ADAPTATION OF BUSINESS MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

### Section 1421—Chief Acquisition Officers

This section would amend section 16 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. § 414) to provide for the appointment of a non-career employee as the chief acquisition officer for each executive agency other than the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense currently has a comparable position established in title 10, United States Code. The chief acquisition officer would have acquisition as the official's primary duty and advise and assist the agency head and other senior officials to ensure that the agency mission is achieved through the management of the agency's acquisition activities. The functions of the chief acquisition officer would include monitoring the agency's acquisition activities, evaluating them based on applicable performance measurements, increasing the use of full and open competition in agency acquisitions, making acquisition decisions consistent with applicable laws, and establishing clear lines of authority, accountability, and responsibility for acquisition decision making and developing and maintaining an acquisition career management program. The chief acquisition officer, as a part of the statutorily required annual strategic planning and performance evaluation process, would assess agency requirements for agency personnel knowledge and skills in acquisition resources management and, if necessary, develop strategies and plans for hiring, training and professional development.

### Section 1422—Chief Acquisition Officers Council

This section would establish a chief acquisition officers council to monitor and improve the federal acquisition system. Deputy Director for Management (DDM) of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) shall chair the council, and membership shall include the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy (Administrator), the Chief Acquisition Officers created under section 16 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 414), the Under Secretary of Defense of Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and any chair designated federal officer or employee. The Administrator shall lead the activities of the council on behalf of the DDM. The General Services Administration shall provide administrative and

other support to the council. The council will, among other things, develop recommendations for OMB on acquisition policies and requirements, assist the Administrator in the identification, development, and coordination of multi-agency and other innovative acquisition initiatives, promote effective business practices to ensure timely delivery of best value products and services to the federal government, and work with the Office of Personnel Management to assess and address hiring, training, and professional development needs related to acquisition.

### Section 1423—Statutory and Regulatory Review

This section would require the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy to establish an advisory panel to review acquisition laws and regulations with a view toward ensuring greater use of commercial practices and performance-based contracting, as well as enhancing the performance of acquisition functions across agency lines, and the use of federal government- wide contracts. The advisory panel shall consist of at least nine experts in acquisition law and policy who represent diverse public and private sector experiences.

## PART II—OTHER ACQUISITION IMPROVEMENTS

### Section 1426—Extension of Authority to Carry Out Franchise Fund Programs

This section would amend section 403(f) of the Federal Financial Management Act of 1994 (P.L. 103–356) to reauthorize the federal government's franchise funds until October 1, 2006.

### Section 1427—Agency Acquisition Protests

This section would amend Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 81–152) to provide statutory authority for an agency-level acquisition protest process. This section would provide for a stay of the award or of contract performance during the 20 working day period in which an agency is to evaluate the protest. The stay could be lifted by the head of the agency procuring activity upon a written finding that urgent and compelling circumstances do not permit waiting for the decision. This section would provide that filing an agency-level protest would not affect the right of an interested party to file a protest with the Comptroller General or in the United States Court of Federal Claims. This section would also amend section 3553(d)(4) of title 31, United States Code, to provide that an interested party filing a protest on the same matter with the Comptroller General within five days of the issuance of the agency protest decision would qualify for a stay of performance in connection with such protest.

### Section 1428—Improvements in Contracting for Architectural and Engineering Services

This section would amend section 2855(b) of title 10, United States Code, to raise from $85,000 to $300,000 the threshold for a participation incentive for small business concerns in acquisitions for architectural and engineering services. This section would also

require that architectural and engineering services offered under multiple-award schedule contracts awarded by the General Services Administration or under federal government-wide task and delivery order contracts be performed under the supervision of a licensed professional engineer and be awarded pursuant to the quality-based selection procedures in chapter 11 of title 40, United States Code.

### Section 1429—Authorization of Telecommuting for Federal Contractors

This section would require an amendment to the federal acquisition regulations to provide that solicitations for federal contracts should not contain any requirement or evaluation criteria that would render an offeror ineligible or would reduce the scoring of the offeror's proposal based upon the offeror's inclusion of a plan to allow its employees to telecommute, unless the contracting officer determines in writing that the needs of the agency could not be met without the requirement. This section would require the General Accounting Office to report to Congress on the implementation one year after the amendment is published.

## SUBTITLE C—CONTRACT INCENTIVES

### Section 1431—Incentives for Contract Efficiency

This section would amend the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (Public Law 93–400) by adding a new section authorizing agencies to include in service contracts options to extend the contract by one or more performance periods based on exceptional performance as measured by standards set forth in the contract. The contract should be, to the maximum extent practicable, performance-based.

## SUBTITLE D—ACQUISITION OF COMMERCIAL ITEMS

### Section 1441—Preference for Performance-Based Contracting

This section would amend the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (Public Law 93–400) by authorizing a performance-based contractor for the procurement of services or a performance-based task order for services to be treated as a contractor for the procurement of a commercial item if each task is defined in measurable, mission related terms with specific products or outputs, and the contractor provides similar services to the general public. This section would also require the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy to establish a center of excellence for service contracting to assist the acquisition community in identifying best practices in service contracting.

### Section 1442—Authorization of Additional Commercial Contract Types

This section would amend section 8002(d) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355) to provide that the federal acquisition regulations include authority for time and material contracts or labor hour contracts to be used for the acqui-

sition of a commercial service commonly sold to the general public through such contracts.

Section 1443—Clarification of Commercial Services Definition

This section would amend section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act [41 U.S.C. § 403(12)] by modifying the criteria that must be applied to purchase a commercial service pursuant to the procedure available for the purchase of a commercial item. Under this section a service would be considered a commercial service if the service is of a type customarily used by the general public and sold in substantial quantities. This change in definition is intended to affect the procurement process by which federal agencies purchase services. This section is not intended to amend government regulations or policy that dictate whether public sector functions are commercial in nature.

Section 1444—Designation of Commercial Business Entities

This section would amend section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (Public Law 93–400) to authorize federal agencies to treat the purchase of items produced or services provided by a commercial entity as a procurement of a commercial item or commercial service. A commercial entity would be defined as any enterprise whose primary customers are other than the federal government, that is, at least 90 percent of its sales over the past three business years must have been to the private sector. This section would also require the General Accounting Office to evaluate the effectiveness of this authority in increasing the availability of commercial items and services to the federal government at fair and reasonable prices.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1451—Authority To Enter into Certain Procurement-Related Transactions and To Carry Out Certain Prototype Projects

This section would amend title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Property Act) (Public Law 81–152) to allow the head of a civilian executive agency, if authorized by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), to enter into transactions (other than contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants) to carry out basic, applied, and advanced research and development projects that are otherwise authorized and necessary to the responsibilities of the agency that may facilitate defense against, or recovery from, terrorism or nuclear, biological, chemical, or radiological, attack. This authority would be similar to that exercised by the Secretary of Defense under section 2317 of title 10, United States Code, with certain exceptions.

This section would further amend the Property Act to provide that the head of an executive agency, designated by the Director of OMB to enter into transactions (other than contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants) may, with the approval of the Director of OMB, carry out prototype projects in accordance with the same requirements and conditions for prototype projects as are provided under section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160).

### Section 1452—Authority To Make Inflation Adjustments To Simplified Acquisition Threshold

This section would provide that the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy may adjust the simplified acquisition threshold as defined in section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (Public Law 93–400) every five years to an amount equal to $100 thousand in constant fiscal year 2003 dollars.

### Section 1453—Technical Correction Related to Duplicative Amendments

This section would repeal superceded provisions and provide conforming amendments.

### Section 1454—Prohibition on Use of Quotas

This section would prohibit the Office of Management and Budget from establishing, applying, or enforcing quotes on federal agencies with respect to the number of employees that should be part of a public private competition.

### Section 1455—Applicability of Certain Provisions to Sole Source Contracts for Goods and Services Treated as Commercial Items

This section would require that cost accounting standards and cost or pricing data requirements would apply to contracts for commercial items or commercial services, in those instances when an award is made on a sole source basis and the value of the contract $15.0 million or more.

### Section 1456—Public Disclosure of Noncompetitive Contracting for the Reconstruction of Infrastructure in Iraq

This section would require that for contracts for the repair, maintenance, or construction of infrastructure awarded without full and open competition the head of the appropriate executive agency shall publish either in the Federal Register or the Commerce Business Daily and otherwise make public specific information within 30 days of the award of the contract. Published information includes the value and scope of the contract, a discussion on how solicited offers were evaluated, and a copy of the justification and approval determination to use procedure other than full and open competition.

## DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

### PURPOSE

The purpose of Division B is to provide military construction authorizations and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 2004. As approved by the committee, Division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of $9,789,530,000 for construction in support of the active forces, reserve components, defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security infrastructure fund for fiscal year 2004.

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OVERVIEW

The Department of Defense requested $5,221,076,000 for military construction and $4,030,811,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2004. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $5,758,719,000 for military construction and $4,030,811,000 for family housing in fiscal year 2004. Including the impact of anticipated rescissions requested by the Department, the committee's recommendations are consistent with a total budget authority level of $9,528,324,000 for military construction and family housing in fiscal year 2004.

The military construction total contains $119,815,000 for chemical agents and munitions destruction construction projects. Although this amount matches the Department's request for chemical agents and munitions destruction construction projects, the Department had requested authorization for these funds elsewhere in the bill. The committee believes that all of the Department's construction activities should be authorized in the military construction portion of the annual defense authorization bill. As such, the committee recommends the transfer of the authorization for chemical agents and munitions destruction construction to Division B—Military Construction Authorizations.

Even after several years of congressional increases to the Department's military construction and family housing budgets, the poor state of U.S. military installations and facilities remains an issue of significant concern. Visits to military installations around the United States and overseas confirm that America's service members continue to live and work in aging and substandard facilities. Of further concern are indications that efforts to increase budgets for sustainment, modernization, and restoration have had little impact on the ability of the military services to maintain the condition of their facilities. According to the Department, more than two-thirds of the services' facilities are classified at "C–3" or "C–4" readiness levels, indicating that their ability to conduct their missions has been significantly degraded.

For the second consecutive year, the budget request contained only sufficient funding to support new mission beddowns and a few quality of life projects. This underfunded approach to military construction and family housing reflects the Department's intent to slow military construction investment until the 2005 base realignment and closure process. This approach severely impacts America's military personnel who must live and work in the housing and facilities available today.

The Department also submitted a remarkable request pertaining to overseas construction projects. Based upon this request, and limited briefings from the Department, the United States military is in the midst of the most significant restructuring of overseas basing strategy since the end of World War II. However, the Department has conducted its work largely behind closed doors, and has not provided Congress with the details of its work.

By submitting a budget to Congress that effectively implements the initial stages of a major overseas realignment, the Department is asking Congress to endorse an undefined plan that will have a dramatic impact on the Department's spending, policies, and operations for the coming decades. Although the committee rec-

ommends the Department's request for overseas construction programs, it does so not as an endorsement of the Department's overseas plans, but as a placeholder marked for further review once the committee receives sufficient information to adequately assess and understand the details of the Department's plans.

A tabular summary of the authorizations provided in Division B for fiscal year 2004 follows:

## TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVIII - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Military Construction** | | | | | |
| Military Construction, Army | 1,678,210 | (73,730) | 104,970 | (178,700) | 1,604,480 |
| Military Construction, Navy | 1,147,537 | 104,409 | 117,299 | (12,890) | 1,251,946 |
| Military Construction, Air Force | 830,671 | 155,405 | 155,405 | 0 | 986,076 |
| Military Construction, Defense-Wide | 655,381 | 147,168 | 147,168 | 0 | 802,549 |
| NATO Security Investment Program | 169,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 169,300 |
| BRAC IV | 370,427 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 370,427 |
| Military Construction, Army National Guard | 168,298 | 85,490 | 92,503 | (7,013) | 253,788 |
| Military Construction, Air National Guard | 60,430 | 62,978 | 62,978 | 0 | 123,408 |
| Military Construction, Army Reserve | 68,478 | 21,362 | 21,362 | 0 | 89,840 |
| Military Construction, Naval and Marine Corp Reserve | 28,032 | 17,730 | 17,730 | 0 | 45,762 |
| Military Construction, Air Force Reserve | 44,312 | 16,831 | 16,831 | 0 | 61,143 |
| **Total Military Construction** | **5,221,076** | **537,643** | **736,246** | **(198,603)** | **5,758,719** |
| **Family Housing** | | | | | |
| Family Housing Construction, Army | 409,191 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 409,191 |
| Family Housing Support, Army | 1,043,026 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,043,026 |
| Family Housing Construction, Navy | 184,193 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 184,193 |
| Family Housing Support, Navy | 852,778 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 852,778 |
| Family Housing Construction, Air Force | 657,065 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 657,065 |
| Family Housing Support, Air Force | 834,468 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 834,468 |
| Family Housing Construction, Defense-Wide | 350 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 350 |
| Family Housing Support, Defense-Wide | 49,440 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49,440 |
| Family Housing Improvement Fund | 300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 300 |
| **Total Family Housing** | **4,030,811** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **4,030,811** |
| **Total Military Construction and Family Housing** | **9,251,887** | **537,643** | **736,246** | **(198,603)** | **9,789,530** |

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Appropriation | Installation | Project Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Alabama | Army | MilCon, Army | Redstone Arsenal | Vibration Dynamic Test Facility | 5,500 | | 5,500 |
| 2 | Alabama | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Maxwell AFB | Integrated Operations Support Facility | | 12,600 | 12,600 |
| 3 | Alabama | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Maxwell AFB | SOC Dormitory, Phase 3 | 13,400 | | 13,400 |
| 4 | Alabama | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC Fort Payne | Readiness Center, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 3,648 | (3,648) | - |
| 5 | Alabama | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC Mobile | Armed Forces Reserve Center (ADRS), Phase 2 | 2,943 | | 2,943 |
| 6 | Alabama | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC Springville | Readiness Center, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 3,365 | (3,365) | - |
| 7 | Alabama | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC Vincent | Readiness Center, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 3,353 | | 3,353 |
| 8 | Alabama | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Ft McClellan | Fire Station (ADRS) | 1,873 | | 1,873 |
| 9 | Alabama | Army National Guard | Milcon, Army NG | Haleyville | Joint Armed Forces Reserve Center Phase 1 | | 13,849 | 13,849 |
| 10 | Alaska | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Richardson | Barracks Complex - D Street, Phase 3 | 33,000 | | 33,000 |
| 11 | Alaska | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Wainwright | Pallet Processing Facility | 16,500 | | 16,500 |
| 12 | Alaska | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Wainwright | Military Operations on Urban Terrain | 11,200 | | 11,200 |
| 13 | Alaska | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Wainwright | Multi-Purpose Training Range Complex | 47,000 | | 47,000 |
| 14 | Alaska | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Wainwright | Ammunition Supply Point Upgrade | 10,600 | | 10,600 |
| 15 | Alaska | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Wainwright | Barracks - Luzon Avenue | 21,500 | | 21,500 |
| 16 | Alaska | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Wainwright | Alert Holding Area Facility | 32,000 | | 32,000 |
| 17 | Alaska | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Eielson AFB | Repair/Expand Enroute Ramp | 19,060 | | 19,060 |
| 18 | Alaska | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Eielson AFB | Dormitory--96 RM | 13,914 | | 13,914 |
| 19 | Alaska | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Elmendorf AFB | Maintenance Facility | 2,000 | | 2,000 |
| 20 | Alaska | Defense Logistics Agency | MilCon, Def-Wide | Eielson AFB | Replace Hydrant Fuel System | 17,000 | | 17,000 |
| 21 | Alaska | Tri-Care Management Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Ft Wainwright | Hospital Replacement, Phase 5 | | | - |
| 22 | Arizona | Navy | MilCon, Navy | MCAS Yuma | Station Ordnance Area | 7,980 | | 7,980 |
| 23 | Arizona | Navy | MilCon, Navy | MCAS Yuma | Aircraft Maintenance Hangar | 14,250 | | 14,250 |
| 24 | Arizona | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Davis-Monthan AFB | CSAR Msn Ready Support Parts | 1,906 | | 1,906 |
| 25 | Arizona | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Davis-Monthan AFB | CSAR C-130 Apron/Shoulder | 1,954 | | 1,954 |
| 26 | Arizona | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Davis-Monthan AFB | CSAR HH-60 Sq Ops/AMU | 6,004 | | 6,004 |
| 27 | Arizona | Air National Guard | MilCon, Air NG | Tucson IAP | Composite Support Complex | | 5,900 | 5,900 |
| 28 | Arkansas | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Little Rock AFB | C-130J Add/Alter Hangar 280 | 1,144 | | 1,144 |
| 29 | Arkansas | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Little Rock AFB | C-130 Operations Training Facility | 2,478 | | 2,478 |
| 30 | Arkansas | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Little Rock AFB | Child Development Center | | 3,750 | 3,750 |
| 31 | California | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Irwin | MOUT Phase 1 | | 3,350 | 3,350 |
| 32 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | MAGTFTC Twentynine Palms | Bachelor Enlisted Quarters | 26,100 | | 26,100 |
| 33 | California | Navy | Milcon, Navy | MAGTFTC Twentynine Palms | Enlisted Dining Facility | | 13,700 | 13,700 |
| 34 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | MAGTFTC Twentynine Palms | Explosive Ordnance Operations | 2,290 | | 2,290 |
| 35 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | MCAS Miramar | Aircraft Fire/Rescue Station | 4,740 | | 4,740 |
| 36 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | MCAS Miramar | Ground Combat Training Range | | 2,900 | 2,900 |
| 37 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | MCB Camp Pendleton | BEQ | 22,930 | | 22,930 |
| 38 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | MCB Camp Pendleton | Tertiary Sewage Treatment, Increment 1 | 24,960 | | 24,960 |
| 39 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAF San Clemente Island | Operational Access - Shoba | 18,940 | | 18,940 |
| 40 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAS Lemoore | Operational Trainer | 9,900 | | 9,900 |

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Appropriation | Installation | Project Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 41 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAS Lemoore | Maintenance Hangar-O/H Space | 24,610 | | 24,610 |
| 42 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAS North Island | Taxiway/Tower | 13,650 | | 13,650 |
| 43 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAS North Island | Squadron Operations Facility | 35,590 | | 35,590 |
| 44 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAVPGSCOL Monterey | Bachelor Officer Quarters Replacement | 35,550 | | 35,550 |
| 45 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAVPGSCOL Monterey | Education Facility Replacement Phase 2 | | 7,010 | 7,010 |
| 46 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAWC China Lake | Airfield Pavement Upgrade | 12,890 | (12,890) | - |
| 47 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAWC China Lake | Propellants and Explosives Lab Ph 3 | | 12,230 | 12,230 |
| 48 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | Island) | Transient Quarters (SNI) | 6,150 | | 6,150 |
| 49 | California | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NS San Diego | BEQ Homeport Ashore | 42,710 | | 42,710 |
| 50 | California | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Beale AFB | Global Hawk Dorm--96 RM | 13,342 | | 13,342 |
| 51 | California | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Beale AFB | Global Hawk Upgrade Docks | 8,958 | | 8,958 |
| 52 | California | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Edwards AFB | Add/Renovate JSF Complex, Phase 1 | 19,060 | | 19,060 |
| 53 | California | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Edwards AFB | Replace Base Operations Facility | | 7,300 | 7,300 |
| 54 | California | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Vandenberg AFB | Consolidated Fitness Center | 16,500 | | 16,500 |
| 55 | California | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Bakersfield | Readiness Center (ADRS) | 5,495 | | 5,495 |
| 56 | California | Navy Reserve | MilCon, Navy Res | NARC San Diego | C-40 Hangar | 15,973 | | 15,973 |
| 57 | California | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | NAB Coronado | Small Arms Range | | 2,800 | 2,800 |
| 58 | Colorado | Army | MilCon, Army | Fort Carson | Vehicle Marshalling Area | | 2,150 | 2,150 |
| 59 | Colorado | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Buckley AFB | Upgrade Base Infrastructure, Phase 3 | 6,957 | | 6,957 |
| 60 | Colorado | Air Force Reserve | MilCon, Air Res | Peterson AFB | Consolidated Aerial Port/Airlift Control Flight Facility | | 7,700 | 7,700 |
| 61 | Colorado | Air National Guard | MilCon, Air NG | Buckley ANG Base | Buckley-Civil Engineer Complex | 6,900 | | 6,900 |
| 62 | Colorado | Tri-Care Management Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Air Force Academy | Hospital Addition/Alteration | 21,500 | | 21,500 |
| 63 | Colorado | ChemDemil | MilCon, Def-Wide | Pueblo Depot Activity | Ammunition Demilitarization Facility Ph 5 | | 88,388 | 88,388 |
| 64 | Connecticut | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NSB New London | Tomahawk Missile Magazine | | 3,120 | 3,120 |
| 65 | Connecticut | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Newtown Mil. Res. | Working Animal Building (ADRS) | 2,167 | | 2,167 |
| 66 | Connecticut | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Stones Ranch Mil. Res. | Fire Station (ADRS) | 2,422 | | 2,422 |
| 67 | Connecticut | Tri-Care Management Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | NSB New London | Dental Clinic Replacement | 6,400 | | 6,400 |
| 68 | District of Columbia | Navy | MilCon, Navy | Marine Corps Bks | Motor Transport Facility Addition | 1,550 | | 1,550 |
| 69 | District of Columbia | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Bolling AFB | Air Force Central Adjudication Facility | 9,300 | | 9,300 |
| 70 | District of Columbia | Tri-Care Management Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | NS Anacostia | Medical/Dental Clinic Conversion/Renovation | 15,714 | | 15,714 |
| 71 | District of Columbia | Tri-Care Management Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Walter Reed MC | Hospital Energy Plant Add/Alter | 9,000 | | 9,000 |
| 72 | Florida | Navy | MilCon, Navy | Blount Island | Land Acquisition | 115,711 | | 115,711 |
| 73 | Florida | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAS Jacksonville | Aircraft Parking Apron Phase 1 | | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| 74 | Florida | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAS Jacksonville | Airfield Perimeter Security Enhancement | 3,190 | | 3,190 |
| 75 | Florida | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAS Whiting Fld | Clear Zone Acquisition (OLF Barin) | 4,830 | | 4,830 |
| 76 | Florida | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NSWC Panama City | Littoral Warfare Research Complex | 9,550 | | 9,550 |
| 77 | Florida | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Hurlburt Fld | AFC2TIG System/Warrior School Complex | 19,400 | | 19,400 |
| 78 | Florida | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Hurlburt Fld | Special Tactics Advanced Skills Training | 7,800 | | 7,800 |
| 79 | Florida | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Tyndall AFB | 1AF Air Operations Center Phase 1 | | 14,400 | 14,400 |
| 80 | Florida | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Tyndall AFB | F-22 Parking Apron/Runway Extension | 6,195 | | 6,195 |

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Appropriation | Installation | Project Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 81 | Florida | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Camp Blanding | Combined Support Maintenance Shop | | 16,470 | 16,470 |
| 82 | Florida | Defense Logistics Agency | MilCon, Def-Wide | Eglin AFB | Replace Jet Fuel Storage Complex | 4,800 | | 4,800 |
| 83 | Florida | Defense Logistics Agency | MilCon, Def-Wide | Hurlburt Fld | Replace Fuel Pier | 3,500 | | 3,500 |
| 84 | Florida | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | Hurlburt Fld | SOF Squadron Ops/AMU AC-130 | 6,000 | | 6,000 |
| 85 | Florida | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | MacDill AFB | SOF Add/Alter Building 501A | 25,500 | | 25,500 |
| 86 | Georgia | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Benning | Fire Station, Two Company | | 2,850 | 2,850 |
| 87 | Georgia | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Benning | Infantry Squad Battle Course | | 1,650 | 1,650 |
| 88 | Georgia | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Benning | Multi-Purpose Training Range Complex | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| 89 | Georgia | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF | Barracks, Ph 1 | 17,000 | | 17,000 |
| 90 | Georgia | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF | Command and Control Facility | 25,050 | | 25,050 |
| 91 | Georgia | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF | Physical Fitness Training Center | 15,500 | | 15,500 |
| 92 | Georgia | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF | Barracks Complex - Perimeter Road | 49,000 | | 49,000 |
| 93 | Georgia | Navy | MilCon, Navy | SWFLANT Kings Bay | Rifle Range | 8,170 | | 8,170 |
| 94 | Georgia | Navy | MilCon, Navy | SWFLANT Kings Bay | Staff Addition & HMMWV Garage | 3,340 | | 3,340 |
| 95 | Georgia | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Robins AFB | Consolidated Aircraft Maintenance Shop | | 7,900 | 7,900 |
| 96 | Georgia | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Robins AFB | Corrosion Control Paint Facility | 25,731 | | 25,731 |
| 97 | Georgia | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Robins AFB | J-STARS Flight Simulator Facility | 2,954 | | 2,954 |
| 98 | Georgia | Air Force Reserve | MilCon, Air Res | Dobbins ARB | North Side Overpass | | 4,200 | 4,200 |
| 99 | Georgia | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | Ft Benning | Physical Evaluation Center | 2,100 | | 2,100 |
| 100 | Georgia | Army Reserve | MilCon, Army Res | Ft Gillem | OMS/DS/Parts Warehouse/Storage | 7,620 | | 7,620 |
| 101 | Hawaii | Army | MilCon, Army | Helemano Mil. Res. | Land Easement | 1,400 | | 1,400 |
| 102 | Hawaii | Army | MilCon, Army | Schofield Barracks | Barracks Complex - Quad E | 49,000 | | 49,000 |
| 103 | Hawaii | Army | MilCon, Army | Schofield Barracks | Land Acquisition | 19,400 | | 19,400 |
| 104 | Hawaii | Army | MilCon, Army | Schofield Barracks | Information Systems Facility | 18,000 | | 18,000 |
| 105 | Hawaii | Army | MilCon, Army | Schofield Barracks | Barracks Complex - Capron Road, Phase 2 | 49,000 | | 49,000 |
| 106 | Hawaii | Army | MilCon, Army | Schofield Barracks | Mission Support Training Facility | 33,000 | | 33,000 |
| 107 | Hawaii | Army | MilCon, Army | Schofield Barracks | Qualification Training Range (1) | | 8,700 | 8,700 |
| 108 | Hawaii | Navy | MilCon, Navy | FISC Pearl Harbor | Waterfront Improvements | 32,180 | | 32,180 |
| 109 | Hawaii | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAVMAG Lualualei | Ordnance Holding Areas | 6,320 | | 6,320 |
| 110 | Hawaii | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NSY Pearl Harbor | Perimeter/Security Lighting | 7,010 | | 7,010 |
| 111 | Hawaii | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Hickam AFB | C-17 Consolidated Maintenance Complex | 7,529 | | 7,529 |
| 112 | Hawaii | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Hickam AFB | C-17 Squadron Operations | 10,674 | | 10,674 |
| 113 | Hawaii | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Hickam AFB | C-17 Kuntz Gate & Road | 3,050 | | 3,050 |
| 114 | Hawaii | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Hickam AFB | C-17 Flight Simulator | 5,623 | | 5,623 |
| 115 | Hawaii | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Hickam AFB | C-17 Corrosion Control/ Maintenance Facility | 30,400 | | 30,400 |
| 116 | Hawaii | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Hickam AFB | C-17 Support Utilities, Phase 1 | 4,098 | | 4,098 |
| 117 | Hawaii | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Hickam AFB | Expand Strategic Airlift Ramp | 10,102 | | 10,102 |
| 118 | Hawaii | Defense Logistics Agency | MilCon, Def-Wide | Hickam AFB | Replace Hydrant Fuel System | 14,100 | | 14,100 |
| 119 | Idaho | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Mountain Home AFB | Add/Alter Fitness Center | 5,337 | | 5,337 |
| 120 | Illinois | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NTC Great Lakes | Battle Station Training Facility, Increment 1 | 13,200 | | 13,200 |

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Appropriation | Installation | Project Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 121 | Illinois | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NTC Great Lakes | Recruit Barracks | 34,130 | | 34,130 |
| 122 | Illinois | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NTC Great Lakes | Recruit Barracks | 31,600 | | 31,600 |
| 123 | Illinois | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Scott AFB | Shiloh Gate (AT/FP) | 1,900 | | 1,900 |
| 124 | Illinois | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Galesburg | Readiness Center | | 3,750 | 3,750 |
| 125 | Indiana | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NSWC Crane | Joint Ordnance Engineering & Logistics Facility | | 11,400 | 11,400 |
| 126 | Indiana | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC Gary | Readiness Center, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 1,417 | | 1,417 |
| 127 | Indiana | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Camp Atterbury | Readiness Center, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 2,849 | | 2,849 |
| 128 | Indiana | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Elkhart | Readiness Center, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 1,770 | | 1,770 |
| 129 | Indiana | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | South Bend | Readiness Center, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 1,496 | | 1,496 |
| 130 | Indiana | ChemDemil | MilCon, Def-Wide | Newport AAP | Ammunition Demilitarization Facility Ph 6 | | 15,207 | 15,207 |
| 131 | Iowa | Air National Guard | MilCon, Air NG | Sioux Gateway APT | Sioux-KC-135 Fire Crash/Rescue Station/Security | 7,409 | | 7,409 |
| 132 | Kansas | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Leavenworth | Lewis and Clark Instr Facility, Ph 1 | 28,000 | | 28,000 |
| 133 | Kansas | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Riley | Barracks Complex - Graves Street | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| 134 | Kansas | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC Kansas City | Readiness Center, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 2,982 | | 2,982 |
| 135 | Kansas | Air National Guard | MilCon, Air NG | McConnell AFB | Construct Air Intelligence Exploitation Facility | | 7,400 | 7,400 |
| 136 | Kansas | Army Reserve | MilCon, Army Res | Ft Leavenworth | AR Center/OMS/Unh Storage | | 7,962 | 7,962 |
| 137 | Kentucky | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Campbell | Barracks Complex - Range Road, Phase 2 | 49,000 | | 49,000 |
| 138 | Kentucky | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Knox | Modified Record Fire Range | 3,500 | | 3,500 |
| 139 | Kentucky | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Knox | Urban Assault Course | | 2,050 | 2,050 |
| 140 | Kentucky | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | Ft Campbell | Flight Simulator | 7,800 | | 7,800 |
| 141 | Kentucky | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC Maysville | Readiness Center, (ADRS) | 4,997 | | 4,997 |
| 142 | Kentucky | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC Richmond | Readiness Center, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 756 | | 756 |
| 143 | Kentucky | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Greenville | Fire Station (ADRS) | 2,238 | | 2,238 |
| 144 | Kentucky | ChemDemil | MilCon, Def-Wide | Blue Grass Army Depot | Ammunition Demilitarization Facility Ph 4 | | 16,220 | 16,220 |
| 145 | Louisiana | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Polk | Aircraft Maintenance Hangar | 34,000 | | 34,000 |
| 146 | Louisiana | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Polk | Arms Storage Facility | 1,350 | | 1,350 |
| 147 | Louisiana | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Polk | Shoot House | 1,250 | | 1,250 |
| 148 | Louisiana | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Polk | Mission Training Support Facility | 27,000 | | 27,000 |
| 149 | Louisiana | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Polk | Alert Holding Area Facility | 8,400 | | 8,400 |
| 150 | Louisiana | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNG Pineville | Consolidated Maintenance Facility, Phase 1 | 18,579 | | 18,579 |
| 151 | Louisiana | Navy Reserve | MilCon, Navy Res | NAS/JRB New Orleans | Armed Forces Reserve Center, Phase 4 | | 10,800 | 10,800 |
| 152 | Maryland | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Meade | Dining Facility | 9,600 | | 9,600 |
| 153 | Maryland | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAWC Patuxent River | JSF Test Facility | 24,370 | | 24,370 |
| 154 | Maryland | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAWC Patuxent River | Relocate Range Theodolite Tracking Station | | 3,900 | 3,900 |
| 155 | Maryland | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NSWC Indian Head | Water System Improvements | 14,850 | | 14,850 |
| 156 | Maryland | National Security Agency | MilCon, Def-Wide | Ft Meade | Critical Utility Control, Phase II-B | 1,842 | | 1,842 |
| 157 | Maryland | Army Reserve | MilCon, Army Res | Ft Meade | ARCenter/OMS/Warehouse, Phase 1 | 19,710 | | 19,710 |
| 158 | Maryland | Air Force Reserve | MilCon, Air Res | Andrews AFB | Alter Aircraft Maintenance Shop | 2,900 | | 2,900 |
| 159 | Maryland | Air Force Reserve | MilCon, Air Res | Andrews AFB | Upgrade Airfield Pavements | 835 | | 835 |
| 160 | Maryland | Air Force Reserve | MilCon, Air Res | Andrews AFB | Hydrant Fuel System | 7,375 | | 7,375 |

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Appropriation | Installation | Project Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 161 | Massachusetts | Army | MilCon, Army | Soldier Systems Center, Natick | Thermal Test Facility | | 5,500 | 5,500 |
| 162 | Massachusetts | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Camp Edwards | Readiness Center | | 2,185 | 2,185 |
| 163 | Massachusetts | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Camp Edwards | Fire Station | | 2,418 | 2,418 |
| 164 | Michigan | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Jackson | Readiness Center, (ADRS) | 5,591 | | 5,591 |
| 165 | Michigan | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Shiawassee County | Readiness Center | | 3,508 | 3,508 |
| 166 | Michigan | Air National Guard | MilCon, Air NG | Selfridge | Joint ANG/AFRC Medical Training | | 9,600 | 9,600 |
| 167 | Minnesota | Air Force Reserve | MilCon, Air Res | Minneapolis-St. Paul IAP | Aeromedical Evacuation Building | | 3,650 | 3,650 |
| 168 | Mississippi | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NS Pascagoula | Littoral Surveillance System Facility | | 6,100 | 6,100 |
| 169 | Mississippi | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAS Meridian | Fire & Rescue Station | 4,570 | | 4,570 |
| 170 | Mississippi | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Columbus AFB | T-6 Parts Warehouse | | 2,200 | 2,200 |
| 171 | Mississippi | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Keesler AFB | ADAL Child Development Center | | 2,900 | 2,900 |
| 172 | Mississippi | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Camp Shelby | Military Education Facility, Phase 3 | 7,733 | | 7,733 |
| 173 | Mississippi | Air National Guard | MilCon, Air NG | Camp Shelby | Camp Shelby-C-17 Assault Runway | 6,091 | | 6,091 |
| 174 | Mississippi | Air Force Reserve | MilCon, Air Res | Keesler AFB | Fuel Cell Maintenance Hangar | 6,650 | | 6,650 |
| 175 | Missouri | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Leonard Wood | Vehicle Operations Site, TA 244 | | 5,900 | 5,900 |
| 176 | Missouri | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Whiteman AFB | Education Center | | 11,600 | 11,600 |
| 177 | Missouri | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC Kansas City MO | Readiness Center, (ADRS) | 4,947 | | 4,947 |
| 178 | Montana | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Billings | Organizational Maintenance Shop, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 1,209 | | 1,209 |
| 179 | Montana | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Kalispell | Organizational Maintenance Shop, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 706 | | 706 |
| 180 | Nebraska | Defense Logistics Agency | MilCon, Def-Wide | Offutt AFB | Replace Hydrant Fuel System | 13,400 | | 13,400 |
| 181 | Nebraska | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC Columbus | Readiness Center, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 618 | | 618 |
| 182 | Nebraska | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC York | Readiness Center, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 758 | | 758 |
| 183 | Nebraska | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Norfolk, NE | Fire Station, (ADRS) | 1,068 | | 1,068 |
| 184 | Nebraska | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Omaha | Readiness Center, (ADRS) | 5,804 | | 5,804 |
| 185 | Nevada | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAS Fallon | High Explosives Magazines | | 4,700 | 4,700 |
| 186 | Nevada | Defense Logistics Agency | MilCon, Def-Wide | Nellis AFB | Hydrant Fuel System | 12,800 | | 12,800 |
| 187 | New Jersey | Army | MilCon, Army | NAES Lakehurst | Special Purpose BN Operations Facility | | 2,250 | 2,250 |
| 188 | New Jersey | Army | MilCon, Army | Picatinny Arsenal | Explosives R&D Loading Facility | | 11,800 | 11,800 |
| 189 | New Jersey | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAWC Lakehurst | EMALS Facility | 20,681 | | 20,681 |
| 190 | New Jersey | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NWS Earle | General Purpose/Berthing Pier Ph 1 | 26,740 | | 26,740 |
| 191 | New Jersey | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | McGuire AFB | C-17 Roads & Utilities | 4,765 | | 4,765 |
| 192 | New Jersey | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | McGuire AFB | C-17 Maintenance Training Device Facility | 6,862 | | 6,862 |
| 193 | New Jersey | Army Reserve | MilCon, Army Res | Ft Dix | Officer Education School | | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| 194 | New Jersey | Army Reserve | MilCon, Army Res | Ft Dix | ADD/ALT Timmerman Conference Center | | 3,700 | 3,700 |
| 195 | New Jersey | Army Reserve | MilCon, Army Res | Ft Dix | Urban Assault Course | | 2,700 | 2,700 |
| 196 | New Mexico | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Kirtland AFB | Arsenic Treatment Plant | 6,957 | | 6,957 |
| 197 | New Mexico | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Kirtland AFB | Electrical Power Main Switching Station | | 4,150 | 4,150 |
| 198 | New Mexico | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Tularosa | Upgrade Radar Test Facility | 3,600 | | 3,600 |
| 199 | New Mexico | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC Albuquerque | Readiness Center, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 2,533 | | 2,533 |
| 200 | New York | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Drum | Alert Holding Area Facility | | 3,500 | 3,500 |

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Appropriation | Installation | Project Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 201 | New York | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Drum | Barracks Complex - Wheeler Sack AAF, Phase 1 | 49,000 | | 49,000 |
| 202 | New York | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Drum | Barracks - 10200 Area | 22,500 | | 22,500 |
| 203 | New York | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Drum | Departure Airfield Arrival Control Group Facility | | 5,100 | 5,100 |
| 204 | New York | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Drum | Mountain Ramp Expansion | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| 205 | New York | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Drum | Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Facility | | 5,200 | 5,200 |
| 206 | New York | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNG Utica | Organizational Maintenance Shop, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 3,261 | | 3,261 |
| 207 | New York | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC Rochester | Readiness Center, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 4,332 | | 4,332 |
| 208 | New York | Air National Guard | MilCon, Air NG | Hancock Field | Munitions Storage Complex | | 6,500 | 6,500 |
| 209 | New York | Air National Guard | MilCon, Air NG | Hancock Field | Replace Mobility Processing Center | | 2,300 | 2,300 |
| 210 | North Carolina | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Bragg | Barracks Complex - Bastogne Drive, Phase 1 | 47,000 | | 47,000 |
| 211 | North Carolina | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Bragg | Barracks Complex - Butner Road, Phase 4 | 38,000 | | 38,000 |
| 212 | North Carolina | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Bragg | Barracks - D Area, Phase 4 | 17,000 | | 17,000 |
| 213 | North Carolina | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Bragg | Soldier Support Center Phase 2 | | 11,400 | 11,400 |
| 214 | North Carolina | Navy | MilCon, Navy | MCAS New River | Water Treatment Facility | 6,240 | | 6,240 |
| 215 | North Carolina | Navy | MilCon, Navy | MCB Camp Lejeune | Consolidated Armory | 10,270 | | 10,270 |
| 216 | North Carolina | Navy | MilCon, Navy | MCB Camp Lejeune | US Joint Maritime Instruction Facility | 6,300 | | 6,300 |
| 217 | North Carolina | Navy | MilCon, Navy | MCB Camp Lejeune | Joint Maritime Ops & Training | 12,880 | | 12,880 |
| 218 | North Carolina | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Pope AFB | C-130J 2-Bay Hanger | 15,629 | | 15,629 |
| 219 | North Carolina | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Pope AFB | C-130J/30 Tech Training Facility | 4,431 | | 4,431 |
| 220 | North Carolina | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Pope AFB | C-130J/30 Ramp Upgrade | 1,239 | | 1,239 |
| 221 | North Carolina | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Pope AFB | C-130J Upgrade Hanger 6 | 2,716 | | 2,716 |
| 222 | North Carolina | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Seymour Johnson AFB | Boundary Fence | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| 223 | North Carolina | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Seymour Johnson AFB | Dormitories--144 RM | 9,530 | | 9,530 |
| 224 | North Carolina | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Seymour Johnson AFB | Fire/Crash Rescue Station | | 11,800 | 11,800 |
| 225 | North Carolina | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | Ft Bragg | Training Complex (SWCS) | 8,500 | | 8,500 |
| 226 | North Carolina | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | Ft Bragg | Maze & Facade | 2,400 | | 2,400 |
| 227 | North Carolina | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | Ft Bragg | Battalion & Company Headquarters | 4,200 | | 4,200 |
| 228 | North Carolina | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | Ft Bragg | Company Operations Facility Addition | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| 229 | North Carolina | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | Ft Bragg | Joint Operations Complex | 19,700 | | 19,700 |
| 230 | North Carolina | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNG Morrisville | Fire Station, (ADRS) | 1,306 | | 1,306 |
| 231 | North Carolina | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNG Salisbury | Fire Station, (ADRS) | 926 | | 926 |
| 232 | North Carolina | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC Asheville | Readiness Center, (ADRS) | 6,251 | | 6,251 |
| 233 | North Carolina | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC Lenoir | Readiness Center | 5,184 | | 5,184 |
| 234 | North Carolina | Defense Education Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | MCB Camp Lejeune | Replace Existing Mainside PS | 15,259 | | 15,259 |
| 235 | North Dakota | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Minot AFB | Add/Alter Missile Maintenance Vehicle Facility | 3,050 | | 3,050 |
| 236 | North Dakota | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Bismarck | Army Aviation Support Facility Complex ADD/ALT | | 7,228 | 7,228 |
| 237 | North Dakota | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Bismarck | Readiness Center, Add/Alter (ADRS) | 1,873 | | 1,873 |
| 238 | Ohio | | MilCon, Air Force | Wright-Patterson AFB | Consolidated Fire/Crash Rescue Station | | 10,600 | 10,600 |
| 239 | Ohio | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Wright-Patterson AFB | Dormitory (144 room) | 10,500 | | 10,500 |
| 240 | Ohio | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Camp Sherman, Chillicothe | Readiness Center | | 5,558 | 5,558 |

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Appropriation | Installation | Project Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 241 | Ohio | Air National Guard | MilCon, Air NG | Airport | Replace Control Tower | | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| 242 | Ohio | Army Reserve | MilCon, Army Res | Cleveland | ARCenter/OMS/AMSA/Storage | 21,595 | | 21,595 |
| 243 | Oklahoma | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Sill | Consolidated Maint. Complex, Ph 2 | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| 244 | Oklahoma | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Sill | Modified Record Fire Range | 3,500 | | 3,500 |
| 245 | Oklahoma | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Sill | Urban Assault Course Complex | | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| 246 | Oklahoma | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Altus AFB | C-17 Modify Simulator Base | 1,144 | | 1,144 |
| 247 | Oklahoma | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Tinker AFB | Building 3001 Revitalization, Phase 1 | 19,060 | | 19,060 |
| 248 | Oregon | Air Force Reserve | MilCon, Air Res | Portland IAP | Alter Flightline Facilities | 2,900 | | 2,900 |
| 249 | Oregon | Air Force Reserve | MilCon, Air Res | Portland IAP | Hydrant Refueling System, Phase 2 | 3,050 | | 3,050 |
| 250 | Oregon | Air Force Reserve | MilCon, Air Res | Portland IAP | Fire/Crash Rescue Station | 4,300 | | 4,300 |
| 251 | Pennsylvania | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Ft Indiantown Gap | Multipurpose Training Range | | 15,338 | 15,338 |
| 252 | Pennsylvania | Defense Logistics Agency | MilCon, Def-Wide | Def Dist Depot New Cumberland | Replace General Purpose Warehouse at #3 & 4 | 27,000 | | 27,000 |
| 253 | Pennsylvania | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | Harrisburg IAP | C-130J Spec Mission Equip Maint Fac | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| 254 | Rhode Island | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NS Newport | Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Replacement (NAPS) | 16,140 | | 16,140 |
| 255 | Rhode Island | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NUWC Newport | Underwater Weapon Systems Lab | 10,890 | | 10,890 |
| 256 | Rhode Island | Air National Guard | MilCon, Air NG | Quonset State APT | Quonset-Replace Composite Aircraft Maintenance Complex | 18,500 | | 18,500 |
| 257 | South Carolina | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Charleston AFB | Dormitory--144 RM | 8,863 | | 8,863 |
| 258 | South Carolina | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Shaw AFB | Deployment Processing Center | | 8,500 | 8,500 |
| 259 | South Carolina | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NWS Charleston | AT/FP South Annex Gate 4 | | 2,350 | 2,350 |
| 260 | Tennessee | Air National Guard | MilCon, Air NG | Memphis IAP | C-5 Upgrade Shops | | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 261 | Tennessee | Army Reserve | MilCon, Army Res | Nashville | AR Center/OMS/Unh Storage | 8,955 | | 8,955 |
| 262 | Texas | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Bliss | Tac Equip Shop-31st CSH | | 5,400 | 5,400 |
| 263 | Texas | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Hood | Barracks Complex - 67th St & Battalion Ave | 47,000 | | 47,000 |
| 264 | Texas | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Hood | Battalion Command and Control Facilities | | 6,900 | 6,900 |
| 265 | Texas | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Hood | Urban Assault Course | 2,800 | | 2,800 |
| 266 | Texas | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAS Corpus Christi | Control Tower | | 5,400 | 5,400 |
| 267 | Texas | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Goodfellow AFB | Student Dormitory--200 RM | 18,107 | | 18,107 |
| 268 | Texas | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Goodfellow AFB | Fire Training Classroom Facility | 1,863 | | 1,863 |
| 269 | Texas | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Lackland AFB | Student Dormitory--200 RM | 20,966 | | 20,966 |
| 270 | Texas | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Lackland AFB | Student Dormitory--300 RM | 35,260 | | 35,260 |
| 271 | Texas | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Laughlin AFB | Aircraft Maintenance Shelter | | 5,200 | 5,200 |
| 272 | Texas | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Laughlin AFB | Student Officers Quarters Phase 1 | | 7,200 | 7,200 |
| 273 | Texas | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Sheppard AFB | Airfield Operations Complex | | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| 274 | Texas | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Sheppard AFB | Student Dormitory--300 RM | 28,590 | | 28,590 |
| 275 | Texas | Air National Guard | MilCon, Air NG | Kelly Field Annex | Upgrade General Purpose Shops | | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| 276 | Texas | Navy Reserve | MilCon, Navy Res | NAS/JRB Ft Worth | Joint Reserve Police Station | | 2,660 | 2,660 |
| 277 | Texas | Navy Reserve | MilCon, Navy Res | NAS/JRB Ft Worth | Combined Passenger Terminal | | 3,520 | 3,520 |
| 278 | Texas | Defense Logistics Agency | MilCon, Def-Wide | Laughlin AFB | Replace Truck Fuel Loading Facility | 4,688 | | 4,688 |
| 279 | Texas | Defense Logistics Agency | MilCon, Def-Wide | NAS Kingsville | Aboveground Storage Tank Fuel Farm | | 9,200 | 9,200 |
| 280 | Texas | Tri-Care Management Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Ft Hood | Troop Medical Clinic #10 | | 9,400 | 9,400 |

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Appropriation | Installation | Project Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 281 | Utah | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Hill AFB | Replace Munitions Storage Igloos | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| 282 | Utah | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Hill AFB | Small Diameter Bomb Storage Igloos | 1,811 | | 1,811 |
| 283 | Utah | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Hill AFB | Munitions Maintenance Facility | 1,000 | | 1,000 |
| 284 | Vermont | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | ARNGRC South Burlington | Army Aviation Support Facility | 23,827 | | 23,827 |
| 285 | Virgina | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Belvoir | NGIC Land Acquisition | | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| 286 | Virgina | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Lee | Fire and Emergency Services Center Phase 2 | | 3,850 | 3,850 |
| 287 | Virgina | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Myer | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 9,000 | | 9,000 |
| 288 | Virgina | Navy | MilCon, Navy | Henderson Hall, Arlington | Physical Fitness Center | 1,970 | | 1,970 |
| 289 | Virgina | Navy | MilCon, Navy | MCCDC Quantico | WTBN Load & Test Facility | 3,700 | | 3,700 |
| 290 | Virgina | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAS Oceana | Child Development Center | | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| 291 | Virgina | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAB Little Creek | Gate 1 Improvements | 3,810 | | 3,810 |
| 292 | Virgina | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NS Norfolk | Aircraft Maintenance Hangars | 36,460 | | 36,460 |
| 293 | Virgina | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NS Norfolk | Pier 11 Replacement, Increment 1 | 27,610 | | 27,610 |
| 294 | Virgina | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NSCC Dahlgren | Naval Networks Operations Center Addition | 20,520 | | 20,520 |
| 295 | Virgina | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NSCC Dahlgren | Weapons Dynamic RDT&E Center | | 3,500 | 3,500 |
| 296 | Virgina | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NSY Norfolk | BEQ Shipboard Ashore, Increment 2 | 46,730 | | 46,730 |
| 297 | Virgina | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NSY Norfolk | Crane/Weight Handling Equipment Shop | 17,770 | | 17,770 |
| 298 | Virgina | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Langley AFB | F-22 Vertical Wing Tank Storage | 2,573 | | 2,573 |
| 299 | Virgina | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Langley AFB | F-22 Squadron Ops/AMU/Hangar | 20,013 | | 20,013 |
| 300 | Virgina | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Langley AFB | F-22 Clear Water Rinse Pad | 2,383 | | 2,383 |
| 301 | Virgina | Defense Logistics Agency | MilCon, Def-Wide | Langley AFB | Replace Hydrant Fuel System | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| 302 | Virgina | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | Dam Neck | SOF Small Arms Range | 9,681 | | 9,681 |
| 303 | Virgina | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | Dam Neck | Mission Support Facility (CDA-N) | 5,600 | | 5,600 |
| 304 | Virgina | Navy Reserve | MilCon, Navy Res | Insp Instr Stf Quantico | Reserve Training Center & Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 9,497 | | 9,497 |
| 305 | Virgina | Washington Headquarters Services | MilCon, Def-Wide | WHS - VA | Pentagon Athletic Center Restoration Project | 38,086 | | 38,086 |
| 306 | Virgina | Defense Threat Reduction Agency | MilCon, Def-Wide | Ft Belvoir | Headquarters Relocation | 25,700 | | 25,700 |
| 307 | Washington | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Lewis | Deployment Staging Facility | 2,650 | | 2,650 |
| 308 | Washington | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Lewis | Barracks Complex -17th & B Street, Phase 3 | 48,000 | | 48,000 |
| 309 | Washington | Army | MilCon, Army | Ft Lewis | Shoot House | 1,250 | | 1,250 |
| 310 | Washington | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAS Whidbey Island | Struc Aircraft/Fire Station Addition | | 4,350 | 4,350 |
| 311 | Washington | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAVMAG Indian Island | Ordnance Transfer Facility | 2,240 | | 2,240 |
| 312 | Washington | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NSB Bangor | Service Pier Upgrade/Mod Building 7111 | 33,820 | | 33,820 |
| 313 | Washington | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NSY Puget Sound | Ship Repair Pier #3 | | 12,120 | 12,120 |
| 314 | Washington | Navy | MilCon, Navy | SWFPAC Bangor | Waterfront Security Force Facility | 6,530 | | 6,530 |
| 315 | Washington | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | McChord AFB | Upgrade Mission Spt Center, Ph 2 | 19,000 | | 19,000 |
| 316 | Washington | Defense Logistics Agency | MilCon, Def-Wide | McChord AFB | Bulk Fuel Storage Tanks | 8,100 | | 8,100 |
| 317 | CONUS Various | Navy | MilCon, Navy | Various Locations CONUS | Outlying Landing Field Facilities, Increment 1 | 27,610 | | 27,610 |
| 318 | Bahrain | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NSA Bahrain | Operations Control Center | 18,030 | | 18,030 |
| 319 | Germany | Army | MilCon, Army | ASG Bamberg | Rescission, Child Development Center | [-7,000] | | [-7,000] |
| 320 | Germany | Army | MilCon, Army | ASG Bamberg | Rescission, Barracks Complex - Warner | [-10200] | | [-10200] |

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Appropriation | Installation | Project Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 321 | Germany | Army | MilCon, Army | Coleman Barracks | Rescission, Upgrade Access Control Points | [-1350] | | [-1350] |
| 322 | Germany | Army | MilCon, Army | Darmstadt | Rescission, Modified Record Fire Range | [-3500] | | [-3500] |
| 323 | Germany | Army | MilCon, Army | Grafenwoehr | Brigade Complex - Barracks & Maint/Support | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| 324 | Germany | Army | MilCon, Army | Grafenwoehr | Brigade Complex - Troop Support Facilities | 46,000 | | 46,000 |
| 325 | Germany | Army | MilCon, Army | Heidelberg | Barracks - Heidelberg Hospital | 17,000 | | 17,000 |
| 326 | Germany | Army | MilCon, Army | Hohenfels | Physical Fitness Training Center | 13,200 | | 13,200 |
| 327 | Germany | Army | MilCon, Army | Mannheim | Rescission, Barracks Complex - Coleman | [-42000] | | [-42000] |
| 328 | Germany | Army | MilCon, Army | Schweinfurt | Rescission, Central Wash Vehicle Facility | [-2000] | | [-2000] |
| 329 | Germany | Army | MilCon, Army | Vilseck | Barracks Complex, Ph 1 | 12,100 | | 12,100 |
| 330 | Germany | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Ramstein AB | CES Midfield Complex | 6,250 | | 6,250 |
| 331 | Germany | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Ramstein AB | Consolidate 1st Combat Comm Sq, Phase 2 | 19,713 | | 19,713 |
| 332 | Germany | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Ramstein AB | Fitness Center Annex | 15,903 | | 15,903 |
| 333 | Germany | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Spangdahlem AB | Fire Station Annex & Training Facility | 3,865 | | 3,865 |
| 334 | Germany | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Spangdahlem AB | Passenger Terminal | 1,546 | | 1,546 |
| 335 | Germany | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | Stuttgart | Forward Station Complex (FSOAR) | 11,400 | | 11,400 |
| 336 | Germany | Defense Education Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Spangdahlem AB | Rescission, Elementary School Classroom Addition | [-997] | | [-997] |
| 337 | Germany | Defense Education Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Grafenwoehr | Grafenwoehr Elementary School/Middle School | 36,247 | | 36,247 |
| 338 | Germany | Defense Education Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Heidelberg | Mark Twain Elementary School New Multi-Purpose Room | 3,086 | | 3,086 |
| 339 | Germany | Defense Education Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Vilseck | Vilseck Elementary School Renovation/Addition | 1,773 | | 1,773 |
| 340 | Germany | Tri-Care Management Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Grafenwoehr | Dispensary/Dental Clinic Add/Alter | 12,585 | | 12,585 |
| 341 | Guam | Navy | MilCon, Navy | COMNAVMARIANAS | Victor Warf Fender System | | 1,700 | 1,700 |
| 342 | Guam | Tri-Care Management Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Andersen AFB | Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement | 24,900 | | 24,900 |
| 343 | Iceland | Navy | MilCon, Navy | Keflavik | Rescission, Combined Dining Facility | [-14679] | | [-14679] |
| 344 | Italy | Army | MilCon, Army | Aviano AB | Joint Deployment Facility | 15,500 | | 15,500 |
| 345 | Italy | Army | MilCon, Army | Aviano AB | Joint Deployment Facility, Ph 2 | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| 346 | Italy | Army | MilCon, Army | Livorno | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 22,000 | | 22,000 |
| 347 | Italy | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAS Sigonella | Base Operations Support 1 | 34,070 | | 34,070 |
| 348 | Italy | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NAS Sigonella | Base Operations Support Facility II | 14,679 | | 14,679 |
| 349 | Italy | Navy | MilCon, Navy | NSA La Maddalena | Consolidated Santo Stefano Facilities | 39,020 | | 39,020 |
| 350 | Italy | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Aviano AB | Airfield Obst-South Ramp | 7,730 | | 7,730 |
| 351 | Italy | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Aviano AB | Munitions Admin Facility | 5,301 | | 5,301 |
| 352 | Italy | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Aviano AB | Zulu Arm/Dearm Pad | 994 | | 994 |
| 353 | Italy | Defense Education Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Sigonella | Elementary School Renovate/New Construct High School | 13,969 | | 13,969 |
| 354 | Italy | Defense Education Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Vicenza | Vicenza Elementary School/High School Renovation | 16,374 | | 16,374 |
| 355 | Korea | Army | MilCon, Army | Camp Humphreys | Barracks Complex | 41,000 | | 41,000 |
| 356 | Korea | Army | MilCon, Army | Camp Humphreys | Barracks Complex | 35,000 | | 35,000 |
| 357 | Korea | Army | MilCon, Army | Camp Humphreys | Barracks Complex | 29,000 | | 29,000 |
| 358 | Korea | Army | MilCon, Army | Camp Humphreys | Barracks Complex | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| 359 | Korea | Army | MilCon, Army | Camp Humphreys | Barracks Complex | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| 360 | Korea | Army | MilCon, Army | Camp Humphreys | Physical Fitness Training Center | 4,350 | | 4,350 |

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Appropriation | Installation | Project Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 361 | Korea | Army | MilCon, Army | Camp Humphreys | Physical Fitness Training Center | 6,800 | | 6,800 |
| 362 | Korea | Army | MilCon, Army | Camp Bonifas | Rescission, Physical Fitness Training Center | [-4350] | | [-4350] |
| 363 | Korea | Army | MilCon, Army | Camp Castle | Rescission, Physical Fitness Training Center | [-6800] | | [-6800] |
| 364 | Korea | Army | MilCon, Army | Camp Hovey | Rescission, Barracks Complex | [-25000] | | [-25000] |
| 365 | Korea | Army | MilCon, Army | K-16 Airfield | Rescission, Barracks Complex | [-40000] | | [-40000] |
| 366 | Korea | Defense Education Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Camp Humphreys | Middle School Replacement | 31,683 | | 31,683 |
| 367 | Korea | Defense Education Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Seoul | Rescission, Middle School Replacement | [-31683] | | [-31683] |
| 368 | Korea | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Kunsan AB | Upgrade Hardened Aircraft Shelter | 7,059 | | 7,059 |
| 369 | Korea | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Osan AB | Dormitory--156 RM | 16,638 | | 16,638 |
| 370 | Kwajalein | Army | MilCon, Army | Kwajalein Atoll | Vehicle Paint & Prep Facility | 9,400 | | 9,400 |
| 371 | Portugal | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Lajes Field | Add/Alter Fitness Center | 4,086 | | 4,086 |
| 372 | Turkey | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Incirlik AB | Consolidated Communications Facility | 3,262 | | 3,262 |
| 373 | United Kingdom | Navy | MilCon, Navy | JMF St. Mawgan Scotland | Bachelor Enlisted Quarters | 7,070 | | 7,070 |
| 374 | United Kingdom | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | RAF Lakenheath | Dormitory--120 RM | 13,606 | | 13,606 |
| 375 | United Kingdom | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | RAF Lakenheath | Add/Alter Crash Fire Station | 2,667 | | 2,667 |
| 376 | United Kingdom | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | RAF Lakenheath | Family Support Center | 5,878 | | 5,878 |
| 377 | United Kingdom | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | RAF Lakenheath | Communications Facility | 8,436 | | 8,436 |
| 378 | United Kingdom | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | RAF Lakenheath | Mobility Cargo Processing Center | 11,900 | | 11,900 |
| 379 | United Kingdom | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | RAF Mildenhall | Child Develop Center Annex | 3,646 | | 3,646 |
| 380 | United Kingdom | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | RAF Mildenhall | Vehicle Maintenance Complex | 3,320 | | 3,320 |
| 381 | United Kingdom | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | RAF Mildenhall | Post Office | 3,592 | | 3,592 |
| 382 | Wake Island | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Wake Island | Wide Infrastructure, Phase 1 | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| 383 | Wake Island | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Wake Island | Repair Airfield, Phase 3 | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| 384 | Worldwide Classified | Army | MilCon, Army | Classified Location | Classified Project | 178,700 | (178,700) | - |
| 385 | Worldwide Classified | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Classified Location | Predator B-Squadron OPS/AMU & Hangar | 25,731 | | 25,731 |
| 386 | Worldwide Classified | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Classified Location | Classified MilCon | 3,250 | | 3,250 |
| 387 | Unspecified | Army | MilCon, Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 20,000 | 2,550 | 22,550 |
| 388 | Unspecified | Army | MilCon, Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 100,710 | 5,870 | 106,580 |
| 389 | Unspecified | Army | MilCon, Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design - Host Nation | 22,000 | | 22,000 |
| 390 | Unspecified | Navy | MilCon, Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 12,334 | 1,290 | 13,624 |
| 391 | Unspecified | Navy | MilCon, Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning & Design | 10,054 | 5,529 | 15,583 |
| 392 | Unspecified | Navy | MilCon, Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning & Design | 55,558 | | 55,558 |
| 393 | Unspecified | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 74,345 | 36,305 | 110,650 |
| 394 | Unspecified | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| 395 | Unspecified | Air Force | MilCon, Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 4,771 | | 4,771 |
| 396 | Unspecified | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 14,768 | 723 | 15,491 |
| 397 | Unspecified | Special Operations Command | MilCon, Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 2,723 | | 2,723 |
| 398 | Unspecified | Missile Defense Agency | MilCon, Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 2,600 | | 2,600 |
| 399 | Unspecified | OSD Contingencies | MilCon, Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Contingency Construction | 8,960 | | 8,960 |
| 400 | Unspecified | OSD Minor Construction | MilCon, Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 3,000 | | 3,000 |

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Appropriation | Installation | Project Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 401 | Unspecified | OSD Planning & Design | MilCon, Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 20,000 | 5,230 | 25,230 |
| 402 | Unspecified | OSD Planning & Design | MilCon, Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 997 | | 997 |
| 403 | Unspecified | NATO Security Investment Program | Program | Unspecified Worldwide | NATO Security Investment Program | 169,300 | | 169,300 |
| 404 | Unspecified | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 26,570 | 19,587 | 46,157 |
| 405 | Unspecified | Army National Guard | MilCon, Army NG | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 1,451 | 2,612 | 4,063 |
| 406 | Unspecified | Air National Guard | MilCon, Air NG | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 16,030 | 14,278 | 30,308 |
| 407 | Unspecified | Air National Guard | MilCon, Air NG | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 5,500 | | 5,500 |
| 408 | Unspecified | Army Reserve | MilCon, Army Res | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 7,712 | | 7,712 |
| 409 | Unspecified | Army Reserve | MilCon, Army Res | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 2,886 | | 2,886 |
| 410 | Unspecified | Navy Reserve | MilCon, Navy Res | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 862 | 750 | 1,612 |
| 411 | Unspecified | Navy Reserve | MilCon, Navy Res | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 1,700 | | 1,700 |
| 412 | Unspecified | Air Force Reserve | MilCon, Air Res | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 11,142 | 1,281 | 12,423 |
| 413 | Unspecified | Air Force Reserve | MilCon, Air Res | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 5,160 | | 5,160 |
| 414 | Unspecified | Defense Finance & Accounting Service | MilCon, Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| 415 | Unspecified | Base Closure IV | BRAC IV | BRAC IV | Base Realignment and Closure IV | 370,427 | | 370,427 |
| 416 | Unspecified | Joint Chiefs of Staff | MilCon, Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Unspecified Minor Construction | 6,330 | | 6,330 |
| 417 | Unspecified | Defense Education Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 6,500 | | 6,500 |
| 418 | Unspecified | Program | MilCon, Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Energy Conservation Improvement Program | 69,500 | | 69,500 |
| 419 | Unspecified | Tri-Care Management Activity | MilCon, Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning and Design | 18,616 | | 18,616 |
| 420 | Alaska | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Ft Wainwright | Family Housing New Construction | 44,000 | | 44,000 |
| 421 | Alaska | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Ft Wainwright | Family Housing Replacement | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| 422 | Arizona | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Ft Huachuca | Family Housing Replacement | 27,000 | | 27,000 |
| 423 | Arizona | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Ft Huachuca | Family Housing Replacement | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| 424 | Arizona | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Davis-Monthan AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 5 | 19,357 | | 19,357 |
| 425 | California | Navy | Fam Hsg Const, Navy | NAS Lemoore | Lemoore Lexington Park Replacement Construction | 41,585 | | 41,585 |
| 426 | California | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Travis AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 4 | 12,723 | | 12,723 |
| 427 | Delaware | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Dover AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 3 | 19,601 | | 19,601 |
| 428 | Florida | Navy | Fam Hsg Const, Navy | NAS Pensacola | Replacement Construction Pensacola | 3,197 | | 3,197 |
| 429 | Florida | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Eglin AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 3 | 32,166 | | 32,166 |
| 430 | Idaho | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Mountain Home AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 5 | 37,126 | | 37,126 |
| 431 | Kentucky | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Ft Knox | Family Housing Replacement | 41,000 | | 41,000 |
| 432 | Kansas | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Ft Riley | Family Housing Replacement | 8,300 | | 8,300 |
| 433 | Kansas | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Ft Riley | Family Housing Replacement | 8,400 | | 8,400 |
| 434 | Maryland | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Andrews AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 2 | 20,233 | | 20,233 |
| 435 | Missouri | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Whiteman AFB | Replace Family Housing | 18,221 | | 18,221 |
| 436 | Montana | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Malmstrom AFB | Replace Family Housing | 19,368 | | 19,368 |
| 437 | New Mexico | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | White Sands Missile Range | Family Housing Replacement | 14,600 | | 14,600 |
| 438 | North Carolina | Navy | Fam Hsg Const, Navy | MCAS Cherry Point | Slocum Vlg, Phase 2 Replacement | 42,803 | | 42,803 |
| 439 | North Carolina | Navy | Fam Hsg Const, Navy | MCB Camp Lejeune | Midway Park, Phase 1 | 21,537 | | 21,537 |
| 440 | North Carolina | Navy | Fam Hsg Const, Navy | MCB Camp Lejeune | Replace Tarawa Terrace Housing, Phase 3 | 46,244 | | 46,244 |

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Appropriation | Installation | Project Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 441 | North Carolina | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Seymour Johnson AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 7 | 18,336 | | 18,336 |
| 442 | North Dakota | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Grand Forks AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase G | 29,550 | | 29,550 |
| 443 | North Dakota | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Minot AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 10 | 41,117 | | 41,117 |
| 444 | Oklahoma | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Ft Sill | Family Housing Replacement | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| 445 | Oklahoma | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Ft Sill | Family Housing Replacement | 15,373 | | 15,373 |
| 446 | South Dakota | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Ellsworth AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 3 | 16,240 | | 16,240 |
| 447 | Texas | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Dyess AFB | Replace Family Housing, Phase 4 | 19,973 | | 19,973 |
| 448 | Texas | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Randolph AFB | Replace Family Housing | 13,754 | | 13,754 |
| 449 | Virgina | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Ft Lee | Family Housing Replacement | 18,000 | | 18,000 |
| 450 | Germany | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Darmstadt | Rescission, Whole House Revitalization (48 units) | [-4200] | | [-4200] |
| 451 | Germany | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Mannheim | Rescission, Whole Neighborhood Revitalization (72 units) | [-10400] | | [-10400] |
| 452 | Germany | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Mannheim | Rescission, Whole Neighborhood Revitalization (60 units) | [-10000] | | [-10000] |
| 453 | Germany | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Schweinfurt | Rescission, Whole Neighborhood Revitalization (234 units) | [-7600] | | [-7600] |
| 454 | Germany | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Vilseck (Amberg) | Rescission, Whole Neighborhood Revitalization (36 units) | [-3900] | | [-3900] |
| 455 | Germany | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Wuerzberg | Rescission, Whole Neighborhood Revitalization (136 units) | [-11200] | | [-11200] |
| 456 | Germany | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Spangdahlem AB | Rescission, Improve Family Housing | [-19347] | | [-19347] |
| 457 | Korea | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Yongsan | Rescission, Whole House Revitalization (8 units) | [-1900] | | [-1900] |
| 458 | Korea | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Yongsan | Rescission, Family Housing Construction (10 units) | [-3100] | | [-3100] |
| 459 | Korea | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Osan AB | Construct Family Housing, Phase 2 | 44,765 | | 44,765 |
| 460 | Portugal | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Lajes Field | Replace Family Housing, Phase 3 | 13,428 | | 13,428 |
| 461 | United Kingdom | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | RAF Lakenheath | Replace Family Housing | 23,640 | | 23,640 |
| 462 | Unspecified | Army | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Management Account | 86,326 | | 86,326 |
| 463 | Unspecified | Army | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Miscellaneous Account | 1,311 | | 1,311 |
| 464 | Unspecified | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning & Design | 32,488 | | 32,488 |
| 465 | Unspecified | Army | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Utilities Account | 167,332 | | 167,332 |
| 466 | Unspecified | Army | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Services Account | 46,735 | | 46,735 |
| 467 | Unspecified | Army | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Insurance Premium | 1 | | 1 |
| 468 | Unspecified | Army | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Furnishings Account | 44,658 | | 44,658 |
| 469 | Unspecified | Army | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Privatization Support | 29,587 | | 29,587 |
| 470 | Unspecified | Army | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Leasing Account | 234,471 | | 234,471 |
| 471 | Unspecified | Army | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Maintenance of Real Property | 432,605 | | 432,605 |
| 472 | Unspecified | Army | Fam Hsg Const, Army | Unspecified Worldwide | Family Housing Improvements | 156,030 | | 156,030 |
| 473 | Unspecified | Navy | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Privatization Support | 10,609 | | 10,609 |
| 474 | Unspecified | Navy | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Utilities Account | 164,556 | | 164,556 |
| 475 | Unspecified | Navy | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Miscellaneous Account | 807 | | 807 |
| 476 | Unspecified | Navy | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Maintenance of Real Property | 377,792 | | 377,792 |
| 477 | Unspecified | Navy | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Furnishings Account | 25,462 | | 25,462 |
| 478 | Unspecified | Navy | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Management Account | 78,325 | | 78,325 |
| 479 | Unspecified | Navy | Fam Hsg Const, Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning & Design | 8,381 | | 8,381 |
| 480 | Unspecified | Navy | Fam Hsg Const, Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Construction Improvements | 20,446 | | 20,446 |

**TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS**

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Location | Service/Agency/Program | Appropriation | Installation | Project Title | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 481 | Unspecified | Navy | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Leasing Account | 132,433 | | 132,433 |
| 482 | Unspecified | Navy | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | SVCM's Mortgage Insurance Premium | 64 | | 64 |
| 483 | Unspecified | Navy | Fam Hsg Ops & Debt, Navy | Unspecified Worldwide | Services Account | 62,730 | | 62,730 |
| 484 | Unspecified | Air Force | Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Leasing Account | 119,908 | | 119,908 |
| 485 | Unspecified | Air Force | Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Housing Privatization | 44,536 | | 44,536 |
| 486 | Unspecified | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning & Design | 33,488 | | 33,488 |
| 487 | Unspecified | Air Force | Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Utilities Account | 132,651 | | 132,651 |
| 488 | Unspecified | Air Force | Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Furnishings Account | 43,006 | | 43,006 |
| 489 | Unspecified | Air Force | Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Maintenance (RMPA & RMPC) | 395,650 | | 395,650 |
| 490 | Unspecified | Air Force | Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Services Account | 26,070 | | 26,070 |
| 491 | Unspecified | Air Force | Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Miscellaneous Account | 2,527 | | 2,527 |
| 492 | Unspecified | Air Force | Fam Hsg Const, Air Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Construction Improvements | 223,979 | | 223,979 |
| 493 | Unspecified | Air Force | Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Management Account | 70,083 | | 70,083 |
| 494 | Unspecified | Air Force | Force | Unspecified Worldwide | Debt Account | 37 | | 37 |
| 495 | Unspecified | Defense Logistics Agency | Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Management Account | 289 | | 289 |
| 496 | Unspecified | Defense Logistics Agency | Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Furnishings Account | 32 | | 32 |
| 497 | Unspecified | Defense Logistics Agency | Fam Hsg Const, Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Planning & Design | 300 | | 300 |
| 498 | Unspecified | Defense Logistics Agency | Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Utilities Account | 412 | | 412 |
| 499 | Unspecified | Defense Logistics Agency | Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Services Account | 72 | | 72 |
| 500 | Unspecified | Defense Logistics Agency | Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Maintenance of Real Property | 2,057 | | 2,057 |
| 501 | Unspecified | National Security Agency | Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Miscellaneous Account | 51 | | 51 |
| 502 | Unspecified | National Security Agency | Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Services Account | 405 | | 405 |
| 503 | Unspecified | National Security Agency | Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Utilities Account | 413 | | 413 |
| 504 | Unspecified | National Security Agency | Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Management Account | 13 | | 13 |
| 505 | Unspecified | National Security Agency | Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Leasing Account | 11,987 | | 11,987 |
| 506 | Unspecified | National Security Agency | Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Maintenance of Real Property | 2,528 | | 2,528 |
| 507 | Unspecified | National Security Agency | Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Furnishings Account | 112 | | 112 |
| 508 | Unspecified | National Security Agency | Fam Hsg Const, Def-Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Construction Improvements | 50 | | 50 |
| 509 | Unspecified | Defense Intelligence Agency | Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Furnishings Account | 3,844 | | 3,844 |
| 510 | Unspecified | Defense Intelligence Agency | Wide | Unspecified Worldwide | Leasing Account | 27,225 | | 27,225 |
| 511 | Unspecified | Family Housing Improvement Fund | Fund | Unspecified Worldwide | Family Housing Improvement Fund | 300 | | 300 |

# TITLE XXI—ARMY

## SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,678,210,000 for Army military construction and $1,452,217,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2004. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1,604,480,000 for military construction and $1,452,217,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2004.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following projects: $158,000 for a munitions training facility at Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, $500,000 for a barracks complex (hospital area) at Fort Carson, Colorado, $740,000 for a satellite communications operations center at Fort Detrick, Maryland, and $720,000 for an aircraft corrosion control facility at Corpus Christi Army Depot, Texas.

### Unspecified Minor Construction

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for unspecified minor construction, the Secretary of the Army execute the following projects: $1,050,000 for a general instruction building at Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, and $1,500,000 for an explosive ordnance disposal operations facility at Fort Irwin, California.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2004. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

### Section 2102—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2004.

### Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize new improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2004.

### Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Army's budget for fiscal year 2004. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Army may spend on military construction projects.

### Section 2105—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2002 Projects

This section would amend the table in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (division B of Public Law 107–107) to provide for an increase in the amount authorized for construction at Fort Richardson, Alaska.

## TITLE XXII—NAVY

### SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,147,537,000 for Navy military construction and $1,036,971,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2004. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1,251,946,000 for military construction and $1,036,971,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2004.

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Navy complete planning and design activities for the following project: $970,000 for a full scale electric drive test facility at the Naval Surface Warfare Center Shipyard Systems Engineering Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

#### Unspecified Minor Construction

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for unspecified minor construction, the Secretary of the Navy execute the following project: $1,290,000 for aviation maintenance officer school modifications at Naval Air Station Whiting Field, Florida.

### LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

#### Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2004. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

#### Section 2202—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2004.

#### Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize new improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2004.

### Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Navy's budget for fiscal year 2004. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Navy may spend on military construction projects.

## TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

### SUMMARY

The budget request contained $830,671,000 for Air Force military construction and $1,491,533,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2004. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $986,076,000 for military construction and $1,491,533,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2004.

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### Reserve Associate Program

The committee commends the Air Force for its commitment to meeting mission requirements through its reserve associate program. The committee encourages the Air Force to consider expanding the reserve associate program to include additional facilities and platforms. Finally, the committee urges the Air Force to consider, in addition to its active bases, the use of one or more of its reserve bases in a reserve associate arrangement.

#### Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Air Force complete planning and design activities for the following projects: $1,350,000 for an air mobility operations group global reach deployment center at Travis Air Force Base, California, $486,000 for a leadership development center at Buckley Air Force Base, Colorado, $1,098,000 for a cadet area protective perimeter at the United States Air Force Academy, Colorado, $729,000 for a consolidated security forces training complex at Schriever Air Force Base, Colorado, $612,000 for force protection and access control at the west gate of Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, $792,000 for a security forces operation facility at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida, $603,000 for a child development center at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida, $2,520,000 for a tanker airlift control center at Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, $1,350,000 for fire crash rescue stations at Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, $990,000 for a consolidated fire and crash rescue station at Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, $580,000 for a tri-service research facility at Brooks Air Force Base, Texas, $990,000 for a fire crash rescue station at Dyess Air Force Base, Texas, $531,000 for an air expeditionary force deployment center at Hill Air Force Base, Utah, and $1,200,000 for a mission support complex at Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2004. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

### Section 2302—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2004.

### Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize new improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2004.

### Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Air Force's budget for fiscal year 2004. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Air Force may spend on military construction projects.

# TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

## SUMMARY

The budget request contained $655,381,000 for defense agency military construction and $49,790,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2004. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $802,549,000 for military construction and $49,790,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2004.

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs Health Care Sharing

The committee continues to believe that significant efficiencies are possible if the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) share health care facilities. However, the Department and VA operate only 7 joint ventures, even though the 2 departments operate approximately 240 hospitals. Such incremental progress is representative of the significant bureaucratic challenges facing the health care sharing effort. Nevertheless, the committee believes that the Department and VA should take advantage of health care sharing opportunities whenever possible.

The committee understands that the Colorado University School of Medicine has begun relocation to the site of the closed Fitzsimons Army Hospital. The Department of Veterans Affairs is currently considering replacement of the Denver VA Medical Center, a 50-year-old structure now co-located with the Colorado medical school, as a part of that relocation. The committee understands

that the Department is also considering participation in the VA Medical Center's new facility. As such, the committee believes that the Department of Defense should participate in design and construction of this facility, which would provide ambulatory and acute care medical services to military personnel attached to Buckley Air Force Base. Such an approach would allow the Department to leverage construction, operations, and maintenance costs of a joint facility with VA, and eliminate the Department's need to construct an additional medical treatment facility at Buckley Air Force Base. In this particular case, a joint facility would further benefit by sharing significant assets with the Colorado University School of Medicine Facility, resulting in further savings.

With the expectation that the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans' Affairs will reach an agreement on sharing design and construction costs at levels representative of their medical requirements, the committee recommends authorization of $4,000,000 for planning and design of a DOD–VA medical treatment facility at the site of the closed Fitzsimons Army Hospital.

### Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of Defense complete planning and design activities for the following projects: $470,000 for a boat launch facility at Naval Air Station North Island, California and $4,000,000 for a DOD–VA medical treatment facility at Fitzsimons Campus, Colorado.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized defense agencies construction projects for fiscal year 2004. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

### Section 2402—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for defense agencies for fiscal year 2004.

### Section 2403—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize new improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2004.

### Section 2404—Energy Conservation Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

### Section 2405—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the defense agencies' budgets for fiscal year 2004.

This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the defense agencies may spend on military construction projects.

# TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

## OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $169,300,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) infrastructure fund (NATO Security Investment Program) for fiscal year 2004. The committee recommends authorization of $169,300,000 for fiscal year 2004.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this bill and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

### Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO

This section would authorize appropriations of $169,300,000 as the U.S. contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.

# TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

## SUMMARY

The budget request contained $369,550,000 for military construction of guard and reserve facilities for fiscal year 2004. The committee recommends authorization for fiscal year 2004 of $573,941,000 to be distributed as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Army National Guard | $253,788,000 |
| Air National Guard | 123,408,000 |
| Army Reserve | 89,840,000 |
| Naval and Marine Corps Reserve | 45,762,000 |
| Air Force Reserve | 61,143,000 |
| Total | 573,941,000 |

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Planning and Design, Air National Guard

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Air Force complete planning and design activities for the following projects: $954,000 for an operations and training complex at Savannah International Airport, Georgia, $754,000 for a composite training facility at the Greater Peoria Regional Airport, Illinois, $468,000 for a fire station

at Pease International Tradeport, New Hampshire, and $602,000 for a fire station at Stewart International Airport, New York.

### Planning and Design, Air Reserve

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Air Force complete planning and design activities for the following project: $220,000 for visitors' quarters at Homestead Air Reserve Base, Florida.

### Planning and Design, Army National Guard

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following projects: $2,500,000 for an armed forces reserve center at Moreno Valley, California, $1,772,000 for an armed forces reserve center in Lawrence, Indiana, $844,000 for a joint armed forces reserve center at Gary/Chicago Airport, Indiana, $726,000 for an aviation support facility at Bangor International Airport, Maine, $7,849,000 for an aviation classification and repair activity depot in Springfield, Missouri, $651,000 for a Blackhawk support facility in Bismarck, North Dakota, $480,000 for a readiness center in Waynesburg, Pennsylvania, and $767,000 for an armed forces reserve center at Fort Jackson, South Carolina.

### Unspecified Minor Construction, Army National Guard

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for unspecified minor construction, the Secretary of the Army execute the following projects: $1,498,000 for a one stop personnel center at Papago Park Military Reservation, Arizona and $1,114,000 for readiness center upgrades at Pontiac Armory, Michigan.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 2601—Authorized Guard and Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction for the guard and reserve by service component for fiscal year 2004. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

# TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 2701—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law

This section would provide that authorizations for military construction projects, repair of real property, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program, and guard and reserve projects will expire on October 1, 2006 or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal

year 2007, whichever is later. This expiration would not apply to authorizations for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 2006 or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2007, whichever is later.

### Section 2702—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2001 Project

This section would extend one fiscal year 2001 military construction authorization until October 1, 2004, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2005, whichever is later. The extended authorization applies to the following project: $250,000 for new construction of General and Flag Officers Quarters at Fort Jackson, South Carolina.

### Section 2703—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2000 Projects

This section would extend certain fiscal year 2000 military construction authorizations until October 1, 2004, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2005, whichever is later. The extended authorizations apply to the following projects: $13,500,000 for construction of a multi-purpose range at Fort Pickett,Virginia, and $6,000,000 to replace family housing at Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma.

### Section 2704—Effective Date

This section would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, and XXVI of this bill shall take effect on October 1, 2003, or the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later.

## TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Housing Privatization Programs

The committee commends the Department of Defense (DOD) for its efforts to privatize military family housing facilities. To date, these efforts have resulted in notable improvements in the quality of life for military families and an achievable approach to meeting the Department's military housing requirements over the next decade.

However, the committee is concerned that the military services have not consistently taken a comprehensive approach to privatization projects. As a result, the services have missed opportunities to include vital community facilities, such as schools, in their privatization contracts. While including such facilities may not be economically feasible in some cases, the committee believes that the services should include integral facilities, particularly schools, whenever possible and necessary.

Unfortunately, in at least one case, a military service and the Department have not agreed upon a funding source for a school to serve a privatized housing site. While the committee prefers to give the Department maximum flexibility in handling such matters, leg-

islation to require a consistent approach to funding military schools may become necessary if the Department does not take a comprehensive view of community planning in privatization.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop clear guidelines for the military services to use in determining when schools must be included in privatization contracts and, in those cases where schools are not included, determine whether the Department or the service shall be responsible for funding educational facilities. In addition, the committee urges the Secretary to ensure that the services and the DOD Education Activity have sufficient resources to meet the school construction needs of the United States military.

Finally, the committee is concerned that the Department did not respond to the committee's direction in the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) to report on the impact of privatized housing on local school systems. The committee again directs the Department to provide such a report to Congress and urges the Department to address school budgeting issues in its fiscal year 2005 budget request.

### U.S.-Mexico Border Airspace

The committee is troubled by reports that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Department of Defense have been unable to reach agreement on access to airspace controlled by the Department of Defense along certain portions of the U.S.-Mexico border. Given the heightened importance of border patrols to homeland security since September 11, 2001, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to work with DHS to develop an access plan that meets both DOD's training and readiness requirements and DHS's requirements to patrol the nation's borders.

### Base Realignment and Closure

The committee recognizes that the United States military must possess the facilities, land, and air space necessary to support its forces in order to maintain national security and remain capable of winning future conflicts. In 1991, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense proposed shaping the military into the "Base Force," a force that included 1.6 million active duty personnel and 900,000 reserve component personnel, 12 active Army divisions, 12 aircraft carrier battlegroups, 3 active divisions for the Marine Corps, and 15 active fighter wings for the Air Force. Although today's United States military is somewhat smaller than the Base Force, the Base Force represents a level to which the military might reasonably be expected to "surge" in a future crisis or significant permanent change in the global security environment. Therefore, the committee recommends a series of provisions to ensure that the United States military retains the resources and facilities it needs to defend the nation's interests. The first provision, contained in title 9 of this bill, would establish a military force structure "floor" at the current level.

The remaining provisions are contained in title 28 of this bill, and specific descriptions may be found in the section-by-section portion below. These provisions would modify current Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) law to ensure that the 2005 BRAC

round results in a national inventory of installations capable of supporting a Base Force-size military that is stationed entirely within the United States. The committee believes that such an inventory will ensure that the United States military has the infrastructure necessary to meet future crises, and that dropping below this level would jeopardize the military's ability to adapt to meet evolving and future threats to U.S. national security.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

#### Section 2801—Increase in Maximum Amount of Authorized Annual Emergency Construction

This section would amend section 2803 of title 10, United States Code, to increase from $30,000,000 to $45,000,000 the annual limit on the amount a service secretary may obligate for emergency military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law.

#### Section 2802—Authority To Lease Military Family Housing Units in Italy

This section would amend section 2828 of title 10, United States Code, to increase from 2,000 to 2,800 the number of family housing units the Secretary of the Navy may lease in Italy for not more than $25,000 per unit per year.

#### Section 2803—Changes to Alternative Authority for Acquisition and Improvement of Military Housing

This section would amend section 2880 of title 10, United States Code, to provide increased flexibility for the Department of Defense to determine the amount of space provided to each person in on-base unaccompanied housing built under the privatization program.

This section would also amend section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, to merge the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund and the Department of Defense Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund into a single Department of Defense Housing Improvement Fund. This single fund will give the Department increased flexibility in managing its housing resources.

Finally, this section would increase the cap on budget authority for contracts and investments to military housing privatization projects from $850,000,000 to $900,000,000.

#### Section 2804—Additional Material for Annual Report on Housing Privatization Program

This section would require the Department to include additional information in its annual report on housing privatization programs. The additional information would include a review of privatization activities entered into in previous years, privatization activities planned in the future, authorities necessary to improve the program, and additional facilities planned as part of each privatization project. Finally, the report must include an explanation for each

case in which a privatization effort does not include additional facilities, such as schools, in the contract.

Section 2805—Authority To Convey Property at Military Installations Closed or to be Closed in Exchange for Military Construction Activities

This section would expand the Department's existing authority to transfer property at a military installation that has been closed or will be closed to persons who construct or provide family housing in exchange. The expanded authority would permit the Department to transfer property at such installations in exchange for family housing, unaccompanied housing, and authorized military construction activities.

Although the Department has had the authority to make land-for-family housing trades for several years, it has rarely taken advantage of the opportunity to do so. The committee believes that the Department should utilize land-for-construction trades to leverage maximum return for excess lands at military installations that have been closed or realigned by the base closure process.

As such, this section would require the Department to utilize the authority for land-for-construction trades in at least 20 percent of base closure disposals of property that has not been identified as essential to a redevelopment plan. This section would also require each of the services to endeavor to use the authority provided for at least $200,000,000 worth of exchanges annually. In meeting the requirements of this section, the fair market value of the housing or facilities received by the Department must equal or exceed the fair market value of the real property conveyed. If not, the Department must receive payments equal to the difference, to be deposited into the Department of Defense Housing Improvement Fund. In order to count a land-for-construction trade towards the 20 percent and $200,000,000 per year requirements of this section, at least 90 percent of the payment for the land must be in the form of new construction.

Finally, this section would require the Department to provide an annual report to Congress on the use of this authority. The committee expects the Department to utilize this exchange authority to support construction programs already authorized by Congress, and that the Department would request that funds not obligated as a result of land for construction trades be reprogrammed to support authorized military construction and family housing projects in future years.

Section 2806—Congressional Notification and Reporting Requirements and Limitations Regarding Use of Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction

This section would limit the Department's ability to utilize operation and maintenance funds for certain construction purposes. First, the section would prohibit the Department from spending more than $5,000,000 of operation and maintenance funds on any single construction project. Second, it would prohibit the annual use of more than $200,000,000 of operation and maintenance funds for such purposes. Third, it would require the Department to notify Congress 14 days before obligating more than $1,500,000 of oper-

ation and maintenance funds for construction purposes. However, a service secretary may waive the notice and wait requirement in those cases where a delay would jeopardize national security, health, or safety. If such a waiver is issued, this section would require the secretary to report to Congress within five days.

Finally, this section would require the Department to provide a quarterly report to Congress on the worldwide use of operation and maintenance funds for construction purposes.

This section reflects the committee's concern about the Department's interpretation of authorities provided by the United States Code for the use of operation and maintenance funds to build "temporary" military facilities to meet operational requirements. The committee believes that the Department's actions in this regard do not reflect congressional intent and, in fact, contradict military construction authorities contained within title 10, United States Code.

Therefore, this section does not codify the Department's practices of using operation and maintenance spending for construction purposes. Rather, it is intended to allow the Department time to reconsider its use of operation and maintenance funds, while limiting the scope of such activities during fiscal year 2004.

Over the coming year, the committee will closely monitor the Department's operation and maintenance spending for construction purposes, and expects the Department to develop and request a military construction legislative proposal and budget that would allow for the flexibility required by the Department. Finally, the committee encourages the Department to report to Congress quarterly on its worldwide use of operation and maintenance funds for construction until enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

### Section 2807—Increase in Authorized Maximum Lease Term for Family Housing and Other Facilities in Certain Foreign Countries

This section would increase from 10 to 15 years the maximum length of lease that the Department may enter for housing facilities in Korea. This section would also increase from 5 to 15 years the maximum length of lease that the Department may enter for other militarily-related facilities in Korea.

## SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

### Section 2811—Real Property Transactions

This section would amend section 2672 of title 10, United States Code, to increase from $500,000 to $1,500,000 the limit on the amount a service secretary may obligate to acquire land in the interest of national defense. This section would also amend section 2672a of title 10, United States Code, to require a service secretary who utilizes the section to acquire land to notify Congress within 10 days of determining that such an acquisition is necessary. Finally, this section would amend section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, which requires service secretaries to report to Congress before entering into certain real estate transactions (including acquisition, leases, and transfers of real property), to shorten congressional notification requirements and increase spending levels at which reports are required.

## SUBTITLE C—LAND CONVEYANCES

### Section 2821—Termination of Lease and Conveyance of Army Reserve Center, Conway, Arkansas

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property in Conway, Arkansas to the University of Central Arkansas. This section would also authorize the Secretary of the Army to terminate a lease between the Secretary and the University for the property on which the facility is located.

### Section 2822—Actions To Quiet Title, Fallin Waters Subdivision, Eglin Air Force Base, Florida

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to quiet title to tracts of land at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida by conveying, acquiring, or exchanging small parcels of land. This authorization is intended to allow the Secretary to resolve longstanding encroachment issues with local communities that resulted from inaccurate surveys.

### Section 2823—Modification of Land Conveyance, Eglin Air Force Base, Florida

Public Law 91–347, directed the Secretary of the Air Force to transfer certain real property to the Okaloosa County School Board on the condition that the property would be used for public schools and that any portion of the property not used as such would be returned to the United States. This section would amend Public Law 91–347 to authorize the Okaloosa County School Board to lease the undeveloped portion of this property to Okaloosa County for other public purposes.

### Section 2824—Land Conveyance, Fort Campbell, Kentucky and Tennessee

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a parcel of real property to the Department of Transportation of the State of Tennessee for consideration. The property is to be used to realign and upgrade United States Highway 79 from a two-lane highway to a four-lane highway. The costs incurred during conveyance of the property, including administrative costs and acquisition of 200 acres of mission-essential replacement property, shall be borne by the State.

### Section 2825—Land Conveyance, Army and Air Force Exchange Service Property, Dallas, Texas

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to authorize the Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES) to sell a parcel of real property, including improvements, at 1515 Roundtable Drive in Dallas, Texas. The section would require that AAFES sell the property at fair market value, and that proceeds be retained as AAFES nonappropriated funds.

### Section 2826—Land Conveyance, Naval Reserve Center, Orange, TX

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey a parcel of real property to the City of Orange, Texas for consideration. The 2.5 acre parcel of property, located at the Naval Reserve Center, Orange, Texas, may be used for construction of an access road, economic development, or other public purposes.

## SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

### Section 2841—Redesignation of Yuma Training Range Complex as Bob Stump Training Range Complex

This section would rename the Yuma Training Range Complex the Bob Stump Training Range Complex in honor of the former chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, Congressman Bob Stump. The committee notes that renaming the Yuma Training Range Complex in Congressman Stump's honor is particularly fitting, as the congressman was a cosponsor of legislation in 1985 that created the Barry M. Goldwater Range as it stands today. The Goldwater Range is used, in part, by the Yuma Training Range Complex, and is supported by Luke Air Force Base, the most significant military installation in the district served by former Congressman Stump.

### Section 2842—Modification of Authority To Conduct a Round of Realignments and Closures of Military Installations in 2005

This section would amend current base realignment and closure law to define the parameters by which the Secretary of Defense determines military force structure and infrastructure requirements. Under current law, the Secretary of Defense must submit a force structure plan and description of necessary supporting infrastructure with the fiscal year 2005 defense budget request. This provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a force structure plan that assumes, at a minimum, the 1991 Base Force structure plan. In addition, the Secretary's description of supporting infrastructure must be capable of sustaining the entire planned force structure if no U.S. forces were permanently based outside of the United States.

This provision would also amend current law to require the Secretary of Defense to submit, not later than April 1, 2005, a list of core military installations considered absolutely essential to national defense, to the base closure commission. This list must contain at least 50 percent of the total number of installations within the United States. Following consideration and approval of this list by the base closure commission and the President, this list of installations would be eliminated from consideration for closure or realignment.

### Section 2843—Use of Force-Structure Plan for the Armed Forces in Preparation of Selection Criteria for Base Closure Round

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, when making closure and realignment recommendations, to use the force

structure plan required by base realignment and closure law, as amended by section 2842 of this act.

Section 2844—Requirement for Unanimous Vote of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission to Recommend Closure of Military Installation not Recommended for Closure by Secretary of Defense

This section would amend section 2914(d) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 to require a unanimous vote of the base closure commission to add an installation to the list of bases recommended for closure by the Secretary of Defense.

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

## TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

### OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $16,679.2 million for the national security activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2004 (excluding a rescission of $75.0 million of balances remaining available for Cerro Grande fire activities). Of this amount, $8,834.6 million is for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration, $7,734.1 million is for environmental and other defense activities, and $110.5 million is for energy supply. The committee recommends the budget request of $16,679.2 million, representing an increase of $1,103.2 million from the amount authorized for fiscal year 2003. The following table summarizes the budget request and the committee recommendations.

## Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENGERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Energy Supply** | | | | | |
| Nuclear Energy | | | | | |
| Infrastructure | | | | | |
| Idaho facilities management | | | | | |
| INEEL infrastructure | | | | | |
| INEEL infrastructure O&M (050) | 21,415 | 0 | | | 21,415 |
| Idaho sitewide safeguards and security (050) | 56,654 | 0 | | | 56,654 |
| Total, Infrastructure | 78,069 | 0 | | | 78,069 |
| Program direction (050) | 35,407 | 0 | | | 35,407 |
| Subtotal Nuclear Energy | 113,476 | 0 | | | 113,476 |
| Less security charge for reimbursable work (NE) (050) | (3,003) | 0 | | | (3,003) |
| **Total, Energy Supply** | **110,473** | **0** | | | **110,473** |
| **Weapons Activities** | | | | | |
| Directed stockpile work | | | | | |
| Stockpile research and development | 433,150 | | | | 433,150 |
| Stockpile maintenance | 405,746 | 0 | | | 405,746 |
| Stockpile evaluation | 202,885 | 0 | | | 202,885 |
| Dismantlement/disposal | 37,722 | 0 | | | 37,722 |
| Production support | 278,113 | 17,000 | 17,000 | | 295,113 |
| Field engineering, training and manuals | 7,170 | 0 | | | 7,170 |
| Total, Directed stockpile work | 1,364,786 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 0 | 1,381,786 |
| Campaigns | | | | | |
| Science campaigns | | | | | |
| Primary certification | 65,849 | 0 | | | 65,849 |
| Dynamic materials properties | 82,251 | 0 | | | 82,251 |
| Advanced radiography | | | | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 65,985 | (5,000) | | (5,000) | 60,985 |

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENGERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins | 55,463 | 0 | | | 55,463 |
| Total, Science campaigns | 269,548 | (5,000) | 0 | (5,000) | 264,548 |
| Engineering campaigns | | | | | |
| Enhanced surety | 37,974 | 0 | | | 37,974 |
| Weapons system engineering certification | 28,238 | 0 | | | 28,238 |
| Nuclear survivability | 23,977 | 0 | | | 23,977 |
| Enhanced surveillance | 94,781 | 0 | | | 94,781 |
| Advanced design and production technologies | 79,917 | 0 | | | 79,917 |
| Engineering campaigns construction activities | | | | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 4,500 | 0 | | | 4,500 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 01-D-108 Microsystem and engineering science applications, SNL, Albuquerque, NM | 61,800 | 0 | | | 61,800 |
| Total, Engineering campaigns construction activities | 66,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66,300 |
| Total, Engineering campaigns | 331,187 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 331,187 |
| Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign | | | | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 316,769 | (5,000) | | (5,000) | 311,769 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 96-D-111 National ignition facility (NIF), LLNL, Livermore, CA | 150,000 | | | | 150,000 |
| Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign | 466,769 | (5,000) | 0 | (5,000) | 461,769 |
| Advanced simulation and computing campaign | | | | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 713,326 | 0 | | | 713,326 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 01-D-101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA | 12,300 | 0 | | | 12,300 |
| 00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA | 25,000 | 0 | | | 25,000 |
| 00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Total, Construction | 37,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37,300 |
| Total, Advanced simulation and computing campaign | 750,626 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 750,626 |

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENGERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pit manufacturing and certification campaign | 320,228 | 0 | | | 320,228 |
| Readiness campaigns | | | | | |
| Stockpile readiness | 55,158 | 2,000 | 2,000 | | 57,158 |
| High explosives manufacturing and weapons assembly/disassembly readiness | 29,649 | | | | 29,649 |
| Non-nuclear readiness | 37,397 | | | | 37,397 |
| Materials readiness | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Tritium readiness | | | | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 59,893 | 0 | | | 59,893 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC | 75,000 | 0 | | | 75,000 |
| 98-D-126 Accelerator production of tritium (APT), various locations | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Total, Construction | 75,000 | 0 | | | 75,000 |
| Total, Tritium readiness | 134,893 | 0 | | | 134,893 |
| Total, Readiness campaigns | 257,097 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 0 | 259,097 |
| Total, Campaigns | 2,395,455 | (8,000) | 2,000 | (10,000) | 2,387,455 |
| Readiness in technical base and facilities | | | | | |
| Operations of facilities | 972,773 | 16,300 | 36,300 | (20,000) | 989,073 |
| Other sites | | [-20,000] | | [-20,000] | |
| Y-12 Plant Facilities and Legacy Material Stewardship | | [7,000] | [7,000] | | |
| Pantex Plant Maintenance | | [14,300] | [14,300] | | |
| Pantex General Plant Projects and Capital Equipment | | [15,000] | [15,000] | | |
| Program readiness | 131,093 | 0 | | | 131,093 |
| Special projects | 42,975 | 0 | | | 42,975 |
| Material recycle and recovery | 76,189 | 0 | | | 76,189 |
| Containers | 16,006 | 0 | | | 16,006 |
| Storage | 11,365 | 0 | | | 11,365 |
| Nuclear weapons incident response | 89,694 | 0 | | | 89,694 |

## Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENGERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities | 1,340,095 | 16,300 | 36,300 | (20,000) | 1,356,395 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 04-D-101 Test capabilities revitalization, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM | 36,450 | 0 | | | 36,450 |
| 04-D-102 Exterior communications infrastructure modernization, Sandia National Laboratories Alb | 20,000 | 0 | | | 20,000 |
| 04-D-103 Project engineering and design, (PED) various locations | 2,000 | 0 | | | 2,000 |
| 04-D-104 National security sciences building Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM | 50,000 | (12,000) | | (12,000) | 38,000 |
| 04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, | 20,500 | 0 | | | 20,500 |
| 04-D-126 Building 12-44 production cellsupgrade, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX | 8,780 | 0 | | | 8,780 |
| 04-D-127 Cleaning and loading modifications Savannah River site, Aiken, SC | 2,750 | 0 | | | 2,750 |
| 04-D-128 TA-18 Mission relocation project Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM | 8,820 | 0 | | | 8,820 |
| 03-D-101 Sandia underground reactor facility Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 03-D-102 LANL Admininistration Building (LANL) | | | | | |
| 03-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations | 10,570 | 0 | | | 10,570 |
| 03-D-121 Gas transfer capacity expansion, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO | 15,300 | 0 | | | 15,300 |
| 03-D-122 Purification facility, Y-12 plant Oak Ridge, TN | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 03-D-123 Special nuclear materials component requalification facility, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX | 7,628 | 0 | | | 7,628 |
| 02-D-103 Project engineering and design, various locations | 10,950 | 0 | | | 10,950 |
| 02-D-105 Engineering technology complex upgrade (ETCU), LLNL, Livermore, CA | 9,776 | 0 | | | 9,776 |
| 02-D-107 Electrical power systems safety communications and bus upgrades, Nevada Test Site | 2,887 | 0 | | | 2,887 |
| 01-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations | 1,600 | 0 | | | 1,600 |
| 01-D-107 Atlas relocation and operations Nevada Test Site, NV | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 01-D-108 Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL, Albuquerque, NM | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 01-D-124 HEU materials facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN | 45,000 | 0 | | | 45,000 |
| 01-D-126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX | 2,838 | 0 | | | 2,838 |
| 01-D-800 Sensitive compartmented information facility, LLNL, CA | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 99-D-103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 99-D-104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA | 3,500 | 0 | | | 3,500 |
| 99-D-106 Model validation & system certification center, SNL, Albuquerque, NM | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 99-D-125 Replace boilers & controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 99-D-127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO | 12,475 | 0 | | | 12,475 |
| 99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |

## Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENGERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 98-D-123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium factory modernization and consoli | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 98-D-124 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Y-12 plant Oak Ridge, TN | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations | 1,552 | 0 | | | 1,552 |
| 90-D-124 High explosive synthesis facility, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 88-D-125 HE machining facility, PX | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Total, Construction | 273,376 | (12,000) | 0 | (12,000) | 261,376 |
| Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities | 1,613,471 | 4,300 | 36,300 | (32,000) | 1,617,771 |
| Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 261,404 | 0 | | | 261,404 |
| Construction | | | | | |
| 04-D-203 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program (FIRP), project engineering design | 3,719 | 0 | | | 3,719 |
| Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program | 265,123 | 0 | | | 265,123 |
| Secure transportation asset | | | | | |
| Operations and equipment | 123,605 | 0 | | | 123,605 |
| Program direction | 58,795 | 0 | | | 58,795 |
| Total, Secure transportation asset | 182,400 | 0 | | | 182,400 |
| Safeguards and security | | | | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 582,067 | 1,700 | 11,700 | (10,000) | 583,767 |
| Physical and Cyber Security Research and Development | | [-10,000] | | [-10,000] | |
| LLNL Security Upgrades | 0 | [11,700] | [11,700] | | |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 99-D-132 Nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM | 3,683 | 0 | | | 3,683 |
| Total, Safeguards and security | 585,750 | 1,700 | 11,700 | (10,000) | 587,450 |
| Subtotal, Weapons Activities | 6,406,985 | 15,000 | 67,000 | (52,000) | 6,421,985 |
| Adjustments | | | | | |

## Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENGERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Use of prior year balances | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Less security charge for reimbursable work | (28,985) | 0 | | | (28,985) |
| Total, Adjustments | (28,985) | 0 | | | (28,985) |
| **Total, Weapons Activities** | **6,378,000** | **15,000** | **67,000** | **(52,000)** | **6,393,000** |
| | | | | | |
| **Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation** | | | | | |
| Nonproliferation and verification R&D | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 203,873 | 0 | | | 203,873 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Total, Nonproliferation & verification R&D | 203,873 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 203,873 |
| | | | | | |
| Nonproliferation and international security | 101,734 | 0 | 5,000 | (5,000) | 101,734 |
| IAEA Safeguards and Nonproliferation Policy | 0 | [-5,000] | | [-5,000] | |
| Nuclear Noncompliance Verification | 0 | [5,000] | [5,000] | | |
| | | | | | |
| Nonproliferation programs with Russia | | | | | |
| International nuclear materials protection and cooperation | 226,000 | 0 | | | 226,000 |
| Russian transition initiatives | 40,000 | 0 | | | 40,000 |
| HEU transparency implementation | 18,000 | 0 | | | 18,000 |
| International nuclear safety and cooperation | 14,083 | (2,500) | | (2,500) | 11,583 |
| Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program | 50,000 | 0 | | | 50,000 |
| Accelerated materials disposition | 30,000 | (25,000) | | (25,000) | 5,000 |
| | | | | | |
| Fissile materials disposition | | | | | |
| U S surplus materials disposition | 193,805 | 0 | | | 193,805 |
| Russian surplus materials disposition | 47,100 | 0 | | | 47,100 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 01-D-407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend down, Savannah River, SC | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC | 13,600 | 0 | | | 13,600 |

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENGERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC | 402,000 | 0 | | | 402,000 |
| Total, Construction | 415,600 | 0 | | | 415,600 |
| | | | | | |
| Program direction | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Total, Fissile materials disposition | 656,505 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 656,505 |
| Total, Nonproliferation programs with Russia | 1,034,588 | (27,500) | 0 | (27,500) | 1,007,088 |
| | | | | | |
| Return of domestic sealed sources | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Program direction | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation | 1,340,195 | (27,500) | 5,000 | (32,500) | 1,312,695 |
| Adjustments: | | | | | |
| Use of prior year balances | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| International renewable energy program | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Total, Adjustments | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| **Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation** | **1,340,195** | **(27,500)** | **5,000** | **(32,500)** | **1,312,695** |
| | | | | | |
| **Naval Reactors** | | | | | |
| Naval reactors development | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 724,600 | 0 | | | 724,600 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 03-D-201 Cleanroom technology facility | 300 | 0 | | | 300 |
| 01-D-200 Major office replacement building, Schenectady, NY | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID | 18,300 | 0 | | | 18,300 |
| Total, Construction | 18,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18,600 |
| Total, Naval reactors development | 743,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 743,200 |
| | | | | | |
| Program direction | 25,200 | 0 | | | 25,200 |
| **Total, Naval Reactors** | **768,400** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **768,400** |
| | | | | | |
| **Office Of The Administrator** | | | | | |
| Office of the Administrator | 347,980 | 0 | | | 347,980 |

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENGERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Defense nuclear nonproliferation | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Total, Office of the Administrator | 347,980 | 0 | | | 347,980 |
| **Total, National Nuclear Security Administration** | **8,834,575** | **(12,500)** | **72,000** | **(84,500)** | **8,822,075** |
| | | | | | |
| **Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management** | | | | | |
| Site/project completion | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 03-D-414 Preliminary project engineering and design (PE&D), Aiken, SC | | | | | |
| 02-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion project, INEEL, Idaho Falls, ID | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 02-D-420 Plutonium packaging and stabilization, Savannah River, SC | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 01-D-414 Preliminary project, engineering anddesign (PE&D), various locations | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory, INEL, ID | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades, Savannah River, SC | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Total, Construction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total, Site/project completion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| Post 2006 completion | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| Office of river protection | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 03-D-403 Immobilized high-level waste interim storage facility, Richland, WA | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENGERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**
(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 01-D-416 Tank waste remediation system, RL | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| 94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Total, Construction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total, Office of river protection | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total, Post 2006 completion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Science and technology | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Excess facilities | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Multi-Site activities | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Safeguards and security | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Program direction | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Subtotal, Defense environmental restoration and waste management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Adjustments: | | | | | |
| Use of prior year balances | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Less security charge for reimbursable work | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Total, Adjustments | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total, Defense Environmental Restoration And Waste Management** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** |
| **Environmental Management Cleanup Reform** | | | | | |
| Environmental management cleanup reform | **0** | **0** | | | 0 |
| **Defense Site Acceleration Completion** *(was Defense Facilities Closure Projects)* | | | | | |
| 2006 Accelerated completions | 1,245,171 | 9,500 | 9,500 | | 1,254,671 |
| 2012 Accelerated Completions | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 1,512,554 | 0 | | | 1,512,554 |
| Construction: | | | | | |

## Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENGERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 04-D-414 Project engineering and design, various locations | 23,500 | 0 | | | 23,500 |
| 04-D-423 3013 container surveillance capability in 235-F, SR | 1,134 | 0 | | | 1,134 |
| 02-D-402 Cathodic protection system expansion, ID | 1,126 | 0 | | | 1,126 |
| 01-D-416 Waste treatment and immobilization plant, RL | 690,000 | 0 | | | 690,000 |
| Total, Construction | 715,760 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 715,760 |
| Total, 2012 Accelerated Completions | 2,228,314 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,228,314 |
| 2035 Accelerated Completions | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 1,892,884 | 0 | | | 1,892,884 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 04-D-408 Glass waste storage building #2, SR | 20,259 | 0 | | | 20,259 |
| 03-D-403 Immobilized HLW interim storage facility, RL | 13,954 | 0 | | | 13,954 |
| 03-D-414 Project engineering and design, various locations | 51,500 | 0 | | | 51,500 |
| Total, Construction | 85,713 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85,713 |
| Total, 2035 Accelerated Completions | 1,978,597 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,978,597 |
| Safeguards and security | 299,977 | 0 | | | 299,977 |
| Technology development and deployment | 63,920 | 0 | | | 63,920 |
| Site closure | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Safeguards and security | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Subtotal, Defense Site Acceleration Completion | 5,815,979 | 9,500 | 9,500 | 0 | 5,825,479 |
| Less security charge for reimbursable work | (1,344) | 0 | | | (1,344) |
| **Total, Defense Site Acceleration Completion** | **5,814,635** | **9,500** | **9,500** | **0** | **5,824,135** |
| **Defense Environmental Services** | | | | | |
| *(was Defense Environmental Management Privatization)* | | | | | |
| Community and regulatory support | 61,337 | 0 | | | 61,337 |
| Federal contribution to the uranium enrichment | 452,000 | 0 | | | 452,000 |
| Non-closure environmental activities | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 189,698 | 0 | | | 189,698 |

## Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENGERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program direction | 292,144 | 0 | | | 292,144 |
| Privatization initiatives, various locations | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Subtotal, Defense Environmental Services | 995,179 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 995,179 |
| Use of prior year balances | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| **Total, Defense Environmental Services** | **995,179** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **995,179** |
| **Other Defense Activities** | | | | | |
| Energy security and assurance | | | | | |
| Energy security | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Program direction | 4,272 | (1,000) | | (1,000) | 3,272 |
| Total, Energy security and assurance | 4,272 | (1,000) | 0 | (1,000) | 3,272 |
| Office of Security | | | | | |
| Nuclear safeguards and security | 104,713 | 0 | | | 104,713 |
| Security investigations | 54,554 | 0 | | | 54,554 |
| Program direction | 52,490 | 0 | | | 52,490 |
| Chief information officer | | | | | |
| Corporate management information program | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Total, Office of Security | 211,757 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 211,757 |
| Intelligence | 39,823 | 5,000 | 5,000 | | 44,823 |
| Counterintelligence | 45,955 | 0 | | | 45,955 |
| Advanced accelerator applications | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Independent oversight and performance assurance | 22,575 | 0 | | | 22,575 |
| Environment, safety & health | | | | | |
| Environment, safety and health (defense) | 87,276 | 0 | | | 87,276 |
| Program direction | 20,410 | 0 | | | 20,410 |
| Total, Environment, safety and health | 107,686 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107,686 |

## Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENGERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Worker and community transition | | | | | |
| Worker and community transition | 12,321 | | | | 12,321 |
| Program direction | 2,679 | (1,000) | | (1,000) | 1,679 |
| Total, Worker and community transition | 15,000 | (1,000) | 0 | (1,000) | 14,000 |
| Office of Legacy Management | | | | | |
| Office of Legacy Management (050) | 19,178 | 0 | | | 19,178 |
| National security programs administrative support | 25,000 | 0 | | | 25,000 |
| Office of hearings and appeals | 3,797 | 0 | | | 3,797 |
| Subtotal, Other defense activities | 495,043 | 3,000 | 5,000 | (2,000) | 498,043 |
| Adjustments: | | | | | |
| Use of prior year balances | 0 | 0 | | | 0 |
| Less security charge for reimbursable work (SO) | (712) | 0 | | | (712) |
| Total, Adjustments | (712) | 0 | | | (712) |
| **Total, Other Defense Activities** | **494,331** | **3,000** | **5,000** | **(2,000)** | **497,331** |
| **Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal** | | | | | |
| Defense nuclear waste disposal | **430,000** | **0** | | | **430,000** |
| **Total, Environmental and Other Defense Activities** | **7,734,145** | **12,500** | **14,500** | **(2,000)** | **7,746,645** |
| Cerro Grande fire activities | | 0 | | | 0 |
| ***TOTAL, Atomic Energy Defense Activities*** | ***16,679,193*** | ***0*** | ***86,500*** | ***(86,500)*** | ***16,679,193*** |

## Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENGERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program | FY 2004 Authorization Request | Committee Change | Committee Increase | Committee Decrease | FY 2004 Committee Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)** | | | | | |
| Energy Programs | | | | | |
| Energy supply | 110,473 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110,473 |
| National Nuclear Security Administration: | | | | | |
| Weapons activities | 6,378,000 | 15,000 | 67,000 | (52,000) | 6,393,000 |
| Defense nuclear nonproliferation | 1,340,195 | (27,500) | 5,000 | (32,500) | 1,312,695 |
| Naval reactors | 768,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 768,400 |
| Office of the administrator | 347,980 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 347,980 |
| Total, National Nuclear Security Administration | 8,834,575 | (12,500) | 72,000 | (84,500) | 8,822,075 |
| Environmental and other defense activities: | | | | | |
| Defense environmental restoration & waste management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Defense environmental cleanup reform | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Defense site acceleration completion | 5,814,635 | 9,500 | 9,500 | 0 | 5,824,135 |
| Defense environmental services | 995,179 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 995,179 |
| Other defense activities | 494,331 | 3,000 | 5,000 | (2,000) | 497,331 |
| Defense nuclear waste disposal | 430,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 430,000 |
| Total, Environmental & other defense activities | 7,734,145 | 12,500 | 14,500 | (2,000) | 7,746,645 |
| Cerro Grande fire activities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total Department of Energy** | **16,679,193** | **0** | **86,500** | **(86,500)** | **16,679,193** |
| Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board | 19,559 | | | | 19,559 |
| **Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities** | **16,698,752** | | | | **16,698,752** |

# ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

## NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

### Overview

The budget request contained $8,834.6 million for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2004. The committee recommends $8,822.1 million, representing an increase of $783.6 million from the amount authorized for fiscal year 2003.

### Adjustments to the Budget Request

*Reductions*

The budget request contained $66.0 million for the Advanced Radiography campaign. The committee recommends $61.0 million, a decrease of $5.0 million. The committee notes a substantial increase in the request for advanced radiography requirements and technology development, including requirements studies for an Advanced Hydrotest Facility. The committee understands that the Dual-Axis Radiographic Hydrotest facility is critical to high priority stockpile life extension efforts, particularly plutonium pit certification. The committee urges the National Nuclear Security Administration to focus on delivering the radiographic tools essential to its nearer term production requirements.

The budget request contained $466.8 million for the Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield campaign. The committee recommends $461.8 million, a decrease of $5.0 million. The committee notes the more than 100 percent growth in the request for experimental support technologies for development of National Ignition Facility diagnostics and target fabrication capabilities. The committee believes this area has been underemphasized in the past, but questions effective executability of the increase. The committee cautions that these funds should be used for their stated purpose.

The budget request for operations of facilities in Readiness in the Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF) contained $37.0 million for "other sites", a more than four fold increase over the comparable fiscal year 2003 request. The committee does not believe the request has been adequately justified, and recommends $17.0 million, a decrease of $20.0 million.

The budget request contained $50.0 million in RTBF to begin construction of a national security sciences building at Los Alamos National Laboratory (project 04–D–104). This is a construction new start that has not previously been authorized by the committee. The committee is aware that this project received an advance appropriation in fiscal year 2003 of $12.0 million, and accordingly recommends $38.0 million for the project, a decrease of $12.0 million.

The operations and maintenance budget request for Safeguards and Security contains $8.0 million to initiate a physical security research and development program, and $2.0 million to initiate a similar cybersecurity effort. The committee views Safeguards and Security as an important but supporting element to the defense nuclear complex, which already spends billions of dollars annually on research and development. The committee further notes that the proposed activities would be largely duplicative of the technology

and systems development program, for which the Department of Energy has requested $20.9 million within Safeguards and Security under other defense activities. The committee recommends no funding for these initiatives.

The international safeguards budget request within the Nonproliferation and International Security program contained $15.7 million for International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards and nonproliferation policy support, an increase of $5.8 million from the comparable fiscal year 2003 request, and 6.0 million for nuclear noncompliance verification. The committee believes that greater attention is required to specific proliferant states, such as North Korea, rather than to strengthening safeguards more globally. Consequently, the committee recommends $10.7 million for IAEA safeguards and nonproliferation policy support, a decrease of $5.0 million, and $11.0 million for nuclear noncompliance verification, an increase of $5.0 million.

The budget request contained $14.1 million for International Nuclear Safety and Cooperation. The committee recommends $11.6 million, a decrease of $2.5 million. The committee notes that this program was originally established to address safety deficiencies in Soviet-designed nuclear reactors in states of the former Soviet Union. This effort is now complete, and the committee believes that international cooperation on nuclear safety, specifically in China and elsewhere in Asia, is more appropriately addressed by other federal departments and international agencies using non-defense funding.

The budget request contained $30.0 million for Accelerated Material Disposition (AMD). The committee recommends $5.0 million, a reduction of $25.0 million. The committee questions the cost effectiveness of the proposed program and suggests that NNSA rethink its approach. Under existing agreements between the United States and the Russian Federation, most notably the 1993 Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) Purchase Agreement, the United States Enrichment Corporation will purchase low enriched uranium (LEU) down-blended from 500 metric tons of Russian weapon source HEU for resale as commercial nuclear reactor fuel. Currently, approximately 30 metric tons of HEU is down-blended per year, and the process is monitored under the HEU Transparency Implementation program at a cost to the taxpayer of $18.0 million for fiscal year 2004. The proposed AMD program would increase the present blend-down rate by 1 to 1½ metric tons per year, at best an increase of five percent, at a cost of $25.0 million per year, more than the total cost of the existing program. The committee notes that reaching NNSA's goal of doubling the blend down rate to 60 metric tons of HEU per year would cost approximately $600 million per year by this approach.

The committee also questions NNSA's priorities in requesting additional funds under the Reduced Enrichment for Research and Test Reactors program to accelerate development of LEU fuel for five HEU-fueled research reactors in the United States. The committee considers foreign HEU-fueled research reactors to pose a more significant proliferation threat. The committee notes that the list of potential nonproliferation efforts worthy of some consideration is practically endless, while resources are not. The committee advises NNSA in the strongest terms to develop a strategy for ana-

lyzing the full spectrum of proliferation risks, and a process for assessing the cost versus the benefit of programs proposed to mitigate those risks.

*Increases*

The committee remains concerned about the ability of an aging defense nuclear complex infrastructure to meet increasing requirements associated with four ongoing stockpile life extension programs. The problem is especially acute in the production plants. The committee understands that many years of sustained funding will be required to reduce maintenance backlogs and re-capitalize the complex. The committee makes a number of recommendations. The committee recommends $295.1 million for production support within Directed Stockpile Work, an increase of $17 million to replace aging manufacturing process equipment and support systems at Y–12. The committee recommends $57.2 million for the Stockpile Readiness campaign, an increase of $2.0 million for critical processing, machining, and inspection equipment required for future directed stockpile work at Y–12. The committee recommends a net increase of $16.3 million to operations of facilities within RTBF for a total of $989.1 million, which includes an additional $7.0 million for facilities maintenance and legacy material stewardship at Y–12, an additional $14.3 million for plant maintenance at Pantex, and an additional $15.0 million for plant projects and capital equipment at Pantex.

The budget request contained $582.1 million for Safeguards and Security operations and maintenance. The committee recommends $583.8 million, a net increase of $1.7 million. The committee provides additional funds of $11.7 million for security enhancements at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, including physical security upgrades to facilities for handling and storing special nuclear materials, cyber-security improvements, and security systems maintenance and replacement.

## Advanced Weapons Concepts

The committee notes that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has requested $21.0 million to explore advanced weapons concepts, including $15.0 million to continue feasibility and cost studies for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, and $6.0 million ($2.0 million per design laboratory) for other concept definition studies. The committee further notes that the budget request for these efforts is less than half of one percent of the total request of $6.4 billion for Weapons Activities, a small research and development investment by most standards. The committee believes that NNSA should consider more significant future investment in these activities.

The committee believes that advanced concepts studies serve a number of important purposes. First, the weapons laboratories are the repository for certain skills critical to national security, and although NNSA executes a wide range of technically challenging and sophisticated weapons related activities, there is still no substitute for actually exercising the design process. Second, most weapons designers with real test experience have retired or are eligible for retirement, and there is a time critical requirement for the next generation of scientists and engineers to gain proficiency under the

tutelage of those remaining. Third, nuclear weapons in the hands of potential adversaries pose a grave and proliferating threat to the security of the United States, and in order to avoid technical surprise, NNSA must understand the "art of the possible". Finally, the present Cold War stockpile may not meet future technical requirements for a credible strategic deterrent.

While mindful of proliferation concerns, the committee does not believe that artificial and arbitrary constraints on what weapons designers may or may not consider serve the best interests of the nation. Accordingly, section 3111 would repeal the statutory prohibition on low yield weapon development under section 3136 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160). The committee observes that before any advanced concept enters engineering development (phase 3/6.3), and prototype hardware is fabricated, NNSA requires the formal approval of the Nuclear Weapons Council and a budget authorization from Congress. Regardless of the outcome of legislative action on section 3111, the committee is unaware of restrictions on design work related to weapons with yields in excess of five kilotons, and accordingly recommends that NNSA proceed with its advanced concepts initiative forthwith.

Coordination of Nonproliferation and Threat Reduction Programs

The committee notes that a number of federal departments (primarily the Departments of Defense, Energy, and State) fund and participate in threat reduction and nonproliferation programs. The committee remains concerned about the coordination between these programs. The committee understands that many if not most of these efforts are based on historical relationships and access agreements. The committee observes that merely de-conflicting activities is not equivalent to development of an effective, efficient, integrated program with well defined departmental roles and responsibilities. The committee suggests that the administration designate a lead department, and urges realignment of these efforts according to distinct assigned departmental mission areas.

Management of Stockpile Life Extension Programs

The committee remains concerned that stockpile life extension programs (SLEPs) for the B61, W76, W80, and W87 continue to be managed as loosely coordinated "level-of-effort" activities spread across the defense nuclear complex. Such an approach is more appropriate to research and development than to a production effort with a well defined quantity, schedule, and scope of work. The committee strongly recommends that the SLEPs be "projectized" under strong leadership, and with cost, schedule and performance milestones against which progress can be measured.

The committee report on H.R. 5431, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2003 (H. Rept. 107–681) directs the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to prepare Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) for each SLEP. The committee believes that such planning and budgeting by warhead type will bring some needed discipline to the refurbishment process, and can help form the basis for "projectizing" these efforts. The committee notes that NNSA submitted classified SARs with the fiscal year

2004 budget request, but that those reports are of a transitional nature. The committee urges NNSA to commit to this approach in a timely and prudent manner.

NNSA Management Structure

Reform of the Department of Energy's organizational structure for managing the defense nuclear complex was of particular interest to Congress when it passed title XXXII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65), also known as the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Act. Section 3153 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) required the NNSA Administrator to submit to the Armed Services Committees a plan for assigning roles and responsibilities among headquarters and field elements. The Administrator submitted an interim plan on May 3, 2001 broadly outlining plans for a reorganization of headquarters elements, and provided a plan for reorganization of field elements on February 25, 2002. On December 17, 2002, the Acting Administrator announced implementation guidance for the reorganization, which is expected to be complete by the end of fiscal year 2004 and to eliminate one layer of management. Noting that it has now been over three years since NNSA was formally established, the committee remains concerned that the slow pace continues to prejudice the process against success, but believes that the intended reorganization could provide for more efficient, effective, and accountable management of the complex. The committee encourages NNSA to follow through.

Support for Los Alamos Public Schools

As in previous years, the budget request includes $8.0 million for support of public schools in the vicinity of Los Alamos National Laboratory. The Los Alamos school system is the only one that continues to receive annual assistance from the Department of Energy. Such annual payments ceased at other previously government-owned communities years ago, specifically in 1970 in the case of Richland, Washington, and in 1985 in the case of Oak Ridge, Tennessee. In a May 2002 report submitted to the congressional defense committees pursuant to section 3136 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107), the Secretary of Energy recommended the continuation of annual assistance for another ten years, essentially indefinitely.

The historical record of efforts to achieve self-sufficiency in the Los Alamos public school system and those of surrounding communities includes buy-out proposals, multi-year assistance plans, and endowment by the Department of a not-for-profit educational enrichment foundation. The committee recognizes some of the unique considerations specific to Los Alamos, but has been, and continues to be, disappointed in progress by all parties toward development of a viable exit strategy for the Department. While fully appreciating the recruitment value to the laboratory of an excellent school system, the committee is also sensitive to the fact that, according to recent census data, Los Alamos County already has the fifth highest median household income in the United States.

### Test Readiness

The committee believes the current lead time of nearly three years for resumption of underground nuclear tests does not present a realistic option should the President determine that such tests are necessary. The committee notes the budget request includes $24.9 million for test readiness, $7.0 million above the fiscal year 2003 request, and that the National Nuclear Security Administration intends to move toward an 18 month test readiness posture. The committee observes that test readiness is of special interest to Congress, and section 3142 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) requires the Secretary of Energy to assess and report to Congress on test readiness options ranging from 6 to 24 months. Section 3142 required submission of that report with the fiscal year 2004 budget request. The report is now overdue, and the committee expects a full explanation of the basis for any final decisions regarding options for enhanced test readiness.

## ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

### Overview

The budget request contained $7,734.1 million for environmental and other defense activities. The committee recommends $7,746.6 million, representing an increase of $209.1 million from the amount authorized for fiscal year 2003.

### Adjustments to the Budget Request

*Reductions*

The budget request contained $15.0 million for the Office of Worker and Community Transition. The committee recommends $14.0 million, a reduction of $1.0 million. The committee notes that the request for programmatic funds drops 46 percent from fiscal year 2003, while program direction remains level. The committee recommends a proportional decrease to program direction.

The budget request contained $4.3 million for the Office of Energy Security and Assurance. The committee recommends $3.3 million, a reduction of $1.0 million. Many of the Department of Energy's energy security and assurance functions move to the new Department of Homeland Security. The committee observes that the number of full time equivalent employees is expected to drop from 22 to 8 in fiscal year 2004, while the request for program direction remains the same as that for fiscal year 2003. The committee recommends a proportional decrease.

*Increases*

The budget request contained $1.2 billion for 2006 Accelerated Completions within Defense Site Acceleration Completion. The committee recommends an increase of $9.5 million to accelerate environmental restoration and waste management activities at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), as well as the transfer of newly generated waste operations responsibility from the Office of Environmental Management to the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The committee understands that the

Department of Energy has developed a Performance Management Plan and signed a Letter of Intent with state and federal regulatory agencies to support completion of legacy waste disposal and remediation activities at LLNL by 2006. The committee believes that assumption by NNSA of responsibility for management of the waste stream from ongoing operations at this site will lead to more judicious generation of that waste.

The budget request contained $39.8 million in other defense activities for Department of Energy Intelligence activities. The committee recommends $44.8 million, an increase of $5.0 million, to match fiscal year 2003 funding. The committee urges the Department to maintain the current level of effort particularly in the area of technical nuclear intelligence related to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

### Cleanup Acceleration

The Department of Energy's environmental management (EM) program is responsible for the cleanup of contamination at 114 sites resulting from more than 50 years of research, development, production, and testing of nuclear weapons. In February 2002, the Department completed the "Top-to-Bottom Review" of EM programs directed by the Secretary of Energy. The review found that the EM program emphasized ". . . managing risk rather than actually reducing risk to workers, the public, and the environment".

In the current fiscal year the Department has begun a comprehensive restructuring of the cleanup program. The process includes signing "Letters of Intent" with state and federal regulatory authorities, and the development of Performance Management Plans for each site to detail strategies, milestones and commitments supporting accelerated cleanup. The Department intends to complete revised site project baselines during the current fiscal year based on these Performance Management Plans. The Department projects that for three of the most heavily contaminated sites—Savannah River Site, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, and Hanford—cleanup completion can be accelerated by 20, 35, and 35 years, respectively, and expects to complete all work by 2035.

The committee supports the Department's aggressive schedule to reduce risk to the public and the environment. The committee believes that by moving quickly, where feasible, to reduce the footprint of contaminated sites, substantial cost savings can be realized in the long term.

## ENERGY SUPPLY

The budget request contained $110.5 million for Energy Supply. In fiscal year 2004, Energy Supply is proposed as a multi-function account split between defense (050) and energy (270) functions. Landlord responsibilities for the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL) have passed from the Office of Environmental Management (EM) to the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science, and Technology (NE). The defense funding requested in this account supports continuing national security activities at INEEL. The committee recommends the budget request.

# LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

## SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATIONS

### Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would authorize funds for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2004, including funds for weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, naval reactor programs, and the Office of the Administrator.

### Section 3102—Defense Environmental Management

This section would authorize funds for defense environmental management activities for fiscal year 2004, including funds for defense site acceleration completion and defense environmental services.

### Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize funds for other defense activities for fiscal year 2004.

### Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

This section would authorize funds for defense nuclear waste disposal for fiscal year 2004.

### Section 3105—Energy Supply

This section would authorize funds for defense energy supply programs for fiscal year 2004.

## SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

### Section 3111—Modification of Prohibition Relating to Low-Yield Nuclear Weapons

This section would amend section 3136 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160). The amendment would maintain the prohibition on development of new nuclear weapons with yields less than five kilotons, but would allow research on such weapons, including concept definition studies, feasibility studies, and detailed engineering design. The amendment would allow development for the purpose of assessing low- yield nuclear weapons development by other nations that may pose a national security risk to the United States.

### Section 3112—Termination of Requirement for Annual Updates of Long-Term Plan for Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Life Extension Program

This section would terminate certain annual reporting requirements related to stockpile life extension programs, effective December 31, 2004. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) submitted with the budget request preliminary Selected Acquisition Reports (SAR) for its stockpile life extension programs. The committee understands that NNSA intends to fully commit to the stockpile life extension SARs in fiscal year 2005. Provided that

they show sufficient fidelity, the committee believes that the SARs will provide an appropriate and sufficient substitute for the current reporting requirement.

Section 3113—Extension to All DOE Facilities of Authority to Prohibit Dissemination of Certain Unclassified Information

This section would amend section 148 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (Public Law 83–703) to expand the range of situations under which the Department of Energy could treat information as sensitive unclassified nuclear information, and consequently limit its dissemination.

Section 3114—Department of Energy Project Review Groups Not Subject to Federal Advisory Committee Act by Reason of Inclusion of Employees of Department of Energy Management and Operating Contractors

This section would allow an officer or employee of a management and operating (M&O) contractor of the Department of Energy, when serving on an advisory committee or review group for the Department on matters related to the Department's M&O contracts, to be treated as an officer or employee of the Department for the purposes of determining whether the group is an advisory committee within the meaning of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 United States Code App.).

Section 3115—Availability of Funds

This section would amend the Atomic Energy Defense Act (title XXXVI of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314)) by limiting the availability for obligation to three years for funds authorized to be appropriated to the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) for operation and maintenance or for plant projects. The limitation is consistent with the NNSA Act (title XXXII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65)), which requires planning, programming and budgeting using funds that are available for obligation for a limited number of years. The section would not amend the one year limitation on the availability of funds for obligation for an appropriation pursuant to a Department of Energy national security authorization for program direction.

Section 3116—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for Nuclear Test Readiness Program

This section would prohibit the obligation of more than 40 percent of funds available to the Secretary of Energy in fiscal year 2004 for the nuclear test readiness program until the Secretary submits the report on test readiness posture options required by subsection 3142(c) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314).

Section 3117—Requirement for On-Site Managers

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to appoint a federal employee as an on-site manager before obligation of funds for any defense nuclear nonproliferation program that involves dis-

mantlement, destruction, or storage facilities, or construction of a facility, and that is executed in a state of the former Soviet Union, if the total contribution by the Department of Energy is expected to exceed $25.0 million. The duties of the on-site manager would include development, in cooperation with participating countries, of a list of steps or activities critical to achieving the project's disarmament or nonproliferation goals, and a schedule for completing those steps or activities. The steps and activities would include acquisition of necessary permits, verification of materials, and provision of resources. The on-site manager would have the authority to suspend United States participation in a project if a non-United States participant fails to complete a scheduled activity on time. The Secretary could direct resumption of United States participation in a suspended project with concurrent notification to Congress.

SUBTITLE C—CONSOLIDATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY PROVISIONS

Section 3121—Consolidation and Assembly of Recurring and General Provisions on Department of Energy National Security Programs

The section would assemble together under the Atomic Energy Defense Act (title XXXVI of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314)), without substantive amendment but with technical and conforming amendments, recurring and general provisions of law on Department of Energy national security programs that remain in force. The transfer of a provision of law under this section should not be construed as amending, altering, or otherwise modifying the substantive effect of that provision. The provisions of the Atomic Energy Defense Act, as amended by this section, would be classified to a new chapter of title 50, United States Code.

# TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 3201—Authorization

This section would authorize $19.6 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2004.

# TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 3301—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds

This section would authorize $69.7 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund for the operation and maintenance of the National Defense Stockpile for fiscal year 2004. The provision would also permit the use of additional funds for extraor-

dinary or emergency conditions 45 days after a notification to Congress.

### Section 3302—Revisions to Objectives for Receipts for Fiscal Year 2000 Disposals

This section would authorize increased sales of stockpile materials through the end of fiscal year 2009.

## TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

### LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize $16.5 million for fiscal year 2004 for the operation and maintenance of the Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves.

## TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

### Authorization of Maritime Security Program

The committee conducted a series of hearings during the 107th Congress to examine the operation of the current Maritime Security program as enacted by the 104th Congress in Public Law 104–239. Those hearings examined not only the ability of the current program to meet the sealift requirements of the Department of Defense (DOD), but also the various changes that had occurred in the commercial marketplace since the enactment in 1996. In the 1995 and 1996 time frame, the makeup of the maritime security fleet was one that was largely owned and operated by U.S. citizen companies. Over the span of the next several years, the two largest U.S. flag vessel operators were purchased by foreign corporations. Indeed, of the 10 maritime security program (MSP) contractors now participating in the program, only five still meet the original "section 2" citizenship or documentation/defense contractor requirements for award of a contract under the first priority as set forth in the Maritime Security Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–239). None of the remaining five "section 2" citizen operators, which collectively hold 33 of the 47 current agreements, were even in existence in 1995.

While the transition, at least from a commercial standpoint, appears to have worked reasonably well, concern was expressed by a number of witnesses over the reliability of these foreign controlled carriers to respond to DOD sealift requirements. These same concerns were not expressed by either the Maritime Administration or the United States Transportation Command. However, the committee, in drafting a new maritime security program, has attempted to add mechanisms that will, to the maximum extent possible, improve the likelihood that existing MSP contractors will be responsive to DOD requirements, and at the same time grant "section 2" citizen owners and operators priority in the award of new contracts.

To meet DOD requirements for a better "mix" of ships in the program, the committee is establishing a new program for the construction of five new, U.S. built product tankers that will be capable of carrying jet fuel during a conflict. The committee notes that the Military Sealift Command chartered 26 product tankers for Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. Only one of these tankers was documented under the U.S. flag, the remaining 25 were foreign flag with foreign crews. While the committee recognizes that these five ships will only partially begin to fill the expected void in available tankers, the committee intends to consider expanding this program if it produces the desired results in a cost effective manner. "Section 2" citizens are given a priority for award of financial assistance to construct these vessels as well as a priority for the award of an operating agreement.

The committee has also provided DOD with greater flexibility in selecting vessels to meet its changing sealift needs. The committee has increased the number of available MSP contracts from 47 to 60. It is the committee's intention that these additional contracts be used to address DOD shortfalls in vessel type and capacity. In addition, the Secretary of Defense can waive age requirements to allow a specific vessel, which is otherwise eligible, to obtain an operating agreement. For instance, it is apparent at this point in time, that additional roll-on/roll-off vessels and lighter aboard ships (LASH) as well as product tankers are required. Under the new legislative formulation, the Secretary of Defense is also granted the authority to reject a vessel that is not required under the contingency plans. It is contemplated that this authority will most likely be used as older vessels are phased out of the program. A vessel operator will be given the opportunity to offer an acceptable vessel, but if the vessel operator fails to do so, the "slot" reverts to the open pool and is available to other eligible companies. Slots that are not filled either because a vessel owner or operator fails to offer a ship that is acceptable to DOD, or if a current owner or operator simply chooses not to participate in the new program, revert to the open pool. The committee intends this selection process to be conducted in a reasonably short time frame. These and other provisions are designed to make the new program more responsive to DOD requirements and to inject a greater degree of U.S. citizen participation in the program.

Finally, the committee looked closely at funding for the new program as well as the start up date for the new program. To avoid disruption of current business relationships, the new program does not begin until October 1, 2005. The committee does however provide an earlier effective date only for the purpose of issuing regulations and allowing application process to begin. As noted above, the committee increases the number of available contracts which results in additional costs. Additional funding is also required to support the national defense tanker construction program. While many in the industry also suggested that the initial MSP payment should be greater than the $2.6 million proposed in section 3515 of the new act, the committee believes that additional increases should be phased in over the next several years and should be increased as the administration has additional time to assess its sealift requirements, including the need to address critical and anticipated U.S. citizen mariner shortfalls. Thus, the committee authorizes $2.6 mil-

lion per ship for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 and requires the Department of Transportation, in consultation with the Department of Defense to seek additional appropriations in the out-years based on the operational requirements noted above. The committee believes this is a more reasonable approach than simply including a cost of living formula that may or may not be sufficient to meet the operational requirements over the next ten years.

Obsolete Vessel Disposal

The budget request contained $11.4 million for the disposal of obsolete vessels from the National Defense Reserve Fleet. The committee recommends $20.0 million, an increase of $8.6 million above the budget request. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) required the Maritime Administration to dispose of all vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet that are not otherwise assigned to the Ready Reserve Fleet or otherwise designated for a specific purpose by September 30, 2006. Section 3102 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), established a program to assist states in the reefing of obsolete ships. In that same section, a pilot program was established to allow for the environmentally safe transfer of obsolete vessels to sites outside the United States for disposal. Further, Section 3504 of that same act states that the establishment of these programs does not constitute a preference for the reefing or export of obsolete vessels over other means, such as domestic scrapping. The Maritime Administration has three possible routes for disposal of obsolete vessels and the committee expects the agency to move aggressively to reach the above noted deadlines.

The committee reiterates its support for this position and recognizes that domestic scrapping may be the most competitive and appropriate course of action. The committee expresses its disappointment that the Maritime Administration has not yet obligated the funds appropriated for disposal activities in the last fiscal year, and, while several projects both within and outside the United States are in the final stages of negotiation, only 14 vessels have been scrapped over the last two years. The committee understands that approximately $30 million remains available. This is in addition to the $20.0 million that the committee recommends for this fiscal year. The committee remains concerned that any further delays could result in harm to the marine environment and a potentially more expensive disposal.

With respect to the domestic disposal of obsolete vessels, the committee understands that the Maritime Administration has suspended the use of a private integrator for the management of ship scrapping projects in favor of managing these projects directly. The committee believes that the use of a domestic, private-sector integrator with experience in management of ship scrapping projects for the U.S. government can facilitate the efficient and environmentally sound disposal of these vessels, and in the long term can result in cost savings to the Maritime Administration. The committee directs the Maritime Administration, to the maximum extent possible, to outsource to domestic integrators the management of ship scrapping projects, including: procurement, project over-

sight, environmental and worker safety compliance monitoring, and quality control.

The Congress has provided the Department of Transportation with substantial resources to assure these ships are disposed of quickly and safely. The committee urges the Maritime Administration to make progress quickly in meeting this objective. If it does not do so, the committee will consider taking additional steps to ensure this outcome.

The committee directs the Maritime Administrator to submit a report to Congressional Defense Committees by November 1, 2003 on any specific financial and contractual details of foreign contracts for ship scrapping.

Merchant Mariner Training to Meet Sealift Requirements

Section 1301 of title XIII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1295) declares that it is the policy of the United States that "merchant marine vessels of the United States should be operated by highly trained and efficient citizens of the United States. . ." In furtherance of that policy, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to take the steps necessary to provide for the education and training of citizens of the United States who are capable of providing for the safe and efficient operation of the merchant marine of the United States at all times and as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency. Recent events in the world required the United States to activate over 50 government owned U.S. flag ships that were part of the Ready Reserve Force and the Military Sealift Command Fleet. These ships were crewed by very capable and well trained merchant mariners drawn from the commercial mariner pool. By all accounts, these mariners performed exceptionally well and the United States was able to activate these ships with virtually no problems. However, the committee is concerned that the number of U.S. citizen mariners available for activations of this type will drop dramatically over the next few years. The committee is concerned that additional steps may need to be taken to ensure that the United States has the well qualified mariners, both licensed and unlicensed it needs to crew not only its merchant ships but also the auxiliary ships. The committee is also concerned that we present the young mariners entering the profession with additional training opportunities prior to licensing. In view of these concerns and the potential for serious shortages of trained mariners in the near future, the committee directs the Secretary of Transportation to prepare an assessment that will address the following matters:

(1) The adequacy of current training opportunities available for licensed and unlicensed mariners.

(2) The ability of student mariners to obtain the time at sea to qualify for licensing or documentation.

(3) The number of trained and qualified mariners available to serve on reserve vessels in time of war or national emergency.

(4) An assessment of the number of qualified mariners projected to be available over the next five years.

(5) Any proposals for legislation or administrative steps that the Secretary considers necessary to ensure that the United States maintains an adequate number of capable and well-trained mariners to meet its future commercial and auxiliary requirements.

This assessment shall be submitted to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation and to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than November 1, 2003.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—GENERAL PROVISIONS; MARITIME ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION

#### Section 3501—Short Title

This section would provide that this title may be cited as the "Maritime Security Act of 2003".

#### Section 3502—Definitions

This section would provide definitions for terms used in the Maritime Security Act of 2003.

### SUBTITLE B—MARITIME SECURITY FLEET

#### Section 3511—Establishment of Maritime Security Fleet

This section would establish the types of vessels that are generally eligible to be included in the maritime security fleet. Final determination of eligibility is vested in the Secretary of Defense based on suitability for use by the United States for national defense or military purposes. This section would also establish specific requirements regarding citizenship of vessel owners and charterers.

#### Section 3512—Award of Operating Agreements

This section would establish procedures for applying for an operating agreement under the maritime security program. This section would also establish a priority mechanism for the award of operating agreements under the program based on both citizenship criteria and vessel criteria.

#### Section 3513—Effectiveness of Operating Agreements

This section would provide authority for the Secretary of Transportation to enter into operating agreements beginning in fiscal year 2006. While the agreements are effective for one year, the agreement is renewable subject to the availability of appropriations for each subsequent fiscal year through the end of fiscal year 2015.

#### Section 3514—Obligations and Rights under Operating Agreements

This section would provide that vessels operating in this program are to be operated only in the foreign commerce of the United States and may not otherwise be operated in the coastwise trade. Each vessel covered by an operating agreement is to remain documented under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code, until the date the operating agreement would terminate according to its terms.

Section 3515—Payments

This section would provide that the each vessel covered by an operating agreement shall be paid $2,600,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and such amount for each fiscal year thereafter for which the agreement is in effect as the Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, considers to be necessary to meet operational requirements.

Section 3516—National Security Requirements

This section would require the Secretary of Transportation to establish an Emergency Preparedness Program that is approved by the Secretary of Defense. The section also requires that each contractor enter into an emergency preparedness agreement under that program. This agreement provides that the respective vessel contractor will make available commercial transportation resources including services upon the request of the Secretary of Defense during time of war, national emergency, or contingency operation as that term is defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code. The commercial transportation resources include vessels, or capacity in vessels, intermodal systems and equipment, terminal facilities, intermodal and management services, and other related services. This section would also authorize the contractor to substitute foreign flag replacement vessels if its regular service is disrupted as a result of an activation.

Section 3517—Regulatory Relief

This section would provide that a vessel may operate in the foreign commerce of the United States without the restrictions contained in section 901(b)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1241(b)(1)) concerning the building or documentation of a vessel.

Section 3518—Special Rule Regarding Age of Former Participating Fleet Vessel

This section would waive certain age requirements with respect to vessels, provided that they will be replaced by otherwise eligible vessels within a 30 month period after new operating agreements are entered into.

Section 3519—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would provide an authorization of appropriations for operating agreements in the amount of $156 million for each of fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and such sums as may be necessary, based on operational requirements, for each fiscal year thereafter through fiscal year 2015.

Section 3520—Amendment to Shipping Act, 1916

This section would amend section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 808) to allow a vessel to be registered under a foreign flag provided that the Secretary of Transportation, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, determines that a replacement

vessel is documented under the U.S. flag and is enrolled in an operating agreement under this program.

Section 3521—Regulations

This section would authorize the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Defense to prescribe permanent and interim rules necessary to carry out the Maritime Security Program.

Section 3522—Repeals and Conforming Amendments

This section would repeal the existing maritime security program, effective October 1, 2005.

Section 3523—Effective Dates

This section would establish dates that specific sections of this act would become effective.

SUBTITLE C—NATIONAL DEFENSE TANK VESSEL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE

Section 3531—National Defense Tank Vessel Construction Program

This section would require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a program to provide financial assistance for the construction in the United States of a fleet of five privately owned tank vessels for enrollment in an emergency preparedness agreement.

Section 3532—Application Procedure

This section would establish procedures to obtain competitive proposals for the construction of new tank vessels to meet the commercial and national security needs of the United States. This section would also require the Secretary to give priority consideration to a proposal submitted by a person that is a citizen of the United States under section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 802).

Section 3533—Award of Assistance

This section would allow the Secretary to enter into a contract to provide assistance for the construction of a new tank vessel in the United States in an amount up to 75 percent of the actual construction cost of the vessel, but in no case more than $50 million per vessel. This section also provides that a vessel constructed under this section is not eligible for a certificate of documentation with a coastwise endorsement. A vessel constructed under this section must also enter into an emergency preparedness agreement under this title.

Section 3534—Priority for Title XI Assistance

This section would require the Secretary of Transportation to give priority to guarantees and commitments for new product tank vessels that are otherwise eligible for a guarantee under this section 1103 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App.U.S.C. 1273).

Section 3535—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize appropriations to carry out this subtitle in the amount of $250 million for fiscal years after fiscal year 2004.

SUBTITLE D—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Section 3541—Authorization of Appropriations for Maritime Administration for Fiscal Year 2004

This section would authorize a total of $163.9 million for fiscal year 2004, and increase of $43.6 million above the budget request for the Maritime Administration. Of the funds authorized, $104.4 million would be for operations and training programs, $35 million would be for costs as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (Public Law 93–344), of loan guarantees authorized by title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, (46 App. United States Code 1271 et seq.), $4.5 million would be for administrative expenses related to providing these loan guarantees, and $20 million would be for the disposal of obsolete ships in the National Defense Reserve Fleet.

Section 3542—Authority To Convey Vessel USS Hoist (ARS–40)

This section would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to convey the vessel USS HOIST to the Last Patrol Museum, located in Toledo, Ohio.

## DEPARTMENTAL DATA

The Department of Defense requested legislation, in accordance with the program of the President, as illustrated by the correspondence set out below:

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
*Washington, DC, March 3, 2003.*

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2004.

The purpose of each legislative proposal included in the Bill is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

In the coming weeks, the Department will propose a few additional legislative initiatives for inclusion in the same Bill.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presentation of this Bill for your consideration and the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. HAYNES II, *General Counsel.*

## MILITARY TRANSFORMATION AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
*Washington, DC, April 10, 2003.*

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed Bill, "The Defense Transformation for the 21st Century Act."

Each section of the Bill is accompanied by an explanatory section-by-section analysis.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presentation of this Bill for your consideration and the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. HAYNES II, *General Counsel.*

---

## COMMITTEE POSITION

On May 14, 2003 the Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 1588, as amended, by a vote of 58–2.

## COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, DC, May 15, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for forwarding a copy of proposed language that would take appropriate action to quiet title tracts of land located in the platted subdivision of Falling Waters, Okaloosa County, Florida adjacent to Eglin Air Force Base.

As you know, this land was at one time within the Choctawatchee National Forest that was transferred in 1940 from the control and jurisdiction of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, to the control and jurisdiction of the War Department for military purposes. However, according to the Act, in the event the area transferred within or adjacent to the national forest shall cease to be needed for military purposes, it be restored to a national-forest status.

Aware of the reliance on inaccurate surveys, I have no objection to the inclusion of this language to H.R. 1588, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004", so as to resolve any and all encroachments upon private property by the United States and upon property of the United States by private parties.

I do so with the understanding that this waiver does not waive any future jurisdiction claim over this or similar measures, and re-

serve the right to seek appropriate representation in the event the measure should go to conference to this section.

I greatly appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
*Washington, DC, May 8, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that statutory authority in Title 10, Section 2883 U.S.C. allows the Department of Defense to execute Military Housing Privatization Initiatives [MHPI] up to a limit of $850 million in budget authority. DOD's legislative proposal for fiscal year 2004 would double that limit to $1.7 billion.

The Congressional Budget office has indicated its intent to treat any legislative provision containing an increase in budget authority for MHPI as direct spending. Such treatment would give rise to a point of order under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act.

Should legislation increasing MHPI be reported to the House during fiscal year 2004, it is my intention to direct CBO to treat the MHPI provision as it has in the past, i.e., as if it did not give rise to direct spending. This declaration of intent is, however, contingent upon the following understanding:

- That the increase in budget authority for MHPI in fiscal year 2004 be limited to $50 million, an amount sufficient for DOD to execute its plan through the end of fiscal year 2004;
- That increases in budget authority for MHPI in legislation reported in years after fiscal year 2004 shall be treated as direct spending. Should the Armed Services Committee intend to legislate future increases in budget authority for the program, it should include this information in its annual "Views and Estimates" letter to the Budget Committee. This will enable the Budget Committee to properly consider the matters prior to markup for the Congressional Budget Resolution.

Let me emphasize that the Budget Committee does not intend to hinder DOD's ongoing military housing program. Rather, I want to clarify that for fiscal year 2004, the Committee intends to adopt a one-year transition treatment of MHPI in the budget. In future fiscal years that Budget Committee will work with the Armed Services Committee to ensure that the needs of DOD's military housing program are met, and that such obligations are properly reflected in the budget.

Thank you very much for your attention to this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

JIM NUSSLE, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter concerns the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. H.R. 1588, as ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services, contains several report-related requirements under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Budget.

Recognizing your interest in bringing this legislation before the House expeditiously, the Committee on the Budget agrees not to seek a referral of the bill based on provisions within its jurisdiction. By agreeing not to seek a referral, the Committee on the Budget does not waive its jurisdiction over these provisions or any other provisions of the bill that may fall within its jurisdiction. In addition, the Committee on the Budget reserves its right to seek conferees on any provisions within its jurisdiction which are considered in the House-Senate conference.

Sincerely,

JIM NUSSLE, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUNTER: On May 14, 2003, the Committee on Armed Services ordered reported H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. As you know, section 814 (relating to certain production capabilities for certain critical items), section 907 (relating to the rotating chairmanship of the Economic Adjustment Committee), and section 1206 (relating to check cashing and exchanges of foreign currency) fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

While we continue to have some concerns about section 814, because of your willingness to consult with the Committee on Financial Services regarding all of these provisions, and the need to move this legislation expeditiously, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Financial Services Committee. By agreement to waive its consideration of the bill, the Financial Services Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 1588. In addition, the Committee on Financial Services reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within the Financial Services Committee's jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Financial Services for conferees on H.R. 1588 or related legislation.

I request that you include this letter and your response as part of your committee's report on the bill and the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL G. OXLEY, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2003.*

Hon. MICHAEL OXLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 16, 2003 regarding H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

I agree that the Committee on Financial Services has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Financial Services is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, as you requested, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that on Thursday, May 15, 2003, the Committee on Armed Services ordered favorably reported H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. The bill includes a number of provisions that fall within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations pursuant to Rule X of the House of Representatives.

The specific provisions within our committee's jurisdiction are: (1) Section 1023, Report on Department of Defense Post-Conflict Activities in Iraq; (2) Section 1047, Use of Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Funds to Support Activities of the Government of Colombia; (3) Section 1201, Expansion of Authority to Provide Administrative Support and Services and Travel and Subsistence Expenses for Certain Foreign Liaison Officers; (4) Section 1202, Recognition of Superior Noncombat Achievements or Performance by Members of Friendly Foreign Forces and Other Foreign Nationals; (5) Section 1205, Report on Acquisition by Iraq of Advanced Weapons; (6) Section 1207, Requirements for Transfer to Foreign Countries of Certain Specified Types of Excess Aircraft; (7) Title XIII, Cooperative Threat Reduction; and (8) Section 3121, Transfer and

Consolidation of Recurring and General Provisions on Department of Energy National Security Programs.

Pursuant to Chairman Dreier's announcement that the Committee on Rules will move expeditiously to consider a rule for H.R. 1588, and your desire to have the bill considered on the House floor next week, the Committee on International Relations will not seek a sequential referral of the bill as a result of including these provisions, without waiving or ceding now or in the future this committee's jurisdiction over the provisions in question. I will seek to have conferees appointed for these provisions during any House-Senate conference committee.

I would appreciate your including this letter as a part of the report on H.R. 1588 and as part of the record during consideration of the bill by the House of Representatives.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
*Washington, DC, May 15, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUNTER: In recognition of the desire to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 1588, the Department of Defense authorization bill, the Committee on the Judiciary hereby waives consideration of the bill with the understanding that proposed section 1004 (relating to litigation costs for agencies that receive third party discovery requests), 1042 (relating to the establishment of the Defense Heritage Foundation), 1402 (relating to the sunset for section 204 of the USA Patriot Act), and an unnumbered section (relating to attorneys fees for cases involving pay differentials because of exposure to asbestos) will not be included in the bill. These sections contain matters within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction.

I further understand that proposed sections 1050 (relating to court procedures for FOIA requests for NSA operational files) and 2827 (relating to an exemption from Justice Department screening of a land conveyance in Orange, Texas) will be included in the bill. These sections also contain matters within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction. If these sections are added to the bill, I will not seek a sequential referral based on their inclusion.

The Committee on the Judiciary takes this action with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdiction over these provisions is in no way diminished or altered. I would appreciate your including this letter in your Committee's report on H.R. 1588 and the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Sincerely,

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr., *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2003.*

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 15, 2003 regarding H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

I agree that the Committee on the Judiciary has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Judiciary is not waiving its jurisdiction.

Further, as you requested, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUNTER: Thank you for working with me in your development of H.R. 1588, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004," specifically:

(1) Section 544, "Standardization of Statutory Authorities for Exemptions from Requirement for Access to Secondary Schools by Military Recruiters;"

(2) Section 553, "Eligibility for Dependents of Certain Mobilized Reservists Stationed Overseas to Attend DOD Dependents Schools Overseas;"

(3) Section 567, Impact Aid Eligibility for Heavily Impacted Local Educational Agencies Affected by Privatization of Military Housing;

(4) Section 907, "Repeal of Rotating Chairman of Economic Adjustment Committee;" and

(5) Section 3121, "Transfer and Consolidation of Recurring and General Provisions on Department of Energy National Security Programs."

As you know, these provisions are within the jurisdiction of the Education and the Workforce Committee. While I do not intend to seek sequential referral of H.R. 1588, the Committee does hold an interest in preserving its future jurisdiction with respect to issues raised in the aforementioned provisions and its jurisdictional prerogatives should the provisions of this bill or any Senate amendments thereto be considered in a conference the Senate. We would expect to be appointed as conferees on these provisions should a conference with the Senate arise.

Again, I thank you for working with me in developing the amendments to H.R. 1588 and look forward to working with you on these issues in the future.

Sincerely,

JOHN BOEHNER, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUNTER: On May 14, 2003, the Committee on Armed Services ordered reported H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. As ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services, this legislation contains a number of provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. These provisions include the following:

Section 316 Report regarding impact of civilian community encroachment and certain legal requirements on military installations and ranges.

Section 601 Increase in basic pay for fiscal year 2004.

Section 3113 Extension of all DOE facilities of authority to prohibit dissemination of certain unclassified information.

Section 3121 Transfer and consolidation or recurring and general provisions on Department of Energy national security programs.

Section 3201 Defense Nuclear Safety Board Authorization.

I understand that one provision within my jurisdiction that is in the bill as ordered reported will be deleted in the reported version of H.R. 1588. That provision is section 3116, which deals with the discretion of the Secretary of Energy concerning certain personnel security matters.

Recognizing your interest in bringing this legislation before the House expeditiously, the Committee on Energy and Commerce agrees not to seek a sequential referral of the bill. By agreeing not to seek a sequential referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce does not waive its jurisdiction over these provisions or any other provisions of the bill that may fall within its jurisdiction. In addition, the Committee on Energy and Commerce reserves its right to seek conferees on any provisions within its jurisdiction which are considered in the House-Senate conference, and asks for your support in being accorded such conferees.

I request that you include this letter as part of the report on H.R. 1588 and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

Sincerely,

W.J. "BILLY" TAUZIN, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
*Washington, DC, May 8, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate your willingness to work with me on the 2004 Defense Authorization bill and I value the working relationship that we have built in our cooperation on this bill. I am pleased that the Government Reform Committee was able to favorably report H.R. 1836, Civil Service and National Security Personnel Improvement Act, and H.R. 1837, the Services Acquisition Reform Act of 2003. I look forward to working with you to include this legislation in the 2004 Defense Authorization bill.

You have shared with me a number of additional provisions where the committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Government Reform have a shared jurisdictional interest. I will not seek a sequential referral to the Committee on Government Reform on many of these proposed provisions with the understanding that I am not waiving the committee's prerogative to be represented on any conference that may occur on the 2004 Defense Authorization bill and that you will support the committee's request to have it's representatives appointed to the conference on the appropriate sections. However, I cannot support a few of the provisions that you have shared with me and consequently I cannot commit to not seeking a sequential referral on these few provisions. The following lists detail the provisions that I am willing to waive the right to sequential referral on and those that I am not.

One of proposals that I am willing to waive a sequential referral of is the BioMedical Countermeasures provision. I would like to work with you to explore the possibility of expanding these provisions to provide government-wide applicability.

In addition, I have reviewed the Administration's proposal to eliminate many unnecessary reports, and I support the elimination of reports that no longer serve any legitimate purpose. However, some of the reports provide invaluable insight and transparency into complex acquisition processes. The elimination of these reports would impede the Government Reform Committee in carrying out its mandated oversight role. I have attached a list of the reports that this committee has and continues to find very valuable.

*Committee on Government Reform will waive sequential referral of the following provisons:*

(1) Enhanced Authority for Defense Intelligence Components and Special Operations Command to obtain needed personnel services overseas (amends 10 U.S.C. § 167 and Chapter 21, partial exemption from 5 U.S.C. § 3109).

(2) Department of Energy Project Review Groups not subject to FACA by reason of inclusion of employees of department of energy management and operating contractors (Amends 31 U.S.C., exemptions from 5 U.S.C. § 552, Federal Advisory Committee Act).

(3) Expediting process by which the Secretary of Interior and Agriculture may utilize military aircraft to fight wildfires and for other purposes (H.R. 575, the Wildfire Response Act of 2003, exemption from 31 U.S.C. § 1534).

(4) Authority to provide living quarters for certain students in cooperative education programs of the National Security Agency (Amends 10 U.S.C. § 2195, exemption from 5 U.S.C. § 5911).

(5) Authority to Convey Property at Military Installations in Exchange for Military Construction Activities (Amends 10 U.S.C. Chapter 169).

(6) Research and Development of Defense Biomedical Countermeasures, Procurement of Defense Biomedical Countermeasures, and Authorization for Use of Medical Products in Emergencies.

(7) Section 403: Reassignment of Retired Members of the Armed Forces to Positions in the Department of Defense (Repeals 5 U.S.C. § 3326).

(8) Amends reporting requirements under 10 U.S.C. § 2410m regarding retention of amounts collected from contractor during the pendency of contract dispute.

(9) Land Conveyance, Naval Reserve Center, Orange, Texas (Amends 10 U.S.C. §§ 2693 and 2696, partial exemption from the Federal Property Act and Administrative Services Act of 1949).

(10) Projects to Accelerate Closure Activities at Defense Nuclear Facilities (Amends Section 3143 of Public Law 104–201).

(11) Authority for Appointment of Certain Scientific, Engineering and Technical Personnel by the Secretary of Energy.

*Committee on Government Reform will not waive sequential referral of the following provisions:*

(1) Requirement for Restoration Advisory Boards and Exemption From Federal Advisory Committee Act (Amends Title 10, Section 2709, exemption from 5 U.S.C. § 552).

(2) Protection of operational files of the National Security Agency (Amends Title I of the National Security Act of 1947, partial exemption from 5 § 552, the Freedom of Information Act).

(3) Section 103: Priority Placement of Displaced Civilian Employees (Amends 10 U.S.C. Chapter 81, exemptions from 5 U.S.C.).

(4) Employee Incentives for Workers at Closure Project Facilities (Amends 5 U.S.C. §§ 5754 and 8905).

I thank you for your attention to these matters. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me or Ellen Brown, my Legislative Director and Senior Policy Counsel.

Sincerely,

TOM DAVIS, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
*Washington, DC, May 13, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to follow-up on my letter of May 8, 2003 regarding committee jurisdiction of provisions included in H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. In that letter, I indicated that I would seek a sequential referral of H.R. 1588 to the Committee on Government Reform if the following provisions were included in the reported bill:

—Protection of operational files of the National Security Agency (Amends Title I of the National Security Act of 1947, partial exemption from 5 U.S.C. §552, the Freedom of Information Act).

—Employee Incentives for Workers At Closure Project Facilities (Amends 5 U.S.C. §§ 5754 and 8905).

Due to the additional information your staff has provided me, I am now satisfied that the inclusion of these provisions in H.R. 1588 is appropriate, and I will not seek a sequential referral of these provisions. In addition, I am now satisfied that Section 3121, "Transfer and Consolidation of Recurring and General Provisions on Department of Energy National Security Programs" is not substantive and I will not seek a sequential referral of H.R. 1588 due to the transfer of these provisions to a new chapter of title 50 of the United States Code. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me or Ellen B. Brown, my Legislative Director and Senior Policy Counsel.

Sincerely,

TOM DAVIS, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
*Washington, DC, May 13, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing with regard to H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. Last week, the Committee on Government Reform ordered reported H.R. 1836, Civil Service and National Security Personnel Improvement Act, and H.R. 1837, the Services Acquisition Reform Act of 2003. I have worked with you to include the provisions of H.R. 1836 and H.R. 1837 in this year's National Defense Authorization Act.

I appreciate your willingness to work with me on these provisions that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Reform. I will not seek a sequential referral of H.R. 1588 based on the inclusion of any provision from H.R. 1836 or H.R. 1837, as ordered reported. Also, I will not seek a sequential referral of H.R. 1588 due to technical and clarifying changes to section 102 of H.R. 1836 relating to the new subsection 5 U.S.C. § 9902(j). Should there be any changes beyond these reported bills and other agreed upon provisions, I will request that H.R. 1588 is referred sequentially to the Committee on Government Reform for its consideration.

If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me or Ellen B. Brown, my Legislative Director and Senior Policy Counsel.

Sincerely,

TOM DAVIS, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
*Washington, DC, May 2, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform the Committee on Armed Services that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs hereby waives any jurisdiction it may have over the provisions of section 1021 of Title X of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal

Year 2004 regarding the repeal of report requirements for Joint Telemedicine and Telepharmacy Demonstration Projects and for Educational Assistance for Members of the Select Reserve, has no objection to them and does not desire their referral. Copies of these provisions are enclosed.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
*Washington, DC, May 12, 2002.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform the Committee on Armed Services that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs hereby waives referral of a measure which includes language identical to that contained in H.R. 1911, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance cooperation and the sharing of resources between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense. Our Committee plans to report H.R. 1911 with a favorable recommendation, and supports its inclusion in the Fiscal Year 2004 Defense Authorization bill which the Committee on Armed Services plans to report.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Congratulations on your successful 21–hour markup of H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. You should be commended for your leadership in marshaling this important legislation through your committee.

I have reviewed the following provisions that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Resources:

Section 317, Military Readiness and Conservation of Protected Species.

Section 318, Military Readiness and Marine Mammal Protection.

Section 319, Limitation on Department of Defense Responsibility for Civilian Water Consumption Impacts Related to Fort Huachuca, Arizona.

Section 601, Increase in Basic Pay for Fiscal Year 2004 (as it relates to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Corps).

Because of the continued cooperation and consideration you have afforded me and my staff in developing these provisions, I will not seek a sequential referral of H.R. 1588 based on their inclusion in the bill. Of course, this waiver does not prejudice any future jurisdictional claims over these provisions or similar language. I also reserve the right to seek to have conferees named from the Committee on Resources on these provisions, should a conference on H.R. 1588 or a similar measure become necessary.

Once again, it has been a pleasure to work with you, Rusty Johnston and Virginia Johnson of your staff. I look forward to seeing H.R. 1588 enacted soon.

Sincerely,

RICHARD W. POMBO, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
*Washington, DC, May 15, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that the Armed Services Committee has requested that the Committee on Science waive its right to a referral on several sections of H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. It is also my understanding that the Parliamentarian's office has confirmed that the Science Committee has jurisdiction over several provisions in H.R. 1588.

To expedite the consideration of this bill by the House, the Committee is willing to waive its right to a referral, provided that the Science Committee's right to participate as conferees on those provisions within its jurisdiction is also protected. I would also appreciate if this exchange of letters could be included in the record of debate on H.R. 1588 during floor consideration.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUNTER: On May 14, 2003, the Committee on Armed Services ordered reported H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. The provisions of Section

804 ("Limitation Period on Task and Delivery Order Contracts"), Section 806 ("Evaluation of the Prompt Payment Provisions"), and Section 1428 ("Improvements In Contracting For Architectural and Engineering Services") refer to small businesses or the Small Business Act and, therefore, fall directly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Small Business pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Section 812 ("Identification of Critical Items: Military Systems Breakout List") is closely allied to the "Breakout Program" contained in the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C section 644). Also, since small businesses comprise the vast majority of our defense industrial base, Section 811 ("Assessment of United States Defense Industrial Base Capabilities") of H.R. 1588 is of great interest to the Committee on Small Business as is Section 1452 ("Authority to Make Inflation Adjustments to Simplified Acquisition Threshold").

I appreciate your willingness to consult and work with the Committee on Small Business regarding these provisions and other provisions of H.R. 1588 that impact small businesses, this nation's defense industrial base, and the economy. Because of the need to move this legislation expeditiously, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Committee on Small Business. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Committee on Small Business does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 1588. In addition, the Committee on Small Business reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within the Committee on Small Business's jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Small Business for conferees on H.R. 1588 or related legislation.

I request that you include this letter and your response as part of your committee's report on the bill and the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your kind attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

DONALD A. MANZULLO, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2003.*

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in matters being considered in H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1588 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over a number of provisions of the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, that every effort will be made to in-

clude any agreements worked out by staff of our two Committees in amendments as the bill is taken to the House Floor, and that a copy of this letter and of your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG, *Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, May 16, 2003.*

Hon. Don Young,
*Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 16, 2003 regarding H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, as you requested, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

## FISCAL DATA

Pursuant to clause 3(d) rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee attempted to ascertain annual outlays resulting from the bill during fiscal year 2003 and the following four years. The results of such efforts are reflected in the cost estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which is included in this report pursuant to clause 3(c)(3).

### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE

In compliance with clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office and submitted pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is as follows:

MAY 16, 2003.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

The CBO staff contact is Kent Christensen. If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS HOLTZ-EAKIN,
*Director.*

Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate

Summary: H.R. 1588 would authorize appropriations totaling $398 billion for fiscal year 2004 for the military functions of the Department of Defense (DoD) and the Department of Energy (DOE). It also would authorize an additional $0.7 billion over the 2005–2008 period for the Maritime Administration. In addition, the bill would prescribe personnel strengths for each active-duty and selected reserve component of the U.S. armed forces. CBO estimates that appropriation of the authorized amounts would result in additional outlays of $394.1 billion over the 2004–2008 period.

The bill also contains provisions that would both increase and decrease costs of discretionary defense programs over the 2005–2008 period. CBO estimates that those provisions combined would reduce the requirements for discretionary spending by about $850 million over those four years, assuming that net appropriations are reduced by the estimated amounts.

The bill contains provisions that would increase direct spending, primarily from increasing the amount that DoD can spend to finance special authorities for the construction and renovation of military family housing. We estimate that the increase in direct spending resulting from provisions of H.R. 1588 would total $420 million over the 2004–2008 period and $466 million over the 2004–2013 period. Those totals include estimated net receipts from asset sales of $20 million over the 2004–2005 period.

H.R. 1588 contains an intergovernmental mandate as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). However, CBO estimates that any costs to state, local, or tribal governments from the mandate would be insignificant and would not, therefore, exceed the threshold established in UMRA for such mandates ($59 million in 2003, adjusted for inflation). The bill would impose no private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 1588 is shown in Table 1. Most of the costs of this legislation fall within budget function 050 (national defense).

TABLE 1.—BUDGETARY IMPACT OF H.R. 1588, THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

| | By fiscal year, in millions of dollars— | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION | | | | | | |
| Spending Under Current Law for Defense Programs: | | | | | | |
| Budget Authority [1] | 453,197 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Outlays | 419,249 | 150,324 | 45,599 | 13,941 | 5,593 | 2,702 |
| Proposed Changes: | | | | | | |
| Estimated Authorization Levels | 0 | 398,081 | 5 | 411 | 161 | 166 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | 267,452 | 89,160 | 26,747 | 7,743 | 3,031 |
| Spending Under H.R. 1588 for Defense Programs: | | | | | | |
| Estimated Authorization Levels [2] | 453,197 | 398,081 | 5 | 411 | 161 | 166 |
| Estimated Outlays | 419,249 | 417,776 | 134,759 | 40,688 | 13,336 | 5,733 |
| CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING (EXCLUDING ASSET SALES) | | | | | | |
| Estimated Budget Authority | 0 | 171 | 296 | 6 | 7 | 2 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | 23 | 99 | 169 | 104 | 45 |
| ASSET SALES [2] | | | | | | |
| Estimated Budget Authority | 0 | −15 | −5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | −15 | −5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

For 2004–2008, the figures under "Proposed Changes" include amounts specifically authorized by the bill plus an inferred authorization in 2004 for the Coast Guard Reserve based on authorized endstrength levels. The bill also implicitly authorizes programs in 2005–2008; those authorizations are not included above (but are shown in Table 3) because funding for those programs would be covered by specific authorizations in future years.

The 2003 level is the amount appropriated for programs authorized by the bill (including $62,808 million in appropriations in Public Law 108–11, the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003).

Asset sale receipts are a credit against direct spending.

## *Basis of Estimate*

*Spending Subject to Appropriation.* The bill would specifically authorize appropriations totaling $398.0 billion in 2004 (see Table 2). Most of those costs would fall within budget function 050 (national defense). Other costs—some occurring beyond 2004—would fall within other budget functions; they include: $65 million in 2004 for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (function 600—income security); $17 million in 2004 for the Naval Petroleum Reserves (function 270—energy); $5 million annually from 2004 to 2008 for the Sikes Act (both function 300—natural resources and environment, and function 050—national defense); and a host of authorizations for the Maritime Administration (both function 400—transportation, and function 050—national defense). Authorizations for the Maritime Administration are discussed later in the estimate, just before the section on direct spending. The estimate assumes that the amounts authorized for 2004 will be appropriated before the start of fiscal year 2004. Outlays are estimated based on historical spending patterns.

For 2003, the bill authorizes the appropriation of the $62.8 billion in supplemental funding for DoD and DOE as provided in Public Law 108–11, the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003, plus other supplemental appropriations that may be necessary before the end of the year. Because the wartime supplemental funding has been enacted into law, Table 1 includes those appropriations in the figures for "Spending Under Current Law." Since DoD has recently stated that under current circumstances it does not anticipate needing further supplemental funding for 2003, this estimate assumes no such appropriations will be enacted for the remainder of this fiscal year.

The bill is silent regarding additional appropriations for 2004 that DoD indicates will be required to fund ongoing operations relating to Iraq and the global war on terrorism. CBO expects that those amounts, which would be additions to appropriations authorized by the bill, will likely be provided in supplemental appropriations enacted during 2004.

| Category | By fiscal year, in millions of dollars— | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Military Personnel: | | | | | |
| Authorization Level | 98,939 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Outlays | 94,261 | 3,958 | 198 | 99 | 0 |
| Operation and Maintenance: | | | | | |
| Authorization Level | 130,324 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Outlays | 99,603 | 24,895 | 3,779 | 1,058 | 331 |
| Procurement: | | | | | |
| Authorization Level | 76,490 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Outlays | 22,726 | 28,966 | 15,209 | 4,900 | 1,899 |
| Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation: | | | | | |
| Authorization Level | 62,686 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Outlays | 33,755 | 22,909 | 4,711 | 759 | 197 |
| Military Construction and Family Housing: | | | | | |
| Authorization Level | 9,790 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Outlays | 2,615 | 3,545 | 2,000 | 823 | 407 |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities: | | | | | |
| Authorization Level | 16,699 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Outlays | 11,493 | 4,341 | 863 | 2 | 0 |
| Other Accounts: | | | | | |
| Authorization Level | 3,033 | 5 | 411 | 161 | 166 |
| Estimated Outlays | 2,016 | 722 | 362 | 290 | 260 |
| General Transfer Authority: | | | | | |
| Authorization Level | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Outlays | 875 | −188 | −375 | −188 | −63 |
| Total: | | | | | |
| Authorization Levels [1] | 397,961 | 5 | 411 | 161 | 166 |
| Estimated Outlays | 267,344 | 89,148 | 26,747 | 7,743 | 3,031 |

After adding the $120 million estimated authorization for the Coast Guard Reserve, the bill would authorize appropriations of slightly less than $398.1 billion for 2004.

These amounts comprise nearly all of the proposed changes for authorizations of appropriations for 2004 shown in Table 1; they do not include the estimated authorization of $120 million for the Coast Guard Reserve, which is shown in Table 3. For 2005–2008 they include various authorizations for the Maritime Administration discussed later in the estimate and shown in Table 4, plus $5 million in annual authorizations for the Sikes Act.

The bill also contains provisions that would both increase and decrease various costs, mostly for personnel, that would be covered by the fiscal year 2004 authorization and by authorizations in future years. Table 3 contains estimates of those amounts. In addition to the costs covered by the authorizations in the bill for 2004, CBO estimates that these combined provisions would reduce estimated costs by $850 million over the 2005–2008 period. These amounts do not include the costs of sections 541, 617, 618, 908, 1031, 1032, 1038, or 1111 because CBO cannot estimate the costs at this time. Those sections of the bill pertain primarily to military and civilian pay and benefits. The provisions identified in Table 3 are described below, including information about CBO's estimates of costs for those provisions.

*Multiyear procurement*

In most cases, purchases of weapon systems are authorized annually, and as a result, DoD negotiates a separate contract for each annual purchase. In a small number of cases, the law permits multiyear procurement; that is, it allows DoD to enter into a con-

tract to buy specified annual quantities of a system for up to five years. In those cases, DoD can negotiate lower prices because its commitment to purchase the weapons gives the contractor an incentive to find more economical ways to manufacture the weapon, including cost-saving investments. Annual funding is provided for these multiyear contracts, but potential termination costs are covered by an initial appropriation.

Section 121 would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear contract to purchase 234 F/A–18 aircraft beginning in 2005 in the F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G configurations. Based on information provided by the Navy, CBO assumes that the Navy would procure 168 aircraft over the 2005–2008 period. CBO estimates that savings from buying these aircraft under a multiyear contract would total $818 million, or about $204 million a year, over the 2005–2008 period. Funding requirements to purchase these aircraft would total just under $12.9 billion over the 2005–2008 period (instead of the $13.7 billion that would be needed under annual contracts). CBO also estimates that additional savings of $235 million would accrue in 2009 if the Navy completes its planned purchase of 42 more aircraft under this multiyear procurement authority.

Section 122 would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear contract to purchase tactical Tomahawk cruise missiles starting in fiscal year 2004 and would direct the Secretary to purchase no more than 900 missiles a year. Based on information provided by the Navy, CBO assumes that the Navy would buy 1,784 missiles over the 2004–2008 period. CBO estimates that savings from buying these missiles under a multiyear contract would total about $135 million over the 2004–2008 period, or about $75,000 a missile. Funding requirements to purchase these missiles would total just over $1.6 billion over the 2004–2008 period (instead of the almost $1.8 billion that would be needed under annual contracts). Multiyear procurement of tactical Tomahawk missiles would raise costs in 2004 because the Navy would need to provide for advance purchases of components for missiles it would purchase later in the 2004–2008 period.

TABLE 3.—ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SELECTED PROVISIONS IN H.R. 1588

| Category | By fiscal year, in millions of dollars | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT | | | | | |
| F/A–18E/F Aircraft | 0 | −166 | −205 | −211 | −236 |
| Tactical Tomahawk Missile | 3 | −40 | −43 | −32 | −23 |
| Virginia Class Submarines | 275 | 210 | −64 | −613 | −613 |
| E–2C and TE–2C Aircraft and Engines | −62 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| FORCE STRUCTURE | | | | | |
| DoD Military Endstrengths | 248 | 510 | 527 | 544 | 562 |
| Coast Guard Reserve Endstrength | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Required Force Structure | 20 | 268 | 269 | 340 | 281 |
| COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS (DoD) | | | | | |
| Military Pay Raises | 190 | 269 | 279 | 288 | 298 |
| Coast Guard Pay Raises | 6 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Expiring Bonuses and Allowances | 624 | 550 | 327 | 217 | 151 |
| Special Pays for Service in Iraq and Afghanistan | 263 | 112 | 81 | 81 | 57 |
| Lodging Expenses for Reservists | 132 | 13 | 10 | 7 | 5 |

TABLE 3.—ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SELECTED PROVISIONS IN H.R. 1588—Continued

| Category | By fiscal year, in millions of dollars | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Undermanned Occupation Bonus | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Provisions | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| CIVILIAN PROGRAMS | | | | | |
| Reduce Acquisition Workforce | −70 | −479 | −911 | −1,367 | −2,110 |
| Modification of Overtime Pay Cap | 107 | 147 | 151 | 156 | 161 |
| Senior Executive Service Pay | 23 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 |
| Administration of Flexible Spending Accounts | 22 | 28 | 33 | 39 | 44 |
| Asbestos Differential Pay | −290 | −290 | −290 | −290 | −290 |
| DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM | | | | | |
| Uniformed Services Medicare Eligible Retiree Healthcare Fund | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| OTHER PROVISIONS | | | | | |
| Base Realignment and Closure Property | 68 | 53 | 27 | 27 | 27 |
| Expanded Commissary Benefits for Reservists | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Assistance for Victims of Domestic Abuse | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Chaplain-Led Programs | 3 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Construct Wetlands Crossings at Camp Shelby | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Services Acquisition Reform | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| BILL TOTAL | | | | | |
| Estimated Authorization Level [1] | 1,713 | 1,266 | 256 | −747 | −1,621 |

For every item in this table except the authorization for the Coast Guard Reserve, the 2004 levels are included in Table 2 as amounts specifically authorized to be appropriated in the bill. Amounts shown in this table for 2005 through 2008 are not included in Table 1.

These amounts do not include the costs of sections 541, 617, 618, 908, 1031–1033, or 1111 because CBO cannot estimate such costs at this time.

Section 123 would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear contract for procurement of Virginia class submarines starting in fiscal year 2004. Based on information provided by the Navy, CBO assumes that the Navy would buy seven submarines over the 2004–2008 period. CBO estimates that savings from buying these submarines under a multiyear contract would total $805 million, or about $115 million a submarine, over the 2004–2008 period. CBO estimates that funding requirements to purchase these submarines, as well as funding the advance purchase of components for future boats, would total about $15.4 billion over the 2004–2008 period (instead of the $16.2 billion that would be needed under annual contracts). Multiyear procurement of Virginia class submarines would raise costs in 2004 and 2005 because the Navy would need to provide increased funding in each of those years for advance purchases of components for the submarines that it would purchase later in the 2004–2008 period.

Section 124 would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a four-year multiyear contract to purchase four E–2C aircraft, four TE–2C aircraft, and 16 engines for these aircraft, beginning in 2004. CBO estimates that savings from buying these aircraft and engines under a multiyear contract would total almost $60 million, or about $15 million a year, over the 2004–2007 period. Funding requirements would total just over $950 million over the 2004–2007 period (instead of the roughly $1 billion that would be needed under annual contracts).

*Military endstrength*

The bill would authorize active and reserve endstrength levels for 2004 and would increase the minimum endstrength authoriza-

tion in permanent law. The authorized endstrengths for active-duty personnel and personnel in the selected reserve would total about 1,400,000 and 863,000, respectively. Of those selected reservists, about 70,000 would serve on active duty in support of the reserves. The bill would specifically authorize appropriations of $98.9 billion for the discretionary costs of military pay and allowances in 2004. The authorized endstrength represents a net increase of 3,385 servicemembers that would boost costs for salaries and other expenses by $248 million in the first year and about $535 million annually in subsequent years, compared to the authorized strengths for 2003.

The bill also would authorize an endstrength of 10,000 servicemembers in 2004 for the Coast Guard Reserve. This authorization would cost about $120 million and would fall under budget function 400 (transportation).

*Required force structure*

Section 911 would require that the Army, Navy, and Air Force maintain a certain force structure. It would specifically direct the Navy to have not less than 305 vessels in active service. The current Navy fleet consists of about 300 ships, but the Navy plans to reduce that amount to 292 ships in 2004 after retiring several surface combatants including Spruance-class destroyers and Ticonderoga-class cruisers. This provision would require the Navy to keep those ships in the fleet for several more years until new ships that are under construction arrive to replace them. Based on information from the Navy, CBO estimates that implementing this provision would require the Navy to keep nine destroyers, two cruisers, and two landing ship docks in the fleet over much of the 2004–2008 period instead of retiring them. CBO estimates that the operations and maintenance costs to keep these ships in the fleet would total about $1.1 billion over the 2005–2008 period. There would be no costs in 2004 because CBO estimates the operating costs would be offset by the savings from forgoing the decommissioning of these ships.

Section 911 also would require the Air Force to maintain 46 fighter squadrons in its active force. Currently, the Air Force has 45 active squadrons. It plans to add one squadron of F/A–22 aircraft in 2004 and retire one squadron of A–10 aircraft, sustaining a force of 45 squadrons. CBO assumes that the Air Force would retain the A–10 squadron over the 2004–2008 period to meet the bill's requirement to maintain 46 active squadrons. CBO estimates that the cost to keep the A–10 squadron in active service would be about $100 million over the 2004–2008 period.

*Compensation and Benefits.* H.R. 1588 contains several provisions that would affect military compensation and benefits for uniformed personnel.

*Military Pay Raises.* Section 601 would raise basic pay for individuals in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force with specific ranks and years of service by 2 percent across-the-board, and would authorize additional targeted pay raises for 2004, ranging from 1.2 percent to 4.25 percent for 2004. CBO estimates that implementing this provision would cost about $2.1 billion in 2004. Because the pay raises would be above those projected under current law, CBO estimates that the incremental costs associated with the

larger pay raise would be about $190 million in 2004 and total $1.3 billion over the 2004–2008 period.

This section also would raise basic pay for members of the Coast Guard by the same across-the-board and targeted pay rates for a total cost of $60 million in 2004. Because these pay raises also would be above those projected under current law, CBO estimates that the incremental costs associated with the larger pay raises would be about $6 million in 2004 and $41 million over the 2004–2008 period.

*Expiring Bonuses and Allowances.* Several sections of H.R. 1588 would extend DoD's authority to pay certain bonuses and allowances to current personnel. Under current law, most of these authorities are scheduled to expire in December 2003, or three months into fiscal year 2004. The bill would extend these authorities through December 2004. Based on data provided by DoD, CBO estimates that the costs of these extensions would be as follows:

- Payment of reenlistment bonuses for active-duty personnel would cost $305 million in 2004 and $171 million in 2005; enlistment bonuses for active-duty personnel would cost $113 million in 2004 and $163 million in 2005;
- Various bonuses for the Selected and Ready Reserve would cost $78 million in 2004 and $89 million in 2005;
- Special payments for aviators and nuclear-qualified personnel would cost $73 million in 2004 and $78 million in 2005;
- Retention bonuses for officers and enlisted members with critical skills would cost $14 million in 2004 and $9 million in 2005; and
- Authorities to make special payments and give bonuses to certain health care professionals would cost $41 million in 2004 and $40 million in 2005.

Most of these changes would result in additional, smaller costs in subsequent years because payments are made in installments.

*Special Payments for Service in Iraq and Afghanistan.* Section 622 would increase certain special payments to servicemembers who serve in a combat zone designated for Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom effective October 1, 2003. (Public Law 108–11 raised these payments for fiscal year 2003 but that authority expires at the end of the fiscal year.) Under current law, the rates for imminent danger pay and the family separation allowance are set at $150 per month and $100 per month, respectively, for fiscal year 2004 and subsequent years. Section 622 would increase those respective rates to $225 per month and $250 per month for those servicemembers serving in the designated combat zones until the President calls an end to the operations. Based on information from DoD about current troop levels in those two areas and CBO assumptions about future troop levels, CBO estimates that implementing this section would cost $263 million in 2004 and $594 million over the 2004–2008 period. Should the President change the name of these operations to reflect a change in mission, CBO expects that the costs would be less than the estimated amounts because the provision would only apply to the operations so named.

*Lodging Expenses for Reservists.* Under current law, a member of the Reserve Components who is called to active duty is eligible for lodging per diem if he or she is assigned to duty away from home.

The member is not eligible for lodging per diem while on leave, however. Section 633 would allow DoD to reimburse a reservist called to active duty for lodging expenses incurred while on leave. This section also would apply retroactively to reservists who served on active duty away from home between September 11, 2001, and the date of enactment of the bill.

Since September 11, 2001, over 300,000 reservists have been called to active duty according to DoD. CBO assumes that 90,000 reservists will be on active duty in 2004 and that the number will decline to about 15,000 reservists by 2008, assuming no hostilities occur elsewhere in the world. Based on data from DoD, CBO assumes that about 50 percent of these reservists on active duty are away from home and receive an average lodging per diem of $55 a day. With an average tour length of one year and one leave day a month, CBO estimates that implementing this section would cost $132 million in 2004 and $167 million over the 2004–2008 period. Of these amounts, about $100 million would be paid to qualified reservists who were called up before this bill is enacted.

*Undermanned Occupation Bonus.* Section 621 would give DoD the authority to offer an incentive bonus of up to $4,000 to encourage certain enlisted members to convert from their current occupational specialty to an occupational specialty where there is a critical shortage of personnel. The new authority would expire on December 31, 2004. According to DoD, the Navy is the only service with the immediate intention to offer this bonus. The Navy plans to scale the amount of the bonus to the degree that an occupational speciality is critically short of personnel. In other words, the Navy would offer a smaller bonus to servicemembers who convert to occupational specialties where there is less of a critical shortage in personnel. Given the number of occupation conversions experienced in previous years, the Navy estimates that about 2,500 enlisted servicemembers would receive this bonus in 2004. Assuming the average bonus is $3,000, CBO estimates that implementing this section would cost $8 million in 2004 and $2 million in 2005.

*Other Provisions.* Section 620 would authorize DoD to grant special pay of $150 a month to servicemembers who are assigned to duty as members of Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams. Section 615 would give reservists the same full monthly hazardous duty pay for performing demolition duty or parachute jumping that active-duty servicemembers receive. Section 534 would give DoD the authority to pay the interest on student loans for reservists with critical skills. Section 535 would allow students in the second year of a four-year Senior Reserve Officer Training Course to receive a monthly stipend. CBO estimates the cost of these increased authorities would total $5 million in 2004 and $29 million over the 2004–2008 period.

Section 541 would change the payment amount that servicemembers who are deployed away from their home base receive if they are gone more than 400 days out of a two-year period and add two additional categories of eligibility for this payment—deployment over 190 consecutive days and call up to active duty for the second time for the same contingency operation. Section 617 would expand to officers an incentive program which encourages enlisted servicemembers to extend the length of their overseas assignments. Section 618 would allow DoD to offer this bonus of up

to $60,000 to newly appointed officers with critical skills. CBO cannot estimate the budgetary impact of implementing these provisions, however, since DoD is unable to provide information about how the department would implement these provisions.

*National Security Personnel System*

Section 1111 would create a new human resources management system for DoD; would allow DoD to give certain employees outside the United States the same pay and benefits as the Foreign Service or Central Intelligence Agency; would require DoD, to the maximum extent practicable, adjust rates of compensation for civilian employees at the same rate as military personnel; and would allow DoD to provide additional pay to attract highly qualified experts. All of these authorities could potentially affect federal spending.

CBO cannot estimate the budgetary impact of implementing these provisions since DoD has not indicated how it would supplant—or improve upon—the personnel system currently governing the department; how many employees would benefit from receiving the same pay and benefits as the Foreign Service or Central Intelligence Agency as the number is classified; whether or how it might institute pay parity between its civilian employees and military members; or how many people it might hire under the authority to provide additional pay to attract highly qualified experts.

Section 908 would require DoD to conduct a pilot program using an automated workforce management system to manage its civilian personnel. CBO cannot estimate the budgetary impact of implementing this provision since DoD has not indicated what automated system it would use nor indicated what it might cost to acquire this system.

*Defense acquisition workforce reductions*

Section 910 would direct DoD to reduce the number of defense acquisition and support personnel within the department by 5 percent each fiscal year over the 2004–2007 period. These reductions would be measured against a baseline workforce defined as the number of defense acquisition and support personnel employed by the department as of October 1, 2003. Based on data from DoD, CBO assumes that the baseline workforce would total about 131,000 personnel on that date and that about 20 percent of that number would be military personnel who would be reassigned to other jobs within the department over the 2004–2008 period. Thus, under the provision, CBO estimates that about 5,300 civilians would need to be cut from the defense acquisition workforce each year. Assuming that these reductions would occur evenly throughout the year and that the average cost of a civilian employee within DoD would be about $77,000 in 2004, CBO estimates that the savings in salaries and benefits that would accrue from this reduction would total about $200 million in 2004 and $5.5 billion over the 2004–2008 period. If DoD chose to replace these workers with contract personnel, these savings would not be realized.

Those potential savings would be offset somewhat by the cost of severance packages that DoD would offer. Based on historical attrition data provided by DoD for its civilian workforce, CBO assumes that about 1 percent of this population would leave the acquisition workforce each year for reasons unrelated to the mandated reduc-

tions and would not be replaced. CBO assumes that the remaining 5,200 workers that must leave DoD each year would be offered severance packages of about $25,000 each, for a total cost of about $130 million each year or $520 million over the 2004–2007 period. Thus, CBO estimates that the net savings under this provisions would total about $70 million in 2004 and almost $5 billion over the 2004–2008 period.

*Modification of the overtime pay cap*

Under current law, overtime pay for work in excess of 40 hours per week for federal managers, supervisors, and other employees exempted under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) is limited to a set rate of roughly $32 an hour (one and a half times the normal rate for a general schedule (GS) grade 10 (GS–10), step 1, employee). Employees who earn salaries above GS–12, step 5, receive overtime pay at a rate that is, on an hourly basis, less than their regular pay.

Section 1101 would raise the overtime pay rate to either one and one-half times the hourly rate of a GS–10, step 1, or the hourly rate of the basic pay of the employee, whichever is greater. Although this change would not affect employees at GS–12, step 5, and lower, those above this pay rate would earn their hourly rate of pay for overtime work. Based on information from the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) on the number of FLSA-exempted employees at each grade and information on overtime worked, CBO estimates that implementing the proposal would cost approximately $100 million in 2004 and $0.7 billion over the 2004–2008 period. About 680,000 federal employees at GS–10 and above are exempt from the FLSA, which is about 36.7 percent of the general schedule (and related) workforce. For this estimate, CBO assumes that this employee group worked 37 percent of all overtime performed by FLSA-exempt employees. We also assume that those overtime hours are distributed proportionately across GS–10 through GS–13 employees, with GS–14 and GS–15 employees working one-third of the hours.

CBO estimated the cost of the proposal by calculating the cost of those overtime hours at the set rate under current law and then calculating the cost of that same amount of overtime at the set rate or the employee's hourly rate, whichever is greater.

*Senior Executive Service (SES) performance provisions*

Under current law, SES employees are paid at six different pay levels. Base pay is capped at Level IV of the Executive Schedule ($134,000) and the maximum pay with the locality-based comparability adjustment is set at Level III of the Executive Schedule ($142,500). SES employees receive the same annual across-the-board pay raises and locality-based comparability adjustments that GS employees receive.

Effective January 1, 2004, section 1107 would eliminate the six SES pay levels and raise the cap on base pay to $142,500. Locality adjustments to SES pay would be eliminated. The proposal would affect roughly 7,900 employees.

The legislation specifies that no SES employee would experience a reduction in the rate of basic pay in the first year after this legislation is enacted, and CBO assumes that this would continue to be

true after the first year. Because the salaries of many SES employees are at the current caps (or are expected to reach such caps over the next few years), raising the cap on base pay would allow those employees to get pay raises. Assuming that executive level salaries (and thus the caps) are raised by the full amount authorized under current law by the Ethics Reform Act, CBO estimates that the legislation would cost $147 million in authorizations over the 2004–2008 period.

*Federal Flexible Benefits Plan administrative costs*

Under current law, federal employees will be allowed to enroll in a flexible spending account (FSA) program offered through OPM beginning in May 2003. An FSA is an employee benefit that allows employees to set aside money, on a pre-tax basis, for health care and dependent care expenses. The administrative costs to the program will be paid by participating employees based on a formula to collect $48 annually for each health care account and 1.5 percent of the total dependent care account.

Section 1108 would prevent any fees from being charged to federal employees for the administrative costs to operate the FSAs. Based on information from the federal judiciary's FSA program and the operation of private FSAs, CBO estimates that about 10 percent of federal employees will initially enroll in the plan, and we expect participation to grow to about 20 percent of federal employees over the next five years. Under the bill, administrative costs of operating the plans would be subject to appropriation of the necessary amounts. Based on the fees OPM plans to charge participants and expected employee participation rates, we estimate that implementing this provision of the bill would cost about $160 million over the 2004–2008 period.

*Asbestos differential pay*

Under section 1104, federal wage-grade employees would be subject to the same standards as general schedule employees when determining eligibility for environmental differential pay (EDP), based on exposure to asbestos. Under current law, general schedule employees are entitled to 8 percent hazard differential pay if they are exposed to asbestos that exceeds the permissible exposure limits established by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). The current EDP standard for wage-grade employees entitles them to the same 8 percent of pay, but does not set an objective measure for determining the level of asbestos exposure necessary to qualify for EDP. In several instances where wage-grade employees have sought back pay for EDP, arbitrators found in favor of the employees when asbestos levels were below those consistent with OSHA standards. Based on information from DoD on prior and pending arbitration rulings, CBO expects that implementing section 1104 would reduce the amount of back pay federal agencies would be required to pay for EDP based on asbestos exposure. Assuming these cases would be handled administratively, CBO estimates establishing OSHA standards for asbestos EDP would save $290 million in 2004 and about $1.5 billion over the 2004–2008 period, assuming appropriations are reduced by the estimated amounts.

*Defense Health Program*

Title VII contains a number of provisions that would affect DoD health care and benefits. TRICARE For Life (TFL) is a program that provides health care benefits to all retirees of the uniformed services, their dependents, and survivors who are eligible for Medicare and enroll in Medicare Part B. TFL provides a generous prescription drug benefit and covers all out-of-pocket costs for those benefits that are provided by both Medicare and TRICARE.

*Uniformed Services Medicare-Eligible Retiree Healthcare Fund*

Under current law, this fund provides the amounts necessary to pay for the TFL benefit. The fund is financed through monthly payments from DoD, annual amortization payments by the Treasury, and interest earned on the fund's current balances. The amount that DoD must pay into the fund is determined by the Secretary of Defense, who must use methods and assumptions approved by an independent board of actuaries to calculate the payment amount or rate. The payment rate is calculated using a number of factors including the probability that servicemembers currently on active duty will retire from military service. Under current law, the Secretary of Defense is not allowed to establish separate payment rates for each of the uniformed services, even though the overall probability of retiring from the Public Health Service (PHS) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) is higher than the probability of retiring from the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Coast Guard.

Section 701 would allow DoD to calculate separate payment rates for the different services if the Secretary determines that doing so improves the quality of the actuarial estimate. CBO estimates that implementing this provision would have no effect on payments to the fund in 2004 but would likely increase the payments PHS and NOAA make to the fund in 2005.

CBO estimates that implementing this provision would have no effect on payments into the fund in 2004 because the payment amounts have already been established and it appears unlikely that the independent board of actuaries would approve any change in assumptions and methods necessary to revise the amounts for that year for the proposed change in law. Although the payment amounts for 2005 may be determined before the enactment of this bill—the board approved the assumptions and methods on May 2, 2003, and the Secretary is expected to determine the rates shortly—CBO believes that the board would likely meet to approve the assumptions and methods necessary for the Secretary of Defense to set new payment rates if they were authorized. CBO expects that separate payment rates for NOAA and PHS would be higher than the rate currently set for fiscal year 2005 because the recommended rate does not presently incorporate information about the higher retirement probabilities for NOAA and PHS.

Using information from the respective organizations, CBO estimates that there are about 6,000 uniformed officers in the PHS and NOAA, with most in PHS. Based on data from DoD's Office of the Actuary, CBO estimates that implementing separate payment rates for PHS and NOAA would increase the payments these organizations must make to the fund in 2005 by almost $2,400 an offi-

cer or about $14 million, assuming appropriation of the estimated amounts.

CBO estimates there would be no change in the level of payments made by DoD or the Coast Guard because the current method for calculating the payment relies solely on DoD data.

CBO does not estimate an impact from having separate payment rates over the 2006–2008 period. The Secretary currently uses only DoD retirement experience to calculate the probability of retiring from the uniformed services, primarily because the fund initially only covered DoD beneficiaries. As data for the other uniformed services becomes available, CBO expects that, absent this provision, DoD would consider that new data when determining the single rate it would charge all of uniformed services for 2006 and subsequent years. Incorporating that data would likely raise the single rate charged to all services somewhat. CBO expects that using separate rates for each service as provided for in the bill would increase costs to PHS and NOAA each year, but would lower costs to DoD and the Coast Guard by approximately the same amount. Thus, total payments into the trust fund would not likely change much over the 2006–2008 period.

*Medical and dental screening*

Section 707 would allow DoD to provide medical and dental screening to members of the selected reserve who are assigned to units that have been alerted for mobilization. Under current law, DoD cannot provide this screening until the reservist has been mobilized. CBO does not expect that speeding up these evaluations would increase the overall amount of medical and dental screening DoD provides to reservists. Because this provision would allow DoD to provide some medical and dental screening earlier than it otherwise would, CBO estimates that implementing the authority would likely affect the timing of outlays but that the net effect would be insignificant.

*Sources of supply*

Several sections of Title VIII would require the Department of Defense to procure certain raw materials, parts, and components solely from sources within the United States. It also would require companies that produce major defense systems to use only U.S-manufactured machinery in the production of those systems. By restricting the sources of supply and imposing a new inventory management burden on defense contractors, CBO expects that implementing these provisions could increase the costs of supplies, parts, and overall weapons systems, and could increase the requirement for future appropriations. CBO has insufficient data to estimate the cost impact but we think it might be large given the number and complexity of weapon systems that DoD plans to develop and purchase over the 2004–2008 period.

*Base realignment and closure (BRAC) property*

Section 2805 would authorize DoD to convey to any nonfederal entity property at closed military installations or at military installations identified for closure. In exchange for that property, the recipient would be required to construct military facilities or family housing at another military installation or provide services associ-

ated with the construction of these facilities. Section 2805 would stipulate that projects received under the barter arrangement must be ones already authorized by the Congress and must be equal to the fair market value of the property conveyed. The provision also would direct each of the military services to use this authority to the maximum extent possible to convey at least 20 percent of the property that they plan to dispose of each year to obtain up to $200 million worth of military facilities and family housing projects each year.

Under current law, DoD has the authority to sell this property and spend the offsetting collections, without further appropriation, on environmental cleanup and caretaker expenses at installations that are being closed under previous BRAC authorities. CBO expects that, under section 2805, conveying these properties in exchange for military construction or family housing projects would eliminate a portion of the collections that would normally be used to offset BRAC cleanup expenses, thus increasing the requirement for discretionary appropriations to pay for these expenses.

Over the last 15 years, the Department of Defense has collected and spent about $30 million a year on average from the disposal of BRAC property. According to budget documents, the department plans to collect and spend $68 million in 2004 and $53 million in 2005 under these authorities. Assuming that DoD exchanges BRAC property as stipulated under section 2805, CBO estimates that implementing this provision would increase requirements for appropriated funds for environmental cleanup and caretaker expenses at closed installations by $68 million in 2004 and about $200 million over the 2004–2008 period.

*Expanded commissary benefits for reservists*

Section 651 would eliminate restrictions on commissary use by members of the ready reserve, retirees of the ready reserve who are less than 60 years of age, and their dependents. Currently, members of the ready reserve who meet their yearly training requirements and retirees of the ready reserve who are under the age of 60 are allowed to shop at a commissary 24 times a year. Members of the ready reserve who do not meet their yearly training requirements do not have commissary privileges.

Section 651 would eliminate these restrictions so that reservists in good standing and retirees of the ready reserve who are less than 60 years of age would have the same commissary privileges as active-duty servicemembers. Based on information from the Defense Commissary Agency, CBO estimates that reservists and reserve retirees who are currently allowed 24 commissary visits a year would not significantly alter their commissary usage if this restriction were lifted. Thus, CBO estimates would have no significant impact on the cost of operating defense commissaries if this restriction were lifted.

This section also would allow members in the ready reserve who do not meet the yearly training requirements to have commissary privileges, but their access would be subject to the policies established by the local base commander (similar to current policies in effect for the use of morale, welfare, and recreation facilities). CBO estimates about 87,000 reservists in the ready reserves who currently have no commissary privileges would be affected by this pro-

vision. Because most reservists do not live close to commissaries and would not use the benefit, CBO estimates the additional cost of operating the commissary system associated with these additional reservists would only be about $40 per person a year, or about $4 million each year over the 2004–2008 period.

*Biomedical countermeasures*

Three sections of the bill would address DoD's ability to protect the Armed Forces from biological, chemical, nuclear, and radiological threats by making it easier to use current authorities to research, develop, and procure biological countermeasures for these threats. Although these provisions could speed up or increase subject to appropriation spending, CBO does not have enough information to estimate the net effect on spending over the 2004–2008 period.

Section 1031 would increase the simplified acquisition threshold for procurement that supports biomedical research and development from $100,000 to $25 million. The section also would authorize DoD to use personal services contracts to employ up to 30 individuals for research and development and appoint up to 30 professional and technical employees without regard to certain sections of title 5, United States Code, that govern appointments in the competitive service, classification, and General Schedule pay rates. Section 1032 would allow DoD to procure biological countermeasures even if they had not yet been approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), as long as the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of HHS, determines that the countermeasures have the potential to be licensed or approved by the FDA within five years. For 2004, section 1032 would authorize such sums as are available under DoD's general transfer authority to purchase these qualified countermeasures and for every year thereafter it would authorize such sums as may be necessary. Section 1033 would allow DoD to use biomedical countermeasures that are not licensed or approved by the FDA in an emergency setting if the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of HHS, determines that there is no adequate, approved, or alternative countermeasure available.

*Assistance for victims of domestic violence*

Section 572 would increase the length of time that a victim of domestic violence receives assistance from DoD. Under current law, the department provides transitional compensation to the spouse and any children of a servicemember who must separate from the military because of dependent-abuse offenses. The amount of the compensation is linked to the dependent and indemnity compensation benefit provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and is paid for 36 months or the remainder of the unserved portion of the servicemember's military obligation, whichever is shorter. According to DoD, families of enlisted servicemembers often receive less than 36 months of compensation. Section 572 would allow for all recipients of transitional compensation to receive it for the full 36-month period. Based on information from DoD indicating that the majority of recipients receive the benefit for 24 months on average and that the total amount of transitional compensation paid in

fiscal year 2000 was less than $6 million, CBO estimates implementing this section would cost about $2 million per year.

Section 571 would require DoD to pay to move a spouse and any dependent children who have been abused by a servicemember if the victim's safety is at risk. Costs would include travel costs for the family and transportation of household goods and a vehicle. Based on information about the amount of transitional compensation paid in fiscal year 2000 and the average benefit amount for that year, CBO estimates that about 400 spouses receive assistance each year for being victims of domestic violence. Using the average cost to move a servicemember with dependents (about $2,000 in 2004), CBO estimates that implementing this section would cost about $1 million per year.

*Chaplain-led family support programs*

Section 564 would expand and permanently extend chaplain-led programs to assist servicemembers in building and maintaining strong families. Under authority provided in Public Law 107–248, DoD may use appropriated funds to pay for transportation, food, lodging, supplies, fees, and training materials for servicemembers and their family members who participate in such programs. The authority expires at the end of fiscal year 2003. The bill would make these programs permanent and also would include the cost of child care as an eligible expense. Based on information from DoD, CBO estimates that the Army would expand its program from the current level of about $1 million (serving 48 brigades) to about $6 million a year by 2006 (serving 144 brigades). The Navy- and Air Force-sponsored family support programs pre-date Public Law 107–248. The Navy currently spends roughly $1 million a year on family support programs and the Air Force spends less than $500,000 annually. Neither branch has any immediate plans to use the new authority provided in the bill, but if they were to do so, there would be modest additional costs.

*Wetland crossings at Camp Shelby*

Section 320 would authorize the Army to use operation and maintenance funds to construct water crossings for use by armored vehicles at Camp Shelby, Mississippi, to protect wetland areas located there. Based on information from the Army National Guard, CBO estimates it would cost about $5 million in 2004 to construct these crossings. According to the Army National Guard, the construction in 2004 would likely constitute the first phase of a potentially larger project which would require further Congressional authorization.

*Services acquisition reform*

Title XIV contains sections that address service acquisition reform; some of which have cost. Section 1412 would authorize the establishment of an Acquisition Workforce Training Fund. Under the bill, 5 percent of the fees collected by the General Services Administration (GSA) from other, nondefense agencies that procure goods and services through GSA's governmentwide contracts would be deposited in the new fund. GSA generates most of those fees by charging other federal agencies approximately 1 percent of the cost of purchases made through GSA's contracts for supply schedule

services and data processing. That fee is designed to recover administrative costs incurred by GSA. In 2002, GSA collected $88 million in fees from agencies other than the Department of Defense. Thus, CBO estimates that this provision would authorize GSA to charge agencies a fee sufficient to establish a $5 million Acquisition Workforce Training Fund each year, as well as continuing to cover the administrative costs of GSA's contracting programs.

Other provisions in Title XIV would establish a new advisory panel to review procurement policies, a Chief Acquisition Officers Council, and a center of excellence in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy; would require GSA, the Office of Personnel Management, and the Office of Management and Budget to issue implementing regulations; and would require the General Accounting Office to prepare certain studies on procurement issues. In total, CBO estimates that implementing these provisions would cost $1 million annually over the 2004–2008 period.

*Funding for special compensation for disabled retirees of the uniformed services*

Under current law, veterans who retire from the military, the Coast Guard, PHS, or NOAA cannot receive both full retirement annuities and disability compensation from the VA. To receive the non-taxable veterans' compensation benefit, retirees must forgo an equal amount of their taxable retirement annuity. Allowing the receipt of both benefits is often referred to as "concurrent receipt." Two programs currently offer special benefits to retirees who are affected by the ban on concurrent receipt.

The first is a program of special compensation for severely disabled retirees of the uniformed services that pays a monthly stipend to certain retirees who are rated by VA as 60 percent or more disabled. The second program, scheduled to begin June 1, 2003, will pay a monthly benefit to retirees who receive disability compensation from VA for the injury for which they were awarded a Purple Heart or have certain combat- or training-related disabilities for which they receive compensation from VA. The benefit will equal the amount of retirement annuity forgone as a result of the ban on concurrent receipt. CBO estimates these programs will together pay military retirees about $300 million in 2004, and $2.8 billion over the 2004–2008 period. Such payments for both programs are currently made from DoD's military personnel accounts. Under section 641, payments under these programs would become a liability of the Military Retirement Fund.

The military retirement system is financed in part by an annual payment from appropriated funds to the Military Retirement Fund, based on an estimate of the system's accruing liabilities. If these special compensation payments were to become a liability of the Military Retirement Fund, DoD's yearly contribution to the fund (paid from the military personal accounts) would normally increase to reflect the added liability from the expected increase in payments to future retirees. This increase—or accrual payment—would recognize the additional costs of deferred compensation in the years during which servicemembers are working, rather than when the benefits are actually paid. Accrual budgeting provides decisionmakers with more complete information about the full costs of labor and provides incentives to use labor cost-effectively.

Under section 641, however, the incremental increase in the accrual payment would be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury and, therefore, not recognized in DoD's budget. Using information from DoD, CBO estimates that the accrual payment from the Treasury would be $100 million in 2004, and total about $930 million over the 2004–2008 period.

*Fast ships*

Section 1014 would authorize the appropriation of $40 million to the Secretary of the Navy to pay the subsidy costs of guaranteeing a loan to construct two high-speed ships in a U.S. shipyard. Under the bill the Secretary would be authorized to issue a 25-year guarantee that would cover up to 87.5 percent of the principal of the loan. CBO expects that construction and related acquisition costs for this project would be around $1 billion. Based on information provided by the Maritime Administration (MARAD) and potential participants in this project, CBO expects that construction would involve a very high subsidy cost because of the expense of the project as well the market and financial uncertainties inherent in the proposal. As a result, we estimate that the $40 million amounts made available under the bill and about $34 million previously appropriated to the Navy for this purpose would be sufficient to guarantee only a portion of the project's full costs. CBO estimates that the subsidy costs for guaranteeing 87.5 percent of the entire project would require appropriations of more than $100 million.

*Maritime administration*

Title XXXV would authorize appropriations for programs carried out within the Department of Transportation by MARAD (see Table 4).

Subtitle B of title XXXV would reauthorize and amend the maritime security program beginning in fiscal year 2006. This program, which expires at the end of fiscal year 2005, provides operating subsidies to owners or operators of U.S. flag vessels carrying cargo between the United States and foreign ports. In exchange, eligible vessel owners or operators agree to keep their ships in the U.S. flag fleet and make them available to DoD when needed for national security purposes.

Subtitle C would expand the maritime security program from the current 47 ships to 60 ships, including up to five tankers. The annual subsidy payment also would increase from its present $2.1 million per ship to $2.6 million per ship for each of fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and to whatever amounts the Secretary of Transportation deems necessary for each ensuing year that a vessel remains in the program. For these payments, the bill would authorize the appropriation of $156 million for each of fiscal years 2006 and 2007 and whatever sums are necessary for each thereafter through 2015 for these programs.

Subtitle C also would authorize, after fiscal year 2004, the appropriation of $250 million to subsidize the cost of constructing five commercial product tankers in a U.S. shipyard. The tankers would operate as U.S. flag vessels in the U.S.-foreign trade and would be available to DoD for national defense purposes upon request.

Subtitle D would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for routine MARAD activities, including $104 million for operations

and training, $39 million for loan guarantees and associated administrative expenses under Title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and $20 million for disposal of obsolete ships in the national defense reserve fleet. (The $39 million for the Title XI program is not shown in Table 4 because such costs are already authorized under the 1936 act and do not require annual authorization.)

TABLE 4.—SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION IN H.R. 1588

| | By fiscal year, in millions of dollars— | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Current Law Authorization for the Maritime Administration: | | | | | | |
| Authorization Levels [a, b] | 201 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Outlays | 195 | 120 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proposed Changes | | | | | | |
| Maritime Security Program: | | | | | | |
| Estimated Authorization Levels | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 | 156 | 161 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 156 | 160 |
| Tanker Construction: | | | | | | |
| Authorization Level | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 63 | 63 |
| Regular MARAD Authorization: | | | | | | |
| Authorization Level | 0 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | 99 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal, Proposed Changes [c]: | | | | | | |
| Estimated Authorization Levels | 0 | 124 | 0 | 406 | 156 | 161 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | 99 | 20 | 211 | 219 | 223 |
| Authorizations Under H.R. 1588 for the Maritime Administration: | | | | | | |
| Authorization Levels [a] | 201 | 224 | 100 | 406 | 156 | 161 |
| Estimated Outlays | 195 | 219 | 125 | 211 | 219 | 223 |

[a] The level for 2003 is the amount currently appropriated for programs authorized by the bill; that amount is also contained in Table 1.
[b] The levels for 2004 and 2005 are authorizations of appropriations in current law for the Maritime Security Program. These amounts are contained in Tables 1 and 2.

## *Direct Spending*

The bill contains provisions that would increase direct spending, primarily by increasing the amount that DoD can spend to finance special authorities for the construction and renovation of military family housing. We estimate that the increase in direct spending (excluding asset sales) resulting from provisions of H.R. 1588 would total $440 million over the 2004–2008 period and $486 million over the 2004–2013 period (see Table 5).

TABLE 5.—ESTIMATED DIRECT SPENDING FROM MILITARY HOUSING PRIVATIZATION AUTHORITIES AND OTHER PROVISIONS IN H.R. 1588

| | By fiscal year, in millions of dollars— | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING (EXCLUDING ASSET SALES) | | | | | | |
| Military Housing Privatization Initiative: | | | | | | |
| Estimated Budget Authority | 0 | 120 | 290 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | 15 | 85 | 151 | 91 | 35 |
| Recovery of Funds from Sale of Nonappropriated Fund Facilities: | | | | | | |
| Estimated Budget Authority | 0 | 51 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 1 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | 8 | 14 | 18 | 12 | 9 |
| Reduction in Time-in-Grade for Retirement: | | | | | | |
| Estimated Budget Authority | 0 | * | * | * | 1 | 1 |

TABLE 5.—ESTIMATED DIRECT SPENDING FROM MILITARY HOUSING PRIVATIZATION AUTHORITIES AND OTHER PROVISIONS IN H.R. 1588—Continued

| | By fiscal year, in millions of dollars— | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | * | * | * | 1 | 1 |
| Subtotal: | | | | | | |
| Estimated Budget Authority | 0 | 171 | 296 | 6 | 7 | 2 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | 23 | 99 | 169 | 104 | 45 |
| ASSET SALES [a] | | | | | | |
| National Defense Stockpile: | | | | | | |
| Estimated Budget Authority | 0 | -15 | -5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | -15 | -5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING | | | | | | |
| Estimated Budget Authority | 0 | 156 | 291 | 6 | 7 | 2 |
| Estimated Outlays | 0 | 8 | 94 | 169 | 104 | 45 |

* = less than $500,000.
[a] Asset sale receipts are a credit against direct spending.

*Military Housing Privatization Initiative (MHPI)*

Section 2803 would raise the statutory limit on the amount that DoD can invest in projects to build or renovate military family housing. DoD is authorized to use direct loans, loan guarantees, long-term outleases, rental guarantees, barter, direct government investment, and other financial arrangements to encourage private-sector participation in building military housing. Funding for those activities comes from the Family Housing Improvement Fund, which is financed by appropriations made to the fund, transfers from other accounts, receipts from property sales and rents, returns on any capital, and other income from operations or transactions connected with the program.

Currently the amounts in the fund are available for use by DoD to acquire housing using the various techniques mentioned above, but the total value of commitments for all contracts and investments undertaken is limited to $1 billion ($850 million for family housing and $150 million for unaccompanied housing). Under the bill, the limit for family housing would increase to $900 million. CBO estimates that enacting section 2803 would increase direct spending by $377 million over the 2004–2008 period and by $409 million over the 2004–2013 period.

*Governmentwide Accounting Principles.* Most of DoD's housing projects under the MHPI authority have involved private-sector financing that is backed by various kinds of government commitments. Some of these commitments may have the characteristics of a capital lease or lease-purchase, others may be public-private partnerships with substantial government control. According to standard principles of federal accounting, obligations of the Family Housing Improvement Fund should reflect the full amount of the financial liability incurred when the government makes such a commitment. In the case of a capital lease, for example, obligations equal to the asset cost should be recorded up front and an amount equal to the interest costs should be recorded on an annual basis over the life of the lease term. Outlays should be recorded over the lease term in an amount equal to the annual lease payments. For commitments that take the form of a lease-purchase, obligations

are recorded in the same manner as a capital lease, but outlays should be recorded over the period it takes to construct the asset. In CBO's view, most ventures that borrow private funds to construct or refurbish military family housing should be treated as governmental and their investments should be recorded up front, equivalent to borrowing authority—a form of budget authority. Amounts expended by these public-private arrangements should be recorded in the budget as outlays at the time they occur.

To date, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has primarily treated DoD's use of these authorities as transactions that have relatively little estimated cost in terms of the obligations and outlays recorded in the federal budget, allowing DoD to obligate the government for significantly more than it records in its budget. In effect, the Administration's accounting enables DoD to record the costs of the projects incrementally over time rather than up front. CBO continues to believe that OMB's accounting practices for MHPI projects are at odds with governmentwide standards. Although the contractual terms vary from project to project, CBO considers most MHPI projects to be governmental undertakings, the purpose of which is to finance and manage the acquisition, construction, or renovation of a government asset, specifically, family housing for military personnel. There are several factors that support treating these arrangements as governmental. For instance, most of the housing constructed or renovated under this authority is on government property. Many deals include government guarantees against base closure. In some instances, rental payments are made to the property manager directly by the government. Likewise, in most deals, title to the property vests with the government at the end of the contract. In the case of public-private partnerships, the debt of the entity is implicitly or explicitly backed by the federal government. Following standard principles of federal accounting, CBO believes the MHPI program should reflect the full amount of the financial liability incurred at the time the government makes such commitments.

For the last few years, CBO has stated that DoD was obligating the government for significantly more than it was recording. After consultation with the Committees on the Budget in both the House and the Senate, CBO has decided to show the full cost of MHPI projects up front in our cost estimates for legislation related to such projects. Thus, expansion or extension of this authority is counted as direct spending in this estimate, since it would allow DoD to obligate the government without appropriations for the full amount of those obligations in advance.

*Cost of Activities Under Current Law.* To date, DoD has signed contracts for 18 family housing projects and is proceeding with solicitations for or considering plans for close to 60 other projects over the next few years. According to OMB's accounting method, DoD has only recorded obligations of about $300 million—well below the current $850 million limit. Given DoD's plans for future projects, it estimates that it could reach the $850 million limit as early as the end of 2004. However, CBO estimates that the full amount of DoD's commitments to date exceeds $2 billion. Using the current method of accounting for only the initial investment costs of these projects, DoD could acquire or modify approximately 60,000 more units and record only $550 million in obligations. CBO

estimates that the true cost of these additional projects, which could be awarded under the current investment cap, would total approximately $4.5 billion dollars. Since DoD can pursue these projects without additional legislative authority, their costs are not counted against this bill.

*Cost of Activities Under the Increased Limitation.* Section 2803 would increase the limit on total investment in family housing projects by $50 million to $900 million, allowing DoD to pursue MHPI projects after it exhausts the authority in current law. Given OMB's accounting practice of recording only the initial investment, CBO assumes that DoD would be allowed to commit the government for much more than the additional $50 million provided. Since DoD could enter into these obligations without further appropriations for the full amount of the obligation, CBO estimates that the additional $50 million investment authority provided in this section would allow DoD to acquire or modify almost 5,500 additional housing units, obligating the government for an additional $410 million. Thus, CBO estimates that these obligations would increase outlays by $15 million in 2004 and by $410 million over the 2004–2013 period.

*Recovery of Funds Due to Sale of Nonappropriated Fund Facilities*

Section 655 would allow DoD to spend (without further appropriation) collections from the sale or lease of commissary or nonappropriated fund assets that have been closed under Base Realignment and Closure. The collections are currently deposited into a reserve account established by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1988 and, under current law, cannot be spent without further appropriation. Based on information from the Department of Defense, CBO estimates that there will be $51 million in the reserve account at the beginning of fiscal year 2004, and that the reserve account will gain an additional $19 million in collections through 2008. Based on information from DoD, CBO expects that the funds in the account would be used primarily for facility improvements and construction. Using historical outlay patterns, CBO estimates that, under section 655, outlays from the fund would total $8 million in 2004 and $70 million over the 2004–2013 period.

Section 3005 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) authorized expenditures from the reserve account for base closures that are schedules to occur after 2005. Therefore, enacting this section would have no impact on collections from the sale of commissaries or nonappropriated fund facilities in future base closure rounds.

*Reduction of Time-in-Grade for Retirement*

Section 513 would reduce, from three years to one year, the length of time senior officers must serve in a grade before being allowed to retire in that grade. Based on information from DoD, CBO estimates that reducing the time-in-grade requirement would cause about 15 officers in the ranks O–7 to O–10 to retire one grade higher than they normally would otherwise. CBO estimates that enacting this measure would cost less than $500,000 in 2004, $2 million over the 2004–2008 period, and $7 million over the 2004–2013 period.

*Land Conveyance and Other Property Transactions*

Title XXVIII would authorize a variety of property transactions involving both large and small parcels of land. CBO estimates that implementing these provisions would not result in significant costs to the federal government because they would authorize DoD to receive fair market value for the property to be conveyed, to exchange one piece of property for another, or to convey land that under current law is unlikely to be declared excess and sold or is likely to be given away.

*Other Provisions.* The following provisions would have an insignificant budgetary impact on direct spending:

Section 545 would instruct DoD to assist former prisoners of war in obtaining information to support their applications for the award of the Purple Heart. Purple Heart recipients are eligible to have their retirement annuities increased by any amount currently withheld to offset their receipt of veterans disability compensation, to the extent that disability pay is related to the injury for which they received the Purple Heart. Thus, if this measure increased the number of Purple Heart recipients, it could potentially increase retirement outlays. However, since this measure does not change the criteria for eligibility for the Purple Heart award, CBO assumes that at most a few additional Purple Hearts would be awarded if it were to be enacted, and that any additional retirement outlays would be negligible.

Section 651 would eliminate restrictions on commissary use by members of the ready reserve, retirees of the ready reserve who are less than 60 years of age, and their dependents. CBO estimates enactment of this provision would increase commissary sales, which are deposited into the commissary revolving fund and used to replenish commissary stock. Commissaries also charge a 5 percent surcharge on all sales which is credited to the commissary surcharge account. Funds in the commissary surcharge account are used to renovate and construct commissary facilities and can be collected and spent without appropriation. CBO estimates the net result of the collection and expenditure of these proceeds would be insignificant.

Sections 801 and 1451 would extend and expand authority for government agencies to provide services to nongovernmental organizations and enter into nonconventional cooperative agreements with private contractors for research into advanced weapons systems and homeland security. These agreements would include the authority for the government agencies to collect and spend reimbursements for any services rendered. While outlays would lag behind receipts, CBO does not have enough information to estimate the net outlay effects in any specific year.

Section 903 would allow the Secretary of Defense to carry out a three-year pilot program to determine the feasibility of providing satellite tracking services with DoD assets to non-U.S. government entities. Under such a pilot program, DoD would be allowed to charge fees for these services and spend these payments. According to the Air Force, the proceeds from selling these services would likely be insignificant. CBO estimates that implementing this provision would have no net effect on direct spending because it would allow DoD to spend any payments that it collects.

Section 906 would allow the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies to accept and spend gifts from U.S. sources, similar to the authority they have to accept gifts from foreign sources. Based on information from DoD, CBO estimates any gifts received under this section would be less than $500,000 annually. (Gifts and donations are recorded in the budget as revenues.)

Section 1012 would allow the Navy to spend the proceeds received from selling the materials and equipment stripped from naval vessels that are to be used for experimental purposes. Under current law, the Navy may only recover their costs from such activities and any receipts in excess of those costs are required to be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury. The Navy has not deposited any excess funds into the general fund from these activities in recent years. Section 1012 also would allow the Navy to use contractors to sell this material and equipment. Based on information from the Navy, CBO estimates that receipts from the expanded authority would likely total less than $500,000 a year. Enacting this provision would have no net effect on direct spending, however, because it would allow the Navy to spend any payments it collects.

Section 1046 would allow the National Security Agency (NSA) to contract for living quarters for co-op students, and would allow the NSA to charge the students for this service and credit the proceeds to appropriated accounts. CBO estimates the net result of the collection and expenditure of these proceeds would be insignificant.

*Asset Sales*

Section 3302 would increase by $20 million the targets contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) for sales from the National Defense Stockpile through 2009. CBO estimates that there will be sufficient quantities of materials in the stockpile to achieve $15 million in receipts in 2004 and the remaining $5 million in receipts in 2005.

## INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE-SECTOR IMPACT

Title XI would authorize the Secretary to appoint older Americans into positions in the excepted service, and—notwithstanding any other provision of law—protect any other retirement benefits they may be receiving from being reduced as a result of that appointment. To the extent that under current law retirement benefits provided by state, local, or tribal governments might be reduced for a beneficiary hired by the Secretary, enacting this provision would prohibit such reductions and thereby impose an intergovernmental mandate as defined in UMRA. However, according to the National Association of State Retirement Administrators, few if any jurisdictions require such benefit reductions under current law. Therefore, CBO estimates that any costs to state, local, or tribal governments from the mandate would be insignificant and would not exceed the threshold established in UMRA ($59 million in 2003, adjusted for inflation).

Other provisions in H.R. 1588 contain no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

## PREVIOUS CBO ESTIMATES

On May 12, 2003, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for H.R. 1497, the Sikes Act Reauthorization Act of 2003, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Resources on May 7, 2003. Both H.R. 1497 and section 311 of H.R. 1588 would authorize the appropriation of up to $4.5 million a year over the 2004–2008 period for DoD and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to develop and implement plans to manage natural resources on certain military lands.

On May 14, 2003, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for H.R. 1837, the Services Acquisition Reform Act of 2003, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Government Reform on May 8, 2003. Both bills would authorize the establishment of an Acquisition Workforce Training Fund; would establish a new advisory panel to review procurement policies, a Chief Acquisition Officers Council, and a center of excellence in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy; would require GSA, the Office of Personnel Management, and the Office of Management and Budget to issue implementing regulations; and would require the General Accounting Office to prepare certain studies on procurement issues. The difference in the other estimated costs reflect differences in the legislation.

On May 15, 2003, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for H.R. 1836, the Civil Service and National Security Personnel Improvement Act of 2003, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Government Reform on May 8, 2003. Sections 1111, 1101, 1104, 1107, and 1108 of H.R. 1588 are identical to sections 102, 201, 204, 209, and 211 of H.R. 1836, as are the cost estimates.

Estimate Prepared by: Federal Costs: Defense Outlays: Kent Christensen. Military Construction: David Newman. Military and Civilian Personnel: Michelle Patterson and Sunita D'Monte, and Ellen Hayes. Military Training: Sarah T. Jennings. Health Programs: Sam Papenfuss. Multiyear Procurement: David Newman and Raymond Hall. Maritime Administration: Deborah Reis. Stockpile Sales: Raymond Hall. Operation and Maintenance: Matthew Schmit. Services Acquisition Reform: Matthew Pickford. Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Victoria Heid Hall. Impact on the Private Sector: Allison Percy.

Estimate Approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

## COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee generally concurs with the estimates as contained in the report of the Congressional Budget Office.

## OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

With respect to clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation results from hearings and other oversight activities conducted by the committee pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X.

With respect to clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this legislation does not include any new

spending or credit authority, nor does it provide for any increase or decrease in tax revenues or expenditures. The bill does, however, authorize appropriations. Other fiscal features of this legislation are addressed in the estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

With respect to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee has not received a report from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight pertaining to the subject matter of H.R. 1588.

## GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

With respect to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation would address several general and outcome-related performance goals and objectives. The general goal and objective of this legislation is to improve the quality of life for military personnel and their families, military readiness, the modernization and eventual transformation of the armed forces, to enhance the development of ballistic missile defenses, and to improve the condition of military housing and facilities.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of improving the quality of life for military personnel and their families, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Add 6,240 personnel, enabling the military services to begin meeting long-standing manpower shortages, as well as new manning requirements;

(2) Provide every military service member an average pay raise of 4.1 percent and up to 6.25 percent for targeted raises effective January 1, 2004; and

(3) Reduce out-of-pocket housing costs for military personnel to less than 3.5 percent during fiscal year 2004.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of improving military readiness, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Increase funding for key readiness accounts by approximately $3.7 billion above the fiscal year 2003 level; and

(2) Satisfy approximately $1.1 billion of the service chiefs' unfunded readiness requirements.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of improving the modernization and eventual transformation of the armed forces and enhancing the development of ballistic missile defenses, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Increase funding for military procurement accounts by $2.25 billion;

(2) Satisfy approximately $1.5 billion of the unfunded procurement and research and development requirements identified by the service chiefs; and

(3) Increase funding for military research and development accounts by $200.0 million.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of improving military housing and facilities, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Provide $9.8 billion for military construction and military family housing programs; and

(2) Provide several enhancements to the authority provided by current law to privatize military housing that will

provide the military services more flexibility to procure adequate military family housing.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of increasing homeland and troop defenses against terrorist and ballistic missile attacks, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Increase the President's request of $9.8 billion for combating terrorism by $202 million; and

(2) Support the approach of the President's ballistic missile defense program and to match the Administration's funding request of $9.1 billion.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to rule XIII, clause 3(d)(1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee finds the authority for this legislation in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

## STATEMENT OF FEDERAL MANDATES

Pursuant to section 423 of Public Law 104–4, this legislation contains no federal mandates with respect to state, local, and tribal governments, nor with respect to the private sector. Similarly, the bill provides no federal intergovernmental mandates.

## RECORD VOTES

In accordance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, record and voice votes were taken with respect to the committee's consideration of H.R. 1588. The record of these votes is attached to this report.

The committee ordered H.R. 1588 reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 58–2, a quorum being present.

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Motion to Close** **Date: 05/13/03**

**Voice Vote** **Ayes** **Nays**

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | X | | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | X | | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | X | | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | X | | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | X | | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Reyes | | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | X | | | Mr. Turner (TX) | | | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. Smith | | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | X | | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | X | | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | X | | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | X | | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | X | | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | X | | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | X | | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | X | | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | | | |
| Mr. Bishop | X | | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | X | | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | X | | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**54 Aye** **0 Nay** **Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 21 **Date:** 05/13/03

**Description:** Strike All General Officer Provisions **Offered by:** Tauscher

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | X | | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

30 Aye 28 Nay Present

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 28 **Date:** 05/13/03

**Description:** RNEP/Advanced Concepts Funding Shift **Offered by:** Tauscher

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | X | | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | | | |
| Mr. Jones | | | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**28 Aye 29 Nay Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 26 **Date:** 05/13/03

**Description:** No New Nuclear Weapons Development **Offered by:** Tauscher

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | X | | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | | X | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

27 Aye 31 Nay Present

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 76 **Date:** 05/13/03

**Description:** Underground Nuclear Testing **Offered by:** Spratt

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | | X | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**27 Aye 32 Nay Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 73 **Date:** 05/13/03
**Description:** Mobilized Reservists **Offered by:** Sanchez

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | | X | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**27 Aye 32 Nay Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 62 **Date:** 05/13/03
**Description:** Sikes Act **Offered by:** Davis (CA)

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | | X | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | | X | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | | X | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | | X | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

23 Aye 35 Nay Present

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 78 **Date:** 05/13/03

**Description:** Hunter 78 as Amended by Hefley 82 **Offered by:** Hunter

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | X | | | Mr. Spratt | | X | |
| Mr. Hefley | X | | | Mr. Ortiz | | X | |
| Mr. Saxton | X | | | Mr. Evans | | X | |
| Mr. McHugh | X | | | Mr. Taylor | | X | |
| Mr. Everett | X | | | Mr. Abercrombie | | X | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Reyes | | X | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | X | | | Mr. Turner (TX) | | X | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | | X | |
| Mr. Hayes | X | | | Mr. Rodriguez | | X | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | | X | |
| Mr. Calvert | X | | | Mr. Brady | | X | |
| Mr. Simmons | X | | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | | X | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | | X | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | | X | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | X | | | Mr. Cooper | | | X |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Marshall | | X | |
| Mr. Cole | X | | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | | X | |
| Mr. Bishop | X | | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | X | | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | | X | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | X | | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**35 Aye 23 Nay 1 Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 107 **Date:** 05/13/03

**Description:** Two year BRAC delay **Offered by:** Taylor

**Voice Vote** **Ayes** **Nays**

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | | X | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | | X | |
| Mr. Hefley | X | | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | | X | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | | X | |
| Mr. Hostettler | X | | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. Smith | | X | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | | X | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | X | | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | X | | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | | X | |
| Mr. Forbes | | | | Mr. Israel | | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | X | | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | | X | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | | X | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | | X | |
| Mr. Bradley | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**25 Aye 33 Nay Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 96 **Date:** 05/14/03

**Description:** Nuclear Policy Commission **Offered by:** Weldon

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Skelton | | X | |
| Mr. Weldon | X | | | Mr. Spratt | | X | |
| Mr. Hefley | X | | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | X | | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | X | | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | | X | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Dr. Snyder | | X | |
| Mr. Hostettler | X | | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | | X | |
| Mr. Gibbons | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | X | | | Mr. Hill | | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | X | | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | | | Mr. Israel | | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | X | | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | X | | | Mr. Cooper | | X | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | X | | | Mr. Meek | | X | |
| Mr. Bradley | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | X | | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | X | | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | | X | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**43 Aye 9 Nay 1 Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 40 **Date:** 05/14/03

**Description:** Transfer Funds from Strategic to CW **Offered by:** Spratt

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

28 Aye 31 Nay Present

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 25 **Date:** 05/14/03

**Description:** Strike DOS from Sec. 1305 **Offered by:** Tauscher

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

29 Aye 30 Nay Present

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 31 **Date:** 05/14/03

**Description:** Snyder DSB/DSP Standards **Offered by:** Snyder

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**29 Aye 30 Nay Present**

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**
**108TH CONGRESS**
**ROLL CALL**

**Amendment Number:** 105 **Date:** 05/14/03

**Description:** Conditions on Counterdrug Expansion in Colombia **Offered by:** Taylor

**Voice Vote** **Ayes** **Nays**

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | | X | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | | X | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | | X | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | | X | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | | X | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**24 Aye 34 Nay 1 Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 108 **Date:** 05/14/03
**Description:** Hunter 108 to Taylor 104 **Offered by:** Hunter

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Skelton | | X | |
| Mr. Weldon | X | | | Mr. Spratt | | X | |
| Mr. Hefley | X | | | Mr. Ortiz | | X | |
| Mr. Saxton | X | | | Mr. Evans | | X | |
| Mr. McHugh | X | | | Mr. Taylor | | X | |
| Mr. Everett | X | | | Mr. Abercrombie | | X | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Meehan | | X | |
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Reyes | | X | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Dr. Snyder | | X | |
| Mr. Hostettler | X | | | Mr. Turner (TX) | | X | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. Smith | | X | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | | X | |
| Mr. Gibbons | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | | X | |
| Mr. Hayes | X | | | Mr. Rodriguez | | X | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | X | | | Ms. Tauscher | | X | |
| Mr. Calvert | X | | | Mr. Brady | | X | |
| Mr. Simmons | X | | | Mr. Hill | | X | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | X | | | Mr. Larson (CT) | | X | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | | X | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Langevin | | X | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Israel | | X | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | X | | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | | X | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | X | | | Mr. Cooper | | X | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Marshall | | X | |
| Mr. Cole | X | | | Mr. Meek | | X | |
| Mr. Bradley | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | | X | |
| Mr. Bishop | X | | | Mr. Alexander | | X | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | X | | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | | X | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | X | | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**32 Aye 28 Nay Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 41 **Date:** 05/14/03

**Description:** 28.8M Discretionary Transfer for Shchuch'ye **Offered by:** Spratt

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

28 Aye 32 Nay Present

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 86 **Date:** 05/14/03

**Description:** Strike Sec. 1451 from SARA **Offered by:** Turner

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

26 Aye 30 Nay Present

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 50 **Date:** 05/14/03
**Description:** Strike Sec. 317 **Offered by:** Abercrombie

**Voice Vote** **Ayes** **Nays**

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | | X | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | | X | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | | X | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | | X | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | | X | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**23 Aye 37 Nay Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 90 **Date:** 05/14/03

**Description:** Limit Sole-source Commercial Contracts **Offered by:** Spratt

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

28 Aye 32 Nay Present

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 87 **Date:** 05/14/03

**Description:** Repeal Incentives for Performance-based Contracts (strike Sec. 1441) **Offered by:** Spratt

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

28 Aye 32 Nay Present

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 89 **Date:** 05/14/03

**Description:** Strike New Commercial Entities Definition **Offered by:** Spratt

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

28 Aye 32 Nay Present

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 98 **Date:** 05/14/03
**Description:** Stike ESA Expansion **Offered by:** Tauscher

**Voice Vote** **Ayes** **Nays**

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | | X | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | | X | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | | X | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**23 Aye 35 Nay Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 51 **Date:** 05/14/03
**Description:** Strike MMPA Section **Offered by:** Abercrombie

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | | X | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**23 Aye 32 Nay Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Previous Question** **Date: 05/14/03**

**Offered by: Saxton**

**Voice Vote** **Ayes** **Nays**

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Skelton | | X | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | | X | |
| Mr. Hefley | X | | | Mr. Ortiz | | X | |
| Mr. Saxton | X | | | Mr. Evans | | X | |
| Mr. McHugh | X | | | Mr. Taylor | | X | |
| Mr. Everett | X | | | Mr. Abercrombie | | X | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Meehan | | X | |
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Reyes | | X | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Dr. Snyder | | X | |
| Mr. Hostettler | X | | | Mr. Turner (TX) | | X | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. Smith | | X | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | | X | |
| Mr. Gibbons | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | | X | |
| Mr. Hayes | X | | | Mr. Rodriguez | | X | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | X | | | Ms. Tauscher | | X | |
| Mr. Calvert | X | | | Mr. Brady | | X | |
| Mr. Simmons | X | | | Mr. Hill | | X | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | | X | Mr. Larson (CT) | | X | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | | X | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Langevin | | X | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Israel | | X | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | X | | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | | X | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | X | | | Mr. Cooper | | X | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Marshall | | X | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | | X | |
| Mr. Bradley | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | | X | |
| Mr. Bishop | X | | | Mr. Alexander | | X | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | X | | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | | X | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | X | | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**29 Aye 30 Nay 1 Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 92 **Date:** 05/14/03
**Description:** Strike NSPS **Offered by:** Cooper

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

28 Aye 32 Nay Present

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 65 **Date:** 05/14/03

**Description:** Political Patronage Prohibited **Offered by:** Meek

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**27 Aye 32 Nay Present**

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Amendment Number:** 67 **Date:** 05/14/03
**Description:** Collective Bargaining **Offered by:** Sanchez

**Voice Vote** Ayes Nays

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | | X | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | | X | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | | X | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | | X | | Mr. Evans | X | | |
| Mr. McHugh | | X | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | | X | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | | X | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | | X | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | | X | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | | X | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | | X | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | | X | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | | X | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | | X | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | | X | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | | X | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | | X | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | | X | | Mr. Larson (CT) | X | | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | | X | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | | X | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | | X | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | | X | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | | X | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | | X | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | | X | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | | X | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | | X | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | | X | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | | X | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | | X | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | | X | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

28 Aye 32 Nay Present

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
### 108TH CONGRESS
### ROLL CALL

**Final Passage of H.R. 1588** **Date: 05/14/03**
**as Amended**

**Voice Vote** **Ayes** **Nays**

| Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present | Rep. | Aye | Nay | Present |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Hunter | X | | | Mr. Skelton | X | | |
| Mr. Weldon | X | | | Mr. Spratt | X | | |
| Mr. Hefley | X | | | Mr. Ortiz | X | | |
| Mr. Saxton | X | | | Mr. Evans | | X | |
| Mr. McHugh | X | | | Mr. Taylor | X | | |
| Mr. Everett | X | | | Mr. Abercrombie | X | | |
| Mr. Bartlett | X | | | Mr. Meehan | X | | |
| Mr. McKeon | X | | | Mr. Reyes | X | | |
| Mr. Thornberry | X | | | Dr. Snyder | X | | |
| Mr. Hostettler | X | | | Mr. Turner (TX) | X | | |
| Mr. Jones | X | | | Mr. Smith | X | | |
| Mr. Ryun (KS) | X | | | Ms. Sanchez | X | | |
| Mr. Gibbons | X | | | Mr. McIntyre | X | | |
| Mr. Hayes | X | | | Mr. Rodriguez | X | | |
| Mrs. Wilson (NM) | X | | | Ms. Tauscher | X | | |
| Mr. Calvert | X | | | Mr. Brady | X | | |
| Mr. Simmons | X | | | Mr. Hill | X | | |
| Mrs. Davis (VA) | X | | | Mr. Larson (CT) | | X | |
| Mr. Schrock | | | | Ms. Davis (CA) | X | | |
| Mr. Akin | X | | | Mr. Langevin | X | | |
| Mr. Forbes | X | | | Mr. Israel | X | | |
| Mr. Miller (FL) | X | | | Mr. Larsen (WA) | X | | |
| Mr. Wilson (SC) | X | | | Mr. Cooper | X | | |
| Mr. LoBiondo | X | | | Mr. Marshall | X | | |
| Mr. Cole | X | | | Mr. Meek | X | | |
| Mr. Bradley | X | | | Ms. Bordallo | X | | |
| Mr. Bishop | X | | | Mr. Alexander | X | | |
| Mr. Turner (OH) | X | | | Mr. Ryan (OH) | X | | |
| Mr. Kline | X | | | | | | |
| Mrs. Miller (MI) | X | | | | | | |
| Dr. Gingrey | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Rogers | X | | | | | | |
| Mr. Franks | X | | | | | | |

**Roll Call Vote Total:**

**58 Aye** **2 Nay** **Present**

## CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

The Committee intends to take steps to make available the analysis of changes in existing law made by the bill, as required by clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS

We write to express our profound disappointment over the process and partisanship that characterized the mark-up of H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

The Armed Services Committee has a well-established record of adhering to a structured legislative process that has resulted in deliberate and fulsome consideration of major legislative initiatives. The Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–433) and the Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act (Public Law 103–337) are just two examples of laws that resulted from a thoughtful series of committee hearings, consideration of views beyond those of the Department of Defense, and adequate time to scrutinize major proposals for change.

The committee also has stood out as one of the few remaining bastions of bipartisanship in the House of Representatives. Over the years, many contentious issues have come before the committee. From the debates over the Midgetman and MX missiles in the 1980s to allied burdensharing and building the B–2 bomber in the early 1990s to counterproliferation and peacekeeping activities more recently, Armed Services Committee members have invariably been able to work through politically charged issues. Resolving these issues has not been easy, but the atmosphere of bipartisanship, mutual respect and cordiality among members has always pervaded the committee authorization process.

The committee's historical practice has been to achieve compromise on all but the most intractably divisive measures, recognizing that national security is too important for partisanship, and that the committee's independence from the administration of the day was both its strength and its constitutional charge.

Unfortunately, the committee's consideration of H.R. 1588 has placed these traditions in jeopardy.

This year, the committee brought difficulty upon itself by accepting legislation beyond the traditional scope of a defense authorization, and then not allowing time for it to be properly considered. Over the years, the defense authorization bill has often included provisions that fall within the legislative jurisdiction of other committees. However, the inclusion in this bill of provisions dramatically changing our civil service laws and rewriting major environmental laws without limited application to the Department of Defense is extraordinary if not unprecedented. Equally troubling is that the Armed Services Committee held fewer than five hearings on the Department's "transformation" proposals, and two of those were on short notice or on a day when the House was not in session. These legislative proposals were submitted to Congress barely a month before the Committee marked up H.R. 1588 and immediately before a two week House recess period. The actual text of the language in this bill was available for Members to review just

a few days before mark up. Consideration of such broad, sweeping policy changes on short notice, with scant opportunity for review, is a dramatic departure from the Committee's history of careful, deliberate evaluation of significant legislation. This process will not produce prudent policy. Our committee has not operated in this fashion in the past, and consideration of the Department's "transformation" proposals warranted more thoughtful review in this instance. There was no committee interest in including this legislation in the authorization bill rather than a separate vehicle, and no committee interest in hastening its consideration. We urge the committee to return to its history of regular order process as we undertake future legislation.

The deterioration in bipartisanship, a hallmark of the Armed Services Committee's operations for decades, was evidenced in the mark up of H.R. 1588. During the 24–hour mark up of this bill, there were 29 roll call votes, and almost all of them were straight party-line or mostly party-line. Moreover, during consideration of the first and most important amendment to the civil service provisions in the bill—the most contentious aspect of this legislation—the previous question was moved in an effort to curtail debate. Both of these occurrences are unprecedented in the modern history of this committee, and we hope that they do not portend a sea change in the way this committee conducts its business. They are, however, symptoms of an underlying deterioration in the committee's legislative process.

It is axiomatic that the legislative process is consultative, and compromise among the parties is key to crafting sound policy that will stand the test of time. The Armed Services Committee's historical bipartisanship is a testament that consultation and compromise work. The mark up of this bill suggests a pronounced decline in these areas. Symptomatic of this decline was the series of three party-line roll call votes to the Service Acquisition Reform Act provisions in the bill. These provisions were included in the bill without consultation. The subject matter was not so inherently partisan that compromise should have been out of the question. Resolution of policy differences should have been easily attained without defaulting to a partisan outcome.

The motion for the previous question is equally disturbing. After full and substantive debate on myriad amendments throughout this mark-up, moving the previous question during the first amendment on the subject of greatest concern to the minority sends a signal of intolerance and unwillingness to respect or even hear opposing views, despite the fact that those views are widely and sincerely held by many members of the Committee. Such action is highly uncharacteristic and disappointing. Despite many contentious and partisan battles on issues in the past, not one member can recall a single instance in which the previous question has been moved during debate on an amendment in this committee. We view this development with sadness and regret.

The universal aim of members who serve on this committee, Republican and Democrat, is to enact policies to provide for our national security. We all endeavor to ensure that the men and women who serve in our military and make such great sacrifices for our nation have the training, equipment and means to best protect our

country. Attaining our mutual goals should not be a partisan enterprise, certainly not to the extent reflected in this bill and in this mark-up. We strongly urge a careful rethinking of the approach the committee has taken so far this year. A decline in one of the paragons of bipartisanship and collegiality in the House—the Armed Services Committee—will occur if this trend continues. Damage to the wisdom of our defense policy will be the unfortunate and inevitable long-term result for the country.

IKE SKELTON.
JOHN SPRATT.
GENE TAYLOR.
LANE EVANS.
MARTY MEEHAN.
NEIL ABERCROMBIE.
SILVESTRE REYES.
CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ.
VIC SNYDER.
LORETTA SANCHEZ.
SUSAN A. DAVIS.
RICK LARSEN.
JIM COOPER.
BARON P. HILL.
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER.
JOHN B. LARSON.
KENDRICK B. MEEK.
JIM LANGEVIN.
TIM RYAN.
ADAM SMITH.
ROBERT A. BRADY.
RODNEY ALEXANDER.
JIM TURNER.
STEVE ISRAEL.
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO.
MIKE MCINTYRE.
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ.
JIM MARSHALL.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS

We write to express our concerns about the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) and nuclear weapons provisions included in H.R. 1588. While, in both areas, the committee took some positive actions, we believe that on the whole the bill does not sufficiently advance the United States' nonproliferation policy goals. On the one hand, the bill does not provide all that the administration has requested to achieve the national security objectives of the CTR program. On the other, by advancing policies that aim to develop new and more usable nuclear weapons, the committee sends a dangerous signal to nations who might seek nuclear weapons and weakens U.S. credibility to push for nuclear restraint by others. Both of these elements of the bill are troubling on their own; when considered together they underline the dangers of these policies.

*Cooperative Threat Reduction Issues*

We are pleased that the committee fully funded the President's budget request for Cooperative Threat Reduction programs. We also commend the committee's decision to approve a one-year extension of waiver authority for certification conditions for the chemical weapons destruction facility at Shchuch'ye, Russia. Waiver authority will allow the construction of this facility—which currently stores 5,400 tons of the world's most dangerous and easily stolen weapons—to continue while still keeping pressure on Russia to comply all of the conditions imposed.

Yet while the bill permits the chemical weapons program to move forward, it also puts serious constraints on the funds needed to construct the Shchuch'ye facility. The chairman's mark, as presented to the committee, moved $28.8 million from the chemical weapons destruction program to the strategic offensive arms elimination program—a program already fully funded in the President's request. Mr. Spratt offered two amendments—one that would restore the administration's request and one that would put the $28.8 million in a separate line item that could be used for either the chemical or the strategic nuclear programs. The latter approach would have given the Secretary of Defense the flexibility to fund Shchuch'ye, while still allowing some members of the committee to express their preference for funding strategic nuclear programs. The bill also contains a complicated and unwieldy cost-sharing system for obligating the money that remains. While we believe that Russia and other members of the international community must remain active and committed partners in this effort, the bill's approach to achieving this outcome is overly complex and likely to slow efforts to dismantle these weapons. Both of these amendments failed on party line votes. We are deeply disappointed that the [national security benefits] value of the nonproliferation efforts to be achieved at Shchuch'ye—which President Bush has ordered to be

accelerated—are not understood or accepted by the majority of this committee.

We are also distressed that the administration's request to allow $50 million in CTR funds to be used outside the former Soviet Union to take advantage of near-term nonproliferation opportunities or to advance our long-standing nonproliferation policies was stripped from this bill. Instead the bill allows for the transfer of such funds to the State Department's Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund. We believe that the State Department undertakes important nonproliferation activities, but it does not have the deep expertise in securing and dismantling the weapons and infrastructure of weapons of mass destruction programs. The administration specifically asked for the Department of Defense to have this authority and we concur with their assessment. Ms. Tauscher offered an amendment that would have restored the requested approach. All committee Democrats and a Republican supported the President's request, but the amendment still failed.

Beyond these amendments, we have concerns about other provisions that may be well-intentioned, but are constraining in their effect. We are aware of and troubled by the waste incurred by the troubles at CTR programs in Votkinsk and Krasnoyarsk. We believe that there must be better program accountability and a renewed commitment by our Russian partners to ensure these problems do not recur. The Defense Department acknowledges this as well and has instituted a series of new procedures and policies designed to achieve this goal which they described to the committee on in testimony on March 4, 2003. The approach taken by this bill including its requirement that the Department identify, for all new or ongoing CTR programs, every permit or license that will ever be needed for a project, and then obtain such permits, regardless of when they would be most appropriately obtained, will hamstring numerous CTR programs, ultimately extending the completion time for these projects and leaving more weapons at proliferation risk. We share the majority's interest in enhanced accountability, but the existing efforts of the Department will achieve this, without risking the health of existing programs.

We hope some of these weaknesses will be reversed in floor consideration of H.R. 1588. Doing so would advance the administration's and Congress' goal of preventing the proliferation of some of the world's most dangerous weapons.

*Nuclear Weapon Issues*

We are pleased that the committee accepted the amendment offered by Rep. Spratt to retain the prohibition on developing new nuclear weapons with yields below five kilotons. Although the amendment permits research of such weapons, it prohibits development engineering (referred to as Phase 6.3 activities by the Department of Energy) and later stages of development. More importantly, the amendment reaffirms that it is the policy of the United States not to develop or produce low-yield nuclear weapons. This bipartisan action in the House sends an important message: the United States is not backsliding towards development of new battlefield nuclear weapons.

Unfortunately, bipartisan agreement on this amendment did not extend to three other amendments on nuclear weapons. On nearly party-line votes, the majority refused to accept the following amendments:

1. A Tauscher Amendment to put in place a one-year moratorium on the development of new nuclear weapons (although research short of phase 6.3 would have been permitted);
2. A Tauscher Amendment to transfer funding from two nuclear weapon studies—the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator and Advanced Concepts—to conventional alternatives for addressing hard and deeply buried targets; and
3. A Spratt Amendment to require notification of Congress 18 months prior to a resumption of underground nuclear testing.

In rejecting these common-sense amendments, the committee has effectively endorsed the Bush Administration's policy to examine new uses for nuclear weapons. We believe this policy is a reversal of the positive trend since the end of the Cold War to rely less and less on nuclear weapons. If the United States starts seeking new nuclear weapons, it signals that nuclear weapons are still desirable and legitimate weapons of war. If other existing nuclear nations—such as Russia, China, India, and Pakistan—follow our lead, the odds increase that terrorist groups will obtain these weapons or the critical fissile materials used to build them. In addition, our pursuit of new nuclear weapons may weaken international resolve to prevent nations such as North Korea, Iran, Syria, and Libya from obtaining nuclear weapons (or more weapons in the case of North Korea).

Instead of developing new nuclear weapons, the United States should redouble its efforts to discourage the development and use of nuclear weapons and reduce the stores of fissile materials available for theft or unauthorized transfer. We are disappointed that the bill as currently drafted heads in the wrong direction, and will continue to seek changes to the bill on the House floor and in conference.

IKE SKELTON.
JOHN SPRATT.
GENE TAYLOR.
LANE EVANS
MARTY MEEHAN.
NEIL ABERCROMBIE.
SILVESTRE REYES.
VIC SNYDER.
LORETTA SANCHEZ.
ADAM SMITH.
ROBERT A. BRADY.
RODNEY ALEXANDER.
JIM TURNER.
RICK LARSEN.
JIM COOPER.
BARON P. HILL.
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER.
JOHN B. LARSON.
KENDRICK B. MEEK.
JIM LANGEVIN.
TIM RYAN.
STEVE ISRAEL.
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO.
SUSAN A. DAVIS.
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS

As members of the Armed Services Committee we clearly understand the importance of a strong national defense. Our record of support is unambiguous. Realistic and rigorous training underpins the capabilities of our military services, forms one of the most important components of readiness, and provides for our repeated successes.

We have an obligation to protect this training. We also have an obligation to protect the natural environment—air, water, and land—upon which all life depends. The protection of our environment has profound consequences on our economic well being and our quality of life.

No one can dispute the importance of military readiness and protecting the environment. However, the current law effectively balances the two. If a case were made that current law was not balanced we would certainly be sympathetic to adjusting the law. Nothing points to an imbalance.

We have heard much rhetoric on the issue, but the truth is the Department of Defense's evidence is fundamentally anecdotal. Moreover, that anecdotal evidence stands in sharp contrast to the successes in Iraq. Should training have been adversely impacted, we would have expected to see evidence of that impact in combat operations. None exists.

We looked for analysis to inform the debate. While metrics exist to measure readiness, no one has presented any measure of reduced readiness resulting from the Department's compliance with existing law. In fact, in an April 2003 Report, the General Accounting Office noted "Despite concerns voiced repeatedly by DOD officials about the effects of encroachment on training, DOD's readiness reports did not indicate the extent to which encroachment was adversely affecting training readiness and costs."

Supplementing this absence of data suggesting an adverse impact on readiness are the statements of Administration officials. In Senate testimony earlier this year, Christine Whitman, administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, said, "I don't believe that there is a training mission anywhere in the country that is being held up or not taking place because of environmental protection regulation." Further, the Deputy Secretary of Defense wrote in a March 3 memorandum "In the vast majority of cases, we have demonstrated that we are both able to comply with environmental requirements and to conduct necessary military training and testing."

Finally, if an adverse impact existed or arose, current law provides a number of exemptions that the Administration could exercise. Rather than support a substantial shift in environmental law, we call upon the Department to exercise its ability to use the existing exemptions in the rare cases in which those exemptions might

be needed. Apparently Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz agrees. He wrote "In those exceptional cases where we cannot [train] and the law permits us to do so, we owe it to our young men and women to request an appropriate exemption."

Instead of addressing those rare cases by supporting existing exemptions or proposing a surgical fix, the majority included far-reaching changes in environmental laws, whose application extends well beyond the Department of Defense and well beyond any determinable national security requirement.

The unfortunate and counterproductive result of exempting all Federal activity from these important protections will be to further exacerbate the threat to endangered species and marine mammals, curtail valuable public, State and local consultation, and in all likelihood increase litigation.

SUSAN A. DAVIS.
LANE EVANS.
NEIL ABERCROMBIE.
CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ.
LORETTA SANCHEZ.
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER.
JIM LANGEVIN.
TIM RYAN.
JOHN B. LARSON.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS

These additional views express our concerns regarding the proposal for a new Department of Defense National Security Personnel System included in H.R. 1588. We recognize the need for some changes in the personnel management system at the Department of Defense (DoD) that help the department adapt to today's international security and employment environment. In particular, we feel that more flexibility in hiring practices and a fair pay-for-performance system that does a better job of rewarding the best DOD civilian employees could be very important steps toward creating a more effective Department of Defense. However, we believe that the proposal included in H.R. 1588 goes too far, too fast. Rather than presenting Congress with a plan to address specific problems in the current civilian personnel system, the Department has requested blanket authority to create an entirely new system with only the flimsiest safeguards for fundamental employee rights. We believe that this "blank check" approach to reform is not the way to proceed.

As recently demonstrated by the performance of our military forces in Iraq, the Department of Defense is a highly effective organization that is producing superb military capability. Civilians at DOD—numbering more than 700,000—were a critical part of this military success. The quality of this performance demonstrates that Congress has time to do this right. Simply put, there is no "crisis" in the DOD civil service system that requires the ill-considered, rushed, and unclear reform effort embodied in H.R. 1588. Our concern is that in trying to go too fast in this critical area of reform, the Department risks undermining the morale and effectiveness of a patriotic and loyal civilian workforce that is a key part of the outstanding military capabilities our nation enjoys today.

In addition to our concerns with the overly broad and rushed approach to reform of the civilian personnel system inherent in H.R. 1588, we are troubled by the lack of explicit protections for fundamental workers' rights in the legislation. The proposal grants broad authority to the current—and every future—Secretary of Defense to create and manage a new personnel system that is exempt from many current employee protections embodied in Title 5, United States Code: the right to true collective bargaining, the right to a fair appeals system, premium payment for employees in hazardous jobs, adequate overtime and weekend compensation, preferences for veterans in hiring and retention, equal pay for equal work, and protection from adverse actions due to political affiliation. We believe that an effective approach to reform does not require casually tossing aside these critical protections, which are now protected in statute, in exchange for the promises and good intentions of the current and future leadership of the Department of Defense. We fear that if the Department of Defense fails to use this new author-

ity in a responsible manner, we risk returning the nation's most important government department to a "spoils" system where political loyalty and favoritism are more important than competence and merit.

During floor consideration of H.R. 1588, we hope to present amendments that address our concerns regarding the overly broad and sweeping provisions that grant the Department of Defense unprecedented authority to establish an entirely new personnel system. Informed and carefully considered reform of the DOD civil service system may be needed, but we feel that the approach represented by H.R. 1588 may place America's current military strength at risk by trying to change too much, too fast. We feel that Congress owes it to our Department of Defense civilian employees, our Armed Forces, and the American people to get these critical reforms right.

JIM COOPER.
IKE SKELTON.
JOHN SPRATT.
GENE TAYLOR.
CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ.
SILVESTRE REYES.
NEIL ABERCROMBIE.
SUSAN A. DAVIS.
ADAM SMITH.
JAMES LANGEVIN.
JOHN B. LARSON.
STEVE ISRAEL.
ROBERT A. BRADY.
KENDRICK B. MEEK.
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ.
RICK LARSEN.
TIM RYAN.
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER.

## ADDITIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE TIM RYAN

This statement is to clarify any inconsistency found in the amendments pertaining to subsection 2533a(c) of the Berry Amendment. My intent is to have consistency throughout 2533a(c), as amended, by having the authority found in 2533a(c), as amended, rest exclusively with the Secretary of Defense, and not with the Secretary of the military department concerned. Hence, the phrase "or the Secretary of the military department concerned" should be stricken throughout 2533a(c) of the Berry Amendment.

TIM RYAN.

## DISSENTING VIEW OF REPRESENTATIVE LANE EVANS

The Fiscal Year 2004 National Defense Authorization as reported out of this committee goes a long way in giving our troops and their commanders the tools to transform our military for the 21st century. But, I remain very concerned about the latitude given to the Secretary of Defense and the enveloping changes to the Department of Defenses' personnel system. My overwhelming concern in handing over so much power to the Pentagon and eliminating vital labor protections forced me to vote against the chairman's mark up.

Section 1111 of the Fiscal Year 2004 National Defense Authorization as reported waives 12 major federal civil service protections for workers in Title 5 of the United States Code. These sweeping changes and others more drastic were presented to the committee for consideration by the Secretary of Defense less than two weeks before we began the mark up process. This gave the members of the committee an extremely short period to listen to expert witnesses and deliberate the effect of this wide ranging rollback. While the creation of the current civil service rules took years to implement and perfect, this major rollback took only a few hours of hearings, with little actual debate.

Section 1111 gives the Department of Defense authority to scrap local bargaining agreements and replace them with one rigid national system. Denying local agreements does not take into account unique workplaces that a national agreement will not incorporate. Further, it scraps the long established General Schedule (GS) wage system and the grade step increases with a system the Secretary of Defense will draw up. Neither the Armed Services Committee nor the Government Reform Committee have given any guidance or parameters over a wage system that will effect over 700,000 government workers.

The hallmark of our nation's civil service system is due process and rights of appeal. This legislation waives a Department of Defense employee's right to appeal a disciplinary discriminatory action to either the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission or the Merit Systems Protection Board.

Many of these changes to the civil service in this legislation are based upon the "Homeland Security" model that has not even been tested, much less implemented. We are about to extend these experimental rollbacks to the 700,000 Department of Defense civilian employees. These effected civilian employees performed tremendously during Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, but upon the recent cessation of hostilities, their rights and protections will now be rolled back, without justification being presented in this committee.

This legislation as reported out of the committee places an unprecedented amount of trust with the Secretary of Defense that would apply to all future Secretaries of Defense in the area of labor

management and civilian protections. This committee should not hand off wide-ranging and absolute authority on the enforcement of veterans' preference in hiring, setting wage and pay classifications, and the definition of merit and performance to the Secretary of Defense and his or her subordinate bureaucrats. It is within the jurisdiction and the assigned role of this committee to define these standards. I believe that in the future, more than likely based upon a negative and publicized experience with these rollbacks, this committee will revisit the broad latitude in the personnel system handed to the Secretary of Defense.

I am aware that the Senate Armed Services Committee has not included these changes to the personnel system and it is my strong desire that the Senate position on this issue prevails.

LANE EVANS.

○