

Calendar No. 185

110TH CONGRESS }
1st Session

SENATE

{ REPORT
110-77

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION
ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008**

R E P O R T

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1547]

TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 FOR
MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL
STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PUR-
POSES

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE**



JUNE 5, 2007.—Ordered to be printed

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Calendar No. 185

110TH CONGRESS }
1st Session

SENATE

{ REPORT
110-77

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION
ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008**

R E P O R T

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1547]

TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 FOR
MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL
STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PUR-
POSES

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE**



JUNE 5, 2007.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

35-737

WASHINGTON : 2007

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(110th Congress, 1st Session)

CARL LEVIN, Michigan, *Chairman*

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts	JOHN McCAIN, Arizona
ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia	JOHN WARNER, Virginia
JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut	JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma
JACK REED, Rhode Island	JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama
DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii	SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine
BILL NELSON, Florida	JOHN ENSIGN, Nevada
E. BENJAMIN NELSON, Nebraska	SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia
EVAN BAYH, Indiana	LINDSEY O. GRAHAM, South Carolina
HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, New York	ELIZABETH DOLE, North Carolina
MARK L. PRYOR, Arkansas	JOHN CORNYN, Texas
JIM WEBB, Virginia	JOHN THUNE, South Dakota
CLAIRE McCASKILL, Missouri	MEL MARTINEZ, Florida

RICHARD D. DEBOBES, *Staff Director*

MICHAEL V. KOSTIW, *Republican Staff Director*

CONTENTS

Purpose of the Bill	Page 1
Committee overview and recommendations	2
Explanation of funding summary	11
Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations	21
Title I—Procurement	21
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations	21
Explanation of tables	21
Rapid Acquisition Fund (sec. 105)	21
Subtitle B—Army Programs	23
Multiyear procurement authority for M1A2 Abrams System Enhance- ment Package upgrades (sec. 111)	52
Multiyear procurement authority for M2A3/M3A3 Bradley fighting vehicle upgrades (sec. 112)	52
Stryker Mobile Gun System (sec. 113)	52
Consolidation of Joint Network Node program and Warfighter Infor- mation Network—Tactical program into a single Army tactical net- work program (sec. 114)	53
Budget Items—Army	55
Armed reconnaissance helicopter	55
CH-47 Chinook helicopter	56
Enhanced electronic digital engine control unit	56
Aircraft survivability equipment infrared countermeasures	57
Aircrew integrated systems	57
Patriot Advanced Capability-3	58
Stryker Vehicle	58
Improved recovery vehicle	59
System enhancement program: SEP M1A2	59
M240 medium machine gun	59
Arsenal support program initiative	59
Grenades	60
Ammunition outloading test bed	60
Ammunition plant solvent recovery system	60
Acid containment and storage system	60
Single channel ground and airborne radio system family	60
Information systems	62
Installation information infrastructure modernization program	62
Explosive ordnance disposal equipment	62
Land warrior	62
Recon and navigation system	64
Army combat training centers	64
Urban training technologies	64
Laser collective combat training system	65
Call for fire trainer	65
Subtitle C—Navy Programs	65
Multiyear procurement authority for <i>Virginia</i> class submarine pro- gram (sec. 131)	94
Budget Items—Navy	94
H-46 modifications	94
H-53 modifications	94
P-3 modifications	94
Weapons industrial facilities	95
Ship Self Defense System for carrier replacement program	95
<i>Virginia</i> class submarine advance procurement	95
DDG-51 program completion costs	96
Littoral combat ship	97

	Page
Title I—Procurement—Continued	
Budget Items—Navy—Continued	
Outfitting and post-delivery	100
LCS modules	100
SPQ-9B radar	100
Sonobuoys	100
Weapons range support equipment	101
NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system	101
Submarine training device modifications	101
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs	101
Limitation on retirement of C-130E/H tactical airlift aircraft (sec. 141)	117
Limitation on retirement of KC-135E aerial refueling aircraft (sec. 142)	117
Budget Items—Air Force	117
B-2 bomber	117
B-52 bomber aircraft	118
Large aircraft infrared countermeasures system	118
C-135 global air traffic management	118
Advanced targeting pod	119
Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile	119
Advanced Extremely High Frequency satellite	119
Joint threat emitter	120
Space-Based Infrared Satellite system mission control station backup	120
Self-deploying infrared streamer	120
Budget Items—Defense-wide	129
Defense Information Systems Network enhancement	129
CV-22 procurement	129
M291 skin decontamination kit	129
Collectively protected deployable medical system	129
Automatic chemical agent detector and alarm	129
Improved chemical agent monitor	130
Joint biological point detection system	130
Items of Special Interest	130
C-5 Reliability Enhancement Re-engining Program	130
DDG-51 <i>Arleigh Burke</i> class destroyer modernization program	131
MQ-1C Predator/Warrior	132
Mine resistant ambush protected vehicle reporting requirement	133
Navy harbor tugs	133
LPD-17 amphibious transport dock	134
Procurement requests related to increasing the size of the Army and the Marine Corps	134
Shipboard personal locator beacon	135
Strike fighter gap	135
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	137
Explanation of tables	137
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations	139
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations	139
Advanced Sensor Applications Program (sec. 211)	139
Active protection systems (sec. 212)	139
Obligation and expenditure of funds for competitive procurement of propulsion system for the Joint Strike Fighter (sec. 213)	139
Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs	140
Limitation on availability of funds for procurement, construction, and deployment of missile defenses in Europe (sec. 231)	140
Limitation on availability of funds for deployment of missile defense interceptors in Alaska (sec. 232)	143
Budget and acquisition requirements for Missile Defense Agency activities (sec. 233)	143
Participation of Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, in missile defense test and evaluation activities (sec. 234)	144
Extension of Comptroller General assessments of ballistic missile defense programs (sec. 235)	144
Subtitle D—Other Matters	145
Modification of notice and wait requirement for obligation of funds for the foreign comparative test program (sec. 251)	145
Modification of cost sharing requirement for Technology Transition Initiative (sec. 252)	145

	Page
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued	
Subtitle D—Other Matters—Continued	
Strategic plan for the Manufacturing Technology Program (sec. 253)	145
Modification of authorities on coordination of Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research with similar Federal programs (sec. 254)	146
Enhancement of defense nanotechnology research and development program (sec. 255)	146
Budget Items	148
Army	148
Army basic research	164
University research initiatives	164
Army university research centers	164
Army materials research	165
Electronics and space research	165
Materials for insensitive munitions	166
Sniper detection systems	166
Army vehicle research	166
Recoil mitigation technologies	167
Unmanned ground vehicle weaponization	167
Army electronics research	167
Standoff explosives detection technologies	168
Force protection materials research	168
Unmanned air systems	168
Army medical research	168
Guided airdrop systems	169
Army medical technologies	169
Dengue infection research	170
Lightweight cannon recoil technologies	170
Combat vehicle armor technologies	170
Unmanned ground vehicle initiative	171
Combat vehicle energy and power technologies	171
Combat vehicle reliability and readiness technologies	171
Leadership training simulators	172
Fuel cells for military applications	172
Counter rocket, artillery, and mortar radar technologies	172
Language translation technologies	172
Radiation hardening initiative	173
Active protection systems development and integration	173
Undersea chemical weapons assessment program	174
Warfighter information network—tactical	174
Future medical shelter systems	174
Nickel boron metal coating technology for crew served weapons	175
Integrated broadcast service	175
Family of heavy tactical vehicles	175
Light Tactical Wheeled Vehicles	176
Future combat systems	176
Combat identification	177
High energy laser systems test facility	178
HIMARS modular launcher communications system	178
Combat vehicle improvement programs	178
Helicopter autonomous landing system	179
Joint tactical ground station	180
Navy	180
Navy science and technology educational outreach	195
Infrared materials research	195
Undersea perimeter security technologies	195
Navy energy and power technologies	195
Composites research for special operations craft	196
Situational awareness processing technologies	196
Navy electronics research	196
Undersea sensor arrays	196
Tactical unmanned air vehicles	196
Free electron laser research	197
Force protection advanced technology	197
Ground sensor networks	198
Navy sensor arrays	199
Shipboard system component development	199

	Page
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued	
Budget Items—Continued	
Navy—Continued	
Surface vessel torpedo tubes	200
Advanced submarine system development	200
Next generation shipboard monitoring	201
Expeditionary fighting vehicle	201
Joint light tactical vehicle	202
Optical interconnect	202
Tactical aircraft direct infrared countermeasures development	203
Conventional Trident modification	203
Permanent magnet motor	203
Wireless encryption technology	204
Improved towed array handler	204
Combat information center conversion	204
Submarine electronic chart updates	205
Next generation Phalanx	205
NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system	205
Navy medical research	206
Joint Strike Fighter research and development	206
Navy support of the reliable replacement warhead	206
Linear accelerator	207
Structural life tracking	207
Ultrasonic consolidation technology	207
Anti-sniper infrared targeting system	207
Satellite communications (space)	207
Internet protocol version 6	208
Navy manufacturing research	208
National Shipbuilding Research Program—Advanced Ship-	
building Enterprise	208
Air Force	208
Air Force basic research	224
Carbon fiber research	224
Optical components for air vehicles	224
Scramjet technologies	224
Network centric collaboration technologies	225
Air Force seismic research for nuclear test monitoring	225
Acoustic shields for rocket payloads	225
Cyber attack mitigation	225
Aerospace metals research	225
Deployable fuel cell processors	226
Aerospace titanium research	226
Thin film amorphous solar arrays	226
High integrity global positioning system	226
Optical interconnects for battlefield communications	227
Space control technology	227
Space radar technology study	227
Common aero vehicle	228
Operationally responsive space	228
Combat search and rescue replacement vehicle	228
Rapid attack identification detection and reporting system	229
Space control test capability	229
Space situation awareness systems	229
Space fence	229
Joint space intelligent decision support	230
Space-Based Infrared Satellite System High GEO	230
Alternate infrared satellite system	230
Ballistic missile range safety technology	231
MQ-9 Reaper	231
Predator trainer upgrade	232
Joint surveillance target attack radar system research and devel-	
opment	232
Weather service research and development	233
Classified program	233
Global Positioning System user equipment	233
MQ-1 Predator signals intelligence direction finding	233
Network-centric collaborative targeting	234
National Security Space Office	234

VII

	Page
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued	
Budget Items—Continued	
Air Force —Continued	
Space situational awareness operations	235
C-130 deicing system	235
KC-135 tanker replacement	235
Combat casualty management system	235
Laser processing of materials	236
Defense-wide	236
Semiconductor focus center research program	254
Superstructural particle evaluation	254
Medical free electron laser	254
Chemical and biological infrared detector	255
Chemical and biological protective textile fabric	255
Verification and validation of chemical agent persistence models ..	255
Blast mitigation and protection	255
Comprehensive national incident management system	256
Advanced technologies for special operations	256
Directly printed electronic components	257
Semi-conducting metal oxide sensors	257
Improved chemical, biological, and radiological filters	257
Raman chemical identification system	257
Biometrics technologies	257
Manufacturing technologies	258
Printed circuit board technologies	258
Energy efficiency technologies	258
Unmanned air vehicle batteries	259
Water remediation research	259
High performance computing modeling and simulation	259
Small craft common operating picture technology	260
Active protection systems comparative testing	260
Joint warfare experimentation	260
Range readiness analyses	260
Terminal High Altitude Area Defense	261
Arrow missile defense program	262
Short-range ballistic missile defense	262
Ground-based midcourse defense in Europe	262
Airborne Laser	263
Real-time non-specific viral agent detector	263
Ballistic missile defense reductions	264
Aegis ballistic missile defense	264
Space tracking and surveillance system	264
Space test-bed	265
Surface-to-air missile threat simulators	265
Prompt global strike	265
Information systems security program technology development ...	266
Software assurance education and research	267
Defense Logistics Agency manufacturing research	267
Manufacturing processes to support surge requirements	268
Items of Special Interest	268
Adaptive optics	268
Advanced cruise missile threats	268
Analyses of the Air Force test and evaluation proposals	269
Director of Operational Test and Evaluation workforce study	270
Ground/air task-oriented radar	270
National Security Agency acquisition management	271
Open Architecture	272
Title III—Operation and Maintenance	275
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations	275
Explanation of tables	275
Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions	307
Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for certain costs in connection with Moses Lake Wellfield Superfund Site, Moses Lake, Washington (sec. 311)	307
Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for certain costs in connection with the Arctic Surplus Superfund Site, Fairbanks, Alaska (sec. 312)	307
Payment to Environmental Protection Agency of stipulated penalties in connection with Jackson Park Housing Complex, Washington (sec. 313)	307

VIII

	Page
Title III—Operation and Maintenance —Continued	
Subtitle C—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations	307
Availability of funds in Defense Information Systems Agency Work- ing Capital Fund for technology upgrades to Defense Information Systems Network (sec. 321)	307
Extension of temporary authority for contract performance of security guard functions (sec. 322)	307
Report on incremental cost of early 2007 enhanced deployment (sec. 323)	308
Individual body armor (sec. 324)	308
Subtitle D—Workplace and Depot Issues	308
Extension of authority for Army industrial facilities to engage in cooperative activities with non-Army entities (sec. 341)	308
Two-year extension of Arsenal Support Demonstration Program (sec. 342)	309
Subtitle E—Other Matters	309
Enhancement of corrosion control and prevention functions within Department of Defense (sec. 351)	309
Reimbursement for National Guard support provided to Federal agencies (sec. 352)	310
Reauthorization of Aviation Insurance Program (sec. 353)	310
Property accountability and disposition of unlawfully obtained prop- erty of the Armed Forces (sec. 354)	310
Authority to impose reasonable conditions on the payment of full replacement value for claims related to personal property trans- ported at Government expense (sec. 355)	311
Authority for individuals to retain combat uniforms issued in connec- tion with contingency operations (sec. 356)	311
Modification of requirements on Comptroller General report on readi- ness of Army and Marine Corps ground forces (sec. 357)	311
Budget Items—Army	312
Extended cold weather clothing system	312
Manufacturing engineering training outreach program	312
Live fire ranges modernization and improvements	312
Budget Items—Navy	312
Naval aircraft depot maintenance	312
Mk45 mod 5" gun depot overhaul	313
Environmental impact assessment, outlying landing field	313
Unobligated balances	313
Excess cash balances	314
Budget Items—Marine Corps	314
Extended cold weather clothing system	314
Family of combat equipment support and services	314
Rapid deployable shelters	315
Mobile corrosion protection and abatement USMC	315
Budget Items—Air Force	315
National Security Space Institute	315
Mobile shear	315
Transfer of funds from Air Force centralized asset management pro- gram to Air Guard and Air Force Reserve	315
Budget Items—Defense-wide	316
Language training shortfalls	316
Defense Security Cooperation Agency	317
Defense readiness reporting system and management tools	317
Readiness and environmental protection initiative	318
Strategic communication and integration	318
Budget Items—Army Reserve	319
Mobile corrosion protection and abatement USAR	319
Budget Items—Army National Guard	319
Extended cold weather clothing system	319
National Guard interoperability upgrades	319
Integrated disaster and rapid data management systems	319
Mobile corrosion protection and abatement USARNG	319
Operator driving simulator	319
Budget Items—Air National Guard	320
Controlled humidity protection	320
Weapons skills trainer	320
Budget Items—Transfer Accounts	320

IX

	Page
Title III—Operation and Maintenance —Continued	
Budget Items—Transfer Accounts—Continued	
Funding for formerly used defense sites	320
Budget Items—Miscellaneous Appropriations	320
Building partnership capacity for humanitarian assistance	320
Items of Special Interest	321
Comptroller General report on depot work	321
Department of Defense foreign language training	321
Fee-for-service air refueling services	322
Next generation enterprise network	322
Report on Department of Defense personnel access to the internet	323
Title IV—Military Personnel Authorizations	325
Subtitle A—Active Forces	325
End strengths for active forces (sec. 401)	325
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces	326
End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411)	326
End strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412)	326
End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413)	327
Fiscal year 2008 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414)	327
Maximum number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support (sec. 415)	327
Subtitle C—Authorizations of Appropriations	327
Military personnel (sec. 421)	327
Title V—Military Personnel Policy	335
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy	335
Increase in authorized strengths for Army officers on active duty in the grade of major to meet force structure requirements (sec. 501)	335
Increase in authorized strengths for Navy officers on active duty in grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain to meet force structure requirements (sec. 502)	335
Expansion of exclusion of military permanent professors from strength limitations for officers below general and flag grades (sec. 503)	335
Mandatory retirement age for active-duty general and flag officers continued on active duty (sec. 504)	335
Authority for reduced mandatory service obligation for initial ap- pointments of officers in critically short health professional special- ties (sec. 505)	336
Increase in authorized number of permanent professors at the United States Military Academy (sec. 506)	336
Expansion of authority for reenlistment of officers in their former enlisted grade (sec. 507)	336
Enhanced authority for reserve general and flag officers to serve on active duty (sec. 508)	336
Promotion of career military professors of the Navy (sec. 509)	337
Subtitle B—Enlisted Personnel Policy	337
Increase in authorized daily average of number of members in pay grade E–9 (sec. 521)	337
Subtitle C—Reserve Component Management	337
Revised designation, structure, and functions of the Reserve Forces Policy Board (sec. 531)	337
Charter for the National Guard Bureau (sec. 532)	337
Appointment, grade, duties, and retirement of the Chief of the Na- tional Guard Bureau (sec. 533)	338
Mandatory separation for years of service of Reserve officers in the grade of lieutenant general or vice admiral (sec. 534)	338
Increase in period of temporary Federal recognition as officers of the National Guard from six to twelve months (sec. 535)	339
Subtitle D—Education and Training	339
Grade and service credit of commissioned officers in uniformed med- ical accession programs (sec. 551)	339
Expansion of number of academies supportable in any State under STARBASE program (sec. 552)	339
Repeal of post-2007–2008 academic year prohibition on phased in- crease in cadet strength limit at the United States Military Acad- emy (sec. 553)	340

	Page
Title V—Military Personnel Policy—Continued	
Subtitle D—Education and Training—Continued	
Treatment of Southold, Mattituck, and Greenport High Schools, Southold, New York, as single institutions for purposes of maintaining a Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit (sec. 554)	340
Subtitle E—Defense Dependents' Education Matters	340
Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 561)	340
Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 562)	340
Inclusion of dependents of non-Department of Defense employees employed on Federal property in plan relating to force structure changes, relocation of military units, or base closures and realignments (sec. 563)	341
Authority for payment of private boarding school tuition for military dependents in overseas areas not served by Department of Defense dependents' schools (sec. 564)	341
Subtitle F—Military Justice and Legal Assistance Matters	341
Authority of judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces to administer oaths (sec. 571)	341
Military legal assistance for Department of Defense civilian employees in areas without access to non-military legal assistance (sec. 572)	341
Modification of authorities on senior members of the Judge Advocate Generals' corps (sec. 573)	342
Subtitle G—Military Family Readiness	342
Department of Defense Military Family Readiness Council (sec. 581) .	342
Department of Defense policy and plans for military family readiness (sec. 582)	342
Subtitle H—Other Matters	343
Enhancement of carryover of accumulated leave for members of the Armed Forces (sec. 591)	343
Uniform policy on performances by military bands (sec. 592)	344
Waiver of time limitations on award of medals of honor to certain members of the Army (sec. 593)	344
Items of Special Interest	344
Army company-grade officer retention	344
Comptroller General study of implementation by the military departments of sexual assault policies and mental health issues related to sexual assault	345
Counter-remote controlled improvised explosive device systems	345
Explosive ordnance disposal personnel	345
Feasibility of expanding access to mental health professionals in military units	346
Implementation of clarifying changes to jurisdiction under the Uniform Code of Military Justice	346
Report on programs assessing feasibility of hotlines and video surveillance in recruiting stations	347
Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits	349
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances	349
Fiscal year 2008 increase in military basic pay (sec. 601)	349
Allowance for participation of Reserves in electronic screening (sec. 602)	349
Midmonth payment of basic pay for contributions of members participating in Thrift Savings Plan (sec. 603)	349
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays	349
Extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611)	349
Extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals (sec. 612)	350
Extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613)	350
Extension of authorities relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays (sec. 614)	350
Increase in incentive special pay and multiyear retention bonus for medical officers of the Armed Forces (sec. 615)	350
Increase in dental officer additional special pay (sec. 616)	350
Enhancement of hardship duty pay (sec. 617)	351

	Page
Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits—Continued	
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays—Continued	
Inclusion of service as off-cycle crewmember of multi-crewed ship in sea duty for career sea pay (sec. 618)	351
Modification of reenlistment bonus for members of the Selected Reserve (sec. 619)	351
Increase in years of commissioned service covered by agreements for nuclear-qualified officers extending periods of active duty (sec. 620)	351
Authority to waive 25-year active duty limit for retention bonus for critical military skills with respect to certain members (sec. 621)	351
Codification and improvement of authority to pay bonus to encourage members of the Army to refer other persons for enlistment in the Army (sec. 622)	351
Authority to pay bonus to encourage Department of Defense personnel to refer other persons for appointment as officers to serve in health professions (sec. 623)	352
Accession bonus for participants in Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance program (sec. 624)	352
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances	352
Payment of expenses of travel to the United States for obstetrical purposes of dependents located in very remote locations outside the United States (sec. 641)	352
Payment of moving expenses for Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps instructors in hard-to-fill positions (sec. 642)	352
Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits	353
Modification of scheme for payment of death gratuity payable with respect to members of the Armed Forces (sec. 651)	353
Annuities for guardians or caretakers of dependent children under Survivor Benefit Plan (sec. 652)	353
Expansion of combat-related special compensation eligibility for chapter 61 military retirees (sec. 653)	354
Clarification of application of retired pay multiplier percentage to members of the uniformed services with over 30 years of service (sec. 654)	354
Commencement of receipt of non-regular service retired pay by members of the Ready Reserve on active Federal status or active duty for significant periods (sec. 655)	354
Subtitle E—Education Benefits	354
Tuition assistance for off-duty training or education (sec. 671)	354
Expansion of Selected Reserve education loan repayment program (sec. 672)	354
Subtitle F—Other Matters	355
Enhancement of authorities on income replacement payments for Reserves experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for active-duty service (sec. 681)	355
Overseas naturalization of military family members (sec. 682)	355
Items of Special Interest	355
Implementation of limitations on terms of consumer credit extended to service members and dependents	355
Survivor Benefit Plan/Dependency and Indemnity Compensation recoupment procedures	356
Title VII—Health Care Provisions	359
Inclusion of TRICARE retail pharmacy program in Federal procurement of pharmaceuticals (sec. 701)	359
Surveys on continued viability of TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra (sec. 702)	359
Items of Special Interest	360
Comptroller General study of post-deployment health reassessment ..	360
Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs Joint Executive Council Strategic Plan and Joint Incentive Fund	360
Mental Health Advisory Team IV findings	361
Reduction in Navy medical personnel and medical efficiency wedge ..	362
TRICARE program cost sharing increases	363
Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters	365
Subtitle A—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs ..	365
Substantial savings under multiyear contracts (sec. 801)	365

XII

	Page
Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Mat- ters—Continued	
Subtitle A—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs— Continued	
Changes to Milestone B certifications (sec. 802)	365
Comptroller General report on Department of Defense organization and structure for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 803)	366
Investment strategy for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 804)	366
Report on implementation of recommendations on total ownership cost for major weapon systems (sec. 805)	367
Subtitle B—Amendments Relating to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations	367
Enhanced competition requirements for task and delivery order con- tracts (sec. 821)	367
Clarification of rules regarding the procurement of commercial items (sec. 822)	368
Clarification of rules regarding the procurement of commercial serv- ices (sec. 823)	368
Modification of competition requirements for purchases from Federal Prison Industries (sec. 824)	369
Five-year extension of authority to carry out certain prototype projects (sec. 825)	369
Multiyear procurement authority for electricity from renewable en- ergy sources (sec. 826)	369
Subtitle C—Acquisition Policy and Management	370
Joint Requirements Oversight Council (sec. 841)	370
Management structure for the procurement of contract services (sec. 842)	370
Specification of amounts requested for procurement of contract serv- ices (sec. 843)	370
Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund (sec. 844)	370
Inventories and reviews of contracts for services based on cost or time of performance (sec. 845)	371
Internal controls for procurements on behalf of the Department of Defense by certain non-defense agencies (sec. 846)	372
Subtitle D—Department of Defense Contractor Matters	372
Protection for contractor employees from reprisal for disclosure of certain information (sec. 861)	372
Requirements for defense contractors relating to certain former De- partment of Defense officials (sec. 862)	372
Report on contractor ethics programs of major defense contractors (sec. 863)	373
Report on Department of Defense contracting with contractors or subcontractors employing members of the Selected Reserve (sec. 864)	373
Subtitle E—Other Matters	373
Contractors performing private security functions in areas of combat operations (sec. 871)	373
Enhanced authority to acquire products and services produced in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 872)	374
Defense Science Board review of Department of Defense policies and procedures for the acquisition of information technology (sec. 873) ..	374
Enhancement and extension of acquisition authority for the unified combatant command for joint warfighting experimentation (sec. 874)	375
Repeal of requirement for identification of essential military items and military system essential item breakout list (sec. 875)	375
Items of Special Interest	375
Exceptional circumstance waivers under the Truth in Negotiations Act	375
Guidance on award and incentive fees	376
Program manager empowerment and accountability	376
Protection of strategic materials critical to national security	377
Regulations on excessive pass-through charges	378
Title IX—Department of Defense Organization and Management	379
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management	379

XIII

	Page
Title IX—Department of Defense Organization and Management—Continued	
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management—Continued	
Repeal of limitation on major Department of Defense headquarters activities personnel (sec. 901)	379
Chief management officers of the Department of Defense (sec. 902)	379
Modification of background requirement of individuals appointed as Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (sec. 903)	380
Department of Defense Board of Actuaries (sec. 904)	380
Assistant Secretaries of the military departments for acquisition matters; principal military deputies (sec. 905)	380
Flexible authority for number of Army Deputy Chiefs of Staff and Assistant Chiefs of Staff (sec. 906)	381
Sense of Congress on term of office of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (sec. 907)	381
Subtitle B—Space Matters	381
Space posture review (sec. 921)	381
Additional report on oversight of acquisition for defense space programs (sec. 922)	381
Subtitle C—Other Matters	382
Department of Defense consideration of effect of climate change on Department facilities, capabilities, and missions (sec. 931)	382
Board of Regents for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (sec. 932)	382
United States Military Cancer Institute (sec. 933)	382
Western Hemisphere Center for Excellence in Human Rights (sec. 934)	382
Inclusion of commanders of Western Hemisphere combatant commands in Board of Visitors of Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (sec. 935)	383
Comptroller General assessment of proposed reorganization of the office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (sec. 936)	383
Title X—General Provisions	387
Subtitle A—Financial Matters	387
General transfer authority (sec. 1001)	387
Authorization of additional emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2007 (sec. 1002)	387
Modification of fiscal year 2007 general transfer authority (sec. 1003)	387
United States contribution to NATO common-funded budgets in fiscal year 2008 (sec. 1004)	387
Financial management transformation initiative for the Defense Agencies (sec. 1005)	388
Repeal of requirement for two-year budget cycle for the Department of Defense (sec. 1006)	388
Extension of period for transfer of funds to Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense account (sec. 1007)	388
Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities	389
Expansion of Department of Defense authority to provide support for counter-drug activities to certain additional foreign governments (sec. 1011)	389
Subtitle C—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations	389
Enhancement of authority to pay rewards for assistance in combating terrorism (sec. 1021)	389
Repeal of modification of authorities relating to the use of the Armed Forces in major public emergencies (sec. 1022)	390
Procedures for Combatant Status Review Tribunals; modification of military commission authorities (sec. 1023)	390
Gift acceptance authority (sec. 1024)	391
Expansion of cooperative agreement authority for management of cultural resources (sec. 1025)	391
Minimum annual purchase amounts for airlift from carriers participating in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (sec. 1026)	391
Provision of Air Force support and services to foreign military and state aircraft (sec. 1027)	391
Participation in Strategic Airlift Capability Partnership (sec. 1028)	392
Responsibility of the Air Force for fixed-wing support of Army intra-theater logistics (sec. 1029)	393
Prohibition on sale of parts for F-14 fighter aircraft (sec. 1030)	394

XIV

	Page
Title X—General Provisions—Continued	
Subtitle D—Reports	394
Renewal of submittal of plans for prompt global strike capability (sec. 1041)	394
Report on threats to the United States from ungoverned areas (sec. 1042)	395
Study on national security interagency system (sec. 1043)	395
Subtitle E—Other Matters	395
Revised nuclear posture review (sec. 1061)	395
Termination of Commission on the Implementation of the New Strategic Posture of the United States (sec. 1062)	396
Communications with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives (sec. 1063)	396
Repeal of standards for disqualification from issuance of security clearances by the Department of Defense (sec. 1064)	396
Advisory panel on Department of Defense capabilities for support of civil authorities after certain incidents (sec. 1065)	397
Sense of Congress on the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (sec. 1066)	397
Technical amendments to title 10, United States Code, arising from enactment of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (sec. 1067)	397
Establishment of National Foreign Language Coordination Council (sec. 1068)	398
Qualifications for public aircraft status of aircraft under contract with the Armed Forces (sec. 1069)	398
Items of Special Interest	399
Certification of no pecuniary interest	399
Intelligence community operations	399
Language and cultural awareness initiatives review	400
Nuclear cruise missiles	401
Reporting and remediation of Anti-Deficiency Act violations	401
Ship disposal	401
Transparency of earmarks for additional funding	402
Title XI—Civilian Personnel Matters	405
Compensation for Federal wage system employees for certain travel hours (sec. 1101)	405
Retirement service credit for service as cadet or midshipman at a military service academy (sec. 1102)	405
Continuation of life insurance coverage for Federal employees called to active duty (sec. 1103)	405
Department of Defense National Security Personnel System (sec. 1104)	405
Authority to waive limitation on premium pay for Federal civilian employees working overseas under areas of United States Central Command (sec. 1105)	405
Authority for inclusion of certain Office of Defense Research and Engineering positions in experimental personnel program for scientific and technical personnel (sec. 1106)	406
Items of Special Interest	406
Increase in authorized number of employees in the Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service	406
Recruitment, hiring, and retention of Department of Defense civilian medical personnel and faculty and staff of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences	407
Title XII—Matters Relating to Foreign Nations	409
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training	409
Authority to equip and train foreign personnel to assist in accounting for missing United States personnel (sec. 1201)	409
Extension and enhancement of authority for security and stabilization assistance (sec. 1202)	409
Commanders' Emergency Response Program (sec. 1203)	410
Government Accountability Office report on Global Peace Operations Initiative (sec. 1204)	411
Subtitle B—Other Authorities and Limitations	412
Cooperative opportunities documents under cooperative research and development agreements with NATO organizations and other allied and friendly foreign countries (sec. 1211)	412

	Page
Title XII—Matters Relating to Foreign Nations —Continued	
Subtitle B—Other Authorities and Limitations —Continued	
Extension and expansion of temporary authority to use acquisition and cross-servicing agreements to lend military equipment for personnel protection and survivability (sec. 1212)	413
Acceptance of funds from the Government of Palau for costs of military Civic Action Teams (sec. 1213)	413
Extension of participation of the Department of Defense in multinational military centers of excellence (sec. 1214)	414
Limitation on assistance to the Government of Thailand (sec. 1215) ...	414
Presidential report on policy objectives and United States strategy regarding Iran (sec. 1216)	414
Limitation on availability of certain funds pending implementation of requirements regarding North Korea (sec. 1217)	415
Subtitle C—Reports	415
Reports on United States policy and military operations in Afghanistan (sec. 1231)	415
Strategy for enhancing security in Afghanistan by eliminating safe havens for violent extremists in Pakistan (sec. 1232)	416
One-year extension of update on report on claims relating to the bombing of the Labelle Discotheque (sec. 1233)	416
Items of Special Interest	417
Iraqi refugee crisis	417
Joint Forces Command support to NATO International Security Assistance Force	417
United States Africa Command	418
Title XIII—Cooperative Threat Reduction With States of the Former Soviet Union	419
Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds (sec. 1301)	419
Funding allocations (sec. 1302)	419
Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs in states outside the former Soviet Union (sec. 1303)	420
Modification of authority to use Cooperative Threat Reduction funds outside the former Soviet Union (sec. 1304)	420
Repeal of restrictions on assistance to states of the former Soviet Union for cooperative threat reduction (sec. 1305)	421
National Academy of Sciences study of prevention of proliferation of biological weapons (sec. 1306)	421
Title XIV—Other Authorizations	423
Summary and explanation of table	423
Subtitle A—Military Programs	426
Reduction in certain authorizations due to savings from lower inflation (sec. 1407)	426
Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile	426
Disposal of ferromanganese (sec. 1411)	426
Disposal of chrome metal (sec. 1412)	426
Modification of receipt objectives for previously authorized disposals from the national defense stockpile (sec. 1413)	426
Subtitle C—Civil Programs	427
Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1421)	427
Subtitle D—Chemical Demilitarization Matters	427
Modification of termination requirement for Chemical Demilitarization Citizens' Advisory Commissions (sec. 1431)	427
Repeal of certain qualifications requirement for director of chemical demilitarization management organization (sec. 1432)	427
Sense of Congress on completion of destruction of United States chemical weapons stockpile (sec. 1433)	428
Budget Items	429
LHA(R) research and development	429
Defense health program research	430
Funding for chemical weapons demilitarization	430
Counterdrug advanced concept technology demonstration	430
Project Athena	431
Department of Defense Inspector General	431
Item of Special Interest	432
National Defense Sealift Fund report	432
Title XV—Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom	433

	Page
Title XV—Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom — Continued	
Subtitle A—Authorization of Additional War-Related Appropriations	433
Overview	433
Explanation of tables	434
Army procurement (sec. 1501)	439
Navy and Marine Corps procurement (sec. 1502)	453
Air Force procurement (sec. 1503)	467
Defense-wide activities procurement (sec. 1504)	476
Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 1505)	481
Operation and maintenance (sec. 1506)	488
Military personnel (sec. 1507)	503
Defense Health Program (sec. 1508)	506
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide (sec. 1509)	506
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1510)	506
Iraq Security Forces Fund (sec. 1511)	506
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (sec. 1512)	506
Iraq Freedom Fund (sec. 1513)	506
Defense Working Capital Funds (sec. 1514)	507
National Defense Sealift Fund (sec. 1515)	507
Defense Inspector General (sec. 1516)	507
Subtitle B—General Provisions Relating to Authorizations	507
Purpose (sec. 1521)	507
Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1522)	507
Special transfer authority (sec. 1523)	507
Subtitle C—Other Matters	507
Limitation on availability of funds for certain purposes relating to Iraq (sec. 1531)	507
Reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations (sec. 1532)	507
Logistical support for coalition forces supporting operations in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 1533)	508
Competition for procurement of small arms supplied to Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 1534)	508
Budget Items	509
105MM high explosive rocket-assisted artillery ammunition	509
Mine-resistant ambush-protected vehicles	509
Night vision advanced technology	510
Night vision devices	510
Single Army Logistics Enterprise	510
UH-1Y/AH-1Z helicopters	511
Radio systems	512
Joint Strike Fighter	512
C-130J aircraft	513
CV-22 Osprey aircraft	513
F-15 modifications	514
Joint surveillance target attack radar system modifications	514
Joint light tactical vehicle	514
F-16 research and development	515
Military satellite communication terminals	515
Operation and maintenance funding transfers	515
Military personnel funding transfers	515
Joint improvised explosive device defeat office	516
Blast injury research	517
Counter radio-controlled improvised explosive device electronic warfare	517
Counter remote-controlled improvised explosive device systems	518
Directed energy for improvised explosive device defeat	518
Division B—Military Construction Authorizations	519
Summary and explanation of funding tables	519
Budget justification material for incrementally funded and phased military construction projects	537
Budget justification material for military construction	537
Short title (sec. 2001)	537
Title XXI—Army	539
Summary	539
Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)	540

XVII

	Page
Title XXI—Army —Continued	
Summary —Continued	
Family housing (sec. 2102)	540
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2103)	540
Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104)	540
Termination of authority to carry out fiscal year 2007 Army projects for which funds were not appropriated (sec. 2105)	540
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2006 project (sec. 2106)	543
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2107)	543
Technical amendments to the Military Construction Authorization Act for 2007 (sec. 2108)	543
Ground lease, SOUTHCOM Headquarters Facility, Miami-Doral, Florida (sec. 2109)	543
Item of Special Interest	543
Army budget justification material for military construction	543
Title XXII—Navy	545
Summary	545
Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)	546
Family housing (sec. 2202)	546
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203)	546
Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)	546
Termination of authority to carry out fiscal year 2007 Navy projects for which funds were not appropriated (sec. 2205)	546
Title XXIII—Air Force	549
Summary	549
Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)	549
Family housing (sec. 2302)	549
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303)	549
Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304)	549
Termination of authority to carry out fiscal year 2007 Air Force projects for which funds were not appropriated (sec. 2305)	549
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2006 project (sec. 2306)	552
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2307)	552
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2004 projects (sec. 2308)	552
Title XXIV—Defense Agencies	553
Summary	553
Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)	553
Energy conservation projects (sec. 2402)	553
Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2403)	553
Termination or modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2007 Defense Agencies projects (sec. 2404)	554
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2405)	556
Title XXV—North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Pro- gram	557
Summary	557
Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501)	557
Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502)	557
Title XXVI—Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities	559
Summary	559
Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)	559
Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2602)	559
Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2603)	559
Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2604)	559
Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2605)	559

XVIII

	Page
Title XXVI—Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities—Continued	
Summary—Continued	
Authorization of appropriations, Guard and Reserve (sec. 2606)	560
Termination of authority to carry out fiscal year 2007 Guard and Reserve projects for which funds were not appropriated (sec. 2607)	560
Modification of authority to carry out fiscal year 2006 Air Force Reserve construction and acquisition projects (sec. 2608)	563
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2609)	563
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2004 projects (sec. 2610)	563
Items of Special Interest	563
Planning and design, Army National Guard	563
Title XXVII—Base Realignment and Closure	565
Summary and explanation of tables	565
Authorization of appropriations for base closure and realignment activities funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 (sec. 2701)	573
Authorized base closure and realignment activities funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 (sec. 2702)	573
Authorization of appropriations for base closure and realignment activities funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 (sec. 2703)	573
Authorized cost and scope of work variations (sec. 2704)	573
Title XXVIII—Military Construction General Provisions	575
Subtitle A—Effective Date and Expiration of Authorizations	575
Effective Date (sec. 2801)	575
Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2802)	575
Subtitle B—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes	575
General military construction transfer authority (sec. 2811)	575
Modifications of authority to lease military family housing (sec. 2812)	576
Increase in thresholds for unspecified minor military construction projects (sec. 2813)	576
Modification and extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects outside the United States (sec. 2814)	577
Temporary authority to support revitalization of Department of Defense laboratories through unspecified minor military construction projects (sec. 2815)	577
Two-year extension of temporary program to use minor military construction authority for construction of child development centers (sec. 2816)	577
Extension of authority to accept equalization payments for facility exchanges (sec. 2817)	578
Subtitle C—Real Property and Facilities Administration	578
Requirement to report transactions resulting in annual costs of more than \$750,000 (sec. 2831)	578
Modification of authority to lease non-excess property (sec. 2832)	578
Enhanced flexibility to create or expand buffer zones (sec. 2833)	579
Reports on Army and Marine Corps operational ranges (sec. 2834)	579
Consolidation of real property provisions without substantive change (sec. 2835)	580
Subtitle D—Base Closure and Realignment	580
Niagara Air Reserve Base, New York, basing report (sec. 2841)	580
Subtitle E—Land Conveyances	580
Land conveyance, Lynn Haven Fuel Depot, Lynn Haven, Florida (sec. 2851)	580
Modification to land conveyance authority, Fort Bragg, North Carolina (sec. 2852)	580
Transfer of administrative jurisdiction, GSA property, Springfield, Virginia (sec. 2853)	580
Subtitle F—Other Matters	581
Report on condition of schools under jurisdiction of Department of Defense Education Activity (sec. 2861)	581

XIX

	Page
Title XXVIII—Military Construction General Provisions—Continued	
Subtitle F—Other Matters—Continued	
Repeal of requirement for study and report on impact to military readiness of proposed land management changes on public lands in Utah (sec. 2862)	581
Additional project in Rhode Island (sec. 2863)	582
Items of Special Interest	582
Host nation burdensharing	582
Military investment strategy in facilities that support training for military operations in urban terrain	583
Naval master jet basing	584
Temporary facilities	585
Title XXIX—War-Related Military Construction Authorizations	587
Summary	587
Authorized war-related Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2901)	590
Authorizations of war-related military construction appropriations, Army (sec. 2902)	590
Division C—Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations	591
Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs	591
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations	591
Overview	591
National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101)	617
Defense environmental cleanup (sec. 3102)	622
Other defense activities (sec. 3103)	623
Defense nuclear waste disposal (sec. 3104)	624
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations	624
Reliable Replacement Warhead program (sec. 3111)	624
Limitation on availability of funds for Fissile Materials Disposition program (sec. 3112)	627
Modification of limitations on availability of funds for Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (sec. 3113)	627
Subtitle C—Other Matters	628
Nuclear test readiness (sec. 3121)	628
Sense of Congress on the nuclear nonproliferation policy of the United States and the Reliable Replacement Warhead program (sec. 3122)	628
Report on status of environmental management initiatives to accelerate the reduction of environmental risks and challenges posed by the legacy of the Cold War (sec. 3123)	628
Comptroller General report on Department of Energy protective force management (sec. 3124)	629
Technical amendments (sec. 3125)	629
Title XXXII—Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	631
Authorization (sec. 3201)	631
Items Funded at the Request of Members	632
Legislative Requirements	651
Departmental Recommendations	651
Committee Action	651
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate	651
Regulatory Impact	651
Changes in Existing Law	651

Calendar No. 185

110TH CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
110-77

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

JUNE 5, 2007.—Ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 1547]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would:

- (1) authorize appropriations for (a) procurement, (b) research, development, test and evaluation, (c) operation and maintenance and the revolving and management funds of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2008;
- (2) authorize the personnel end strengths for each military active duty component of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2008;
- (3) authorize the personnel end strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2008;
- (4) impose certain reporting requirements;
- (5) impose certain limitations with regard to specific procurement and research, development, test and evaluation actions and manpower strengths; provide certain additional legislative authority, and make certain changes to existing law;

- (6) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2008; and
- (7) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2008.

Committee overview and recommendations

The United States armed forces are fighting wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, deployed in other places throughout the globe, or training at home for future deployment. Whether fighting in Afghanistan or Iraq, delivering humanitarian assistance to the victims of natural disasters in Asia or Africa, training foreign national forces in the Philippines, or assisting State and federal agencies responding to emergencies at home, the men and women of our armed forces, both active and reserve, are serving honorably and courageously to promote and defend our national interests. They do so often at great personal risk and at significant sacrifice to themselves and their families.

After more than 5 years of war, our military, particularly our ground forces, and their families are severely stressed. Equipment is wearing out faster than anticipated. In many cases a lack of personnel and equipment is hampering the readiness of non-deployed forces, both active and reserve. As a result, the Nation lacks the strategic depth it enjoyed before the wars began. This lack of depth increases our strategic risk to the point that, although we can defeat potential adversaries in various danger spots around the world, the time it would take to do so would be longer and the cost in casualties to our forces and resources would be higher.

To date in this First Session of the 110th Congress, the Committee on Armed Services has conducted 41 hearings and numerous briefings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 2008 and related defense matters. In order to provide a framework for the consideration of these matters, the committee identified seven priorities to guide its work on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008. These priorities are:

- (1) Provide fair compensation and first rate health care, and improve the quality of life of the men and women in the armed forces (active duty, National Guard, and reserves) and their families.
- (2) Provide our service men and women with the resources, training, technology, equipment (especially force protection), and authorities they need to participate in combat and stability operations, particularly in Iraq and Afghanistan.
- (3) Reduce our Nation's strategic risk by starting and, if possible, accelerating the restoration of the readiness of the military services to conduct the full range of their assigned missions.
- (4) Improve the efficiency of Department of Defense (DOD) programs and activities, and apply the savings toward high priority programs.
- (5) Improve the ability of the armed forces to meet nontraditional threats, including terrorism and weapons of mass destruction.
- (6) Promote the transformation of the armed forces to meet the threats of the 21st Century.

(7) Conduct aggressive oversight of the Department's programs and activities to ensure proper stewardship of taxpayer dollars and compliance with relevant laws and regulations.

To improve compensation and quality of life for the men and women in uniform and to seek to ease the pressure on our over-committed troops, the committee:

- Authorized an across the board pay raise of 3.5 percent, a half percent above the administration's request, as well as a half percent above the average increase in private sector pay raises as measured by the increase in the employment cost index. This additional boost in pay is in recognition of the strain our military personnel and their families are under.
- Authorized an end strength of 524,000 for the Army, 13,000 more than authorized last year, and 189,000 for the Marine Corps, 9,000 more than authorized last year. Although the administration's proposal divided this end strength between the base and supplemental budget requests, the mark combines them in the base budget.
- Authorized payment of combat-related special compensation to service members who are medically retired because of a combat-related disability. Under current law, only those retired with 20 or more years of service are eligible for this payment.
- Reduced below age 60 the age at which a member of a reserve component may draw retirement pay by 3 months for every aggregate 90 days' service on active duty under certain mobilization authorities.
- Included a provision to help protect our troops, uphold our values, and restore our image around the world by providing a fair process for reviewing the status of DOD detainees at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. This provision would require that detainees receive legal representation, provide for legal rulings to be made by military judges, and prohibit the use of statements that are obtained through cruel and inhuman treatment of a detainee.
- Authorized the use of federal pricing for pharmaceuticals dispensed through the TRICARE retail program.
- Directed the DOD to study and develop a plan to address the findings of the Army medical department's fourth assessment of the mental health and well-being of soldiers and marines in Iraq, including findings that multiple deployments and lengthy deployments lead to increased mental health and marital problems and more frequent mistreatment of non-combatants.
- Rejected the administration's proposal to give DOD broad authority to increase TRICARE program cost sharing amounts for military retirees and their dependents.

The committee included provisions to better assist survivors of military personnel by:

- Modifying the death gratuity statute to allow service members to designate in writing any person as the beneficiary.
- Modifying the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) to allow guardians or caretakers of dependent children to receive SBP benefits.

Particular emphasis was placed on addressing the needs of an Army stressed and stretched by over 5 years of war, but doing so in a way that also positions the Army to meet the challenges of the future.

In a series of legislative and funding actions designed to achieve those objectives, the committee:

- Authorized multiyear procurement for Abrams tank and Bradley Fighting Vehicle upgrades.
- Fully funded the President's budget request for the Army's Future Combat Systems (FCS), added \$90.0 million to restore fiscal year 2008 funding for the Armed Robotic Vehicles deleted in the recent program restructure, and added \$25.0 million to accelerate development of the FCS active protection system.
- Added \$40.0 million for integration of an active protection system on the Stryker vehicles.
- Added \$80.0 million to restore fiscal year 2008 funding for the Land Warrior system, ensuring sufficient quantities to field the remaining two battalions of the Stryker Brigade Combat Team currently equipped with the system in Iraq.
- Added \$2.7 billion for items on the Army Chief of Staff's unfunded requirements list, including over \$1.5 billion for Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles, \$775.1 million for reactive armor and other Stryker requirements, \$207.4 million for aviation survivability equipment, \$102.4 million for combat training centers, and funding for explosive ordnance disposal equipment, night vision devices, and machine guns.
- Added funding for other major force protection items, including \$430.0 million for MRAP vehicles for the Air Force, and fully funded the President's budget request for \$4.5 billion for the Joint Improvised Explosive Defeat Office (JIEDDO), directing JIEDDO to invest at least \$50.0 million in blast injury research and over \$150.0 million for the procurement of improvised explosive device (IED) jammers for the Army.

The committee also put particular emphasis on support for marines and naval forces engaged in combat operations and on the continuing transformation of the Navy.

The committee focused on force protection for Marine Corps ground forces and on execution of the shipbuilding budget. The committee was concerned with the amount of funding in the budget request devoted to shipbuilding, and took steps to protect the capability of the Navy to provide necessary global presence into the future. Specifically, the committee:

- Added almost \$2.0 billion for MRAP vehicles. This addition will support all known requirements of the Navy and Marine Corps for these vehicles that improve protection for our troops exposed to the IED threat in Iraq and Afghanistan.
- Authorized construction for five warships and provided multiyear procurement authority for fiscal years 2009 to 2013 for Virginia class submarines.
- Added \$470.0 million in advance procurement funding for Virginia class submarines to support buying an additional submarine in fiscal year 2010. There is no requirement that the Navy allocate additional funds to buy the second submarine in fiscal year 2010. If the Navy chooses not to do that, the funds

could be used to support economic order quantity buys of material in fiscal year 2008, which could yield additional savings for the multiyear procurement and reduce pressure on the outyear shipbuilding budget.

- Reduced \$430.5 million in funding for the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program, requiring that future ships of the program be competitively awarded with added measures to control cost. This reflects a response to the more than doubling of the price of these ships, schedule delays, and delays in promulgating an acquisition strategy.

- Reduced title XV war-related funding by \$492.5 million for five CV-22 Special Operations Command aircraft and \$123.4 million for six UH-1Y / AH-1Z Marine Corps helicopters due to concerns about the production cost growth and management processes at the contractor plant that builds both of these aircraft. Production in fiscal year 2008 for all V-22s would still increase from 16 to 28 and H-1 production would increase from 11 to 20 aircraft.

- Added \$78.6 million to Navy and Marine Corps research and development programs.

- Supported critical efforts to efficiently and effectively modernize the force; including C-5 Galaxy strategic airlift aircraft Reliability Enhancement Re-engining Program, Arleigh Burke (DDG-51) class destroyer modernization, and Navy Open Systems Architecture.

- Reduced the request for the Marine Corps Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle by \$100.0 million, since the program has encountered serious technical problems and cost growth, and will not be able to spend the funds appropriated for the current fiscal year.

The committee continued implementing the policy of focusing on the development, testing, fielding, and improvement of effective near-term missile defense capabilities, particularly to protect forward-deployed U.S. forces and allies against existing threats from short- and medium-range ballistic missiles. Specifically, the committee:

- Approved the Army funding request for the Patriot PAC-3 program, including the “Pure Fleet” initiative, and added \$75.0 million to procure 25 additional PAC-3 missiles.

- Authorized an addition of \$75.0 million for the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) program to increase the production rate of Standard Missile-3 (SM-3) interceptors, procure 15 additional SM-3 missiles, and accelerate work on the Aegis BMD Signal Processor and Open Architecture program.

- Approved an increase of \$105.0 million for the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system to increase the missile production rate, begin the upgrade of the evolved THAAD interceptor, and to conduct an additional test.

- Added \$25.0 million for co-production of the Arrow missile, and added \$10.0 million to study the suitability of the THAAD missile to serve as a follow-on to Israel’s Arrow system.

- Authorized an increase of \$25.0 million for accelerated joint development of a short-range ballistic missile defense (SRBMD) system for Israel.

- Reduced the budget request of \$310.4 million for the proposed European missile defense deployment by \$85.0 million for site activation and construction work, to reflect the schedule of negotiations with the host nations, but authorized the remaining budget request, with availability of funding for some activities being subject to meeting certain conditions.
- Reduced funding for the Airborne Laser program by \$200.0 million.
- Reduced funding for BMD Special Programs by \$150.0 million, and for BMD Systems Core by \$50.0 million.
- Reduced the budget request for the Space Tracking and Surveillance System by \$55.0 million for premature development of follow-on satellites, and authorized no funds for the proposed space test-bed.
- Included legislative provisions that would:
 - Extend by 5 years the requirement for the Comptroller General to assess the ballistic missile defense program annually.
 - Require the Department of Defense, starting in fiscal year 2009, to submit the budget request for the Missile Defense Agency using regular budget categories (research and development, procurement, operation and maintenance, and military construction), and make certain acquisition and oversight improvements.
 - Require a certification from the Secretary of Defense that the Block 2006 Ground-Based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system is operationally effective before deploying more than 40 Ground-Based Interceptors (GBIs) at Fort Greely, Alaska.
 - Ensure that the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation has full access to missile defense test and evaluation data.

The committee supported improved national security space capabilities for satellite communications, missile warning, space situational awareness and surveillance, space control, and reduced space system vulnerability. Specifically, the committee:

- Added \$125.0 million for advanced procurement for a fourth Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) communications satellite, and \$10.0 million for Ultra High Frequency to reduce the risk of communications gaps.
- Added \$15.0 million for sensors for small satellite efforts to provide operationally responsive space support capability for the warfighter.
- Added \$35.0 million for the Space-Based Space Surveillance System to provide improved situational awareness in space.
- Added \$16.8 million for space situational awareness operations, \$9.8 million for the space fence, \$13.8 million to the Rapid Attack Identification Detection and Reporting System (RAIDRS), and \$50.0 million for space control technology to improve space protection and awareness capabilities.
- Fully funded the Global Positioning System (GPS) III program and the Transformational Communications Satellite program.

- Provided an additional \$100.0 million for the Space-Based Infrared Satellite System (SBIRS) GEO-4 and \$27.6 million for the SBIRS backup control station, but no funding for the Alternative Infrared Satellite System.
- Provided no funding for the Space Radar program but provided additional funding for research and development of space radar capabilities.
- Included provisions that would direct the Secretary of Defense in the next administration to conduct a space posture review, and direct the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) to participate in the National Security Space Office.

The committee addressed strategic systems as follows:

- Refocused efforts to achieve a prompt global strike capability into a single coordinated program.
- Added \$19.0 million for modernization efforts to sustain 76 B-52 aircraft.
- Directed the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the retirement schedule for remaining nuclear cruise missiles.
- Included a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense in the next administration to conduct a new nuclear posture review.

The committee continues to support the Stockpile Stewardship Program and modernization of the Nation's nuclear weapons complex. The committee also supports efforts to enhance the security posture of the Department of Energy (DOE) nuclear sites, reduce deferred maintenance, and complete the environmental cleanup of Cold War legacy sites. Specifically, the committee:

- Consolidated funding for the Reliable Replacement Warhead into one funding line, reduced the total amount requested by \$43.0 million, and limited fiscal year 2008 program activities to phase 2A activities only.
- Added \$62.4 million to enhance security at DOE nuclear sites.
- Added \$36.8 million to reduce deferred maintenance within the nuclear weapons complex.
- Added \$10.0 million for nuclear weapons incident response.
- Included provisions directing the Comptroller General to review issues related to security protection forces at DOE sites and to review a report that would be prepared by the Secretary of Energy on the future plans and cost of the Environmental Management program.

In the area of science and technology, the committee:

- Authorized an increase of over \$450.0 million for defense science and technology (S&T) programs, for a total authorization of \$11.2 billion.
- Increased funding for development of advanced technologies to support current operational needs and develop new military capabilities to defeat emerging threats, including:
 - Nearly \$85.0 million for advanced manufacturing research and processes to reduce the production costs of weapons systems, to improve the Department's ability to surge production of critical items—such as body and vehi-

cle armor and to preserve the domestic defense industrial base;

- Over \$70.0 million in research and technologies to enhance the force protection of deployed units, including advanced materials for vehicle and body armor, active protection systems that shoot down incoming rocket propelled grenades, and sniper detection systems;
- Nearly \$75.0 million for advanced energy and power technologies, including programs to develop fuel cells, hybrid engines, and biofuels for military systems;
- Nearly \$65.0 million for defense related research performed at our Nation's universities, which develops next generation military capabilities, while training tomorrow's scientists and engineers; and
- Nearly \$50.0 million for research on combat casualty care and military medical technologies, including work to address blast injuries and brain trauma.
- Authorized a provision that would expand the nanotechnology research and development efforts of the Department of Defense, to include enhanced efforts in nanomanufacturing and the incorporation of nanotechnologies into defense systems.
- Authorized a provision that would require the development of a strategic plan for defense manufacturing technology development to ensure that the defense industrial base has the most advanced manufacturing processes available to support the production of defense systems at the lowest cost possible, while being responsive to surge production demands driven by military needs.
- Authorized a provision to revitalize defense laboratories by providing more flexibility in funding construction projects and other infrastructure investment to ensure that these laboratories remain world class technical institutions to support the engineering and technical needs of operational forces.

In the area of nonproliferation and cooperative threat reduction, the committee:

- Authorized an increase of \$87.0 million to the amount requested for DOE nonproliferation programs.
- Authorized an increase of \$100.0 million for the DOD Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program.
- Included provisions that would repeal all of the required annual certifications and that would expand the CTR program to countries outside of the former Soviet Union.

In the area of Special Operations Forces and programs, the committee:

- Authorized an additional \$124.0 million to meet unfunded requirements of the Special Operations Command for MRAP vehicles.
- Directed the Comptroller General to review the ongoing reorganization of the office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, especially as it pertains to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict.
- Added over \$25.0 million in funding for the Special Operations Command (SOCOM) to meet critical language and cul-

tural awareness training requirements, and for various SOCOM science and technology programs.

The committee also took the following steps to promote the development of the Department's language capabilities:

- Authorized the creation of a National Foreign Language Coordination Council, to ensure that the administration's current efforts to promote foreign language competency will develop into an organized and concerted effort to improve the Nation's foreign language capabilities.
- Directed the Comptroller General to review DOD programs to improve language and cultural awareness.

In the area of counterdrug activities, the committee:

- Authorized an increase of \$22.5 million to support DOD drug interdiction activities, primarily those of the U.S. Southern Command.
- Authorized the Department to provide counterdrug support to Mexico and the Dominican Republic.

In the area of chemical and biological defense and chemical demilitarization, the committee:

- Authorized an increase of nearly \$70.0 million for enhancements to chemical and biological defense programs, including:
 - \$30.0 million for procurement of chemical detection equipment for the Army National Guard that can be used both for overseas deployments and for domestic consequence management missions; and
 - Nearly \$20 million for research and development projects to enhance the Department's ability to detect and protect its forces from chemical and biological warfare agents.
- Included a provision stating the sense of Congress that the United States should make every effort to meet its legal obligation under the Chemical Weapons Convention to destroy its entire stockpile of chemical weapons by April 2012, or as soon as possible thereafter, and that the DOD should budget sufficient funds to allow the most expeditious destruction of the chemical weapons stockpile, consistent with the legal requirement to protect public health, safety, and the environment.
- Authorized an increase of \$36.0 million to restore funds that were removed from the chemical demilitarization program budget request. These funds would help avoid further delays in destroying the U.S. stockpile of chemical weapons, as required by law.

In the area of homeland defense, the committee included a provision that would require an advisory panel to assess the capabilities of the Department to provide support to civil authorities for consequence management in the event of a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or high-yield explosive incident in the United States. The panel would report its findings and recommendations within 1 year from starting its duties.

To address the readiness and management needs of the military, the committee supported the stated requirements of the military services for the next fiscal year, including the funds needed for the cost of normal operations, war-related operations, and the initial operating cost of increasing the size of our ground forces.

The committee fully funded the Army and Marine Corps request for depot level maintenance. The committee also recommended \$4.8 billion for the procurement of ammunition of all types to support the services' war fighting, training, and war reserve requirements.

With regard to management and acquisition policy, the committee included a provision requiring, for the first time, that DOD have a Chief Management Officer. The Comptroller General has repeatedly stated that the Department needs to do this, to ensure that the Department's many high-risk areas get the top level management attention they deserve.

In addition, the committee included a number of important acquisition reform provisions. These include:

- A provision that would provide the resources that DOD needs to address the shortcomings in its acquisition workforce.
- A series of provisions that would tighten DOD management of contract services.
- A provision that would ensure that our commanders on the battlefield have the authority that they need to establish rules for armed contractors of all Government agencies in an area of combat operations.
- A provision establishing guidelines for DOD to use in determining whether savings are "substantial" for the purpose of justifying multiyear contracts.
- A provision that would require that each of the Assistant Secretaries for Acquisition in the military departments be assisted by a three-star military deputy who has significant acquisition experience.

The committee also proposed the investment of an additional \$461.0 million above the budget request in infrastructure to repair, replace, and modernize our aging defense facilities and improve the quality of life and the productivity of our military. The committee has adhered to its traditional criteria for military construction projects in this markup.

The committee continued its longstanding record of supporting the implementation of the base closure process without intervening or playing favorites in that process. There are no provisions that would attempt to overturn any Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) decisions or move some people ahead of others in line for BRAC funding.

The committee also took a number of other important actions, including:

- Establishing a requirement that the President report to Congress on his long-term strategy for engaging with Pakistan to eliminate safe havens for the Taliban, al-Qaeda, and other violent extremists in Pakistan and to stop their cross-border movements into Afghanistan. Reimbursements to Pakistan for support to U.S. military operations would be restricted unless the President certifies that Pakistan is making substantial and sustained efforts to eliminate terrorist safe havens on its territory.
- Extending and enhancing DOD's authority to provide services or transfer funds to the Department of State for police training and stabilization assistance.
- Extending and expanding DOD's authority to lease or lend equipment for personnel protection and survivability to allies

and coalition partners participating in combined military operations with U.S. forces.

- Extending the participation of Department personnel in North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) military centers of excellence.
- Directing the Comptroller General to assess the implementation of the Global Peace Operations Initiative, including whether it would have an impact on participation in upcoming peace operations.
- Recognizing the significant changes in the role and missions of the National Guard and reserve, by:
 - Increasing the grade of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau from lieutenant general to general and expanding the duties of and eligibility requirements for this position.
 - Requiring the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to prescribe the charter for the National Guard Bureau.
 - Enhancing the authority for National Guard and reserve general and flag officers to serve on active duty.
 - Authorizing federal civilian employees who are in the National Guard or reserves to continue their coverage under the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance for up to 24 months when mobilized.
 - Repealing the existing authority of the Department of Defense to establish a new labor relations system under the National Security Personnel System (NSPS). This would guarantee the rights of DOD employees to union representation in NSPS.
 - Consistent with the committee's longstanding practice, the committee report identifies all funding provided for programs, projects, and activities that were not requested in the President's budget. For the first time, the report will also identify the name of members requesting such funding. The committee will also make this information available to the general public in an electronically searchable format at least 48 hours before consideration of the bill or conference report.

In making its recommendations, the committee realizes that much remains to be done, particularly in terms of restoring the readiness of the military services.

Explanation of funding summary

The administration's budget request for the national defense function of the federal budget for fiscal year 2008 was \$505.4 billion for the base budget excluding the costs of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, plus an additional \$141.8 billion in emergency defense funding requested for those operations and other costs, including some of the cost of the administration's proposal to increase the size of the Army and the Marine Corps. The combined total requested by the President for the national defense budget function was \$647.2 billion. According to the estimating procedures used by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the amount requested for the base budget was \$507.0 billion, and the total amount re-

quested, including the emergency war-related funding, was \$648.8 billion.

The primary discrepancy between the administration and CBO estimates related to assumed savings in the Defense Health program (DHP) account. The funding summary table that follows uses the budget authority levels as calculated by CBO, both for the DHP and the bill as a whole.

The following table summarizes both the direct authorizations and equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 2008 defense programs. The columns relating to the authorization request do not include funding for items that are not within the jurisdiction of this committee or that do not require an annual authorization. The table also includes the authorization for spending from the trust fund of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, which is outside the national defense budget function.

Funding for all programs in the national defense function is reflected in the columns related to the budget authority request and the total budget authority implication of the authorizations in this bill. The committee recommends funding for national defense programs totaling \$648.8 billion in budget authority.

The funding level recommended by the committee is within the combined budget authority levels of \$507.0 billion for the national defense function (function 050) plus \$145.2 billion for defense and nondefense expenses related to contingency operations in the new overseas deployments and other activities function (function 970) in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008 (S. Con. Res. 21) adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives on May 17, 2007. As permitted by the budget resolution, the committee bill assumes that additional appropriations for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan will be made available at the levels requested by the President.

In order to clearly identify the cost of war, the committee bill reallocates funding that the committee believes is not directly related to operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, in particular funding requested for paying, equipping, and providing facilities for additional Army and Marine Corps personnel, from the war-related emergency request portion of the bill into the base budget accounts. Such transfers are noted in the detailed tables in this report. Funding for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan is contained in title XV (for personnel, operation and maintenance, procurement, and other costs normally funded in division A of this Act) and title XXIX (for military construction projects in Iraq or Afghanistan) of this Act.

In accordance with views and estimates of this committee to the Senate Committee on the Budget and with the conference report on the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008 (S. Con. Res. 21), the committee bill does not designate any of the funding authorized by this Act as emergency spending.

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008
In Thousands of Dollars

	BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION		
	FY 2008 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
DIVISION A			
Title I -- PROCUREMENT			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	4,179,848	5,229,175	5,229,175
Missile Procurement, Army	1,645,485	2,178,102	2,178,102
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	3,089,998	7,546,684	7,546,684
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	2,190,576	2,228,976	2,228,976
Other Procurement, Army	12,647,099	15,013,155	15,013,155
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	500,000		-500,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	12,747,767	13,475,107	13,475,107
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,084,387	3,078,387	3,078,387
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy	13,656,120	13,605,638	13,605,638
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	760,484	926,597	926,597
Other Procurement, Navy	5,470,412	5,432,412	5,432,412
Procurement, Marine Corps	2,999,057	2,999,057	2,999,057
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	12,393,270	12,593,813	12,593,813
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	868,917	868,917	868,917
Missile Procurement, Air Force	5,131,002	5,166,002	5,166,002
Other Procurement, Air Force	15,421,162	16,312,962	16,312,962
Procurement, Defense-Wide	3,318,834	3,385,970	3,385,970
Rapid Acquisition Fund	100,000	100,000	100,000
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction	1,455,724		-1,455,724
Defense Production Act Purchases			18,592
Total PROCUREMENT	101,660,142	109,840,954	109,859,546
Title II -- RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION			
RD&E, Army	10,589,604	11,268,904	11,283,904
RD&E, Navy	17,075,536	16,296,395	16,296,395
RD&E, Air Force	26,711,940	25,581,989	25,581,989
RD&E, Defense-Wide	20,559,850	21,331,475	21,331,475
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	180,264	180,264	180,264
Total RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVALUATION	75,117,194	74,659,027	74,674,027

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008
In Thousands of Dollars

	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Authorization</u>	BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION		
			<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change to Request</u>	<u>Senate Authorization</u>
Title IV -- MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel, Army		34,952,762	31,623,865	3,328,897	34,952,762
Military Personnel, Navy		23,300,841	23,305,233	-4,392	23,300,841
Military Personnel, Marine Corps		11,065,542	10,278,031	787,511	11,065,542
Military Personnel, Air Force		24,091,993	24,097,354	-5,361	24,091,993
Military Personnel, Army Reserve		3,701,197	3,734,620	-33,423	3,701,197
Military Personnel, Navy Reserve		1,766,408	1,797,685	-31,277	1,766,408
Military Personnel, Marine Corps Reserve		593,961	594,872	-911	593,961
Military Personnel, Air Force Reserve		1,356,618	1,370,479	-13,861	1,356,618
Military Personnel, Army National Guard		5,914,979	5,959,149	-44,170	5,914,979
Military Personnel, Air National Guard		2,607,456	2,642,410	-34,954	2,607,456
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Accruals			10,876,204		10,876,204
Mandatory Spending - Current Law			2,640,500		2,640,500
Total MILITARY PERSONNEL	105,403,698	109,351,757	118,920,402	3,948,059	122,868,461

Title X -- GENERAL PROVISIONS
Section 1007: Foreign Currency Fluctuations
Total GENERAL PROVISIONS

Title XIV -- OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A -- Military Programs					
Defense Working Capital Funds	102,446	102,446	102,446		102,446
Defense Commissary Working Capital Fund	1,250,300	1,250,300	1,250,300		1,250,300
Defense Coalition Support Fund	22,000		22,000	-22,000	
National Defense Sealift Fund	1,079,094	1,044,194	1,079,094	-34,900	1,044,194
Defense Health Program	22,541,124	22,543,124	22,541,124	2,000	22,543,124
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction		1,491,724		1,491,724	1,491,724
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	936,822	936,822	936,822	22,500	959,322
Office of the Inspector General	214,995	224,995	215,995	10,000	225,995
Inflation savings (Section 1407)				-1,627,000	-1,627,000
Subtitle B -- National Defense Stockpile					

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008
In Thousands of Dollars

	Authorization Request	Senate Authorization	BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION		
			FY 2008 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
Disposals (Mandatory spending)	-50,000	-50,000	-50,000		-50,000
Subtitle C – Civil Programs					
Armed Forces Retirement Home	61,624	61,624			
Total OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	26,158,405	26,000,729	26,097,781	-157,676	25,940,105
 Title XV – OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND					
OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM					
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,900,306	890,786	1,900,306	-1,009,520	890,786
Missile Procurement, Army	492,734	492,734	492,734		492,734
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	4,780,172	1,249,177	4,780,172	-3,530,995	1,249,177
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	313,000	303,000	313,000	-10,000	303,000
Other Procurement, Army	13,630,977	10,310,055	13,630,977	-3,320,922	10,310,055
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	3,099,958	2,263,018	3,099,958	-836,940	2,263,018
Weapons Procurement, Navy	251,281	251,281	251,281		251,281
Other Procurement, Navy	793,311	814,311	793,311	21,000	814,311
Procurement, Marine Corps	2,462,140	4,236,140	2,462,140	1,774,000	4,236,140
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	590,090	590,090	590,090		590,090
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	3,336,809	2,069,009	3,336,809	-1,267,800	2,069,009
Missile Procurement, Air Force	1,800	1,800	1,800		1,800
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	74,005	74,005	74,005		74,005
Other Procurement, Air Force	3,760,206	4,163,450	3,760,206	403,244	4,163,450
Procurement, Defense-Wide	469,768	593,768	469,768	124,000	593,768
 RDT&E, Army					
RDT&E, Navy	141,653	121,653	141,653	-20,000	121,653
RDT&E, Air Force	618,428	370,798	618,428	-247,630	370,798
RDT&E, Defense-Wide	1,369,781	922,791	1,369,781	-446,990	922,791
	727,498	535,087	727,498	-192,411	535,087
 Operation and Maintenance, Army					
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	46,230,964	45,519,264	46,230,964	-711,700	45,519,264
	5,203,800	5,190,000	5,203,800	-13,800	5,190,000

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008
In Thousands of Dollars

	Authorization Request	Senate Authorization	BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION		
			FY 2008 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	4,013,093	4,013,093	4,013,093		4,013,093
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	10,536,330	10,532,630	10,536,330	-3,700	10,532,630
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	6,098,990	5,976,216	6,098,990	-122,774	5,976,216
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	158,410	158,410	158,410		158,410
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	69,598	69,598	69,598		69,598
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	68,000	68,000	68,000		68,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	466,150	466,150	466,150		466,150
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	31,168	31,168	31,168		31,168
Military Personnel, Army	12,504,398	9,140,516	12,504,398	-3,363,882	9,140,516
Military Personnel, Navy	752,089	752,089	752,089		752,089
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	1,601,882	817,475	1,601,882	-784,407	817,475
Military Personnel, Air Force	1,411,890	1,411,890	1,411,890		1,411,890
Military Personnel, Army Reserve	235,000	235,000	235,000		235,000
Military Personnel, Navy Reserve	70,000	70,000	70,000		70,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps Reserve	15,420	15,420	15,420		15,420
Military Personnel, Air Force Reserve	3,000	3,000	3,000		3,000
Military Personnel, Army National Guard	476,584	476,584	476,584		476,584
Defense Health Program	1,022,842	1,022,842	1,022,842		1,022,842
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	257,618	257,618	257,618		257,618
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	4,000,000	4,500,000	4,000,000	500,000	4,500,000
Iraq Security Forces Fund	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000		2,000,000
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000		2,700,000
Iraq Freedom Fund	107,500	107,500	107,500		107,500
Defense Working Capital Funds	1,676,275	1,676,275	1,676,275		1,676,275
National Defense Sealift Fund	5,100	5,100	5,100		5,100
Office of the Inspector General	4,394	4,394	4,394		4,394
TOTAL OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM	140,534,412	127,473,185	140,534,412	-13,061,227	127,473,185

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008
In Thousands of Dollars

	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Authorization</u>	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change to Request</u>	<u>BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION Senate Authorization</u>
DIVISION B					
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION					
Military Construction, Army	4,039,197	4,055,747	4,039,197	16,550	4,055,747
Military Construction, Navy	2,104,276	2,361,291	2,104,276	257,015	2,361,291
Military Construction, Air Force	912,109	1,046,275	912,109	134,166	1,046,275
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	1,799,336	1,895,181	1,799,336	95,845	1,895,181
Chemical Demilitarization Construction	86,176		86,176	-86,176	
NATO Security Investment Program	201,400	201,400	201,400		201,400
Military Construction, Army National Guard	404,291	458,515	404,291	54,224	458,515
Military Construction, Army Reserve	119,684	134,684	119,684	15,000	134,684
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	59,150	59,150	59,150		59,150
Military Construction, Air National Guard	85,517	216,417	85,517	130,900	216,417
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	26,559	26,559	26,559		26,559
Total MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	9,837,695	10,455,219	9,837,695	617,524	10,455,219
FAMILY HOUSING					
Family Housing Construction, Army	419,400	419,400	419,400		419,400
Family Housing Operations, Army	742,920	742,920	742,920		742,920
Family Housing Construction, Navy & Marine Corps	298,329	300,095	298,329	1,766	300,095
Family Housing Operations, Navy & Marine Corps	371,404	371,404	371,404		371,404
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	362,747	362,747	362,747		362,747
Family Housing Operations, Air Force	688,335	688,335	688,335		688,335
Family Housing Operations, Defense-Wide	48,848	48,848	48,848		48,848
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund	500	500	500		500
Total FAMILY HOUSING	2,932,483	2,934,249	2,932,483	1,766	2,934,249
Base Realignment and Closure IV	220,689	220,689	220,689		220,689
Base Realignment and Closure 2005	8,174,315	8,174,315	8,174,315		8,174,315
Subtotal Base Closure	8,395,004	8,395,004	8,395,004		8,395,004
Prior Year Savings		-3,100		-3,100	-3,100
Subtotal Non War-Related Funding	21,165,182	21,781,372	21,165,182	616,190	21,781,372

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008
In Thousands of Dollars

	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Authorization</u>	BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION	
			<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change to Request</u> <u>Authorization</u>
Title XXIX - War-Related Military Construction				
Military Construction, Army	738,850	752,650	738,850	13,800
Military Construction, Navy	157,305		157,305	-157,305
Family Housing Construction, Navy & Marine Corps	11,766		11,766	-11,766
Subtotal War-Related Military Construction	907,921	752,650	907,921	-155,271
TOTAL DIVISION B	22,073,103	22,534,022	22,073,103	460,919
Other Discretionary Programs			52,000	52,000
Mandatory Programs			-686,000	-686,000
TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)	613,739,347	613,259,267	626,687,643	-480,080
DIVISION C				
Energy Supply and Conservation	5,860		5,860	-5,860
National Nuclear Security Administration				
Weapons Activities	6,511,312	6,472,172	6,511,312	-39,140
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,672,646	1,809,646	1,672,646	137,000
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (Emergency funding)	50,000		50,000	-50,000
Naval Reactors	808,219	808,219	808,219	
Office of the Administrator	394,656	399,656	394,656	5,000
IAEA Fuel Bank		50,000		50,000
Total National Nuclear Security Administration	9,436,833	9,539,693	9,436,833	102,860
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,363,905	5,410,905	5,363,905	47,000
Other Defense Activities	763,974	663,074	763,974	-100,900
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	292,046	242,046	292,046	-50,000
Total DOE/NSA Discretionary Authorizations	15,862,618	15,855,718	15,862,618	-6,900

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008
In Thousands of Dollars

	Authorization Request	Senate Authorization	BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION		
			FY 2008 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
Mandatory Programs:					
Energy Employees Compensation Admin Expenses			152,000		152,000
Energy Employees Occ Illness Compensation Fund			760,000		760,000
Total Department of Energy/NNSA	15,862,618	15,855,718	16,774,618	-6,900	16,767,718
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	22,499	27,499	22,499	5,000	27,499
Formerly Used Sites Remedial Action Program			130,000		130,000
DIVISION C/Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	15,885,117	15,883,217	16,927,117	-1,900	16,925,217
DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES					
Discretionary Programs			4,541,816		4,541,816
Discretionary Programs: War-Related			323,728		323,728
Mandatory Programs			293,500		293,500
DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)			5,159,044		5,159,044
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)	629,624,464	629,142,484	648,773,804	-481,980	648,291,824
NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS					
Armed Forces Retirement Home	61,624	61,624			
Total Non-Defense Authorizations	61,624	61,624			
TOTAL AUTHORIZATIONS	629,686,088	629,204,108	648,773,804	-481,980	648,291,824
Memo: Non War-Related Funding	488,132,131	500,916,649	506,957,743	12,784,518	519,742,261
Memo: DOD War-Related Funding (XV & XXIX)	141,442,333	128,225,835	141,442,333	-13,216,498	128,225,835
Memo: Total War-Related Funding	141,492,333	128,225,835	141,816,061	-13,266,498	128,549,563

**DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
AUTHORIZATIONS**

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Explanation of tables

The following tables provide the program-level detailed guidance for the funding authorized in title I of this Act. The tables also display the funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2008 budget request for procurement programs, and indicate those programs for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the Department of Defense may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense), without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in this report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

Rapid Acquisition Fund (sec. 105)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$100.0 million for the rapid acquisition fund.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Title I -- PROCUREMENT</u>	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorization</u>
Aircraft Procurement, Army	4,179,848	1,049,327	5,229,175
Missile Procurement, Army	1,645,485	532,617	2,178,102
Procurement of W&TCV, Army	3,089,998	4,456,686	7,546,684
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	2,190,576	38,400	2,228,976
Other Procurement, Army	12,647,099	2,366,056	15,013,155
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	500,000	-500,000	
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	12,747,767	727,340	13,475,107
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,084,387	-6,000	3,078,387
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	760,484	166,113	926,597
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	13,656,120	-50,482	13,605,638
Other Procurement, Navy	5,470,412	-38,000	5,432,412
Procurement, Marine Corps	2,999,057	-300,000	2,699,057
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	12,393,270	200,543	12,593,813
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	868,917		868,917
Missile Procurement, Air Force	5,131,002	35,000	5,166,002
Other Procurement, Air Force	15,421,162	897,800	16,312,962
Procurement, Defense-Wide	3,318,834	67,136	3,385,970
National Guard and Reserve Equipment			
Rapid Acquisition Fund	100,000		100,000
TOTAL PROCUREMENT	100,204,418	9,636,536	109,840,954

Subtitle B—Army Programs

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Line	Program Title	Request		Change		Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
Aircraft Procurement, Army							
Aircraft							
Fixed Wing							
1	UTILITY F/W CARGO AIRCRAFT		157,043		-157,043		
2	Transfer fixed-wing intra-theater logistics mission to USAF				[-157,043]		
UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT							
Rotary Wing							
3	ARMED RECONNAISSANCE HELICOPTER		468,259		-131,000		337,259
	Transfer to Kiowa Warrior (APA 19)				[-31,000]		
	Transfer to PE 64220A (RDA 77)				[-100,000]		
4	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)		230,491				230,491
5	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	42	773,799		552,430	42	1,326,229
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-185,098				-185,098
	Grow the Force Transfer				[182,050]		
	Transfer from Title XV				[370,380]		
6	UH-60 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		116,745				116,745
7	CH-47 HELICOPTER	6	157,908		6,000	6	163,908
	CH-47 - annual contract				[6,000]		
8	CH-47 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		32,982				32,982
Modification of Aircraft							
9	GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)		149,062				149,062
10	ARL MODS (TIARA)		52,298				52,298
11	AH-64 MODS		689,628				689,628

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
11	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-18,924		-18,924			
12	AH-64 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	40,957		40,957			
13	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS	577,250				530,540	1,107,790
	CH-47 modifications - annual contract					[16,000]	
	Transfer from Title XV					[514,540]	
13	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-36,592		-36,592			-36,592
14	CH-47 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	39,182		39,182			39,182
15	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	17,175		17,175			17,175
16	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS	340		340			340
17	Longbow						
18	UH-60 MODS	13,035		13,035		3,000	16,035
	Enhanced electronic digital engine control unit (EDECU)					[3,000]	
19	KIOWA WARRIOR	20,807		20,807		31,000	51,807
	Transfer from ARH (APA 3) for cockpit display systems					[31,000]	
20	AIRBORNE AVIONICS	179,565		179,565			179,565
21	GATM ROLLUP	53,071		53,071			53,071
	Spares and Repair Parts						
22	SPARE PARTS (AIR)	9,304		9,304			9,304
	Support Equipment and Facilities						
	Ground Support Avionics						
23	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	48,120		48,120		207,400	255,520
	Additional aircraft survivability equipment					[207,400]	

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Qty

Cost

Senate Change

Qty

Cost

Senate Authorized

Qty

Cost

Program Title

Line

24 ASE INFRARED CM

365,472

365,472

Other Support

25 AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL

5,065

5,065

26 AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT

80,221

80,221

27 COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT

42,727

49,727

28 AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS

7,000

49,727

Aircraft wireless intercom system (AWIS)

[5,000]

Air Warrior primary survival gear carrier (PSGC)

[2,000]

29 AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

95,203

95,203

30 INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES

2,377

2,377

31 LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET

2,376

2,376

Total - Aircraft Procurement, Army

4,179,848

1,049,327

5,229,175

Missile Procurement, Army

Other Missiles

Surface-to-air Missile System

1 OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT

243,251

-243,251

Grow the Force Transfer

[-243,251]

2 PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY

472,907

75,000

547,907

Patriot PAC-3 missiles

25

[75,000]

133

3 SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYSTEM SUMMARY

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Program Title

Qty

Cost

Qty

**Senate
Change**

**Senate
Authorized**

Cost

Cost

Line

Air-to-surface Missile System

4 HELFIRE SYS SUMMARY 46,000 46,000

Anti-tank/Assault Missile System

5 JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY 385 103,799 76,914 180,713

Grow the Force Transfer [76,914]

6 TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY 2,255 110,593 110,593

6 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) -22,700 -22,700

7 TOW-2 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) 1,482 225,282 225,282

8 GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS) 3,492 22,585 22,585

9 MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR) 57 235,865 235,865

10 MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS 57 235,865 235,865

11 HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (HIMARS)

12 ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM

Modification of Missiles

Modifications

13 PATRIOT MODS 67,479 502,514 569,993

Grow the Force Transfer [502,514]

14 JAVELIN MISSILE MODS 92,330 121,440 213,770

15 ITAS/TOW MODS [121,440]

Grow the Force Transfer

16 MLRS MODS 5,578 5,578

17 HIMARS MODIFICATIONS 10,541 10,541

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Qty

Cost

Qty

Senate
Change

Cost

Qty

Senate
Authorized

Cost

Cost

Line

Program Title

Spares and Repair Parts

18 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS

23,643

23,643

Support Equipment and Facilities

19 AIR DEFENSE TARGETS

4,268

4,268

20 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MISSILES)

10

10

21 PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT

4,054

4,054

22 CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS

Total - Missile Procurement Army

1,645,485

532,617

2,178,102

Procurement of Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles

Tracked Combat Vehicles

1 ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD

2 BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT

140,314

1,402,500

1,542,814

Transfer from Title XV

3 BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)

4,684

4,684

4 ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES

127

1,038,984

1,060,875

2,099,859

Transfer from Title XV

Additional Stryker vehicles

6 FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEMS (FCS)

79,483

[402,775]

79,483

7 FCS SPIN OUTS

20,123

[658,100]

20,123

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
	Modification of Tracked Combat Vehicles						
8	CARRIER, MOD						
	Transfer from Title XV						
9	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)						
	Grow the Force Transfer						
	Transfer from Title XV						
10	BFVS SERIES (MOD)		37,611				37,611
11	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		36,924				36,924
12	FAASV PIP TO FLEET						
13	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)	12	36,826		134	398,000	434,826
	Grow the Force Transfer						
	Transfer from Title XV						
	Hercules Recapitalization						
14	HEAVY ASSAULT BRIDGE (HAB) SYS (MOD)						
15	ARMORED BREACHER VEHICLE		41,500				41,500
16	ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)						
17	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE						
18	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		12,927				12,927
19	SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2	18	588,979		-18	-52,928	588,979
	M1A2 SEP requirements already funded						
19A	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM (M1A2 SEP) (GA0750)				235	1,303,100	1,303,100
	Transfer from Title XV						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
	Support Equipment and Facilities						
20	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (TCV-WTCV)			7,760			7,760
21	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)						
	Weapons and Other Combat Vehicles						
22	HOWITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM, M119		53	48,902	57	52,800	101,702
	Grow the Force Transfer					[52,800]	
23	INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY			331,729		-331,729	
	Grow the Force Transfer					[-331,729]	
24	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62MM)		2,308	37,096	2,308	27,389	64,485
	Grow the Force Transfer					[7,989]	
	M240 medium machine gun (7.62 mm)			19,000		[19,400]	32,317
25	MACHINE GUN, CAL .50 M2 ROLL					13,317	
	Grow the Force Transfer					[13,317]	
26	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN (5.56MM)		8,382	35,335	8,382	9,241	44,576
	Grow the Force Transfer					[9,241]	
27	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN (40MM)		970	21,000	970	15,448	36,448
	Grow the Force Transfer					[15,448]	
28	MORTAR SYSTEMS		313	4,320	313	4,704	9,024
	Grow the Force Transfer					[4,704]	
29	M16 RIFLE						
30	M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE			417			417

Title I - Procurement (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>		<u>Change</u>		<u>Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
31	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM) Grow the Force Transfer		21,620		5,505 [5,505]		27,125
32	XM110 SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM (SASS) Grow the Force Transfer	694	10,000		460 [460]	694	10,460
33	M4 CARBINE Grow the Force Transfer	69,678	97,550		8,274 [8,274]	69,678	105,824
34	SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM (MASS) Grow the Force Transfer	5,328	7,000		906 [906]	5,328	7,906
35	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WPNS STATION Grow the Force Transfer				29,895 [29,895]		29,895
36	FUTURE HANDGUN SYSTEM (FHS) HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T)		3,500				3,500
37	Grow the Force Transfer	126	270,251		192,318 [192,318]	126	462,569
38	Modification of Weapons and Other Combat Vehicles						
39	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS M4 CARBINE MODS		6,264 13,696		4,018 [4,018]		6,264 17,714
40	Grow the Force Transfer						
41	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS		17,173				17,173
42	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		12,361 10,177				12,361 11,700
43	Grow the Force Transfer PHALANX MODS				1,523 [1,523]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate Change</u>		<u>Senate Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
44	M119 MODIFICATIONS		1,794				1,794
45	M16 RIFLE MODS		3,900		188		4,088
	Grow the Force Transfer				[188]		
46	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)						
	Support Equipment and Facilities		2,791				2,791
47	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)						
	Grow the Force Transfer				1,262		1,262
					[1,262]		
48	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		6,466				6,466
49	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		3,189		12,000		15,189
	Arsenal Support Program Initiative (ASPI)				[12,000]		
50	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		5,424				5,424
51	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	Spares						
52	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)						
Total - Procurement of WTCV, Army			3,089,998		4,456,686		7,546,684
Procurement of Ammunition, Army							
Ammunition							
Small/Medium Caliber Ammunition							
1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		189,179				189,179
2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		68,045				68,045

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate Change</u>		<u>Senate Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
3	CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES		4,527				4,527
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		179,466				179,466
5	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES						
6	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		29,243				29,243
7	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		21,759				21,759
8	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		208,504				208,504
	Mortar Ammunition						
9	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		6,495				6,495
10	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		53,798				53,798
11	CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ALL TYPES		111,594				111,594
	Tank Ammunition						
12	CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES		14,338				14,338
13	CTG, TANK, 120MM, ALL TYPES		180,400				180,400
	Artillery Ammunition						
14	CTG, ARTY, 75MM: ALL TYPES		2,699				2,699
15	CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES		41,965				41,965
16	CTG, ARTY, 155MM, ALL TYPES		88,049				88,049
17	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982		28,781				28,781
18	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T		60,076				60,076
	Artillery Fuzes						
19	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES		4,251				4,251
	Mines						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
20	MINES, ALL TYPES	4,791					4,791
21	MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES	2,522					2,522
22	ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE ALTERNATIVES	51,876					51,876
	Rockets						
23	SHOULDER FIRED ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	29,453					29,453
24	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	137,861					137,861
	Other Ammunition						
25	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	30,945					30,945
26	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	72,392			13,000		85,392
	Smoke grenades				[13,000]		
27	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	181,787					181,787
28	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	21,608					21,608
	Miscellaneous						
29	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	15,000					15,000
30	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES	25,241					25,241
31	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	2,748					2,748
32	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	6,564					6,564
33	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	11,757					11,757
34	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	12,100					17,100
	Ammunition outloading test bed				5,000		
					[5,000]		
35	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Ammunition Production Base Support						
	Production Base Support						
36	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		143,708			164,108	
	AAP solvent recovery system						
	Acid containment and storage system						
37	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		3,436			3,436	
38	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES		5,418			5,418	
39	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL		135,256			135,256	
40	ARMS INITIATIVE		2,944			2,944	
	Re-Estimate of Guaranteed Loan						
41	RE-ESTIMATE OF GUAR LOAN						
	Interest on Re-Estimate						
42	INTEREST ON RE-ESTIMATE						
	Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Army		2,190,576	38,400		2,228,976	
	Other Procurement, Army						
	Tactical and Support Vehicles						
	Tactical Vehicles						
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS		57,053	9,631		66,684	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[9,631]			

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2008		Senate		Senate	
		Request		Change		Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
2	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED Grow the Force Transfer		6,100		171 [171]		6,271
3	SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS		2,185				2,185
4	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)		596,627		389,782 [389,782]		986,409
5	Grow the Force Transfer		828,403		1,024,349 [1,024,349]		1,852,752
6	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)						
	Grow the Force Transfer		36,011		80,641 [80,641]		36,011
7	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMEN		483,023		428,186 [126,288]		563,664
	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)						
	Grow the Force Transfer		155,124				583,310
8	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)						
	Grow the Force Transfer						
	Transfer from Title XV						
9	MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY		199,100				199,100
10	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916		83,897				83,897
11	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV P		197,499				197,499
12	LINE HAUL ESP		1,925,867				
	Grow the Force Transfer				-1,925,867 [-1,925,867]		
13	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM						
14	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		32,725				32,725
15	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (TAC VEH)						

(Dollars in Thousands)

(Dollars in Thousands)

37

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
						<u>Qty</u>	
	Grow the Force Transfer						
30	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	6,042			[2,250]		6,042
	Comm-C3 System						
31	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	25,512			400		25,912
	Grow the Force Transfer				[400]		
	Comm-Combat Communications						
32	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)	7,893			1,598		9,491
	Grow the Force Transfer				[1,598]		
33	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)	3,021			28,995		32,016
	Grow the Force Transfer				[28,995]		
34	SINGGARS FAMILY	137,080			1,005,910		1,142,990
	Grow the Force Transfer				[10,563]		
	Transfer from Title XV				[1,370,347]		
	Singgars Family				[-375,000]		
35	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS - OPA2	8,000					8,000
36	MULTI-PURPOSE INFORMATIONS OPERATIONS	8,653					8,653
37	JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS	1,248,884					
	Grow the Force Transfer				-1,248,884		
38	BRIDGE TO FUTURE NETWORKS	433,526			[-1,248,884]		
	Grow the Force Transfer				1,626,133		2,059,659
	Transfer from Title XV				[65,562]		
	Bridge to Future Networks - Joint Network Node				[2,560,571]		
					[-1,000,000]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
			<u>Cost</u>		<u>Cost</u>		<u>Cost</u>
39	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING		7,902				7,902
40	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT		18,801		887		19,688
	Grow the Force Transfer				[887]		
41	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		10,192				10,192
42	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)		12,072				12,072
43	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY		65,530		15,844		81,374
	Grow the Force Transfer				[15,844]		
44	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)		19,525		2,429		21,954
	Grow the Force Transfer				[2,429]		
	Comm-Intelligence Communications						
45	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,461				1,461
	Information Security						
46	TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)		23,225		4,568		27,793
	Grow the Force Transfer				[4,568]		
47	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP		60,301		31		60,332
	Grow the Force Transfer				[31]		
	Comm-Long Haul Communications						
48	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION		9,619				9,619
49	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		34,520				34,520
50	ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)		511				511
51	VW TECH CON IMP PROG (VWTCIP)		27,880				27,880
	Comm-Base Communications						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
52	INFORMATION SYSTEMS Grow the Force Transfer			156,170			156,170
	Unjustified program growth				[81,361]		
53	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)			6,662	[-81,361]		6,662
54	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD			217,298	1,700		218,998
	DISN hardware enhancements				[1,700]		
55	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM			32,076			32,076
	Elect Equip-Nat For Int Prog (NFIP)						
56	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)			[]			[]
57	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)			[]			[]
	Elect Equip-Tact Int Rel Act (TIARA)						
58	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (MIP)			36,132	16,353		52,485
	Grow the Force Transfer				[16,353]		
59	JTT/CIBS-M (MIP)			3,560	4,006		7,566
	Grow the Force Transfer				[4,006]		
60	PROPHET GROUND (MIP)			119,482			119,482
61	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYS (TUAS)MIP			196,419	30,660		227,079
	Grow the Force Transfer				[30,660]		
62	SMALL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM (SUAS)			20,682	12,798		33,480
	Grow the Force Transfer				[12,798]		
63	ARMY COMMON GROUND STATION (CGS) (TIARA)						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Senate

Change

Senate

Authorized

Line

Program Title

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

64 DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (MIP)

Grow the Force Transfer

34,604

4,250

38,854

65 DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)

66 TACTICAL EXPLOITATION SYSTEM (MIP)

67 DCGS-A (MIP)

Grow the Force Transfer

68 JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)

69 TROJAN (MIP)

70 MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)

71 CI HUMINT INFO MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CHIMS)

Grow the Force Transfer

72 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MIP)

Grow the Force Transfer

Elect Equip-Electronic Warfare (EW)

73 LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR

Grow the Force Transfer

74 COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY

75 CI MODERNIZATION (MIP)

Elect Equip-Tactical Surv. (TAC SURV)

76 SENTINEL MODS

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Senate

Change

Senate

Authorized

Line

Program Title

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

77 NIGHT VISION DEVICES
Grow the Force Transfer

278,641

180,102

458,743

78 LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE
Fill unfunded requirement for night vision devices

129,951

[33,000]

159,489

79 NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT
Grow the Force Transfer

230,607

[29,538]

333,024

80 RADIATION MONITORING SYSTEMS
Grow the Force Transfer

3,518

[102,417]

3,518

81 ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP
Grow the Force Transfer

300

[300]

300

82 MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MMS)

7,572

7,572

83 ENHANCED PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SE

8,000

10,800

84 PROFILER
Grow the Force Transfer

41,480

[2,800]

41,480

85 MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)

175,975

250,135

86 FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)
Grow the Force Transfer

93,986

[74,160]

137,386

87 LIGHTWEIGHT LSR DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD)
Grow the Force Transfer

[43,400]

1,001

88 COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMCB XM32
Grow the Force Transfer

14,000

[1,001]

14,000

89 MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM

90 INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - MIP

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate Change</u>		<u>Senate Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
91	ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM						
92	Elect Equip-Tactical C2 Systems		393,883				393,883
93	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS		40,626		6,676		47,302
	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY				[6,676]		
	Grow the Force Transfer				828		33,763
94	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM		32,935		[828]		
	Grow the Force Transfer						
95	FAAD C2		9,000				9,000
96	AIR & MSL DEF PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (AMD)		19,611		20,751		40,362
	Grow the Force Transfer				[20,751]		
97	KNIGHT FAMILY		68,280		26,000		94,280
	Grow the Force Transfer				[26,000]		
98	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		2,070				2,070
99	AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY		71,034				71,034
100	TC AIMS II		29,037		362		29,399
	Grow the Force Transfer				[362]		
101	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JNMS)		10,745				10,745
102	TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER		9,215		1,053		10,268
	Grow the Force Transfer				[1,053]		
103	DATA PRODUCTS		36,142				36,142
104	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)		120,767		1,722		122,489
	Grow the Force Transfer				[1,722]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Senate

Change

Senate

Authorized

Line

Program Title

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

105 SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)

Grow the Force Transfer

53,563

96,042

149,605

106 MOUNTED BATTLE COMMAND ON THE MOVE

Elect Equip - Automation

42,000

[96,042]

42,000

107 GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM

ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION

39,353

39,353

108 ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION

AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP

11,389

11,389

109 AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP

CSS COMMUNICATIONS

120,732

120,732

110 CSS COMMUNICATIONS

Grow the Force Transfer

32,955

2,680

35,635

111 RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)

Elect Equip-Audio Visual Sys (AV)

30,427

[2,680]

30,427

112 AFRTS

ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (A/V)

964

964

113 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (A/V)

ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)

6,306

6,306

114 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)

Grow the Force Transfer

3,358

3,760

7,118

Elect Equip-Mods Tactical Sys/Eq

WEAPONIZATION OF UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM

15,207

15,207

115 WEAPONIZATION OF UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM

Elect Equip-Support

14,430

14,430

116 ITEMS UNDER \$5M (SSE)

PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)

508

508

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2008		Senate		Senate	
		Request	Qty	Change	Qty	Authorized	Cost
		Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Cost
Other Support Equipment							
Chemical Defensive Equipment							
118	RADIAC SET AN/PDR 770	1,500		39		1,539	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[39]			
119	RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM NUCLEAR - BIOLOGICAL	316				316	
120	CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION	46,294		13,532		59,826	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[13,532]			
121	SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM)	7,700		1,379		9,079	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[1,379]			
Bridging Equipment							
122	TACTICAL BRIDGING	50,443				50,443	
123	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	74,785				74,785	
Engineer (Non-construction) Equipment							
124	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-	45,218		3,945		49,163	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[3,945]			
125	KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING	334,068		-334,068			
	Grow the Force Transfer			[-334,068]			
126	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM	63,016				63,016	
127	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)						
128	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD	33,283		25,000		58,283	
	Additional EOD equipment			[25,000]			
129	ITEMS< \$5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	3,562				3,562	

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
130	AERIAL DETECTION	11,708					11,708
	Combat Service Support Equipment						
131	HEATERS AND ECU'S	18,463					19,860
	Grow the Force Transfer			1,397			
				[1,397]			
132	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES			7,050			7,050
	Grow the Force Transfer			[7,050]			
133	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	13,540					19,803
	Grow the Force Transfer			6,263			
				[6,263]			
134	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)						
135	LAND WARRIOR			49,500			49,500
	LRIP items for 2 battalions			[49,500]			
136	MOUNTED SOLDIER SYSTEM						
137	FORCE PROVIDER						
138	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT						
	Grow the Force Transfer	26,123		30,022			56,145
				[30,022]			
139	CARGO AERIAL DELIVERY PROGRAM	43,842					43,842
140	MOBILE INTEGRATED REMAINS COLLECTION SYSTEM	9,941					9,941
141	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (ENG SPT)	20,099					21,084
	Grow the Force Transfer			985			
				[985]			
142	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (CSS EQ)			4,500			4,500
	Recon-navigation system (RNAV)			[4,500]			

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>
Petroleum Equipment					
143	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	1,293			1,293
144	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER Grow the Force Transfer	34,056		350 [350]	34,406
Water Equipment					
145	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS Grow the Force Transfer	41,981		436 [436]	42,417
Medical Equipment					
146	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL Grow the Force Transfer	85,490		871 [871]	86,361
Maintenance Equipment					
147	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS Grow the Force Transfer	29,475		10,698 [10,698]	40,173
148	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MAINT EQ) Transfer from Title XV	23,396		120,586 [120,586]	143,982
Construction Equipment					
149	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE) Grow the Force Transfer	11,700		3,310 [3,310]	15,010
150	SKID LOADER (SSL) FAMILY OF SYSTEM	16,900			16,900
151	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING Grow the Force Transfer	19,440		6,579 [6,579]	26,019
152	DISTR, WATER, SP MIN 2500G SEC/NON-SEC	6,440			6,440

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
Material Handling Equipment							
167	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)						
	Grow the Force Transfer	20,587		22,308			42,895
				[22,308]			
168	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM	24,757		14,985			39,742
	Grow the Force Transfer			[14,985]			
Training Equipment							
169	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	16,337		102,400			118,737
	Combat training centers			[102,400]			
170	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	201,843		39,800			241,643
	Urban training center			[24,800]			
	Laser Collective Combat Training System (LCCATS)			[10,000]			
	Call for fire trainer II / JFETS			[5,000]			
171	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	67,123		67,123			67,123
172	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (AVCA)	67,386		67,386			67,386
Test Measure and Dig Equipment (TMD)							
173	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	10,644		10,644			10,644
174	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	36,516		36,516			36,516
175	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	19,302		19,302			19,302
Other Support Equipment							
176	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	48,704		48,704			48,704
177	IED DEFEAT EQUIPMENT						
178	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	103,018		1,638			104,656

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>		<u>Change</u>		<u>Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Grow the Force Transfer				[1,638]		
179	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT		29,976				29,976
180	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)		58,223				58,223
181	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		3,061				3,061
182	BUILDING, PRE-FAB, RELOCATABLE						
183	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING		23,968				23,968
184	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3		7,000				7,000
185	MA8975		2,499				2,499
	Spares and Repair Parts						
	OPA2						
186	INITIAL SPARES - C&E		44,497				44,497
	OPA3						
187	INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP		8,636				8,636
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
	Total - Other Procurement, Army		12,647,099		2,366,056		15,013,155

Title I - Procurement
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
				<u>Cost</u>		<u>Cost</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund						
	Network Attack						
1	ATTACK THE NETWORK						
	JIEDDO Device Defeat						
2	DEFEAT THE DEVICE	200,000				-200,000	
	Transfer to Title XV					[-200,000]	
	Force Training						
3	TRAIN THE FORCE						
	Staff and Infrastructure						
4	OPERATIONS	300,000				-300,000	
	Transfer to Title XV					[-300,000]	
	Total - Joint IED Defeat Fund	500,000				-500,000	

Multiyear procurement authority for M1A2 Abrams System Enhancement Package upgrades (sec. 111)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide authority to the Secretary of the Army to enter into a multiyear contract for the upgrade of Abrams tanks to the M1A2 System Enhancement Package (SEP) versions.

Section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, authorizes the Department of Defense to enter into multiyear contracts for the purchase of property, but only if six statutory criteria are met. One of these criteria is that the use of a multiyear contract must result in “substantial savings” compared to the anticipated costs of carrying out the program through annual contracts.

The Department estimates that the multiyear contract for the M1A2 Abrams SEP upgrades will result in savings of approximately \$178.0 million, or a total of approximately 10 percent, compared to the cost of five annual contracts. The committee considers these savings to be substantial and concludes that the multiyear proposal meets the statutory criteria.

Multiyear procurement authority for M2A3/M3A3 Bradley fighting vehicle upgrades (sec. 112)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide authority to the Secretary of the Army to enter into a multiyear contract for the upgrade of Bradley Fighting Vehicles and Bradley Fire Support Team Vehicles to the M2A3/M3A3/BFIST versions.

Section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, authorizes the Department of Defense to enter into multiyear contracts for the purchase of property, but only if six statutory criteria are met. One of these criteria is that the use of a multiyear contract must result in “substantial savings” compared to the anticipated costs of carrying out the program through annual contracts.

The Department estimates that a multiyear contract for the Bradley upgrades over 4 fiscal years beginning in fiscal year 2008 and ending in fiscal year 2011 will result in savings of approximately \$131.0 million, or a total of approximately 5 percent, compared to the cost of four annual contracts. Because the Department plans to purchase a procurement quantity of 525 in the first year, the Department assumes that savings resulting from larger procurement quantities will be achieved in that year regardless of whether a multiyear contract is approved. However, the Department estimates that a multiyear contract will result in savings of \$131.0 million, or a total of 10 percent, compared to the cost of annual contracts over the final 3 years of the contract. The committee considers these savings to be substantial and concludes that the multiyear proposal meets the statutory criteria.

Stryker Mobile Gun System (sec. 113)

The committee recommends a provision that would withhold all funding for the procurement of the Stryker Mobile Gun System (MGS) until 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Army certifies to Congress that the results of the initial operational test and evaluation indicate that the Stryker MGS is operationally effective, suitable, and survivable. The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation on MGS funding if the Secretary determines

that further procurement of the Stryker MGS is in the national security interest of the United States, submits to the Congress, in writing, a notification of the waiver together with a discussion of the reasons for the waiver and the actions that will be taken to mitigate any deficiencies which cause the system to be deemed not operationally effective, suitable, and/or survivable.

In January 2007, the Army decided to deploy the Stryker MGS with the Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT) that was deploying to Iraq as part of the “surge” of units called for by the revamped Baghdad security plan. This was done despite the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation’s concern that planned operational and live fire ballistic test and evaluation were not complete and were not yet adequate to support a final assessment of MGS crew and system survivability, operational effectiveness, and operational suitability. The Director expressed concern about the current reliability and operational effectiveness of the vehicle, with mean rounds between system aborts being well below the entrance criteria for entry into initial operational test and evaluation (IOT&E), and with significant “fightability” shortfalls, particularly with regard to the functioning of the two machine guns. More troubling are the unique survivability concerns expressed by the Director, with MGS crews at greater risk than crews in other Stryker configurations, the details of which are classified and cannot be discussed in this report.

The committee is troubled by the Army’s decision and shares the concerns expressed by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation and believes that no more Stryker MGS’s should be procured until adequate testing shows that the system is operationally effective, suitable, and survivable. The committee notes that the MGS IOT&E has been delayed from earlier this year to November 2007, because of the SBCT’s early deployment to Iraq, and a full rate production decision is not expected until February 2008.

Consolidation of Joint Network Node program and Warfighter Information Network—Tactical program into a single Army tactical network program (sec. 114)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of the Army to consolidate the joint network node (JNN) and warfighter information network—tactical (WIN-T) programs into one Army tactical network program.

The budget request included \$312.6 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for JNN and fiscal year 2008 budget requested an additional \$2.2 billion in war-related funding in OPA for JNN. The combined budget request for JNN totals over \$2.5 billion. If approved, the Department of the Army would procure 10 JNN hubs, 175 JNNs, 557 battalion command post nodes, and would sustain all previous JNN units fielded.

The JNN is a commercially-based Ku-band satellite system that supports the Army’s tactical communications requirements for the exchange of voice, data, and video from theater to the battalion level. The JNN was designed to be operational within 30 minutes of the time that the tactical operations center ceases movement and sets up in a static position. The Army began the JNN program as a quick-start initiative funded by emergency supplemental dollars

in response to an urgent operational need statement from U.S. Central Command. The committee recognizes the importance of this capability in the theater today and notes that the urgent operational need has now been met. The committee notes that the budget request would complete the fielding of JNN to the rest of the Army.

The committee is concerned that the Army did not comply with title 10 of the United States Code in its acquisition of Lots 1–9 of JNN by not adequately testing the JNN platform and its associated systems before it was produced and fielded. The committee is also concerned that the Army does not own, nor does it have access to, the technical data package for JNN.

The committee directs the Department to perform an initial operational test and evaluation (IOT&E) and deliver to the congressional defense committees a low rate initial production report before a full rate production decision has been made by the Department. The committee is concerned that the Army's investment in JNN is not appropriately aligned with its knowledge of its shortcomings and an IOT&E will help the Army develop a better understanding of its investment and the additional investments necessary for the sustainment of JNN.

In addition to the JNN request, the Army's fiscal year 2008 baseline budget request included \$222.3 million for the continued research and development of the WIN–T program.

As envisioned, WIN–T will also support the Army's tactical communications, including video, data, imagery, and voice services, for commanders at all echelons at remote locations throughout the battle space. WIN–T is also expected to interface with the Joint Tactical Radio System, which extends to the individual warfighter platform level, and will be integral to the Army's modernization to the Future Combat Systems (FCS). The committee believes that the Army should move as quickly as possible to incorporate this capability into JNN.

JNN and WIN–T are duplicate programs. However, WIN–T will meet the requirements of JNN, but with greater capability, providing on-the-move capabilities to Army commanders—a long-standing requirement. It is estimated that the Army will require well over \$2.0 billion to field JNN to all Army units.

In September 2004, after competitively awarding two contracts for the Systems Development and Demonstration phase for the WIN–T communications system, the Army received approval to merge the winning contractors into a single team to accelerate WIN–T development. Since that time, and mostly due to affordability issues, the Army has restructured the WIN–T program, further delaying its fielding.

According to the Army's February 2007 "Report to Congress on the Bridge to Future Networks," the Army intends to replace JNN with WIN–T beginning in 2014. The committee is concerned that the Army cannot afford to field both JNN and WIN–T in such a short time period and that the training, logistical, and maintenance burdens for the rapid fielding of two highly complex communication networks in such a close time frame has not been sufficiently analyzed.

The committee is also concerned about the Secretary of the Army's January 2007 notification to Congress of the WIN-T breach of the Nunn-McCurdy unit cost threshold which was a result of the Army's decision to expand WIN-T's capability and increase the scope of its fielding. The committee shares the concern of the Government Accountability Office that the WIN-T program has been operating without a bona fide acquisition program baseline for 18 months, and may not have a new approved acquisition program baseline until well after the June 2007 Nunn-McCurdy certification.

The committee believes that, should JNN and WIN-T remain as two programs on separate and parallel paths, the result may be two sub-optimal systems instead of a single, integrated, fully-capable system as currently envisioned. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to consolidate these two programs into a single tactical network program which will provide a seamless transition from JNN to WIN-T as soon as possible, and at optimum cost.

Further, the committee recommends transferring the \$2.6 billion in title XV, OPA for JNN to title I, OPA for JNN. Further, the committee recommends a reduction of \$1.0 billion in OPA for JNN.

Budget Items—Army

Armed reconnaissance helicopter

The budget request included \$468.2 million in the base budget request for 37 Armed Reconnaissance Helicopters (ARH), and \$222.6 million in the fiscal year 2008 war-related budget request for an additional 29 Armed Reconnaissance Helicopters to replace OH-58D Kiowa Warrior combat losses.

In April 2007, the Army issued a "stop work notice" to the contractor, giving the company 30 days to address cost and scheduling performance problems for the ARH program. The Army subsequently evaluated the contractor's response and proposal for executing the ARH program, and after a special meeting of the Army Systems Acquisition Review Council on May 18, 2007, decided that continuing with the current contractor enables ARH fielding sooner and at less cost than re-competing the program.

The committee recommends a transfer of \$131.0 million from title I, Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA), for the Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter, including \$31.0 million to APA for OH-58D cockpit display system software upgrades and mast mounted sight circuit cards, and \$100.0 million to PE 64220A to fund remaining research and development requirements for ARH.

The committee also recommends a reduction of \$38.6 million in title XV, APA for ARH, and a transfer of \$184.0 million—including \$86.0 million to Operations and Maintenance, Army (OMA) for the recapitalization of UH-60A Blackhawk helicopters, \$38.0 million to APA for the upgrade of UH-60A helicopters to UH-60L models, and \$60.0 million to APA for common missile warning systems for fixed wing aircraft.

The committee recognizes the long standing Army requirement for an ARH and commends the Army for taking a critical look at the program as currently structured and executed. The committee

urges the Army to continue rigorous oversight of the contractor's performance and expects frequent consultation with the congressional defense committees on the results of that oversight. The committee encourages the Army to submit a comprehensive reprogramming that will adequately fund the required restructuring of the ARH program.

CH-47 Chinook helicopter

The budget request included \$157.9 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA) for six new build CH-47 helicopters and \$577.3 million in PE 23744A for CH-47 cargo helicopter modifications. These amounts assumed savings for procurement and modifications under a 5-year multiyear contract authority requested by the Department of Defense.

Section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, authorizes the Department of Defense to enter into multiyear contracts for the purchase of property, but only if six statutory criteria are met. One of these criteria is that the use of a multiyear contract must result in "substantial savings" compared to the anticipated costs of carrying out the program through annual contracts.

The Department estimates that the multiyear contract will result in savings of approximately 3.8 percent for the new build CH-47 helicopters and 4.3 percent for the modifications. The committee does not consider these savings to be substantial and concludes that the statutory standard for approval of a multiyear contract has not been met. The committee encourages the Department to resubmit its proposal for a multiyear contract in the future, if it determines that more substantial savings can be achieved.

To meet the cost of an annual contract in fiscal year 2008, the committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in APA, a total of \$163.9 million, for CH-47 helicopters; and an increase of \$16.0 million in APA, a total of \$593.3 million, for CH-47 cargo helicopter modifications.

Enhanced electronic digital engine control unit

The budget request included \$13.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA) for UH-60 Blackhawk helicopter modifications, but no funding for the Enhanced Electronic Digital Engine Control Unit (EDECU).

The common EDECU will standardize engine controls among all Army helicopter platforms flying GE-T700-701C and GE-T700-701D engines, and provide increased processing capability and memory beyond the capacity of the legacy Digital Engine Control Unit (DECU). The EDECU provides single channel engine supervisory control for engine governing, over-speed protection, temperature limiting protection, and integral auto relight capability.

The EDECU is a common engine control unit designed for interchangeable support for UH-60L/M and Apache AH-64D Block II/III aircraft equipped with T700-GE-701C or -701D engines. The EDECU has greater reliability, serviceability, and a lower unit cost than its legacy predecessor system, the DECU. The EDECU hardware will be common for all platforms, and will be introduced directly to production or fielded through depot level replacement.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million for the EDECU, for a total of \$16.0 million.

Aircraft survivability equipment infrared countermeasures

The budget request included \$365.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA) for Advanced Threat Infrared Countermeasure (ATIRCM)/Common Missile Warning System (CMWS) installation kits (A-Kits) and mission kits (B-Kits) to provide an integrated warning and countermeasure system for aircraft survivability against infrared guided missile systems. The committee notes that the Chief of Staff of the Army identified additional funds for this aircraft survivability equipment among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2008. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$207.4 million in APA, for a total of \$572.9 million.

Aircrew integrated systems

The base budget request included \$42.7 million for aircrew integrated systems, including \$2.2 million for an encrypted Aircraft Wireless Intercom System (AWIS), but no funding for a non-encrypted version. The budget request also contained no funding for the Air Warrior Generation 3 Primary Survival Gear Carrier (PSGC).

The AWIS is a cordless, voice-activated crew intercommunications system integrated with the aircraft communications system. The system provides a wireless communication capability between crew members in flight and during ground service operations, allows medical personnel freedom of both hands to perform onboard medical procedures while communicating with the flight crew, and eliminates the operational hazards and operational restrictions inherent to the existing tethered system. Currently there is no integrated or qualified communication system between the crew flying medical evacuation (MEDEVAC) aircraft and the medic on the ground preparing a patient for transport or suspended beneath the hovering aircraft over hazardous terrain during critical rescue hoist operations. Hand and arm signals are currently used as the means for communication.

The committee notes that the Army MEDEVAC community has requested the immediate fielding of an unencrypted AWIS based upon Hurricane Katrina relief experience. Funding appropriated in fiscal year 2007 was sufficient to procure only 60 AWIS of the 363 required for the Army's UH-60 MEDEVAC aircraft.

The Air Warrior Generation 3 PSGC is a modular, integrated, rapidly reconfigurable combat aircrew ensemble that saves lives and maximizes Army aircrew member mission performance. The PSGC incorporates first aid, survival, signaling, and communications equipment with body armor, microclimate cooling, and an integrated extraction capability.

The Generation 3 PSGC incorporates numerous system and safety improvements based upon combat lessons learned, including the Universal Camouflage pattern, and will result in a significant signature reduction for a downed aircrew member in a desert environment.

The committee recommends an additional \$5.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army to procure non-encrypted AWIS for the remain-

ing 303 MEDEVAC aircraft, and \$2.0 million to replace over 3,500 previously-fielded Generation 1 PSGCs with the improved Generation 3, for a total \$49.7 million.

Patriot Advanced Capability-3

The budget request included \$472.9 million in Missile Procurement, Army (MPA) for procurement of 108 Patriot Advanced-Capability-3 (PAC-3) missiles. The committee recommends an increase of \$75.0 million in MPA to procure an additional 25 PAC-3 missiles.

The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff included in the Army's fiscal year 2008 unfunded priorities list an initiative to upgrade three Patriot PAC-2 battalions to the most modern and capable PAC-3 configuration. This PAC-3 "Pure Fleet" initiative was the number three priority for the Army, for \$452.2 million. This upgrade will increase significantly the capability of Patriot battalions to defend against longer-range and more complex missile threats currently facing forward-deployed U.S. forces, allies, and friends.

Since the submission of the original budget request, the Army clarified its plans for funding the PAC-3 Pure Fleet initiative, and prepared a fiscal year 2007 reprogramming proposal for \$212.0 million to begin the initiative. Additionally, it has budgeted \$208.0 million in its fiscal year 2008 "Grow the Army" budget plan to complete the initiative. Furthermore, the Grow the Army plan includes funding to add two additional PAC-3 battalions to the force structure to meet the requirements of regional combatant commanders. This plan, with the Pure Fleet initiative, would bring the Patriot force to a total of 15 PAC-3 battalions, which represents a significant increase in capability from today's force. The committee supports this proposed funding for the PAC-3 system.

The committee notes that the PAC-3 system is in high demand by regional combatant commanders, and that U.S. forces do not have a sufficient inventory of PAC-3 missiles to meet the requirements of U.S. military operational plans. The committee commends the Army for taking steps to fund the PAC-3 Pure Fleet initiative, and urges the Army to plan and budget for increased PAC-3 missile inventory in the future to meet the needs of regional combatant commands.

Section 223 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) named the Patriot PAC-3 system as one of the effective, near-term missile defense systems that the Department of Defense shall make a missile defense priority. Patriot is the only combat-tested and combat-proven missile defense system in the U.S. arsenal.

Stryker Vehicle

The base budget request included \$1.0 billion and the fiscal year 2008 war-related budget request included \$402.8 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles (WTCV) for Stryker vehicles.

The committee notes that the Chief of Staff of the Army identified additional funds for Stryker among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2008, including add-on armor, ballistic shields, remote weapons stations, medical evacuation vehicles, and additional Stryker vehicles for depot repair cycle floats.

The committee recommends an increase of \$658.1 million in the base budget, and an increase of \$117.0 million in the war-related budget to replace projected Stryker battle losses.

Improved recovery vehicle

The budget request included \$36.8 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles (WTCV) for the M88A2 Heavy Equipment Recovery Combat Utility Lift and Evacuation System (HERCULES). The HERCULES is the only single-recovery vehicle capable of performing recovery, evacuation, and limited repair of the Abrams tank. Without improvements incorporated in the M88A2 HERCULES, units must use two recovery vehicles to perform the spectrum of recovery missions. The committee notes that the Chief of Staff of the Army identified additional funds for the HERCULES among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2008. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$24.9 million, a total of \$61.7 million for the M88A2 HERCULES.

System enhancement program: SEP M1A2

The budget request included \$52.9 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles (WTCV) to upgrade M1A2 Abrams tanks to the System Enhancement Package (SEP) configuration. The fiscal year 2007 main supplemental budget request included \$325.0 million for the same purpose. The committee understands that all of the remaining M1A2 Abrams tanks will be upgraded to the SEP configuration with the fiscal year 2007 funding. Therefore, the committee recommends no funding for upgrading M1A2 Abrams tanks to the SEP configuration in fiscal year 2008.

M240 medium machine gun

The base budget request included \$37.1 million for the M240 medium machine gun and the fiscal year 2008 war-related request included \$42.7 million for the same. The committee notes that the Chief of Staff of the Army identified additional funds for the M240 among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2008. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$19.4 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, a total of \$56.5 million for M240 medium machine guns in the base budget.

Arsenal support program initiative

The budget request included no funding in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles (WTCV) for the Arsenal Support Program Initiative (ASPI).

The military arsenals serve a compelling national security need by providing rapid manufacturing capabilities for specialized and unique defense manufacturing requirements. The arsenals, however, suffer from underutilization which has affected overhead rates, making it increasingly difficult for them to compete with private industry and maintain a base of skilled workers.

The ASPI was established in 2001 to address that problem. The program integrates commercial activity in the arsenals to reduce the Army's cost of ownership and modernize the facilities, while maintaining their core competencies in support of national defense requirements. The program establishes broad economic goals,

maintains the viability of the Army manufacturing arsenals, and encourages the sharing of manufacturing facilities and unique capabilities on a “pay as you go” basis for non-governmental entities performing commercial work at Army manufacturing arsenals.

The committee recommends an increase of \$12.0 million for the ASPI.

Grenades

The budget request included \$13.9 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army for yellow and green smoke grenades. The committee recommends an increase of \$13.0 million in PAA for the procurement of additional yellow and green smoke grenades.

Ammunition outloading test bed

The budget request included \$11.8 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA) for ammunition-peculiar equipment, but did not include funds necessary to complete an automated ammunition outloading test bed. The test bed combines state of the art Gantry robotic equipment with conveyor systems allowing ammunition plant personnel to outload ammunition directly from trucks to shipping containers. The benefits of the automated outloading capability include increased capacity and increased personnel safety. The Army acknowledges that its current outloading capability is less than half that required to meet readiness goals. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PAA to complete an automated ammunition outloading test bed.

Ammunition plant solvent recovery system

The budget request included \$143.7 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA) for the provision of industrial facilities, but included no funds for a centralized solvent recovery system. The Army uses ether and alcohol as the primary solvents in the manufacture of propellants. A study last year indicated that 5 million pounds of solvents were used for production at one ammunition plant. Of that level, only 1.2 million pounds were recovered by the current system. The committee understands that a modern system will significantly increase the amount of solvent recovered, resulting in reduced environmental risks and lower costs of propellant production. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.2 million in PAA for an ammunition plant solvent recovery system.

Acid containment and storage system

The budget request included \$143.7 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA) for the provision of industrial facilities, but included no funds for the modernization and upgrade of acid containment and storage systems. The committee understands that a modern system will reduce maintenance costs and increase safety. The committee recommends an increase of \$13.2 million in PAA for an ammunition plant acid storage and containment system.

Single channel ground and airborne radio system family

The base budget request included \$137.1 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for single channel ground and airborne radio system (SINCGARS) hardware units. The fiscal year 2008

war-related budget request included \$1.4 billion in OPA for the SINCGARS hardware units. SINCGARS provides the primary means of command and control for combat, combat support, and combat service support units in the Army.

From fiscal year 2003 to fiscal year 2007, the Army received \$2.0 billion to acquire approximately 210,000 SINCGARS hardware units. In the fiscal year 2007 supplemental budget, the Army requested an additional \$532.5 million for 31,425 hardware units. The combined fiscal year 2008 budget request would permit the Army to procure an additional approximately 107,000 units of SINCGARS radios. According to the Army, the combined budget request is intended to address modular force structure increases, the need to equip National Guard units, and support an effort to provide SINCGARS communications in all combat service and combat service support tactical wheeled vehicles.

The SINCGARS program is currently in the third year of a 5-year base contract with 2 option years. The largest discount is available for orders of 10,000 or more hardware units. The Secretary of the Army recently directed the SINCGARS program office to determine if a new competition for SINCGARS radios is warranted, given the increased demand and requirement for radios. Given that the government owns the technical data package, additional discounts may be available if a second contractor can be established. Currently, the Army is conducting a market assessment to ascertain if there are any potential vendors interested in and capable of meeting the Army's SINCGARS requirements. In the event that there will not be a new competition for SINCGARS, the Army could still seek additional quantity discounts through a renegotiation with the current contractor.

It is the committee's understanding that the Army plans to make a contract award in June 2008, to acquire the over 100,000 SINCGARS hardware units. The SINCGARS units funded with fiscal year 2008 dollars are expected to be delivered beginning in May 2009, and continue at a monthly delivery rate of 4,000 to 6,600 units through October 2010. Based on the contractor's production rates, the Government Accountability Office has determined that the Army does not need to acquire all of the radios it is requesting in the fiscal year 2008 war-related budget request given supplier lead times and delivery schedules.

The committee is also reluctant to approve the Army's full SINCGARS budget request in light of program uncertainties related to the Army's requirements for SINCGARS radios. Currently, there are Army and Office of Secretary of Defense force structure and communications studies underway that may impact requirements for SINCGARS radios. Both studies are scheduled for completion in the summer of 2007. The committee expects these studies will address the Army's acquisition of commercial off-the-shelf radios and the prospects for joint tactical radio systems future production and fielding.

Therefore, the committee recommends transferring the \$1.4 billion in title XV, OPA for SINCGARS family to title I, OPA for SINCGARS family. Further, the committee recommends a reduction of \$375.0 million in OPA for SINCGARS hardware units.

Information systems

The budget request included \$156.2 million in Other Procurement, Army for information systems, a 700 percent increase over the amount requested in fiscal year 2007. According to Army budget justification materials, \$81.4 million of the increase in the base budget is for Grow the Army initiative requirements at locations such as Forts Carson, Leonard Wood, and Lee. The Army again requested the same amount in its justification materials for Grow the Army, duplicating the request of \$81.4 million for information systems. While the committee endorses the Army's need to increase force structure, some of the requested funding to support the increase in troop strength is unjustified. The committee recommends a decrease of \$81.4 million in information systems, leaving only the initial base budget request of \$156.2 million.

Installation information infrastructure modernization program

The budget request included \$217.3 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the Installation Information Infrastructure Modernization program (I3MP). I3MP encompasses the modernization and upgrade of the telecommunications/information infrastructure on Army installations in the continental United States, Europe, and Pacific theaters, and the management of the Army Enterprise Systems. At the installation level, I3MP delivers a secure, interoperable network that is capable of passing large data packages at high speeds to a user's desktop. The committee notes that high bandwidth connectivity provides military users with enhanced capabilities for data, voice, and video communications. These capabilities enable military organizations to better support deployed forces and other Department of Defense activities. The committee recommends an additional \$1.7 million for hardware enhancements to the Defense Information System Network, especially to increase network geographic diversity and alternative data pathways.

Explosive ordnance disposal equipment

The budget request included \$33.3 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) equipment. Explosive ordnance disposal personnel are in constant contact with the most dangerous threats to coalition forces in Iraq and Afghanistan. They need adequate equipment for operations and training. The committee notes that the Chief of Staff of the Army identified additional funds for EOD equipment among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2008. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$25.0 million in OPA for EOD equipment.

Land warrior

Many analysts believe that the most prevalent threats the Nation will confront over the next 2 decades will be similar to those it currently faces in Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee understands that the Army must be organized, trained, and equipped to respond to all threats at any level on the spectrum of conflict. However, the most likely missions the Army will be called upon to conduct will be counterinsurgency and stability and support operations. These missions are infantry-intensive. The Army itself has

recognized this and has increased the number of infantry in the modular brigade combat teams (BCTs), and plans to do the same in the Future Combat Systems BCTs.

Given that the Army will depend more on infantry, not less, the committee is troubled that the Army has not requested funding for procurement of the Land Warrior system after 10 years of development at a cost of \$2.0 billion. The committee has no clear understanding as to how the Army intends to take advantage of the technologies already developed and ready to field that will give the infantry advantages it needs on the battlefield today.

Land Warrior, under its latest configuration, gives the infantry small unit leaders a suite of capabilities that enhance situational awareness and command and control. It includes an advanced combat helmet with an optical display attachment, a modified M-4 rifle, digital imaging equipment, a 12-hour lithium-ion battery, a voice and data radio, a Global Positioning System, a computer subsystem, a multifunction laser, and a control card for identity management.

The committee is aware that over the years Land Warrior suffered not only from management, cost, performance, and schedule problems, but also with requirements growth and the challenges associated with so many information technology and software-based systems. However, the Department of Defense Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) recently assessed Land Warrior during tests with the 4th Battalion, 9th Infantry, a Stryker unit preparing to deploy to Iraq. The Director, in a carefully worded report to this committee, determined that the system was "on track" to be operationally effective and suitable, even though it has not completed its Initial Operational Test.

Although Land Warrior still has two technological issues to address, the committee understands that DOT&E has indicated that the system's test items could deploy with the 4th Battalion, 9th Infantry, that the battalion is eager to take the system to Iraq, and that the Army has approved the plan.

The committee notes that funding to support Land Warrior items of equipment in Iraq was originally on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded requirements list, but understands that the Army has now identified sources of funding for that purpose.

The committee also understands that the Army intends to take the Land Warrior program to a Milestone C acquisition decision to begin low rate initial production (LRIP), but does not intend to actually fund LRIP.

The committee believes that such a decision may be short-sighted, especially in light of the Army's recognition of the centrality of the infantryman to the likely missions the Army will face over the next decades. The committee urges the Army to review its decision to terminate the Land Warrior program. Accordingly, the committee recommends an addition of \$30.4 million in PE 64827A, and \$49.5 million in Other Procurement, Army, to continue development of the Land Warrior program, and to procure LRIP items of equipment to field to the remaining two battalions of the Stryker brigade combat team currently equipped with Land Warrior.

Recon and navigation system

The budget request included \$2.3 billion in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for other support equipment, but included no funds for the Recon and Navigation System (RNAV). This navigation system supports the mission requirements of Army special operations divers. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.5 million in Other Procurement, Army for RNAV.

Army combat training centers

The budget request included \$16.3 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) to support improvements at the Army's premier training ranges: the National Training Center (NTC), the Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC), and the Joint Multinational Readiness Center (JMRC). The committee notes that the Army's force generation and rotation training strategies have strained the time available for units to conduct their normal mission rehearsal exercises at either the NTC, JRTC, or JMRC.

The Army currently plans to invest modestly over the next 3 years and up to \$176.7 million through the future-years defense plan to upgrade and modernize the combat training centers. The committee is concerned that this investment profile is inadequate to meet the mid-term demands of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the Army's plans to increase its end strength. The committee notes that the Chief of Staff of the Army identified additional funds for the combat training centers among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2008. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$102.4 million in OPA for the combat training centers.

Urban training technologies

The budget request included \$94.9 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for training range instrumentation and modernization. The committee notes that the Army's readiness and rotation training strategies call for units to accomplish more of their mission training and rehearsals at their local training areas and facilities. The Army is using several technologies to increase the flexibility and value of local training ranges and facilities including the Deployable Range Package, the Homestation Instrumentation System, and the Integrated Military Operations in Urbanized Terrain Training System. The committee recommends an increase of \$24.8 million in OPA to accelerate the procurement of these training systems and for the instrumentation of a regional urban operations training center.

The committee understands that the Army's Force Generation model (ARFORGEN) depends heavily on increasing the readiness of reserve units prior to mobilization. To accomplish this, in part, the Army plans to consolidate equipment at regional training facilities where units rotate through weapons and maneuver qualification then return to their home stations.

The committee is concerned that the Army has not developed a comprehensive modernization plan for local and regional training installations, such as Camp Atterbury, Fort Pickett, Camp Blanding, Camp Shelby, Fort McCoy, and many others necessary to support its reserve component ARFORGEN concept. The com-

mittee directs the Army to provide the defense committees with its regional training facilities modernization plan—including identification of installations, projected training demand, facilities modernization requirements, priorities, costs, and schedules, by January 31, 2008.

Laser collective combat training system

The budget request included \$201.4 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) but did not include funds for the Laser Collective Combat Training System (LCCATS). This is a laser-based marksmanship training system currently in use by National Guard units for urban operations, reflexive fire training, close quarters marksmanship, and small unit maneuver drills. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million for the laser collective combat training system for the procurement and fielding of 250 additional systems.

Call for fire trainer

The budget request included \$4.1 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the Call For Fire Trainer (CFFT), but included no funds for the conclusion of the Joint Fires and Effects Trainer System (JFETS) demonstration project. JFETS is a next generation, virtual reality call for fire training simulation. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in OPA to complete this demonstration project.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Senate

Change

Senate

Authorized

Line

Program Title

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

Aircraft Procurement, Navy

Combat Aircraft

1	AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP)	18	3,016		18	3,016
2	EA-18G		1,307,303			1,307,303
2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-39,593			-39,593
3	EA-18G ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		51,117			51,117
4	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	24	2,112,973	12	713,540	2,826,513
4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-55,824			-55,824
	Transfer from Title XV				[713,540]	
5	F/A-18E/F ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		46,817			46,817
6	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER	6	1,112,564		6	1,112,564
7	JSF ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		119,598			119,598
8	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	21	1,847,877		21	1,847,877
8	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-89,216			-89,216
9	V-22 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		200,690			200,690
10	UH-1Y/AH-1Z	20	518,475		20	518,475
11	MH-60S (MYP)	18	509,763		18	509,763
11	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-86,223			-86,223
12	MH-60S ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		80,037			80,037
13	MH-60R	27	958,816		27	958,816
13	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-114,095			-114,095
14	MH-60R ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		152,841			152,841

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Senate

Change

Senate

Authorized

Line

Program Title

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

15 E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)

15 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)

16 E-2C ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)

Airlift Aircraft

C-40A

Trainer Aircraft

18 T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK

19 JPATS

Other Aircraft

20 KC-130J

20 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)

21 KC-130J ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)

22 F-5

23 VTUAV

24 OTHER SUPPORT AIRCRAFT

Modification of Aircraft

25 EA-6 SERIES

26 AV-8 SERIES

27 ADVERSARY

28 F-18 SERIES

29 H-46 SERIES

Upgrade H-46 communications equipment

57,275

32,523

295,272

57,275

32,523

295,272

4

268,096

-45,553

33,900

3

37,687

30,602

37,549

3,523

441,883

24,125

2,000

[2,000]

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate Change</u>		<u>Senate Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
30	AH-1W SERIES		7,404				7,404
31	H-53 SERIES		48,145		2,900		51,045
	Integrated mechanical diagnostics health monitoring				[2,900]		
32	SH-60 SERIES		58,609				58,609
33	H-1 SERIES		6,489				6,489
34	EP-3 SERIES		46,862				46,862
35	P-3 SERIES		262,563		8,900		271,463
	Equipment for integrated P-3C tactical picture				[8,900]		
36	S-3 SERIES		470				470
37	E-2 SERIES		11,047				11,047
38	TRAINER A/C SERIES		20,227				20,227
39	C-2A		32,420				32,420
40	C-130 SERIES		1,208				1,208
41	FEWSG		651				651
42	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		20,903				20,903
43	E-6 SERIES		126,185				126,185
44	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		55,823				55,823
45	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		13,707				13,707
46	T-45 SERIES		57,157				57,157
47	POWER PLANT CHANGES		22,454				22,454
48	JPATS SERIES		9,872				9,872
49	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS		8,389				8,389

Modification of Missiles

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Senate

Change

Senate

Authorized

Line

Program Title

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

1 TRIDENT II MODS

Conventional Trident missile modifications

12

1,087,801

12

1,051,801

Support Equipment and Facilities

MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES

3,486

3,486

Other Missiles

Strategic Missiles

TOMAHAWK

Tactical Missiles

AMRAAM

SIDEWINDER

JSOW

SLAM-ER

STANDARD MISSILE

RAM

HELLFIRE

AERIAL TARGETS

DRONES AND DECOYS

OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT

Modification of Missiles

ESSM

HARM MODS

STANDARD MISSILES MODS

FY 2008

71

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate Change</u>		<u>Senate Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
5	PRACTICE BOMBS		36,339				36,339
6	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		44,255				44,255
7	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS						
8	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		78,546				78,546
9	JATOS		4,774				4,774
10	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION		26,619				26,619
11	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION		11,211				11,211
12	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		21,696				21,696
13	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		45,375				45,375
14	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		11,041				11,041
15	AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		3,229				3,229
	Proc Ammo, MC						
	Marine Corps Ammunition						
16	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		37,116		92,494		129,610
	Grow the Force Transfer				[92,494]		
17	MC GROUND FORCES AUGMENTATION		69,375		-69,375		
	Grow the Force Transfer				[-69,375]		
18	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES						
19	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES						
20	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES						
	Grow the Force Transfer		19		8,827		8,846
21	.50 CALIBER				[8,827]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
22	40 MM, ALL TYPES Grow the Force Transfer	30,679		13,973		13,973	44,652
23	60MM, ALL TYPES Grow the Force Transfer	17,414		[13,973]		[13,973]	35,003
24	81MM, ALL TYPES Grow the Force Transfer	20,329		17,589		[17,589]	61,049
25	120MM, ALL TYPES Grow the Force Transfer	23,841		40,720		[40,720]	34,769
26	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES Grow the Force Transfer	11,328		10,928		[10,928]	11,328
27	9 MM ALL TYPES						
28	GRENADERS, ALL TYPES Grow the Force Transfer	26,625					26,625
29	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES Grow the Force Transfer	2,146		21,769		21,769	23,915
30	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES Grow the Force Transfer	36,604		[21,769]		[21,769]	58,878
31	EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	4		22,274		[22,274]	4
32	Grow the Force Transfer	34				4,770	4,804
33	FUZE, ALL TYPES Grow the Force Transfer	2,330		[4,770]		[4,770]	4,291
34	NON LETHALS	4,191		1,961		[1,961]	4,374
				183			

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
						<u>Qty</u>	
35	Grow the Force Transfer						
36	AMMO MODERNIZATION			5,264			5,264
	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION				[183]		
	Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine			760,484	166,113		926,597
	Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy						
	Other Warships						
1	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	1	1	5,864,838		1	5,864,838
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)			-3,140,885	-20,000		-3,160,885
	Excess funding for Ship Self Defense System (SSDS)				[-20,000]		
2	CARRIER ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)			124,401			124,401
3	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	1	1	2,649,297		1	2,649,297
3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)			-853,106			-853,106
4	SSN ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)			702,710	470,000		1,172,710
	Advance procurement for building 2 boats in FY 10				[470,000]		
5	SSGN CONVERSION						
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
6	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS						
6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
7	CVN REFUELING ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)			297,344			297,344

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
			<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
8	SSN ERO				
8	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)				
9	SSBN ERO	1	222,887		222,887
9	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-35,235		-35,235
10	SSBN ERO ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		42,744		42,744
11	DDG 1000		2,802,637		2,802,637
11	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)				
12	DDG-1000 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		150,886		150,886
13	DDG-51		78,078		48,078
	Program close-out costs funded ahead of need				
14	DDG MODERNIZATION PROGRAM				
15	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	3	910,482	-2	480,000
	Reflect delays & cost growth in the LCS program				
	Amphibious Ships				
16	LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP				
17	LPD-17	1	1,698,825		1,698,825
17	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-299,903		-299,903
18	LPD-17 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				
19	LHA REPLACEMENT		1,377,414		1,377,414
19	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)				
20	LHA ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2008		Senate		Senate	
		Request	Qty	Change	Qty	Authorized	Cost
	Auxiliaries, Craft and Prior Yr Program Costs						
21	SPECIAL PURPOSE						
22	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS						
23	OUTFITTING						
	Funding in excess of need for post-delivery availabilities						
24	SERVICE CRAFT	419,811		-40,000			379,811
25	LCAC SLEP	32,903		[-40,000]			32,903
26	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS	5	5	98,518	5	98,518	511,474
		511,474					
	Total - Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	13,656,120		-50,482		13,605,638	
	Other Procurement, Navy						
	Ships Support Equipment						
	Ship Propulsion Equipment						
1	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE	6,690					6,690
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	9,468					9,468
	Navigation Equipment						
3	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	29,503					29,503
	Underway Replenishment Equipment						
4	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT						
	Periscopes						
5	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	69,753					69,753

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
			<u>Cost</u>				
	Other Shipboard Equipment						
6	DDG MOD		50,008				50,008
7	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT		9,139				9,139
8	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD		2,192				2,192
9	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		25,219				25,219
10	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		31,178				31,178
11	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		146,787				146,787
12	SUBMARINE BATTERIES		40,837				40,837
13	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		10,076				10,076
14	DSSP EQUIPMENT		6,159				6,159
15	CG MODERNIZATION		267,809				267,809
16	LCAC		65				65
17	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT		14,127				14,127
18	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		186,018				186,018
19	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS		3,968				3,968
20	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM		16,128				16,128
	Reactor Plant Equipment						
21	REACTOR POWER UNITS		391,610				391,610
22	REACTOR COMPONENTS		234,245				234,245
	Ocean Engineering						
23	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT		6,840				6,840

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate Change</u>		<u>Senate Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Small Boats						
24	STANDARD BOATS		30,236				30,236
	Training Equipment						
25	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT		9,239				9,239
	Production Facilities and Equipment						
26	OPERATING FORCES IPE		50,335				50,335
	Other Ship Support						
27	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS		70,101				70,101
28	LCS MODULES		80,324		-65,000		15,324
	Defer module funding to reflect delay in LCS program				[-65,000]		
	Drug Interdiction Support						
29	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
	Communications and Electronics Equipment						
	Ship Radars						
30	RADAR SUPPORT						
	Ship Sonars						
31	SPQ-9B RADAR		14,480		6,000		20,480
	Additional radar for backfitting on Navy surface vessels				[6,000]		
32	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	1	25,423			1	25,423
33	SSN ACOUSTICS		319,981				319,981
34	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		14,929				14,929
35	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		13,357				13,357

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>
	ASW Electronic Equipment				
36	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	16,955			16,955
37	SSTD	2,924	22		2,924
38	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	60,745			60,745
39	SURTASS	10,484			10,484
40	TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER	7,173			7,173
	Electronic Warfare Equipment				
41	AN/SLQ-32	29,903			29,903
42	INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS				
	Reconnaissance Equipment				
43	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	51,375			51,375
	Submarine Surveillance Equipment				
44	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	105,015			105,015
	Other Ship Electronic Equipment				
45	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	26,562			26,562
46	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	63,190			63,190
47	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT	27,853			27,853
48	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM	3,861			3,861
49	ATDLS	48,399			48,399
50	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	1,447			1,447
51	SHALLOW WATER MCM	7,619			7,619
52	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)				

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Cost</u>
53	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV	4,252			4,252
54	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	3,997			3,997
	Training Equipment				
55	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	17,423			17,423
	Aviation Electronic Equipment				
56	MATCALS	20,100			20,100
57	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	7,719			7,719
58	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	18,403			18,403
59	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	25,331			25,331
60	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,935			7,935
61	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM	9,384			9,384
62	FACSFAC				
63	ID SYSTEMS	29,835			29,835
64	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)	8,959			8,959
	Other Shore Electronic Equipment				
65	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT	3,983			3,983
66	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT TACTICAL/MOBILE	63,973			63,973
67	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS	10,205			10,205
68	RADIAC	7,042			7,042
69	GPETE	4,466			4,466
70	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	9,476			9,476
71	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	40,843			40,843
72	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION				

Cost

Drug Interdiction Support

27,298

27 209

82

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Aviation Support Equipment							
Sonobuoys							
88	SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES		67,373		15,000		82,373
	Additional procurement to improve training & readiness				[15,000]		
Aircraft Support Equipment							
89	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		58,155		8,000		66,155
	Multi-spectral threat emitter system (MTES)				[8,000]		
90	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		8,281				8,281
91	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT		12,897				12,897
92	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT		38,863				38,863
93	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		12,248				12,248
94	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		1,507				1,507
95	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT		12,750				12,750
96	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES		79,536				79,536
97	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		31,811				31,811
98	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		11,638				11,638
Ordnance Support Equipment							
Ship Gun System Equipment							
99	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM	2	1,382			2	1,382
100	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT		5,567				5,567
Ship Missile System Equipment							
101	HARPOON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						

Request

84

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
		<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	
117	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS SSN training device mods	32,093		5,000 [5,000]		37,093	
118	Civil Engineering Support Equipment	1,455				1,455	
119	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	839				839	
120	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	12,097				12,097	
121	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	17,648				17,648	
122	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	32,853				32,853	
123	TACTICAL VEHICLES	138,485				138,485	
124	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	5,434				5,434	
125	COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT	5,778				5,778	
126	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	23,337				23,337	
127	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES	2,047				2,047	
128	Supply Support Equipment	13,037				13,037	
129	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	15,521				15,521	
130	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,153				6,153	
131	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	72,576				72,576	
	Personnel and Command Support Equipment						
	Training Devices						
132	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	19,463				19,463	

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Command Support Equipment						
133	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		42,539				42,539
134	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1,983				1,983
135	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,418				3,418
136	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		[]				[]
137	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		11,608				11,608
138	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		13,996				13,996
139	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		30,938				30,938
140	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		137,366				137,366
141	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		49,572				49,572
142	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		[]				[]
143	SPECIAL PROGRAM		[]				[]
	Other						
144	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	Spares and Repair Parts						
145	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		218,071				218,071
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		11,362				11,362
	Total - Other Procurement, Navy		5,470,412	-38,000			5,432,412

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Procurement, Marine Corps						
	Weapons and Combat Vehicles						
	Tracked Combat Vehicles						
1	MC GROUND FORCES AUGMENTATION		2,211,625	-2,211,625			
	Grow the Force Transfer			[-2,211,625]			
2	AAV7A1 PIP		3,050	1,329		4,379	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[1,329]			
3	EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE						
3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
4	EFV ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
5	LAV PIP		30,883	1,182		32,065	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[1,182]			
6	M1A1 FIREPOWER ENHANCEMENTS		14,716	113		14,829	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[113]			
	Artillery and Other Weapons						
7	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		3,895			3,895	
8	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER		93,379	107,500		200,879	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[107,500]			
9	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		30,650			30,650	
10	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER \$5 MILLION		15,779	39,655		55,434	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[39,655]			

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Weapons						
11	MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM						
	Grow the Force Transfer			12,735			12,735
				[12,735]			
	Other Support						
12	MODIFICATION KITS						
	Grow the Force Transfer		4,429	190,430			194,859
				[190,430]			
13	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM						
	Grow the Force Transfer		14,994	15			15,009
				[15]			
14	OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR						
	Guided Missiles and Equipment						
	Guided Missiles						
15	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE		1,988				1,988
16	JAVELIN			9,240			9,240
	Grow the Force Transfer			[9,240]			
17	COMPLEMENTARY LOW ALTITUDE WEAPON SYSTEM						
	Other Support						
18	MODIFICATION KITS		641	80,020			80,661
	Grow the Force Transfer			[80,020]			
	Communications and Electronics Equipment						
	Command and Control Systems						
19	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER		19,493	37,450			56,943
	Grow the Force Transfer			[37,450]			

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
	Repair and Test Equipment						
20	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
	Grow the Force Transfer	21,051		53,468		[53,468]	74,519
21	AUTO TEST SYSTEMS						
	Other Support (Tel)						
22	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	18,669		443			19,112
	Grow the Force Transfer			[443]			
23	MODIFICATION KITS	10,926		24,232			35,158
	Grow the Force Transfer			[24,232]			
	Command and Control System (Non-tel)						
24	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	6,374		25			6,399
	Grow the Force Transfer			[25]			
25	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	40,664		26,017			66,681
	Grow the Force Transfer			[26,017]			
26	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS						
	Repair and Equipment (Non-tel)						
27	RADAR SYSTEMS	16,061		134,654			150,715
	Grow the Force Transfer			[134,654]			
	Intell/Comm Equipment (Non-tel)						
28	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	1,438		25,584			27,022
	Grow the Force Transfer			[25,584]			

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Qty

Cost

Qty

**Senate
Change**

**Senate
Authorized**

Qty

Cost

Line

Program Title

29 INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT
Grow the Force Transfer

Other Comm/Elec Equipment (Non-tel)

30 NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT
Grow the Force Transfer

Other Support (Non-tel)

31 COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES
Grow the Force Transfer

32 COMMAND POST SYSTEMS
Grow the Force Transfer

33 RADIO SYSTEMS
Grow the Force Transfer

34 COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS
Grow the Force Transfer

35 COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT
Grow the Force Transfer

Support Vehicles

Administrative Vehicles

36 COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES

37 COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES

28,902 120,751
[120,751]

8,991 33,553
[33,553]

75,101 22,147
[22,147]

20,535 11,044
[11,044]

61,148 118,670
[118,670]

27,019 76,593
[76,593]

20,090 2,303
[2,303]

1,070 1,070

13,366 13,366

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Tactical Vehicles						
38	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)		1,572	179,083		180,655	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[179,083]			
39	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS						
40	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT		660	106,095		106,755	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[106,095]			
41	LIGHTWEIGHT PRIME MOVER						
42	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP		26,763	8,300		35,063	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[8,300]			
43	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		9,002	29,680		38,682	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[29,680]			
43A	TRAILERS			147,388		147,388	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[147,388]			
	Other Support						
44	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		3,947	2,920		6,867	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[2,920]			
	Engineer and Other Equipment						
45	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		1,717	4,064		5,781	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[4,064]			
46	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		3,662	2,402		6,064	
	Grow the Force Transfer			[2,402]			

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
47	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS Grow the Force Transfer			5,187		12,365	17,552
						[12,365]	
48	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED Grow the Force Transfer			4,188		7,233	11,421
						[7,233]	
49	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT Grow the Force Transfer			10,523		1,876	12,399
						[1,876]	
50	EOD SYSTEMS Grow the Force Transfer			14,656		31,555	46,211
						[31,555]	
	Materials Handling Equipment						
51	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT			12,388			12,388
52	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)			12,439			12,439
53	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP Grow the Force Transfer			3,157		22,333	25,490
						[22,333]	
54	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION General Property			6,613			6,613
55	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT Grow the Force Transfer			2,236		16,050	18,286
						[16,050]	
56	TRAINING DEVICES Grow the Force Transfer			31,074		41,075	72,149
						[41,075]	
57	CONTAINER FAMILY Grow the Force Transfer			878		8,307	9,185
						[8,307]	

Title I - Procurement
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
58	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT Grow the Force Transfer		8,585				87,991
59	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)		2,472				2,472
60	BRIDGE BOATS Grow the Force Transfer						43,903
61	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN Grow the Force Transfer		1,109				23,091
62	Other Support						
63	MODIFICATION KITS ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION Grow the Force Transfer		6,508				22,963
64	Spares and Repair Parts SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		12,794				12,794
Total - Procurement, Marine Corps			2,999,057	-300,000			2,699,057

Multiyear procurement authority for *Virginia* class submarine program (sec. 131)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear contract to purchase *Virginia* class submarines, subject to the Secretary's providing a certification that all of the criteria in section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, have been met.

Navy officials have said that contracting for the next set of *Virginia* class submarines under a multiyear contract would allow the Federal Government to achieve roughly 13 percent savings when compared to acquiring the same submarines using annual contracts.

Budget Items—Navy

H-46 modifications

The budget request included \$22.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN, line 29) for modifications of H-46 helicopters, but included no funding to upgrade H-46 communications equipment. The H-46 helicopter was initially designed for a service life of 10,000 hours, but that life has been extended twice, and is now expected to reach more than 15,000 hours before the MV-22 will replace all of them. Extending this venerable platform has caused the Marine Corps to experience critical obsolescence and sustainment issues. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million for the procurement of H-46 communications upgrades.

H-53 modifications

The budget request included \$48.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN, line 31) for modifications of H-53 helicopters, of which \$2.3 million is for the Integrated Mechanical Diagnostics Health and Usage Management System (IMDS). Since 2001, the Marines have been equipping the fleet of H-53 helicopters with the IMDS, and have procured kits for nearly half of the fleet of 148 helicopters. The systems flying have already provided a significant improvement in aircraft readiness rates and ability to maintain the aircraft to support high tempo operations, while simultaneously improving the accuracy of the fleet health and material status reporting. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.9 million for the procurement of additional IMDS systems.

P-3 modifications

The budget request included \$262.6 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN, line 35) for modifications of P-3 aircraft, but included no funding for the procurement of integrated tactical picture (ITP) systems until fiscal year 2009. The P-3 aircraft is the workhorse of the U.S. Navy, providing a wide array of missions from conducting anti-submarine warfare to identifying and validating targets on the ground or on the ocean's surface, to participating in humanitarian relief operations. The P-3 aircraft host a wide variety of sensors, from video to radars, to antennas and communications, but lack the ability to fuse these inputs into one complete tactical picture. Because of this need, the Navy developed an ITP system (the automatic fusion of data), but deferred procurement

funding for ITP until the fiscal year 2009 budget. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.9 million for the procurement of ITP systems for P-3 aircraft.

Weapons industrial facilities

The budget request included \$3.7 million for various activities at government-owned, contractor-operated weapons industrial facilities. The committee recommends an increase of \$30.0 million to accelerate the facilities restoration program at the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory.

Ship Self Defense System for carrier replacement program

The budget request included \$2,879.2 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN, line 1) for the Carrier Replacement program. Within the budget for the CVN-78, the committee notes that the unit cost for the Ship Self Defense System (SSDS) is 150 percent greater than the similar system procured for the fiscal year 2007 amphibious assault ship, LHA(R). The committee has placed significant emphasis on the importance of the Navy's managing shipbuilding costs in other sections of this report on costs from the shipbuilding prime contractors. Given the high proportion of ship costs that accrue from sources other than the prime contractors, the committee believes that it is equally important for the Navy to manage the cost for Government-furnished equipment.

The committee recommends a reduction of \$20.0 million in SCN for the SSDS for CVN-78.

Virginia class submarine advance procurement

The budget request included \$702.7 million for advance procurement for the *Virginia* class submarine program. However, the budget request included no funding for economic order quantity (EOQ) procurement of long lead material in conjunction with the fiscal year 2009 multiyear procurement request. The Navy has reported that roughly 13 percent savings will be achieved through the multiyear procurement for the seven *Virginia* class submarines programmed in fiscal years 2009 through 2013. Further, as reported by the Navy and testified by the Chief of Naval Operations and Secretary of the Navy to the Subcommittee on Seapower, additional advance procurement for economic order quantity purchases of long lead material would increase multiyear savings, help stabilize the Nation's critical submarine industrial base, provide greater opportunity to achieve program schedule reductions, and provide for an efficient transition to build two submarines per year. The Navy estimates that approximately 14 percent savings can be achieved on an additional \$470.0 million investment in advance procurement.

The Navy has identified the requirement for a fleet of 313 ships, including 48 attack submarines. However, the Navy projects that attack submarine levels will fall as low as 40 boats, and remain below the 48-boat requirement for more than a decade.

The Navy is now claiming that it will be able to mitigate this shortage in forces using three techniques:

- (1) building the new *Virginia* class submarines faster by reducing the time between the start of construction to delivery

from the current level of 86 months for the last boat to deliver to a level of 60 months;

(2) extending the life of some boats currently in the fleet from 3 to 24 months; and

(3) increasing the length of deployments.

By using a combination of these measures, the Navy claims that it will be able to maintain no fewer than 42 boats in the force and will be able to maintain the current level of commitments to the combatant commanders (roughly 10 boats continuously on deployment).

The committee commends the Navy for exploring alternatives for maintaining the current levels of commitment to the combatant commanders. However, these potential actions are not without some risk.

Reducing the construction start-to-delivery time would certainly speed the arrival of new construction boats in the fleet. However, the committee understands that on the whole SSN-688 class consisting of 62 boats, the contractors were only able to deliver three boats with a start-to-delivery interval of 60 months or less. The maximum building time was 86 months and the average for all 62 boats was 72 months.

In addition, extending the length of deployments would help produce more deployed days for meeting requirements, but the committee wonders about the price that this could exact. The Navy's previous attempts to extend times on deployment (and reduce the amount of time spent at home) have resulted in retention problems. In fact, submarine sailors already spend much more time deployed on average than the rest of the Navy.

But even if one assumes that these measures are successful, current deployments are not sufficient to meet all of the priority national requirements and less than 60 percent of the combatant commanders' overall requirements.

The committee believes that it is essential for the Navy to increase attack submarine production rates as soon as practicable in order to minimize the risk to our national security posture posed by the long-term shortfall to the attack submarine force. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$470.0 million for *Virginia* class advance procurement, which would support building two submarines in fiscal year 2010.

DDG-51 program completion costs

The budget request included \$78.1 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN, line 13) for DDG-51 program completion and production shutdown costs. This request is in addition to approximately \$500 million that has been previously appropriated for these activities. The committee understands the necessity to properly fund these activities in order to support the efficient and effective delivery of remaining ships in the program, and to transition special tooling and program material for in-service support. The committee notes that the full scope of the program closeout effort continues to be defined as shipbuilders and vendors plan to transition from DDG-51 production to DDG-1000 production. Previous appropriations provide sufficient funding to support program completion activities through fiscal year 2008, while the Navy com-

pletes its determination of the scope of requirements for closing out the DDG-51 program. The committee expects the Navy to refine estimates for program completion based on the ongoing determination of requirements, and to include remaining funding requirements in the fiscal year 2009 budget request.

The committee recommends a decrease of \$30.0 million in SCN for DDG-51 program completion.

Littoral combat ship

The budget request included \$910.5 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN, line 15) for the construction of three Littoral Combat Ships (LCS). The Navy intends this to be a relatively smaller, more affordable vessel that carries modular payloads. The Navy concept is that, on one day, an LCS might be configured to operate as an anti-submarine vessel. However, as a mission needs to change, it could rapidly change the whole mission payload, within a day or so, and operate in an anti-surface warfare or mine warfare mode.

Each of the two prime contractor teams had contracts to build two ships. The prime contractors have teamed with smaller shipyards in both cases in order to keep LCS costs lower than would be possible in one of the major yards that normally build Navy ships.

The first ship (LCS-1) was scheduled to deliver in late 2006. The Navy is now estimating that the first ship will deliver sometime in the middle of 2008. The LCS-1 contractor team had barely started on their second ship (LCS-3) when the program ran into major cost problems earlier this year. The Navy then issued a stop work order on LCS-3 in order to reduce expenditures and limit further cost exposure on the program while it separately re-evaluated program cost estimates.

The Navy entered into negotiations with the LCS-1 team to sign up to a fixed price contract on the two ships or face outright cancellation on the second ship. These negotiations occurred during this past spring. When the stop work order was nearly ready to expire, the Navy announced that it and the LCS-1 contractor team were unable to reach an agreement and that the Navy was terminating the contract for LCS-3 for the convenience of the Government. It is too early to precisely estimate the termination costs, but the Navy has reported that significant funds for LCS-3 are on hold pending completion of the termination negotiations.

The second contractor team has a contract to build two LCS vessels of another design (LCS-2 and LCS-4). The Navy awarded this contract later, so LCS-2 is roughly 1 year behind the LCS-1. Unfortunately, it appears that this team is experiencing similar cost problems. The Navy has not issued the same ultimatum to this contractor team, but has claimed that the Navy will do so if the cost of LCS-2 continues to grow toward the Navy's estimate. Meanwhile, the Navy is proceeding with the start of construction on LCS-4, although it is not clear that the root causes for early cost growth on LCS-2 have been addressed.

The committee is disappointed that the cost of the lead ship has more than doubled and the delivery schedule has slipped several times.

The committee commends the Secretary of the Navy for exercising oversight and for trying to bring cost and schedule discipline to this troubled program. The committee is also interested in supporting the Secretary's efforts to improve the Navy's acquisition process. Reviewing this LCS situation will undoubtedly result in a new set of "lessons learned" that the acquisition community will dutifully try to implement. However, the committee has previously expressed concerns about the LCS concept and the LCS acquisition strategy. The LCS situation may be more a case of "lessons lost." Long ago, we knew that we should not rush to sign a construction contract before we have solidified requirements. We also knew that the contractors will respond to incentives, and that if the incentives are focused on maintaining schedules and not on controlling cost, cost growth on a cost-plus contract should surprise no one. After the fact, everyone appears ready to agree that the original ship construction schedule for the lead ship was overly aggressive.

The Navy has said that the capability that this vessel will bring to the fleet is of the utmost urgency for responding to asymmetric threats. The committee believes that if the Navy really believed that the threat were that urgent, it might have taken more near-term steps to address it. For example, the Navy might not have cancelled the remote minehunting system (RMS) capability on a number of the DDG-51 class destroyers, ships that will be available to the combatant commanders much sooner than LCS. The Navy might also have taken this modular capability slated for the LCS and packaged those modules to deploy sooner on ships of opportunity. Rather, the Navy is waiting on a shipbuilding program to deliver that capability (in a useful quantity) at some future date.

The Navy now proposes to use the funds requested in fiscal year 2008 to award contracts for two LCS vessels, rather than the three originally envisioned. Given the uncertainty about what is happening with the earlier ships in the program and uncertainties about the options for an acquisition strategy that will remain available to the Navy next year, the Navy does not intend to award these two contracts until late in fiscal year 2008.

In summary:

(1) a high degree of cost uncertainty will continue to overshadow the LCS program until the two lead ships execute test and trials, starting late in 2007.

(2) the Navy's current estimate is that the approximately \$1.6 billion appropriated for the first six ships will be required to complete the three ships currently under contract, with significant additional funding being held for termination of a fourth ship.

(3) if the Navy's estimates are correct, or low, then the Navy will be engaging in fixed price negotiations with the second prime contractor for LCS-2 and LCS-4 late in 2007, with the distinct possibility that LCS-4 would be terminated.

(4) if the Navy's estimates are high, then sufficient funding from within previous appropriations should be available for a newly procured LCS.

(5) the Navy has yet to formulate its acquisition strategy for the LCS program, however, the challenges inherent to fair competition between two dissimilar ship designs have become

significantly more complex in light of the recent termination of LCS-3 (or potential termination of LCS-4).

(6) the Navy has announced a delay for conducting a program downselect decision until 2010, at which time it also plans to revise the LCS combat system, which raises concerns regarding the infrastructure and life cycle support costs for the three or four ships of the LCS variant not selected for “full rate production.”

(7) program delays have pushed the next notional contract award until late in fiscal year 2008.

(8) termination negotiations for LCS-3 will likely be proceeding at the same time the prime contractor is being solicited for a proposal to build another LCS ship, in which case the material procured for LCS-3 would likely revert back to the contractor for this new procurement. The net effect is that the current LCS-3 obligations that are fenced for termination costs would sufficiently cover the contractor’s fiscal year 2008 obligations for a newly procured LCS.

The committee recommends \$480.0 million for LCS in fiscal year 2008, a decrease of \$430.5 million. We cannot relive the early days of the LCS program and remember “lessons learned,” but we have the opportunity to take positive steps now to right the program. Before awarding contracts for additional ships in the LCS program, we need to maintain focus on delivering the most capability possible for the \$1.6 billion invested thus far for six ships. This would require that we impose accountability for the quality of program estimates; halt further changes to program requirements; and ensure that the contracts provide effective incentives for cost performance.

The Secretary of the Navy has advised the committee that the Navy’s estimates appear to be quite conservative based on contractor performance over the past quarter, as measured against recently revised baselines. Although further risk is acknowledged, the Navy has expressed confidence that the program will be able to improve on the Navy’s worst case estimates and avoid further termination action. If the Navy and industry are successful in managing costs going forward, this should allow four ships to be delivered within previously appropriated funds.

The committee notes that the LCS-1 contractor was awarded a lead ship contract that targeted a significantly lower price and a significantly more aggressive schedule for starting construction. The risks inherent in this aggressive schedule were exacerbated by changes to Navy requirements. These factors may have contributed to the decision to terminate LCS-3—an outcome referred to as “winner-loses.” The resultant imbalance between the two competing shipbuilders jeopardizes the Navy’s ultimate goal for a competitive downselect in 2010, followed by full and open competition for the winning LCS variant.

Therefore, the committee directs that funds authorized for a fiscal year 2008 LCS ship may only be used when combined with LCS SCN funds appropriated in prior years, to solicit, on a competitive basis, bids for two fixed price LCS ship construction contracts, one for each of the two competing LCS variants. The Secretary of the Navy may waive this requirement only if: he determines that there is only one acceptable LCS variant, based on completion of accept-

ance trials on the two LCS variants; and he notifies the congressional defense committees 30 days before releasing a solicitation based on that waiver determination.

The committee believes that the history of the LCS acquisition strategy has been one of documenting decisions, rather than guiding and informing decisions. Therefore, the Secretary of Defense is directed to submit a report on the approved acquisition strategy for the LCS program at least 90 days prior to issuing any solicitation or requests for proposal, but no later than December 1, 2008.

Outfitting and post-delivery

The budget request included \$419.8 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN, line 23) for outfitting and post-delivery funding. Outfitting and post-delivery is a centrally-managed account for all ship programs funded in the SCN account. Outfitting and post-delivery requests are made annually based on projected vessel delivery schedules. The Navy has requested funding in the fiscal year 2008 budget request for post-delivery purposes in advance of execution requirements because ship delivery schedules across multiple programs have been delayed.

The committee recommends a decrease of \$40.0 million in SCN for outfitting and post-delivery.

LCS modules

The budget request included \$80.3 million for assembling and outfitting Littoral Combat Ships (LCS) mission modules. The Navy intends the LCS to be a relatively smaller vessel that carries modular payloads. The Navy concept is that, using these mission modules, an LCS might be configured to operate as an anti-submarine vessel on one day. On the next day, the Navy might change the whole mission payload and operate the LCS in an anti-surface warfare mode.

As described elsewhere in this report, the LCS program has run into serious problems. The committee sees no particular reason to acquire mission modules at the pace planned by the Navy, since there have been significant delays in the ship program. The committee recommends a decrease of \$65.0 million for LCS modules.

SPQ-9B radar

The budget request included \$14.5 million for procurement of SPQ-9B radar equipment. The SPQ-9B radar provides surface ships with a gunfire control radar that also enhances ship self-defense capabilities. The Navy plans to buy another SPQ-9B in fiscal year 2010. The committee believes that the Navy could achieve more efficient production by combining the procurement of the two buys. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million to procure an additional SPQ-9B radar.

Sonobuoys

The budget request included \$67.4 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN, line 88) for sonobuoy procurement. The Navy's current sonobuoy inventory and planned procurement for fiscal year 2008 fall short of the Navy's Non-Nuclear Ordnance Requirement

(NNOR), which was established to support the National Military Strategy plus annual training requirements.

Anti-submarine warfare (ASW) continues to be a core mission of the United States Navy. Our naval force could face modern, highly capable submarines operating in littoral waters where acoustic conditions are poor and sonobuoy expenditures could greatly exceed projections.

The committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million for sonobuoy procurement to improve training and readiness.

Weapons range support equipment

The budget request included \$58.2 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN, line 89) for the procurement of equipment to implement the Navy fleet training range instrumentation training plan, but included no funding for the continued procurement of the multi-spectral threat emitter system (MTES).

The proliferation of lethal surface-to-air missiles and anti-aircraft artillery presents a clear threat to the warfighter. Threat emitters replicate the electronic signatures of these threats on training ranges. Additional funding would permit the Navy to expand usage of MTES capabilities to other fleet training ranges. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million for the procurement of two MTES.

NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system

The budget request included \$42.4 million for anti-ship missile decoy systems, including \$25.5 million for procuring 55 new NULKA decoys. Procuring additional NULKA decoys would ensure that fleet installations remain on a reasonable schedule, would keep production rates above the minimum sustaining level, and would achieve more reasonable unit production costs. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million for the NULKA procurement program to purchase additional decoys.

Submarine training device modifications

The budget request included \$32.1 million to procure submarine training device modifications. The Navy has critical training requirements to support submarines in the fleet and has been using performance support systems (PSS) that would enhance training quality opportunities. The committee understands that the Navy could expand the development of the oxygen generator and air purification PSS capabilities to be used to support onboard qualifications, operation, and maintenance activities for the submarines. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million to expand the use of performance support systems in conducting submarine training.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate Change</u>		<u>Senate Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Aircraft Procurement, Air Force						
	Combat Aircraft						
	Tactical Forces						
1	F-35	6	1,391,824			6	1,391,824
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-93,657				-93,657
2	F-25 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		123,539				123,539
3	F-22A	20	3,737,976			20	3,737,976
3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-585,263				-585,263
4	F-22 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		426,666				426,666
5	F-15E						
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
	Airlift Aircraft						
	Tactical Airlift						
6	C-17A (MYP)		260,601				260,601
6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
7	C-17 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
	Other Airlift						
8	C-130J	9	799,658			9	799,658
8	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-113,589				-113,589
9	C-130J ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
10	HC-130 RECAP		9,990				9,990
11	MC-130 RECAP		65,742				65,742

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
11A	Joint Cargo Aircraft Transfer fixed-wing intra-theater logistics mission from Trainer Aircraft						
				157,043			157,043
				[157,043]			
12	Operational Trainers JPATS	39	245,889		39	245,889	
	Other Aircraft						
	Helicopters						
13	V22 OSPREY	5	473,957		5	473,957	
13	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-20,160			-20,160	
14	V-22 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		41,245			41,245	
	Mission Support Aircraft						
15	C-40	2	48,615		2	48,615	
16	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C		4,477			4,477	
	Other Aircraft						
17	TARGET DRONES		85,604			85,604	
18	C-37A						
19	GLOBAL HAWK	5	564,722		5	564,722	
19	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-50,717			-50,717	
20	GLOBAL HAWK ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		63,841			63,841	
21	MQ-1 PREDATOR	24	277,999		24	277,999	
22	MQ-9	4	58,470		4	58,470	

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
	Modification of In-service Aircraft						
	Strategic Aircraft						
23	B-2A	316,055		-48,000			268,055
	Transfer to PE 64240F (RDAF 70)			[-38,000]			
	Delay in radar modernization program			[-10,000]			
24	B-1B	53,125					53,125
25	B-52	18,091		19,000			37,091
	Avionics midlife & electronic countermeasures (AMI & ECMI) for 76 aircraft			[19,000]			
26	F-117						
	Tactical Aircraft						
27	A-10	167,107					167,107
28	F-15	19,165					19,165
29	F-16	329,370					329,370
30	F-22A	281,905					281,905
	Airlift Aircraft						
31	C-5	398,473					398,473
31	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-66,457					-66,457
32	C-5 MOD ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	66,700					66,700
33	C-17A	211,206					211,206
34	C-21	13,920					13,920
35	C-32A	1,646					1,646
36	C-37A	420					420

Title I - Procurement (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>
Trainer Aircraft					
37	GLIDER MODS	118			118
38	T-6	17,089			17,089
39	T-1	24			24
40	T-38	130,803			130,803
41	T-43	2,230			2,230
Other Aircraft					
42	KC-10A (ATCA)	1,924			1,924
43	C-12	459			459
44	C-20 MODS	535			535
45	VC-25A MOD	28,416			28,416
46	C-40	209			209
47	C-130	384,386		14,000	398,386
	LAIRCM for AFSOC AC-130 & MC-130 aircraft			[14,000]	
48	C130J MODS	62,259			62,259
49	C-135	118,561		9,000	127,561
	KC-135 global air traffic management (GATM) upgrades			[9,000]	
50	COMPASS CALL MODS	45,293			45,293
51	C-29A MODS				
52	DARP	106,108			106,108
53	E-3	54,286			54,286
54	E-4	19,745			19,745

Title I - Procurement
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
55	E-8	79,689					79,689
56	H-1	22,112					22,112
57	H-60	19,565					19,565
58	GLOBAL HAWK MODS	24,332					24,332
59	OTHER AIRCRAFT	109,496					109,496
60	MQ-1 MODS	74,692					74,692
61	MQ-9 MODS	20,578					20,578
62	CV-22 MODS	16,523					16,523
	Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts						
63	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	267,386					267,386
	Aircraft Support Equipment and Facilities						
	Common Support Equip						
64	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP	111,136					111,136
	Post Production Support						
65	B-1						
66	B-2A						
67	B-2A	34,780					34,780
68	B-52						
69	C-5	18,277					18,277
70	C-21	14,904					14,904
71	C-130	16,929					16,929
72	EC-130J	5,348					5,348

FY 2008

Total - Aircraft Procurement, Air Force

Title I - Procurement (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
				<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force				
	Procurement of Ammo, Air Force				
	Rockets				
1	ROCKETS	18,188			18,188
	Cartridges				
2	CARTRIDGES	165,343			165,343
	Bombs				
3	PRACTICE BOMBS	26,080			26,080
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	150,247			150,247
5	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON				
6	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION		3,817		
7	WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISPENSER	112,783		3,817	112,783
	Flare, IR MJU-7B				
8	CAD/PAD	33,867			33,867
9	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)	3,198			3,198
10	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	4,726			4,726
11	MODIFICATIONS	935			935
12	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000	4,169			4,169
	Fuzes				
13	FLARES	274,921			274,921
14	FUZES	70,808			70,808

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Weapons					
Small Arms					
15	SMALL ARMS	3,652			3,652
Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force		868,917	3,817		868,917
Missile Procurement, Air Force					
Ballistic Missiles					
Missile Replacement Equipment-Ballistic					
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC	26,446			26,446
Other Missiles					
Tactical					
2	JASSM	201,125	210	-47	161,125
	Reduce ramp-up to reflect testing difficulties			[-40,000]	
3	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	52,690	172		52,690
4	AMRAAM	224,577	206		224,577
5	PREDITOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	65,143	662		65,143
6	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	95,297	1,395		95,297
Industrial Facilities					
7	INDUSTRI'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION	2,382			2,382

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Senate

Change

Senate

Authorized

Line

Program Title

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

Modification of In-service Missiles

Class IV

8 ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE

9 MM III MODIFICATIONS

10 AGM-65D MAVERICK

11 AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE

Spares and Repair Parts

Missiles and Repair Parts

12 INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS

Other Support

Space Programs

13 ADVANCED EHF

13 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)

Advance procurement for additional satellite (AEHF 4)

14 WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)

14 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)

15 WIDEBAND ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)

16 SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)

17 GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)

17 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)

18 GPS SPACE ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)

19 DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)

31

505,395

252

10,111

46,675

125,744

125,000

1

375,682

-50,499

18,242

200,161

10,100

127,350

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Qty

Cost

Qty

Change

Cost

Qty

Authorized

Cost

111

Line

Program Title

20 DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE)

21 TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS(SPACE)

22 EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)

23 MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)

24 SBIR HIGH ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)

Special Programs

25 DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM

26 SPECIAL PROGRAMS

27 SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

28 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS

29 SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS

999 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS

Total - Missile Procurement, Air Force

Other Procurement, Air Force

Vehicular Equipment

Passenger Carrying Vehicles

1 ARMORED VEHICLE

2 PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES

Cargo and Utility Vehicles

3 MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE

36,457

1,166,591

117,740

479,000

184,314

[]

[]

[]

148,581

1,086,415

5,131,002

35,000

19,254

32,737

19,254

32,737

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
4	HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)						
5	CAP VEHICLES			875			875
	Special Purpose Vehicles						
6	HMMWV, ARMORED						
7	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES			38,939			38,939
	Fire Fighting Equipment						
8	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES			27,016			27,016
	Materials Handling Equipment						
9	HALVERSEN LOADER						
	Base Maintenance Support						
10	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU			25,919			25,919
11	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000(VEHICLES)			47,351			47,351
	Cancelled Account Adjustment						
12	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	Electronics and Telecommunications						
	Comm Security Equipment (COMSEC)						
13	COMSEC EQUIPMENT			180,186			180,186
14	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)			1,526			1,526
	Intelligence Programs						
15	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT			3,057			3,057
16	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT			24,139			24,139

Title I - Procurement (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>
Electronics Programs					
17	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS	12,821			12,821
18	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	50,429			50,429
19	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMEN	61,769			61,769
20	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST	23,650			23,650
21	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	41,216			41,216
22	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	18,612			18,612
23	DRUG INTERDICTION SPT	446			446
Special Comm-Electronics Projects					
24	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	113,348			113,348
25	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	14,319			14,319
26	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	10,420			10,420
27	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	78,189			78,189
28	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	33,423		8,000	41,423
	Joint threat emitter (JTE)			[8,000]	
29	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM N	10,700			10,700
30	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	7,421			7,421
31	GCSS-AF FOS	27,798			27,798
32	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM	22,702			22,702
33	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS	43,659			43,659
Air Force Communications					
34	BASE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE	323,347			323,347

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
35	USCENTCOM			113,553			113,553
	DISA Programs						
36	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE			3,979		27,600	31,579
	SBIRS - mission control ground station backup					[27,600]	
37	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE			14,077			14,077
38	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE			16,459			16,459
39	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE			50,268			50,268
40	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE			122,559			122,559
41	MILSATCOM SPACE			116,902			116,902
42	SPACE MODS SPACE			26,490			26,490
43	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM			22,846			22,846
	Organization and Base						
44	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT			208,863			208,863
45	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER			27,174			27,174
46	RADIO EQUIPMENT			12,235			12,235
47	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)			3,110			3,110
48	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT			9,839			9,839
49	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE			115,606			115,606
50	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000						
	Modifications						
51	COMM ELECT MODS			35,460			35,460

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Other Base Maintenance and Support Equip						
	Personal Safety and Rescue Equipment						
52	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	21,251					21,251
53	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000 (SAFETY) Self-deploying infrared streamers			2,500 [2,500]			2,500
	Depot Plant and Material Handling Equip						
54	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	22,177					22,177
	Base Support Equipment						
55	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	17,360					17,360
56	MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT						
57	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	6,221					6,221
58	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT	3,035					3,035
59	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	36,932					36,932
60	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000 (BASE S)	53,876					53,876
61	PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES	[]					[]
	Special Support Projects						
62	DARP RC135	22,532					22,532
63	DISTRIBUTED GROUND SYSTEMS	197,806					197,806
64	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	[]		[853,700]		[]	[]
65	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	532,214					532,214
66	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.	15,573					15,573
	Spares and Repair Parts						

Title I - Procurement
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
67	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		27,935				27,935
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		12,269,562				13,123,262
	Total - Other Procurement, Air Force		15,421,162				16,312,962

Limitation on retirement of C-130E/H tactical airlift aircraft (sec. 141)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from retiring any C-130E/H tactical airlift aircraft in fiscal year 2008.

The committee believes it would be premature to retire C-130 aircraft until an Air Force Fleet Viability Board has conducted an assessment of the C-130E/H fleet of aircraft and the results of the Intra-theater Lift Capability Study (ITLCS) and the Force Mix Study identify the right mix and number of intra-theater airlift assets, and the results of the assessment and the ITLCS and Force Mix studies have been provided to the congressional defense committees.

Limitation on retirement of KC-135E aerial refueling aircraft (sec. 142)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from retiring any KC-135E aircraft during fiscal year 2008 unless the Air Force provides the congressional defense committees with a request to retire KC-135E aircraft during fiscal year 2008 in accordance with established procedures similar to those used for prior approval reprogramming requests. The Air Force's number one acquisition priority is to replace its aged KC-135E fleet of aircraft with a new tanker, the KC-X. Two contractor teams have submitted offers responding to the KC-X request for proposals. The Air Force is currently reviewing those offers.

The committee notes that multiple studies have been conducted, both by the Air Force and independent groups, on service life and viability of the KC-135 fleet. These include: (1) "Air Force Fleet Viability Board, KC-135 Assessment Report," September 2005; (2) "Defense Science Board Task Force Report on Aerial Refueling Requirements," May 2004; (3) "The Tanker Requirement Study 2005"; (4) "KC-135 Economic Service Life Study (ESLS)"; and (5) "CNA Summary Analysis of the Material Condition of the KC-135 Aerial Refueling Fleet," August 2004.

The committee remains concerned, however, that as recommended in the "Air Force Fleet Viability Board, KC-135 Assessment Report," the Air Force has still not done destructive testing on a KC-135E aircraft. In addition, the Air Force has a history of retiring aircraft before fielding a replacement, creating its own shortfall in capabilities. The committee expects that the retirement of KC-135E aircraft should be informed by the progress made on the KC-X acquisition strategy and the outcome of the destructive testing.

Budget Items—Air Force

B-2 bomber

The budget request included \$316.1 million for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for the B-2 bomber, of which \$270.6 million was for radar modernization. The budget request also included \$244.0 million for the B-2 bomber in PE 64240F. The fiscal year 2008 budget requested \$45.8 million in war-related funding for

APAF line 23 for the B-2, of which an additional \$10.0 million was for B-2 radar modernization. The radar modernization program has experienced a number of problems and is in the process of being restructured. To address the requirements of the restructured program the committee recommends a decrease of \$38.0 million in APAF and an increase of \$38.0 million in PE 64240F for the restructured B-2 bomber radar modernization program. The committee recommends a further decrease of \$10.0 million in APAF line 23 due to the delay in the radar program and an additional \$14.1 million reduction in the fiscal year 2008 budget request for war-related funding, which is excess to the restructured program.

B-52 bomber aircraft

The budget request included \$18.1 million for the B-52 bomber in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) line 25 for aircraft modernization, but no funds for the electronic countermeasure improvement (ECMI) program and avionics midlife improvement (AMI) program. The committee recommends an additional \$19.0 million to ensure that AMI and ECMI capabilities are available for all 76 B-52 bomber aircraft. The committee urges the Air Force to include full funding in the fiscal year 2009 budget request to support 76 modernized bomber aircraft with 44 combat coded aircraft.

Large aircraft infrared countermeasures system

The budget request included \$73.7 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF, line 47) for procurement of aircraft installation kits for the large aircraft infrared countermeasures (LAIRCM) system for various C-130 aircraft. The LAIRCM system provides protection against man-portable air defense systems (MANPADS) which are widely available and have been used by terrorists in Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom against both military and commercial aircraft. Additional funding for LAIRCM, including funding for nonrecurring engineering and kit production for Special Operations Command (SOCOM) AC-130 and MC-130 aircraft, is included on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$14.0 million to accelerate LAIRCM upgrades for the SOCOM C-130 aircraft.

C-135 global air traffic management

The budget request included \$118.6 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF, line 49) for modifications to the C-135 and KC-135 aircraft, including \$103.3 million for the procurement of Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) modifications. The GATM modification includes avionics upgrades, wiring interfaces, and associated preparation activities for added communications, navigation, and surveillance equipment needed for operations in oceanic airspace where there are reduced spacing requirements between aircraft. To accelerate this program, the committee recommends an increase of \$9.0 million for procurement of additional KC-135 GATM modifications.

Advanced targeting pod

The budget request included \$683.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF, line 78) for miscellaneous production charges, including \$105.4 million for the procurement of advanced targeting pods (ATPs). Advanced targeting pods provide targeting capability for use with precision guided munitions on fighter, bomber, and attack aircraft. The LITENING ATP is currently in use by both the active and reserve components of the Air Force. The Air Force Chief of Staff included \$22.0 million for additional ATPs in his unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$49.5 million for the procurement of 33 additional LITENING ATPs.

Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile

The budget request included \$201.1 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force (MPAF, line 2) for the Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile (JASSM). The committee notes that the JASSM program has recently suffered a series of four unsuccessful flight tests, covering the first four production lots. In addition, the Air Force notified Congress in April that the JASSM program had suffered a Nunn-McCurdy breach due to cost growth. Press reports quote the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition as saying the program is currently under review and termination is one possible course of action.

The committee recognizes that JASSM was designed to meet a needed capability. However, increasing production from 163 missiles in fiscal year 2007 to 210 missiles in fiscal year 2008 appears unwarranted given the program's current difficulties.

The committee recommends a reduction of \$40.0 million in MPAF for the JASSM.

Advanced Extremely High Frequency satellite

The budget request included \$0.7 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force for the Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) satellite. The committee recommends an increase of \$125.0 million for advanced procurement for the fourth AEHF satellite.

The AEHF is a satellite that provides secure, survivable anti-jam, anti-sciintillation communications for tactical and strategic users. It will provide low, medium, and high data rate capability to all military services and defense agencies. It is the successor satellite system to the Milstar system, but provides 10 times more capacity. The first AEHF launch is on schedule for the third quarter of fiscal year 2008, with follow launches in 2009 and 2010.

In 2002, the Air Force decided that new technology, particularly laser communications, would provide greater communications capability and established the Transformational Satellite Communications system (TSAT) as a successor to AEHF. Originally the first TSAT was going to replace the fourth AEHF satellite and launch in 2012. As a result of schedule, technical, and other issues the TSAT program has been delayed with a first launch now scheduled for the first quarter of fiscal year 2016. The fourth AEHF was to have launched in 2011.

With the slip in TSAT there is a gap in projected communications capability that is worrisome. General Cartwright, Com-

mander of United States Strategic Command testified before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces that “the constellation of satellites is critical to us. We cannot afford a gap in that capability.” The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has recommended a fourth AEHF as a way to mitigate the risk of the communications gap.

The committee notes that in the AEHF program, as in several other space modernization programs, early termination of one program in favor of a new, technically complex replacement program could increase the risk that gaps in capability might arise when there are delays in the new program. While the committee fully supports the TSAT program and the significant improvements in capabilities that it provides, including communications on the move, the committee believes that it is prudent to procure a fourth AEHF to mitigate the risk of subsequent delays in TSAT, which would result in increasingly significant communications gaps.

The committee also directs the Air Force to fund TSAT fully to minimize any further gaps resulting from future TSAT program delays. Delays will surely occur for a variety of reasons that are unknown at this time and the Air Force should avoid deliberate programmatic delays. The committee is not aware of any satellite program that launched on the schedule and budget in place 8 years prior to the first launch.

Joint threat emitter

The budget request included \$9.5 million in Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF, line 28) for the joint threat emitter (JTE) program. This Air Force program provides a state-of-the-art surface-to-air missile (SAM) threat simulation incorporating commercial technology into a modular architecture to maximize diverse capabilities and configurations for joint aircrew training. A transportable, single reprogrammable unit provides multiple (up to three) threat presentations, realistic aircraft tracking simulation, and video feedback debrief functions. JTE is designed to reduce range operations and maintenance requirements up to 80 percent as compared to previous systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million for JTE procurement to allow the Air Force to deploy JTE systems at additional training sites.

Space-Based Infrared Satellite system mission control station backup

The budget request included \$4.0 million in Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF) line 36 for Space-Based Infrared Satellite (SBIRS) system ground control mobile and fixed site communications and electronics upgrades. The committee recommends an additional \$27.6 million for the SBIRS backup mission control ground station. This additional funding is needed to provide the backup ground station with capabilities compatible with both the legacy missile warning satellites and both SBIRS elements. This item is listed on the Air Force Space Command unfunded priority list.

Self-deploying infrared streamer

The budget request included no funding in Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF) for personal safety and rescue equipment items

less than \$5.0 million. The self-deploying infrared streamer (SDIRS) system aids in the rescue of downed aircrew at sea. The SDIRS system is attached to an ejection seat and automatically deploys and activates upon submergence in the water, making the wearer highly visible to search and rescue teams using the naked eye during daylight and night vision equipment during hours of darkness. The SDIRS installation requires only minimal modification to the existing system without affecting other components of the pilot's survival kit.

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million for procurement of the self-deploying infrared streamer.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Senate

Change

Senate

Authorized

Line

Program Title

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

Procurement, Defense-Wide

Major Equipment

Major Equipment, OSD/WH

1 MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD

2 Major Equipment, NSA

3 INTEL SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPS

4 CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM

5 INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)

6 DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PGM

7 COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE

8 TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM

Major Equipment, WHS

9 WHS MOTOR VEHICLES

10 MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS

Major Equipment, DISA

11 INTERDICTION SUPPORT

12 INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY

13 DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM

14 GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM

15 GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM

16 TELEPORT PROGRAM

17 ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION

NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)

98,063

[]

[]

8,145

[]

[]

[]

175

22,393

45,564

10,779

2,596

39,082

127,177

10,836

98,063

[]

[]

8,145

[]

[]

[]

175

22,393

45,564

10,779

2,596

39,082

127,177

10,836

[12,336]

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
18	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK (DISN)	48,946		48,946		14,000	62,946
19	DISN enhancements for network geographic diversity					[14,000]	
19	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE	1,909		1,909			1,909
	Major Equipment, DIA						
20	INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS	[]		[]			[]
21	COMBATANT COMMAND INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS	[]		[]			[]
22	DIA SUPPORT TO SOUTHCOM INTEL OPS	[]		[]			[]
23	DIA SUPPORT TO PACOM MANAGEMENT HQ	[]		[]			[]
24	INTEL SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPS	[]		[]			[]
25	DEFENSE HUMINT INTELLIGENCE (HUMINT) PROGRAM	[]		[]			[]
	Major Equipment, DLA						
26	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	8,971		8,971			8,971
	Major Equipment, DCAA						
27	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	1,522		1,522			1,522
	Major Equipment, TJS						
28	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	24,234		24,234			24,234
	Major Equipment, DHRA						
29	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	7,013		7,013			7,013
	National Geospatial Intelligence Agency						
30	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA	[]		[]			[]
	Defense Threat Reduction Agency						
31	VEHICLES						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
32	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	4,624					4,624
33	Defense Security Cooperation Agency						
34	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT						
34	Major Equipment, AFIS	2,361					2,361
35	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS						
35	Major Equipment, DODDE	1,500					1,500
36	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS						
36	Major Equipment, DCMA	2,092					2,092
37	MAJOR EQUIPMENT						
37	Major Equipment, DTSA						
38	MAJOR EQUIPMENT						
38	Major Equipment, CIFA	[]					[]
39	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
39	Major Equipment, BTA	7,330					7,330
40	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA						
40	Special Operations Command						
40	Aviation Programs						
41	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT	74,414					74,414
42	SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS						
43	MC-130H AIR REFUELING SYSTEM	61,254					61,254
44	MH-47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM	76,756					76,756
44	MH-60 SOF MODERNIZATION PROGRAM						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
45	NON-STANDARD AVIATION			22,513			22,513
46	SOF TANKER RECAPITALIZATION			18,565			18,565
47	MC-130H, COMBAT TALON II			38,302			38,302
48	CV-22 SOF MOD		5	238,636	-8,700		229,936
	Slow obligations of CV-22 modifications				[-8,700]		
49	AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION			133,477			133,477
50	C-130 MODIFICATIONS			1,322			1,322
51	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT						
	Shipbuilding						
52	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS)			10,621			10,621
53	MK8 MOD1 SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE			8,080			8,080
	Ammunition Programs						
54	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT			51,837			51,837
55	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION			26,509			26,509
	Other Procurement Programs						
56	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS			175,073			175,073
57	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS			70,943			70,943
58	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS			160,087			160,087
59	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			[]			[]
60	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS			2,952			2,952
61	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES			12,047			12,047
62	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS			17,038			17,038

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Program Title

Qty

Cost

Qty

**Senate
Change**

Cost

Qty

**Senate
Authorized**

Cost

Cost

Line

63 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS

64 SPECIAL PROGRAMS

65 TACTICAL VEHICLES

66 MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS

67 COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS

68 MILCON COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT

69 UNMANNED VEHICLES

70 CLASSIFIED PROGRAM (GDIP)

71 SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT

72 DRUG INTERDICTION

73 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT

74 SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS

75 PSYOP EQUIPMENT

Chemical/Biological Defense

CBDP

76 INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION

77 INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION

78 DECONTAMINATION

M291 skin decontamination kit

79 JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

80 COLLECTIVE PROTECTION

Collectively protected deployable medical systems

3,651

[]

10,612

70,014

20,000

12,500

37,107

[]

6,973

17,644

366,024

76,198

86,418

127,537

28,639

55,991

38,857

14,000

[14,000]

1,500

[1,500]

3,651

[]

10,612

70,014

20,000

12,500

37,107

[]

6,973

17,644

366,024

76,198

86,418

127,537

42,639

55,991

40,357

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
81	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE						
	M22 ACADA			211,311		34,000	245,311
	Improved chemical agent monitor					[20,000]	
	Joint biological point detection system					[10,000]	
						[4,000]	
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			473,620		12,336	485,956
	Total - Procurement, Defense-Wide			3,318,834		67,136	3,385,970
	National Guard & Reserve Equipment						
	Reserve Equipment						
	ARMY RESERVE						
1	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
2	NAVY RESERVE						
	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
3	MARINE CORPS RESERVE						
	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
4	AIR FORCE RESERVE						
	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	National Guard Equipment						
5	ARMY NATIONAL GUARD						
	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	AIR NATIONAL GUARD						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
6	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
	Total - National Guard & Reserve Equipment						
	Rapid Acquisition Fund						
1	RAPID ACQUISITION FUND	100,000		100,000			100,000
	Total - Rapid Acquisition Fund	100,000		100,000			100,000

Budget Items—Defense-wide

Defense Information Systems Network enhancement

The budget request included \$48.9 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), line 18 for Defense Information System Network related procurement. The committee notes that high bandwidth connectivity provides military users with enhanced capabilities for data, voice, and video communications. These capabilities enable military organizations to better support deployed forces and other Department of Defense activities. The committee recommends an additional \$14.0 million for enhancements to the Defense Information System Network, especially to increase network geographic diversity and alternative data pathways.

CV-22 procurement

The fiscal year 2008 budget request included \$238.6 million in Procurement Defense-wide (PDW) for Special Operations Command aviation programs for the CV-22 Special Operations Forces modifications. The Navy has been slow to obligate funds for the aircraft. Therefore, \$8.7 million will not be required in fiscal year 2008 to fund procurement for the modifications.

The committee recommends a decrease of \$8.7 million in PDW for Special Operations Command aviation programs for the CV-22 Special Operations Forces modifications.

M291 skin decontamination kit

The budget request included \$28.6 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW) for chemical and biological decontamination equipment, of which \$13.0 million is to procure M291 Skin Decontamination Kits (SDK) for high threat areas. The committee recommends an increase of \$14.0 million in PDW to procure additional M291 SDKs. The committee notes that decontamination capabilities are not sufficiently robust, and the additional funding would help to increase the primary personal decontamination system for U.S. forces, pending approval by the Food and Drug Administration of the follow-on skin decontamination system.

Collectively protected deployable medical system

The budget request included \$38.9 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW) for procurement of collective protection equipment to protect U.S. forces from chemical and biological warfare agents. Of this amount, \$3.5 million is for procurement of collectively protected field hospitals, including the Army's Collectively Protected Deployable Medical system (CP DEPMEDS). The committee recommends an increase of \$1.5 million for procurement of an additional Army CP DEPMEDS unit. These systems fill a collective protection capability requirement to sustain medical operations in a chemical and biological contaminated environment for 72 hours.

Automatic chemical agent detector and alarm

The budget request included \$211.3 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW) for contamination avoidance equipment to support the procurement of chemical and biological detection, warning

and reporting, and reconnaissance systems, such as the M-22 Automatic Chemical Agent Detector and Alarm (ACADA). The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million in PDW to meet procurement shortfalls in fielding ACADA systems. The committee notes that a number of Army National Guard units are deployed in support of military operations, but do not have adequate chemical agent detection and warning equipment. These units must have the best available equipment for defense against chemical warfare threats. Additional ACADA procurement will provide this needed equipment.

Improved chemical agent monitor

The budget request included \$211.3 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW) for chemical and biological contamination avoidance equipment, but included no funding for the Improved Chemical Agent Monitor (ICAM). The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PDW for procurement of additional ICAM units, to increase the Army National Guard's chemical contamination avoidance capabilities.

The ICAM is a hand-held, soldier operated, post-attack device that provides a means of quickly detecting the presence of chemical agent contamination on personnel and equipment. The committee notes that Army National Guard units do not all possess the capability to rapidly and effectively detect the presence of chemical agents. These units must have the best available force protection equipment to detect the presence of chemical threats.

Joint biological point detection system

The budget request included \$211.3 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW) for chemical and biological contamination avoidance equipment, including \$77.8 million for the Joint Biological Point Detection system (JBPDS). The JBPDS provides continuous, rapid, and fully automated collection, detection, and identification of biological warfare agents. It is configured for a variety of service operating platforms and environments. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PDW for procurement of additional JBPDS units, which are high-demand, low-density systems.

Items of Special Interest

C-5 Reliability Enhancement Re-engineing Program

The 2005 Mobility Capability Study (MCS), submitted with the fiscal year 2007 President's budget request, determined that the Department of Defense requires 292 to 383 large aircraft to meet the strategic airlift requirements of the National Military Strategy (NMS). The quantity and mix of aircraft planned for the strategic airlift fleet reflects: (i) the Department's tolerance for risk associated with accomplishing the strategic airlift mission; (ii) the Department's plan to augment organic airlift assets with commercial assets to meet peak airlift demands; and (iii) the Department's determination of the mix and utilization of large aircraft that would most affordably accomplish the anticipated strategic lift missions.

The MCS concluded that a strategic airlift force of 112 modernized C-5 aircraft plus 180 C-17 aircraft would meet the NMS re-

quirements with acceptable risk. The 2006 MCS update, submitted with the fiscal year 2008 President's budget request, further verified that the current program plan for 301 strategic airlift aircraft (111 modernized C-5 aircraft plus 190 C-17 aircraft) would meet the NMS requirements with acceptable risk.

The modernization plan for C-5 aircraft includes the Reliability Enhancement Re-engining Program (RERP), which intends to increase reliability significantly and reduce operating costs for the C-5 fleet. The Air Force's plan to modernize all 111 remaining C-5 aircraft reflects the unique capability and critical capacity contributed by the C-5 fleet to the airlift mission, and the affordability of modernizing C-5 aircraft as compared to procuring new replacement aircraft. The contractor team has completed the RERP modification on one C-5A and two C-5B aircraft. The Air Force plan is to complete operational testing on these three aircraft in fiscal year 2009. The fiscal year 2008 President's budget request included \$253.3 million in procurement funding for the first lot of low rate initial production RERP aircraft. The program of record would complete the final C-5 RERP in 2021.

The committee is aware that the Department is reviewing C-5 RERP cost performance to determine whether it will incur a Nunn-McCurdy breach. Since C-5 RERP is a critical element of all force planning scenarios under consideration, inability by the Department to control C-5 RERP cost increases the risk associated with the U.S. Transportation Command's ability to meet U.S. objectives in a national emergency. The committee is concerned by the apparent cost growth on the program and the implications of this cost growth to airlift capability. The Air Force's reaction to these potential cost increases appears to be focused on revisiting the 'business case' for whether to modernize C-5A aircraft or replace them. It is not clear to the committee whether the Department has formulated an effective strategy for restoring affordability to the critical program.

In view of these concerns, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report on C-5 RERP within 30 days of enactment of this Act. The report shall: provide a current assessment of C-5 RERP qualification testing; estimate projected in-service performance of C-5 aircraft with the RERP modification; and outline the current estimated program costs, the causes for cost growth, and the Air Force's strategy to employ lessons learned with the developmental RERP aircraft to reduce cost risk for RERP production.

DDG-51 *Arleigh Burke* class destroyer modernization program

The Secretary of the Navy's fiscal year 2007 report to Congress on the long-range plan for construction of naval vessels identified the requirement to operate the 62-ship DDG-51 class for a full 35-year service life in order to meet the Navy's surface combatant force structure requirements. The DDG-51 modernization program, which upgrades the DDG-51 class with key technologies for improved warfighting capability and reduced operating and support cost, is essential to achieving this 35-year expected service life. The Navy plans to accomplish the modernization at the approximate

mid-life point for each ship, commencing with USS *Arleigh Burke* (DDG-51) in 2010. As currently programmed, the 62-ship modernization effort would span approximately 20 years at a cost in excess of \$5.0 billion.

The magnitude of this investment, coupled with the criticality of the modernization effort to surface combatant mission effectiveness, warrants a thorough understanding of how the Navy is balancing requirements for system performance, affordability, schedule, competition, quality of life, industrial base factors (including consideration of the building yards, other private yards, and the Navy shipyards), risk, and other priorities in its procurement of the DDG-51 modernization program. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, with the fiscal year 2009 budget request, outlining the alternative acquisition strategies under consideration for the DDG-51 modernization program. The report shall address the specific factors identified above, the priorities assigned to these factors, and the methodology the Navy is using to optimize the DDG-51 modernization program in accordance with its established priorities.

MQ-1C Predator/Warrior

The budget request included \$45.6 million for development and \$118.5 million for procurement of an extended range/multi-purpose (ERMP) unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV). This vehicle is a variant of the Air Force MQ-1 Predator A, with 50 percent greater payload and other improvements, such as an automatic takeoff and landing system and a heavy fuel engine. The Air Force has designated the air vehicle as the MQ-1C, and the Army has named it Warrior. The budget request also included \$278.0 million in procurement for the MQ-1 Predator for the Air Force.

The Air Force has expressed interest in procuring the Army MQ-1C. The committee directs that the Air Force attempt to change over to MQ-1C production on the existing Predator A production line in fiscal year 2008, if possible. As noted elsewhere in this Report, the MQ-1C's additional payload will allow the Air Force to field better signals intelligence payloads.

The committee notes that the Air Force has proposed that it be designated as the executive agent for medium- and high-altitude UAVs. The Air Force asserts that an executive agency would provide efficiencies in acquisition and airspace control, and ensure interoperability and responsiveness to the joint theater commander. The concern of the Army at this juncture is assuredness of support to ground forces.

The committee does not believe that a service must build and operate its own systems in order to ensure that it is adequately supported. Indeed, the mutual dependencies of each of the specialized military services are clear and numerous. At the same time, the committee is not naive about how hard it can be at times for one service to gain adequate and timely support from the others.

The committee agrees that the Air Force has raised a legitimate issue for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense. However, the committee wants to ensure that all pertinent aspects of the issue are considered. For example, the Air

Force emphasizes the benefits of tight integration into the Joint Force Air Component Command (JFAC) structure, but the Army stresses tight coupling into the major elements of its ground and helicopter forces. Another example is the cost savings that the Army will achieve by using enlisted personnel instead of rated-pilot officers to fly the MQ-1Cs. It also appears that the Army may have gained a significantly better Predator than the one the Air Force planned to continue buying, through a competition that might never have occurred under an executive agency.

The committee expects a careful study of the issue of executive agency for UAVs, including different levels of comprehensiveness. In the meantime, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Navy, and the Army should strive to achieve as much commonality, interoperability, and flexibility as possible between UAV acquisitions.

Mine resistant ambush protected vehicle reporting requirement

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, and every 60 days thereafter until the termination of Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), setting forth the respective military services' requirements for all armored tactical and support vehicles, such as the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicle, and the extent to which those requirements have been met. This report shall be submitted as part of the Up-armored High Mobility Multi-purpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV) reporting requirement included in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 109-13).

The committee supports the urgency with which the Department of Defense plans to produce and field the MRAP vehicle. However, there is concern about how the demands of this new production program in addition to the current production of HMMWVs and other tactical and support armored vehicles, will impact the availability of raw materials such as suitable steel. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide the congressional defense committees not later than January 31, 2008, and annually thereafter until the termination of OIF, an assessment of the Department's ability to acquire suitable steel to meet its armored vehicle production requirement.

Navy harbor tugs

Since the mid-1980s, the Navy has been decommissioning its aging harbor tug (YTB) fleet at its bases around the world and replacing the YTBs with time-charter contracts with commercial tug boat companies. Competition among tug boat operators for these contracts has been intense. The Military Sealift Command (MSC) has employed contract tug services though the use of performance specifications, commercial procurement practices, and communication with the harbor craft industry to ensure our solicitations and contracts did not impose unnecessary administrative burdens. By requiring commercial firms to provide fully operational tugs, in-

cluding logistics, maintenance, and management/crewing support, the Navy has been able to reassign military personnel previously operating these Navy tugs.

The Navy's transition from organic to commercial tug services holds the promise of achieving additional savings. The committee encourages the Navy to review the potential for shifting to commercial tug services in areas where the Navy is still operating YTBs.

LPD-17 amphibious transport dock

The budget request for fiscal year 2008 included funding for the ninth ship of the USS *San Antonio* (LPD-17) class amphibious ship program. The Secretary of the Navy's 2007 report to Congress on the long-range plan for construction of naval vessels calls for a "below threshold" expeditionary warfare force. Specifically, the plan would reduce expeditionary force size, including a reduction in the LPD-17 class from a total of 12 to 9 ships. The committee is concerned that this plan does not provide the total number of amphibious ships needed to support the Department of the Navy's two Marine Expeditionary Brigade lift requirements for forcible entry operations. In testimony before Congress in fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007, Marine Corps leadership stated that a class of 10 LPD-17 ships was required to meet Marine Corps forcible entry requirements, with acceptable risk. The Chief of Naval Operations has identified procurement of a tenth LPD-17 ship in 2008 as the Navy's top unfunded priority.

The committee is aware that construction for a tenth LPD-17 ship would not commence until fiscal year 2009, but delaying procurement beyond 2009 would cause significant cost growth and jeopardize industrial base stability by introducing production breaks in the program. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report not later than November 1, 2007, that outlines the funding required for a "smart buy" of LPD-26, maintaining continuous, uninterrupted production at critical vendors' and shipbuilders' facilities.

Procurement requests related to increasing the size of the Army and the Marine Corps

The fiscal year 2008 budget submitted by the President in February included "placeholder" line items totaling \$4.1 billion in the Army procurement budget and an additional \$2.3 billion in the Navy and Marine Corps procurement accounts. These amounts were set aside for increased equipment procurement to support the proposal in the fiscal year 2008 budget to increase the size of the Army and the Marine Corps. On April 3, 2007, the Army submitted a proposed program, project, and activity level allocation of the \$4.1 billion in Army funds, together with justification material to support that proposal. Later in April the Marine Corps made a similar unofficial request and provided justification material to support that request. Although neither of these requests were submitted by the administration as budget amendments, the committee has reviewed them and incorporated these proposed allocations in this legislation where warranted. Reductions in the "placeholder" line items, and increases proposed by the services in their detailed proposals to allocate those funds, are reflected in the Army procure-

ment tables and the tables relating to Procurement, Marine Corps and Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps in this report. All such reallocations are designated in the table as relating to “Grow the Force” (GTF).

Shipboard personal locator beacon

In response to the Naval Safety Center’s recommendation to improve safety for sailors operating topside while underway, the committee has supported increases to the President’s budget request in fiscal years 2006 and 2007 for the procurement of man overboard indicator systems for the fleet. The technology incorporated in such personal locator beacons may potentially provide applications for improved response to damage control, security alert, or other shipboard actions requiring accountability for personnel location and movement. The committee is aware that the Navy is developing state-of-the-art damage control information management systems for coordination of shipboard response to casualties. Personal locator beacon technology could be integrated with this development effort to provide an automated personnel tracking and monitoring capability for improved casualty response. The committee believes that such capability is an intrinsic requirement of the Navy’s overarching effort to reduce shipboard manning.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees with the fiscal year 2009 President’s budget request that provides the Navy’s assessment of: (i) the feasibility of developing an automated personnel location and monitoring system; (ii) the benefits such a system would provide to shipboard operations and safety; (iii) an estimate of the cost to develop and integrate such capability; and (iv) an estimate of the potential reduction to manpower costs or workload provided by such capability.

Strike fighter gap

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) has not adequately studied the potential risks associated with shortages in U.S. strike fighter aircraft over the next decade. Last year, Navy witnesses testified before the committee about a potential gap in strike fighters that might develop toward the end of the next decade, and could reach as high as 50 aircraft. While the uncertainties of the service life of the current F-18s and the production schedules for the future F-35 were mentioned then, the potential gap now under discussion could be as high as 220 Navy aircraft by the middle of the next decade. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) recently released a study entitled “Tactical Aircraft: DOD Needs a Joint Integrated Investment Strategy,” that reached several interesting conclusions. The report concluded that DOD does not have a single, integrated investment plan for recapitalizing and modernizing its tactical air forces, and without a joint, integrated investment strategy, it is difficult to evaluate the efficacy and severity of capability gaps or, alternatively, areas of redundancy. The GAO report additionally asserts, “[l]ooking forward over the next 20 years, the Department’s collective tactical aircraft recapitalization plans are likely not affordable as currently planned.”

Under the Department's current plans, the DOD would spend, on average, about \$13 billion annually through 2020 developing and purchasing tactical combat aircraft. Over the long-term, that demand for funding will coincide with increases needed to execute other major Air Force and Navy acquisitions, including space systems, cargo aircraft, and surface combatants. In the near-term, it will coincide with the funding needed to "reset" and replace equipment worn out and lost during operations conducted in Iraq and Afghanistan.

To better understand the challenges DOD faces as it modernizes its fleets of tactical combat aircraft, the committee directs the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to conduct a study of alternative approaches to structuring and investing in our Nation's tactical air forces. The CBO analysis should include alternatives that address shortfalls in the size and composition of tactical aircraft forces relative to the services' current and past stated requirements. CBO should also develop other alternatives that, while not necessarily satisfying all current requirements, could require less funding to execute than the Department's current plans. Such options should include, but not be limited to, the potential for unmanned air systems to bridge part of the looming gap in strike fighter capability. CBO should provide the committee with a briefing describing interim results by April 2008, and a final report no later than October 2008.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Explanation of tables

The following tables provide the program-level detailed guidance for the funding authorized in title II of this Act. The tables also display the funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2008 budget request for research, development, test, and evaluation programs, and indicate those programs for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the Department of Defense may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense), without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in this report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Title II -- RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION</u>	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	10,589,604	679,300	11,268,904
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	17,075,536	-779,141	16,296,395
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	26,711,940	-1,129,951	25,581,989
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	20,559,850	771,625	21,331,475
Operational Test & Evaluation	180,264		180,264
TOTAL RDT&E	75,117,194	-458,167	74,659,027

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations**Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations****Advanced Sensor Applications Program (sec. 211)**

Section 211 would require that \$20.0 million in funds authorized and appropriated for the Foreign Material Acquisition and Exploitation program and for activities of the Office of Special Technology in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence shall be allocated to the Advanced Sensor Applications program (ASAP). Section 211 also would require that the ASAP program be promptly transferred to the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and executed by the Navy's Program Executive Officer for Aviation. Additional information is contained in the classified annex to this report.

Active protection systems (sec. 212)

The committee recommends a provision to accelerate the development and evaluation of active protection systems (APS), enabling accelerated deployment if APS is determined to be the most effective counter to current and emerging direct- and top-attack threats. The committee notes that these systems have the potential to deal with the threat of anti-tank guided munitions, rocket propelled grenades, kinetic energy rounds, and other emerging and proliferating threats. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has undertaken and is currently investing in a number of research and development programs for APS. The committee notes that the recent independent assessment of APS, as required by section 234 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), made a number of specific recommendations that would serve to enhance the Department's efforts to deploy these systems.

The committee's recommended provision includes a number of these recommendations, including a requirement for a comparative live fire test of appropriate active protection systems; an assessment of current and developing foreign and domestic active protection systems to assess technologies and analyze the operational impact on military forces of the deployment of APS and countermeasures to those systems; and a number of funding increases to accelerate the fielding of the systems to United States forces. These funding increases are described elsewhere in this report.

Obligation and expenditure of funds for competitive procurement of propulsion system for the Joint Strike Fighter (sec. 213)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to obligate sufficient annual amounts to develop and procure a competitive propulsion system for the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program, in order to conduct a competitive propulsion source selection, from funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations or otherwise made available for research, development, test, and evaluation, and procurement for the JSF program. The committee notes that current plans for the

competitive JSF propulsion system would complete the development of the competitive propulsion system so that a competition for the JSF propulsion system would occur in fiscal year 2012 with the sixth lot of low-rate initial production.

The budget request contained \$1.7 billion in PE 64800N, and \$1.8 billion in PE 64800F for development of the JSF, but contained no funds for development of a competitive JSF propulsion system.

The competitive JSF propulsion system program is developing the F136 engine, which would provide a competitive alternative to the current baseline F135 engine. Section 211 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) required that, by March 15, 2007, the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Department of Defense Cost Analysis Improvement Group, the Comptroller General, and a federally funded research and development center, each provide an independent life cycle cost analysis of the JSF propulsion system, which would include a competitive engine program. The committee has been briefed on the results of these reviews and believes those results were, in the aggregate, inconclusive on whether there would be a financial benefit to the Department of Defense in continuing to develop a competitive propulsion system for the JSF program.

However, the committee notes that all studies identified significant non-financial factors of a two-engine competitive program that should be considered in deciding between the alternatives. These factors include: better engine performance; improved contractor responsiveness; a more robust industrial base; increased engine reliability; and improved operational readiness. The committee believes that the potential benefits from the non-financial factors favor continuing the JSF competitive propulsion system program. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$480.0 million for this purpose, including \$240.0 million in PE 64800N, and \$240.0 million in PE 64800F.

Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs

Limitation on availability of funds for procurement, construction, and deployment of missile defenses in Europe (sec. 231)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the availability of funds authorized to be appropriated in this Act from being obligated or expended for procurement, site activation, construction, preparation of equipment for, or deployment of a long-range missile defense system in Europe until two conditions have been met: (1) the governments of the countries in which major components of the missile defense system (including interceptors and associated radars) are proposed to be deployed have each given final approval to any missile defense agreements negotiated between such governments and the United States concerning the proposed deployment of such components in their countries; and (2) 45 days have elapsed following the receipt by Congress of a report required by the provision.

The provision would also limit funds for the acquisition or deployment of operational interceptor missiles for the proposed long-

range missile defense system in Europe until the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress, after receiving the views of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, that the proposed interceptor to be deployed as part of such a missile defense system has demonstrated, through successful, operationally realistic flight testing, that it has a high probability of working in an operationally effective manner.

The provision would also require a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC) to conduct an independent assessment of options for missile defense of Europe. The assessment would consider the ballistic missile threat to Europe, particularly from Iran, including short-range, medium-range, intermediate-range, and long-range missiles, and would consider a number of related issues, technologies, and factors. The FFRDC would be required to provide the results of its assessment, including any findings and recommendations, in an unclassified report not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

The provision makes clear that it would not limit continuing obligation and expenditure of funds for missile defense, including for research and development and for other activities not otherwise limited by the provision. This would include site surveys, studies, analysis, and planning and design for the proposed missile defense deployment in Europe.

The administration requested \$310.4 million in the budget request for planning, design, development, construction and deployment activities for 10 Ground-based Interceptors (GBIs) to be deployed in Poland, and a large X-band radar to be deployed in the Czech Republic. The committee believes that construction and deployment activities are premature for the reasons explained below.

The two-stage interceptor proposed for deployment in Europe has not yet been developed or tested, and is not currently planned to be flight-tested until 2010. It could be several years before it is known if the interceptor will work in an operationally effective manner.

The United States is just beginning to negotiate with the Governments of Poland and the Czech Republic on detailed agreements for the proposed deployments in their nations. These negotiations may not be concluded before the end of this year, and then would have to be ratified by the parliaments in each nation. The Missile Defense Agency has estimated that such ratification would not take place before 2009. Construction and deployment would not begin before such ratification.

The budget request seeks funds to deploy up to 10 GBIs at a third deployment site, either in Europe or at Fort Greely, Alaska. The budget request anticipates the possibility of not deploying the interceptors in Europe, and both deployment options are under consideration.

The proposed European deployment would not defend all of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) European territory. Additional missile defense systems, such as those described below, would be needed to provide coverage of all NATO European territory against all ranges of Iranian ballistic missiles. NATO, which has not yet decided to pursue missile defense of its territory, has not endorsed or rejected the proposed deployment.

The proposed deployment is intended to counter a potential future threat to the United States or Europe from Iranian long-range or intermediate-range ballistic missiles armed with nuclear warheads. There is uncertainty about whether Iran will have such long-range missiles, or nuclear warheads that could work on such missiles, by 2015.

However, there is no doubt that Iran currently has the largest inventory of short-range and medium-range ballistic missiles in the Middle East, and is working to increase their number, range, and capability. It is also clear that forward-deployed U.S. forces and some NATO allies are currently within range of those missiles, and that the United States does not have adequate regional missile defense capability in place today to protect our forward-deployed forces.

There are a number of near-term missile defense options to provide such defenses against short-range and medium-range missiles (and future intermediate-range missiles), including the Patriot PAC-3 system, the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) system and its Standard Missile-3 (SM-3) interceptor, and the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system.

General James Cartwright, the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, who has operational responsibility for global integrated missile defense, testified to the committee that his missile defense focus this year is to expand “beyond long-range intercontinental ballistic missiles to start to address those that hold at threat our forward deployed forces, or allies and our friends. Those are more in the short and medium-range ballistic missiles, things that Patriot, Standard Missile-2 and [Standard Missile]-3 will be able to address, and THAAD as it comes on.” All such options should be considered as Congress makes decisions on what missile defense capabilities are appropriate for Europe.

The current Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system deployed in the United States already has the range to provide defense of the United States against a potential future long-range missile threat from Iran.

Russia has expressed strong concerns about the proposed deployment, and it will take time to work through these issues in a manner that ensures improved security, rather than reduced security in Europe. The administration is planning high-level talks with the Russian Government starting in the fall of 2007.

The proposed European missile defense deployments would cost an estimated \$4.0 billion through fiscal year 2013, all of which the United States would be expected to pay.

Given these considerations, the committee believes that it is premature to authorize the appropriation of funds for construction or deployment of the proposed system without conditions. The committee notes that fiscal year 2008 research, development, test and evaluation funds authorized and appropriated for this proposed deployment would remain available for two years, during which time negotiations and development activities could move forward.

As discussed elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends a reduction of \$85.0 million proposed for site activation and construction activities for the proposed European GMD deployment.

Limitation on availability of funds for deployment of missile defense interceptors in Alaska (sec. 232)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the availability of funds authorized to be appropriated in this Act from being obligated for the deployment of more than 40 Ground-based Interceptors at Fort Greely, Alaska, until the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress, after receiving the views of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, that the Block 2006 Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) element of the Ballistic Missile Defense system (BMDS) has demonstrated, through operationally realistic end-to-end flight testing, that it has a high probability of working in an operationally effective manner.

The committee notes that section 234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) required the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to provide to the Secretary of Defense and to Congress an assessment of the operational capability of each block of the BMDS, starting with the 2006 block, at the completion of test and evaluation for each block. This assessment will be available well before any additional interceptors would be ready to deploy in Alaska. If the Department of Defense decides it wants to deploy additional interceptors at Fort Greely beyond the 40 already planned, it would have to certify that the Block 2006 GMD system is operationally effective. If the system is not operationally effective, then it would not make sense to deploy more interceptors.

Budget and acquisition requirements for Missile Defense Agency activities (sec. 233)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to submit its annual budget request, starting in fiscal year 2009, using all of the major categories of funding: research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E); procurement; operation and maintenance; and military construction. The provision would also establish acquisition objectives for MDA to improve transparency, accountability, and oversight of its budget and programs. To accomplish these objectives, the provision would establish a number of specific acquisition improvements, including acquisition baselines for cost, schedule, and performance for those missile defense elements that have either entered the equivalent of the System Development and Demonstration phase of acquisition, or are being produced and fielded for operational use.

The extraordinary flexibility granted to the MDA to use exclusively RDT&E funds for all its activities, including such non-RDT&E activities as procurement, operation and maintenance, and military construction, was sought and granted in order to permit MDA to implement the President's December 2002 decision to deploy an initial missile defense system for the United States within 2 years, and without any of the normal acquisition or testing rules that apply to all other major defense acquisition programs. Now that the system has been developed and deployed, the rationale for this extraordinary flexibility, and the resultant lack of accountability, has expired.

As the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported in March 2007, the extraordinary acquisition flexibility granted to the

MDA has resulted in a lack of accountability, transparency, and oversight, such that it is not possible for GAO to determine the cost of a 2-year block of work performed on the Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) system, nor to determine the unit cost for such a fundamental item as the Ground-Based Interceptor (GBI) of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) element.

After studying the MDA acquisition program and process, GAO concluded that there were a number of improvements that MDA should make. GAO recommended several steps designed to improve accountability, transparency, and oversight of the BMD program, including that MDA should use procurement funding for missile defense elements that are in the equivalent of the System Development and Demonstration phase, or are being fielded for operational use. GAO also recommended that MDA should establish acquisition baselines for cost, schedule, and performance for these elements, and that it should provide unit cost data, and other information that would help improve accountability. The committee agrees with the GAO recommendations and believes that MDA should make significant progress in accomplishing these objectives.

Participation of Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, in missile defense test and evaluation activities (sec. 234)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide authorities for the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to have the same access to information concerning ballistic missile defense test and evaluation activities that exists for test and evaluation information for all other major defense acquisition programs under section 139 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee commends the Missile Defense Agency and the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation for establishing a constructive and cooperative relationship. This provision is intended to ensure that this important and necessary cooperation continues in the future.

Extension of Comptroller General assessments of ballistic missile defense programs (sec. 235)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend by 5 years the period during which the General Accountability Office (GAO) would continue to assess and report to Congress annually on the progress of the Missile Defense Agency to meet its annual goals for cost, schedule, testing, and performance of the ballistic missile defense system.

The committee has found the previous GAO annual assessments and reports to be valuable sources of oversight and insight into the ballistic missile defense program. This provision would ensure that such valuable assessments would continue for the period of the current future-years defense program.

Subtitle D—Other Matters**Modification of notice and wait requirement for obligation of funds for the foreign comparative test program (sec. 251)**

The committee recommends a provision that would enhance the efficiency of the Foreign Comparative Test program by modifying the congressional reporting requirement associated with the program, so that obligation of funds can occur after Congress reviews the program's intended action for 7 days. The committee understands that Congress has never utilized its current statutorily mandated 30 day review period to change a Foreign Comparative Test funding recommendation. This proposed change to the statute will expedite the execution of the Foreign Comparative Testing program, allowing contracting officers to enter into negotiations with potential vendors earlier and funds to be obligated and expended more quickly.

Modification of cost sharing requirement for Technology Transition Initiative (sec. 252)

The committee recommends a provision that would give the Department of Defense more flexibility in its execution of the Technology Transition Initiative, but would remove restrictions on the types of cost sharing arrangements allowed between a service or agency and the initiative manager in funding technology transition projects. The committee notes that this program, originally established by the committee in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314) has successfully transitioned a number of technologies from the Department's science and technology programs into fielded systems.

The committee notes that the Department has expressed concern that the current statute requires the Office of the Secretary of Defense through the initiative manager to provide no less than 50 percent of funds towards a transition project, with the balance coming from the sponsoring service or agency. This has restricted the number of projects that the program could support and on occasion prevented the sponsoring service or agency from contributing more funding to the projects. The committee's recommended proposal would allow the initiative manager complete flexibility in determining the appropriate cost sharing arrangement for each technology transition initiative project.

Strategic plan for the Manufacturing Technology Program (sec. 253)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and publish a biennial strategic plan for the manufacturing technology program. The committee notes that advanced manufacturing technologies are the key to a vital defense industrial base, as well as a support for United States economic competitiveness. The manufacturing technology program has traditionally been the activity through which the Department of Defense has pursued defense-related manufacturing technologies that serve to improve the performance and reduce the life cycle costs of defense systems. The committee commends the Department

for attempting to expand the scope and reach of the program, through the creation of the Joint Defense Manufacturing Technology Panel, the utilization of manufacturing readiness assessments as metrics on acquisition programs, and the establishment of a manufacturing science and technology initiative.

The committee notes that the 2006 Defense Science Board Task Force on the Manufacturing Technology Program recommended that the Department “must not only publish a strategic plan, but also ensure its implementation with periodic reviews of the plan’s execution.” The committee provision would implement the DSB’s recommendation. The committee encourages the Secretary to consider the other strategic planning recommendations of the DSB task force described in their report.

Modification of authorities on coordination of Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research with similar Federal programs (sec. 254)

The committee recommends a provision that would give the Department of Defense more flexibility in its execution of the Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (DEPSCoR) program. The provision would enable the Department to award merit-based grants and other support under the program’s authority directly to entities in participating DEPSCoR states, or by using the existing mechanism of awarding contracts through state planning committees.

The committee notes that the DEPSCoR program funds defense-related research in eligible states where educational institutions historically performed less well in full and open competitions, with the intent of enabling them to become more successful in merit-based competitions. The committee notes that the Department plans to terminate its support for the program in fiscal year 2010, due to an inability to identify any DEPSCoR award “which led to any application used by, or supportive of, the warfighter,” due to resource constraints on science and technology programs and due to the need to provide more resources for the activities of the National Defense Education Program (NDEP). The Department has indicated that it intends to work with researchers in DEPSCoR states through NDEP.

The committee believes that the flexibility provided by this provision will enable the Department to better utilize DEPSCoR funding to support warfighter needs, including potentially supporting educational activities, while still preserving the important role of state planning committees to coordinate activities with other similar federal programs and state-based efforts where appropriate.

Enhancement of defense nanotechnology research and development program (sec. 255)

The committee recommends a provision to assist in the acceleration of the development, integration, and fielding of appropriate nanotechnology-based capabilities in defense systems. This recommendation is consistent with a series of actions taken by Congress over the past few years to highlight the importance that the growing nanotechnology research area can help both our national security and global competitiveness. Previously, with the intent to

ensure that the United States had global superiority in nanotechnology necessary for meeting national security requirements, the committee established the defense nanotechnology research program in section 246 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314), which this provision updates and enhances. Later, Congress also passed the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (Public Law 108-153) to coordinate Federal Government investments and activities related to nanotechnology.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has invested roughly \$2.0 billion in nanotechnology research and development since fiscal year 2000. These investments have been in areas such as advanced sensors, structural materials, and electronic systems based on the unique properties enabled by nanotechnology. The Department has also established a number of nanotechnology-focused research centers, including the Institute for Nanoscience at the Naval Research Laboratory and the Army's Institute for Soldier Nanotechnologies. These investments are developing technologies that will soon be integrated into deployed systems, and enable advanced capabilities that will enhance our forces' battlefield superiority.

The committee believes that nanotechnology is at the stage where the Department needs to focus more on transitioning technologies to demonstrate the return of the significant research investment made thus far. Therefore, the committee's provision directs the Department to focus more closely on the manufacturing of nanotechnologies and ensuring the vitality of the nanotechnology industrial base, since these are key to adoption of new technologies in defense systems. The committee notes that the Department should conduct state-of-the art research on nanomanufacturing involving collaborations between academic institutions, Department of Defense laboratories, and industry partners, as well as working through the Department's manufacturing technology programs. Further, the committee notes that there would be significant value in collaborating with National Science Foundation centers working on nanomanufacturing and working toward a national nanomanufacturing enterprise that encourages extensive industrial collaboration, in order to maintain United States global leadership.

The committee's recommended provision also strengthens the connection between Department nanotechnology efforts and the Government-wide National Nanotechnology Initiative, by requiring participation in coordination activities, as well as in participation in and support of the mandatory external reviews of the program. The committee also recognizes the need for metrics and goals to ensure that the Department's nanotechnology program is well structured and successfully developing needed defense technologies. Therefore, the committee recommends a review by the Government Accountability Office of the overall Department nanotechnology program.

Finally, the committee is concerned that the United States may be losing its lead in the development of defense nanotechnologies to international competitors and partners. Therefore, the committee's recommended provision strengthens the monitoring and as-

assessment of international nanotechnology research and development capabilities in areas of interest to the Department of Defense.

Budget Items

Army

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY			
		Basic Research			
0601101A	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	19,266		19,266
0601102A	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	137,676	7,500	145,176
		Respiratory infections research		[2,000]	
		Document exploitation systems		[3,000]	
		Organic semiconductor modeling & simulation research		[1,000]	
		Nanostructure de-icing research		[1,500]	
0601103A	3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	64,843	9,000	73,843
		Program increase		[9,000]	

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0601104A	4	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	84,034	18,200	102,234
		Information assurance research		[1,500]	
		Nanoscale biosensor research		[2,500]	
		Low temperature vehicle performance research		[2,000]	
		Automotive research		[3,000]	
		Integrated sensing & communications systems		[2,000]	
		Urban simulation & training research		[1,400]	
		Network security research		[2,000]	
		Machine interface research		[1,500]	
		Transparent nanocomposite armor research		[300]	
		Nanocomposite materials research		[2,000]	
		Applied Research			
0602105A	5	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	18,614	13,000	31,614
		Nanosensor manufacturing research		[2,000]	
		Ballistic materials for future combat systems		[2,000]	
		IED protection materials research		[4,000]	
		Advanced composite materials research		[3,000]	
		Soldier torso armor systems		[2,000]	

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0602120A	6	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY Advanced microelectronics manufacturing Operationally responsive space research Integrated remote sensing technologies	39,826	9,000 [2,000] [5,000] [2,000]	48,826
0602122A	7	TRACTOR HIP	4,367		4,367
0602211A	8	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	42,567		42,567
0602270A	9	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	16,411		16,411
0602303A	10	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY Materials for munitions protection research	53,038	2,000 [2,000]	55,038
0602307A	11	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	19,342		19,342
0602308A	12	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION Photonics research for sniper detection	16,654	4,000 [4,000]	20,654
0602601A	13	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY Medium/heavy duty fuel cell vehicle demonstration Transparent armor research Military fuels research	53,342	7,000 [3,000] [2,000] [2,000]	60,342
0602618A	14	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	55,014		55,014
0602622A	15	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	2,235		2,235
0602623A	16	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM Recoil mitigation technologies	7,008	2,000 [2,000]	9,008

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0602624A	17	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY UGV weaponization technologies	40,469	3,000 [3,000]	43,469
0602705A	18	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES High-frequency, high-power electronic & optoelectronic devices Advanced rechargeable batteries	43,391	6,000 [3,000] [3,000]	49,391
0602709A	19	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	24,391		24,391
0602712A	20	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS Standoff IED detection technologies	21,795	5,000 [5,000]	26,795
0602716A	21	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	17,426		17,426
0602720A	22	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	15,809		15,809
0602782A	23	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	22,215		22,215
0602783A	24	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	5,368		5,368
0602784A	25	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	51,120		51,120
0602785A	26	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	16,208		16,208
0602786A	27	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY Ballistic materials for force protection	23,083	5,000 [5,000]	28,083
0602787A	28	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY Advanced fibrin dressings Battlefield head injury diagnostic tools Biomechanics research Bioengineering research	76,544	6,500 [2,000] [1,000] [2,000] [1,500]	83,044

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Advanced Technology Development			
0603001A	29	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	47,065	2,000	49,065
		AGAS technology development		[2,000]	
0603002A	30	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	53,274	19,000	72,274
		Lower limb prosthetics research		[3,000]	
		Combat wound initiative		[2,000]	
		Electronic vital signs monitoring systems		[2,000]	
		Robotic telesurgery research		[2,000]	
		Blast trauma detection research		[2,000]	
		Dengue infections research		[5,000]	
		Tissue regeneration research		[3,000]	
0603003A	31	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	53,890	5,000	58,890
		UAV munitions technologies		[3,000]	
		UAV payload delivery systems		[2,000]	
0603004A	32	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	59,389	1,000	60,389
		Cannon recoil reduction system		[1,000]	

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0603005A	33	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY Composite armor cab development Antibalistic windshield armor Hostile fire detection systems Unmanned ground vehicle initiative Military hybrid engine development program Solid hydrogen storage vehicle research Composite ceramic vehicle armor program Fuel cell cost reduction research Solid oxide fuel cell manufacturing research Vehicle design optimization tools Dynamometer facility upgrade Fastening & joining research Tactical vehicle APS research	131,436	55,000 [3,000] [4,000] [3,000] [12,000] [10,000] [4,000] [1,000] [3,000] [1,500] [1,500] [3,000] [1,500] [7,500]	186,436
0603006A	34	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	12,255		12,255
0603007A	35	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	6,783		6,783
0603008A	36	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	49,199		49,199
0603009A	37	TRACTOR HIKE	12,633		12,633
0603015A	38	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS Joint leadership training systems	18,723	4,000 [4,000]	22,723
0603020A	39	TRACTOR ROSE	6,526		6,526

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0603100A	40	IED DEFEAT TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603103A	41	EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	10,349		10,349
0603105A	42	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	6,998		6,998
0603125A	43	COMBATING TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,061		13,061
0603238A	44	GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE/AIR DEFENSE/PRECISION STRIKE T			
0603270A	45	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	17,419		17,419
0603313A	46	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	60,353		60,353
0603322A	47	TRACTOR CAGE	18,448		18,448
0603606A	48	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,315		25,315
0603607A	49	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	8,097		8,097
0603710A	50	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	35,892	10,000	45,892
		Intelligence, surveillance & detection sensor research		[2,500]	
		FCS short range electro optic sensor research		[7,500]	
0603728A	51	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	14,982		14,982
0603734A	52	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	6,837	6,000	12,837
		Direct methanol fuel cell development		[3,000]	
		Fuel cells for continuity of operations		[3,000]	
0603772A	53	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TI	67,011	6,000	73,011
		Advanced radar technologies		[3,000]	
		Phaselator improvement program		[3,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Advanced Component Development & Prototypes			
0603024A	54	UNIQUE ITEM IDENTIFICATION (UID)	668		668
0603305A	55	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (NON SPA Radiation space hardening	14,389	2,000	16,389
0603308A	56	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (SPACE)	17,421		17,421
0603327A	57	AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	176,142		176,142
0603460A	58	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	53,500		53,500
0603619A	59	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV	24,737		24,737
0603627A	60	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DE	19,449		19,449
0603639A	61	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	44,578		44,578
0603653A	62	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS) Stryker active protection system integration	142,486	40,000	182,486
0603747A	63	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	4,787	[40,000]	4,787
0603766A	64	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV	[]		[]
0603774A	65	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	3,454		3,454
0603779A	66	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY Undersea chemical weapons assessment	6,149	8,000	14,149
0603782A	67	WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL Warfighter Information Network - Tactical	222,296	[8,000] 100,000	322,296
0603790A	68	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,959	[100,000]	4,959
0603801A	69	AVIATION - ADV DEV	6,481		6,481

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0603804A	70	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV	27,499		27,499
0603805A	71	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATIC	19,054		19,054
0603807A	72	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	12,479	7,500	19,979
		Future medical shelter systems		[7,500]	
0603827A	73	SOLDIER SYSTEMS - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	18,178	5,300	23,478
		Nickel boron metal coating technology for crew served weapons		[5,300]	
0603850A	74	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	[]	[-10,000]	[]
		IBS		[-10,000]	
		System Development & Demonstration			
0603808A	75	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM	[]		[]
0604201A	76	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	57,786		57,786
0604220A	77	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE OH-58D	82,310	100,000	182,310
		Transfer From ARH (APA 3)		[100,000]	
0604270A	78	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	55,716		55,716
0604280A	79	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO			
0604321A	80	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	[]		[]
0604328A	81	TRACTOR CAGE	17,821		17,821
0604329A	82	COMMON MISSILE			
0604601A	83	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	45,229		45,229
0604604A	84	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	1,994		1,994
0604609A	85	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-SDD	1,347		1,347

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0604622A	86	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES Advanced thermal & oil management controls research	1,947	5,000 [5,000]	6,947
0604633A	87	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	8,956		8,956
0604642A	88	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES Joint light tactical vehicle (JLTV) - transfer from Title XV Army fuel cell non-tactical vehicle propulsion	82,300	23,000 [20,000]	105,300
0604645A	89	ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-SDD		[3,000]	
0604646A	90	NON-LINE OF SIGHT LAUNCH SYSTEM	253,410		253,410
0604647A	91	NON-LINE OF SIGHT CANNON	137,802		137,802
0604660A	92	FCS MANNED GRD VEHICLES & COMMON GRD VEHICLE FCS active protection system acceleration	696,333	25,000 [25,000]	721,333
0604661A	93	FCS SYSTEMS OF SYSTEMS ENGR & PROGRAM MGMT	1,589,466		1,589,466
0604662A	94	FCS RECONNAISSANCE (UAV) PLATFORMS	41,164		41,164
0604663A	95	FCS UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLES FCS armed robotic vehicles	90,667	90,000 [90,000]	180,667
0604664A	96	FCS UNATTENDED GROUND SENSORS	10,999		10,999
0604665A	97	FCS SUSTAINMENT & TRAINING R&D	678,781		678,781
0604666A	98	MODULAR BRIGADE ENHANCEMENT	64,796		64,796
0604710A	99	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - SDD	44,619		44,619
0604713A	100	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	2,501		2,501
0604715A	101	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - SDD	35,992		35,992

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0604741A	102	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - SI	21,513		21,513
0604742A	103	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	31,962		31,962
0604746A	104	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	18,025		18,025
0604760A	105	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - SDD	16,594		16,594
0604780A	106	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	37,035		37,035
0604783A	107	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	2,786		2,786
0604802A	108	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - SDD	55,368		55,368
0604804A	109	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - SDD	45,009		45,009
0604805A	110	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - SDD	10,047		10,047
0604807A	111	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIP	15,823		15,823
0604808A	112	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - SDD	142,315		142,315
0604814A	114	ARTILLERY MUNITIONS	63,039		63,039
0604817A	115	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	11,362	2,000	13,362
		SINCGARS based combat ID research		[2,000]	
0604818A	116	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFT	99,202		99,202
0604820A	117	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	7,067		7,067
0604822A	118	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS)	53,559		53,559
0604823A	119	FIREFINDER	77,279		77,279
0604827A	120	SOLDIER SYSTEMS - WARRIOR DEM/VAL		30,400	30,400
		Continued development of Land Warrior		[30,400]	
0604854A	121	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS	24,221		24,221

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0604869A	122	PATRIOT/MEADS COMBINED AGGREGATE PROGRAM (CAP)	372,146		372,146
0604870A	123	NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL MONITORING SENSOR NETWORK	7,300		7,300
0605013A	124	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	103,485		103,485
		RD&E Management Support			
0603808A	125	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM	[]		[]
0604256A	126	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	21,887		21,887
0604258A	127	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,499		13,499
0604759A	128	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	66,921		66,921
0604812A	129	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM	[]		[]
0605103A	130	RAND ARROYO CENTER	16,342		16,342
0605301A	131	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	182,136		182,136
0605326A	132	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	34,004		34,004
0605502A	133	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0605601A	134	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	357,964		357,964
0605602A	135	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	74,391		74,391
0605604A	136	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	40,343		40,343
0605605A	137	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY HELSTF	2,801	7,500 [7,500]	10,301
0605606A	138	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	4,688		4,688
0605702A	139	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RD&E ACTIVITIES	8,346		8,346
0605706A	140	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	16,526		16,526

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0605709A	141	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	[]		[]
0605712A	142	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	75,293		75,293
0605716A	143	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	61,694		61,694
0605718A	144	SIMULATION & MODELING FOR ACQ, RQTS, & TNG (SMART)	5,342		5,342
0605801A	145	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	73,718		73,718
0605803A	146	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	41,607		41,607
0605805A	147	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFE	19,606		19,606
0605857A	148	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	4,958		4,958
0605898A	149	MANAGEMENT HQ - R&D	14,889		14,889
0909999A	150	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
		Operational Systems Development			
0603778A	151	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	54,055	2,500	56,555
		HIMARS modular launcher communications system (MLCS)		[2,500]	
0603820A	152	WEAPONS CAPABILITY MODIFICATIONS UAV	3,900		3,900
0102419A	153	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	481,251		481,251
0203726A	154	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	16,837		16,837
0203735A	155	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	27,615	10,900	38,515
		Vehicle health management systems development		[6,000]	
		Combat vehicle transmission improvement		[4,900]	
0203740A	156	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	43,961		43,961

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0203744A	157	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROG Helicopter autonomous landing system (HALS)	325,643	5,000 [5,000]	330,643
0203752A	158	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			476
0203758A	159	DIGITIZATION	476		9,737
0203759A	160	FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCE)	32,446		32,446
0203764A	161	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			
0203801A	162	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	30,219		30,219
0203802A	163	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	1,897		1,897
0203808A	164	TRACTOR CARD	16,573		16,573
0208010A	165	JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	1,536		1,536
0208053A	166	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM JTACS	23,462	-10,000 [-10,000]	13,462
0208058A	167	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	5,148		5,148
0301359A	168	SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM	[]		[]
0303028A	169	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES			
0303140A	170	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	28,332		28,332
0303141A	171	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	129,689		129,689
0303142A	172	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	107,849		107,849
0303150A	173	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	24,836		24,836
0303158A	174	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	10,415		10,415

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0305204A	175	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES Constant Hawk	97,947	30,000 [30,000]	127,947
0305206A	176	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	[]		[]
0305208A	177	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	[]		[]
0702239A	178	AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,024		1,024
0708045A	179	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	66,869		66,869
1001018A	180	NATO JOINT STARS	147,162	-10,000	137,162
	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			
		Total, RDT&E Army	10,589,504	679,300	11,268,904

Army basic research

The budget request included \$137.7 million in PE 61102A for defense research sciences. The committee notes that the National Research Council's 2005 "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" report highlighted the important role that basic research funding plays in areas like global competitiveness and national security. The report noted that with respect to basic research funding "... the Department of Defense research picture is particularly troubling in this regard." It went on to note that the Department of Defense funds 40 percent of the engineering research performed at universities, including more than half of all research in electrical and mechanical engineering and 17 percent of basic research in mathematics and computer science.

The committee supports increasing investments in basic research typically performed at universities to develop next generation military operational capabilities. The committee recommends increases of: \$2.0 million for research on the development of vaccines to combat respiratory infections; \$1.0 million for research on organic semiconductor materials for use in military flexible electronics; and \$1.5 million for research on nanomaterials that can speed the decaying of Army rotary wing vehicles.

University research initiatives

The budget request included \$64.8 million in PE 61103A for Army university research initiatives. The committee notes that this is down by approximately 20 percent in constant dollars from the fiscal year 2004 request, when the program was originally transferred to the services from the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD). The committee notes that all of the service university research initiatives programs are below the original fiscal year 2004 request in constant dollars, despite OSD assurances to Congress that the programs would at least keep pace with inflation.

To continue to preserve the Department of Defense efforts to support the valuable defense research undertaken at universities, the committee recommends an increase of \$9.0 million in PE 61103A for Army university research initiatives, an increase of \$9.0 million in PE 61103N for Navy university research initiatives, and an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 61103F for Air Force university research initiatives.

Army university research centers

The budget request included \$84.0 million in PE 61104A for university and industry research centers. The committee notes that basic research investments by the Army serve the dual purpose of developing next generation military capabilities through the exploration of fundamental scientific issues, as well as training the next generation of scientists, engineers, and technology entrepreneurs at our nation's academic institutions. The committee also notes that the National Research Council's committee on Department of Defense Basic Research recommended that the Department "should redress the imbalance between its current basic research allocation, which has declined critically over the past decade, and its need to better support the expanded areas of technology, the need for increased unfettered basic research, and the support of new research-

ers.” In support of that recommendation, the committee recommends a number of increases to the Army basic research program.

The committee recommends increases of: \$1.5 million for information assurance research; \$2.5 million for nanotechnology-based biosensors to detect biological threats; \$3.0 million for military automotive research; \$2.0 million for research on wireless optical communications systems; \$1.4 million for research on training and simulation in urban terrain; \$2.0 million for military network security research; \$1.5 million for research on soldier health monitoring systems; \$300,000 for nanocomposite transparent armor materials research; \$2.0 million for research on nanotechnologies for advanced lightweight armor systems; and \$2.0 million for research on the low temperature performance of Army vehicles.

Army materials research

The budget request included \$18.6 million in PE 62105A for applied research on materials technologies. The committee notes that the development of modular protective systems for future force assets and the development of vehicle armor technology are two of the official Army Technology Objectives (ATO). This includes the development of “advanced composite materials with properties tailorable for blast and ballistic protection . . .” Therefore, the committee recommends an additional \$2.0 million for the development of composite armor materials for Future Combat Systems (FCS) vehicles and an additional \$3.0 million for research on advanced composite materials for Army air and ground vehicles. The Army’s soldier protection technologies ATO focuses on the development of innovative materials for improved individual armor systems. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional \$2.0 million for development of armor for soldier torso and extremity protection, and an additional \$4.0 million for the development of lightweight armor systems designed to reduce casualties due to improvised explosive device blast effects.

The committee notes that the interagency National Nanotechnology Initiative has identified nanomanufacturing as one of its program component areas of emphasis. The Director of Defense Research and Engineering, in a May 2006 report to Congress entitled “Defense Nanotechnology Research and Development,” indicated that increased support of nanomanufacturing was recommended “in order to facilitate transitioning and the sustained supply of research results for defense technologies.” Therefore, the committee recommends an additional \$2.0 million for the development of advanced nanomanufacturing capabilities for sensors and other defense needs.

Electronics and space research

The budget request included \$39.8 million in PE 62120A for applied research on sensors and electronic survivability. The committee notes that the National Research Council’s report “Materials Research to meet 21st Century Defense Needs” highlights the need for continued defense research on electronic microsystems. The report listed fabrication of microsystems for displays as a high priority research area for the Department of Defense. Consistent with

this analysis, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million for research on advanced microelectronics manufacturing for Army display applications.

The committee understands the Department of Defense's need to track hundreds of moving targets in space or terrestrial environments, including space debris or chemical and biological agents. The committee recommends an additional \$2.0 million for research on integrated remote sensing technologies.

The committee established the Joint Program Office for Operationally Responsive Space in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) with the responsibility to pursue innovative approaches to the development of operationally responsive space capabilities. In coordination with the efforts of that office, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for operationally responsive space research efforts.

Materials for insensitive munitions

The budget request included \$53.0 million in PE 62303A for applied research on missile technology. The Army's Insensitive Munitions Technology Objective seeks to develop energetic materials and system-level innovations to maintain and improve munitions safety at lower weight and cost. The committee also notes that the Office of the Secretary of Defense has initiated new research efforts specifically aimed at improving capabilities in insensitive munitions. In support of these efforts, the committee recommends an additional \$2.0 million for the development of advanced materials for munitions protection in missile systems.

Sniper detection systems

The budget request included \$16.7 million in PE 62308A for advanced concepts and simulation technologies. The committee notes that urgent operational needs statements have called for the development of sniper detection systems for potential use in urban environments. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional \$4.0 million for the development of wearable sniper detection systems to aid in localizing sniper fire and mortar launches.

Army vehicle research

The budget request included \$53.3 million in PE 62601A for applied research on combat vehicles and automotive technology. The committee notes that research in this area will lead to: enhanced survivability for Army ground vehicles, including against improvised explosive devices and other threats; improved energy efficiency for vehicles—resulting in extended ranges and combat capability, as well as life cycle cost savings; and the development of more capable unmanned systems to extend the reach and capabilities of Army forces, while reducing the risks to soldiers.

The committee notes that the Army is developing a fuel cell strategy that is exploring the use of fuel cells in vehicles in tactical and support missions. In coordination with that effort, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million for the development of hydrogen fuel cells for medium and heavy Army vehicles. Consistent with the efforts of the Department of Defense's Energy and

Power Technology Initiative to examine the utility of alternative fuels for military platforms, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million for research on alternative military fuels.

The Army's Vehicle Armor Technology Objective is developing a comprehensive solution to threats to Future Combat Systems ground vehicles. In coordination with these efforts, as well as similar efforts in the Army's small business innovative research program, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million for nanotechnology research to develop transparent armor for Army vehicles.

Recoil mitigation technologies

The budget request included \$7.0 million in PE 62623A for the joint service small arms program. The committee notes that the research goal of this program is to develop "new technologies for improved accuracy and greater lethality . . . while reducing the weight of the Soldier's weapon." To support these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million for research on recoil mitigation technologies which reduce small arms weight while maintaining and improving weapons lethality.

Unmanned ground vehicle weaponization

The budget request included \$40.5 million in PE 62624A for weapons and munitions technology. The committee has been supportive of the development of unmanned ground systems to reduce casualties and to enable new operational concepts and capabilities. The committee notes that the Near Autonomous Unmanned Systems Army Technology Objective is developing robotic technologies for future unmanned systems, and working to transition technologies to programs such as Future Combat Systems and the Armed Robotic Vehicle. To support these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million to develop remotely controlled unmanned systems with lethal and non-lethal capabilities.

Army electronics research

The budget request included \$43.4 million in PE 62705A for applied research on electronics and electronic devices. The committee notes that all of the services are developing needs for higher frequency and high power systems, as well as systems that operate at higher temperatures. These systems will require the development of semiconductor materials that operate efficiently at these power levels and temperature ranges. Accordingly, the wide-bandgap technology development Defense Technology Objective includes specific technical challenges for the development of new semiconductor materials and devices to meet military missions. In support of these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million for research on high frequency, high power electronic and optoelectronic devices.

The Army's effort to reduce the load on soldiers includes a desire to develop smaller, lightweight battery technologies to power radios, computers, and other man-portable equipment. The Mounted/Dismounted Soldier Power Army Technology Objective addresses these challenges through the development of novel power technologies. In support of those efforts, the committee recommends an

increase of \$3.0 million for the development of high capacity portable battery technologies.

Standoff explosives detection technologies

The budget request included \$21.8 million in PE 62712A for applied research on countermine systems. The committee notes that the standoff detection of explosives is a capability that is of critical concern to the Department of Defense as it seeks to combat the use of improvised explosive devices in Iraq and Afghanistan. The National Research Council's 2004 report entitled "Existing and Potential Standoff Explosives Detection Techniques" recommended that "research into both new sensor types and new systems of real-time integration and decision making is needed." Therefore, the committee recommends an additional \$5.0 million in PE 62712A for the development of standoff explosives detection technologies.

Force protection materials research

The budget request included \$23.1 million in PE 62786A for applied research on warfighter technologies. The committee notes that the Army is developing requirements documents that call for the development of advanced modular force protection systems for base camps, which are coming under attack from mortars and improvised explosive devices in Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee also notes that the Army's Modular Protective Systems for Future Force Assets Technology Objective is seeking to develop advanced composite materials with properties tailorable for blast and ballistic protection. To support these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for research on advanced materials for enhanced ballistic protection of assets.

Unmanned air systems

The budget request included \$53.9 million in PE 63003A for aviation advanced technology. The committee is supportive of efforts to explore the use of unmanned systems in a variety of roles and missions on the battlefield, as was indicated in the requirements of section 941 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364). To support the development of new capabilities for unmanned systems, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million for the development of unmanned systems for the precision delivery of supplies to friendly forces.

In section 220 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-398) the committee also established the goal that by 2010, one-third of all operational deep strike force aircraft will be unmanned. Further, the committee notes that the Unmanned Aircraft Systems Roadmap calls for development of weapons optimized for concept of employment from unmanned systems. In order to support this goal, the committee recommends an additional \$3.0 million for development of advanced munitions for unmanned air systems.

Army medical research

The budget request included \$76.5 million in PE 62787A for applied research on medical technologies. The committee notes that

research in this area contributes significantly to the successful treatment of battlefield injuries. The committee recommends a number of increases in this account to address a variety of medical issues resulting from current operations. The committee recommends increases of \$1.0 million for advanced battlefield head injury diagnostic tools; \$2.0 million for biomechanics research to address head, neck, and chest injuries; \$1.5 million for bioengineering research to support combat casualty care missions; and \$2.0 million for the development of advanced wound dressings.

Guided airdrop systems

The budget request included \$47.1 million in PE 63001A for advanced warfighter technologies. The committee notes that the 82nd Airborne Division recently submitted an operational needs statement for guided airdrop systems. The committee also notes that the Army and United States Joint Forces Command are investing in the Joint Precision Airdrop System to meet urgent needs in Iraq and Afghanistan. In support of those efforts, the committee recommends an additional \$2.0 million for research on guided airdrop systems.

Army medical technologies

The budget request included \$53.3 million in PE 63002A for advanced medical technologies. The committee recognizes the critical need to advance military medical technologies to address battlefield injuries. The committee has taken a number of steps to advance those efforts, including the establishment of a Department of Defense-wide initiative to prevent, mitigate, and treat blast injuries in section 256 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2006 (Public Law 109-163). To support these and similar efforts, as well as to support a number of Army Technology Objectives in medical technologies, the committee recommends a number of increases in medical research investments.

The committee notes that improvised explosive devices have created a new set of challenges for medical personnel in dealing with soft tissue and bone damage. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million for research on the treatment of combat wounds. To help address the treatment of blast injuries, in coordination with the Blast Mitigation Initiative, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million for the development of technologies to efficiently detect blunt trauma injuries, and an increase of \$2.0 million for remote vital signs monitoring systems.

The committee recognizes the continuing need to develop advanced lower limb prostheses for battlefield amputees. The committee recommends an additional \$3.0 million for the development of advanced lower limb prosthesis technologies.

The committee notes that the Battlefield Treatment of Fractures and Soft Tissue Trauma Care Defense Technology Objective includes a specific challenge to improve tissue viability technologies. In support of this goal, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million for research on novel tissue regeneration techniques to treat battlefield injuries. In addition, to support advances in military capabilities to treat battlefield injuries, the committee recommends an additional \$2.0 million for the development of ad-

vanced technologies to support telesurgery applications in battlefield environments.

Dengue infection research

The budget request included \$53.3 million in PE 63002A for advanced medical technology. The committee notes that dengue viruses have proven highly debilitating to U.S. military personnel in a number of past operational deployments, and that the military has long pursued a vaccine against all four types of dengue viruses. The committee also notes that the Joint Requirements Oversight Council has identified the Army as the lead agent to develop capabilities to address the Initial Capabilities Document for Infectious Disease Countermeasures. To support these efforts, the committee recommends an additional \$5.0 million in PE 63002A for research on the development of vaccines and therapeutics for dengue infections.

Lightweight cannon recoil technologies

The budget request included \$59.4 million in PE 63004A for advanced weapons and munitions technologies. The committee notes that the Army has a goal to reduce the size and weight of weapon systems associated with Future Combat Systems (FCS) to maintain lethality while being rapidly transportable. The committee recommends an additional \$1.0 million for the development of technologies to reduce the weight of FCS cannon systems using advanced recoil reduction technologies.

Combat vehicle armor technologies

The budget request included \$131.4 million in PE 63005A for advanced combat vehicle and automotive technologies. The Vehicle Armor Technology Army Technology Objective (ATO) seeks to provide comprehensive solutions for Future Combat System (FCS) ground vehicles to address a variety of threats, including mines, rocket propelled grenades, improvised explosive devices, and other ballistic threats. In conjunction with that objective, the Army's long term armoring strategy, and the need for armor technologies to be robust, lightweight, and affordable, the committee recommends a number of increases for armor technologies. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million for the development of composite armored cabs, \$1.0 million for research on ceramic composite materials for armor, and \$4.0 million for development of windshield armor systems.

The committee continues to be concerned about the development of technologies to support force protection missions in Iraq and Afghanistan, including defenses against snipers and rocket propelled grenades. To enhance the force protection capabilities of our deployed forces, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million for the development of counter sniper detection systems in coordination with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and an additional \$7.5 million for the development and testing of vehicle-based active protection systems (APS) for use on light tactical vehicles. The committee notes that the recent independent technical assessment of APS indicated that the best possible sys-

tem “may be based on ‘best of breed’ solutions developed within multiple programs.”

Unmanned ground vehicle initiative

The budget request included \$131.4 million in PE 63005A for advanced combat vehicle and automotive technologies. The committee notes that section 220 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-398) established a goal that by 2015, one-third of the operational ground combat vehicles acquired through the Army’s Future Combat Systems (FCS) program will be unmanned. The committee understands that the Army believes that given current development and fielding schedules for the FCS program, this goal will be met. Significant technical challenges remain in the development of unmanned ground vehicles, including development of propulsion systems, intelligent navigation systems, human-machine interfaces, and reliability. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$12.0 million for this initiative.

Combat vehicle energy and power technologies

The budget request included \$131.4 million in PE 63005A for advanced combat vehicle and automotive technologies. The committee notes that the Department of Defense’s Energy & Power Technology Initiative includes a thrust on energy storage technologies to support hybrid electric vehicle mobility, including research on batteries, fuel cells, and safety issues. The committee also notes that the Army is developing hybrid systems for use on Future Combat Systems vehicles and other vehicle applications. The committee recommends a number of funding increases which will demonstrate the viability of hybrid technologies in military environments and explore the feasibility of deploying hybrid engines for military applications. The committee recommends increases of \$10.0 million for a program to develop advanced hybrid vehicle technologies including research on engine technology, power electronics, control technology, and other areas; \$4.0 million for advanced solid hydrogen storage technologies for military vehicles; \$3.0 million for research on improving the reliability and reducing the cost for fuel cells in military materiel handling equipment applications; and \$1.5 million for developing manufacturing processes needed to reduce fuel cell costs to the military.

Combat vehicle reliability and readiness technologies

The budget request included \$131.4 million in PE 63005A for advanced combat vehicle and automotive technologies. The Prognostics and Diagnostics for Operational Readiness and Condition-based Maintenance Army Technology Objective has a goal to improve near-term and Future Combat Systems commodity readiness and maintainability through improvements in the capability to detect and predict equipment health status and performance. In coordination with this objective and as part of efforts to improve the readiness of Army forces, the committee recommends an increase of \$1.5 million for research on computer models and simulations to better predict military vehicle reliability, and an increase of \$3.0 million for the development of test facilities to evaluate ad-

vanced combat vehicle power train designs. Further, the committee notes that the Army is planning an initiative to invest in research activities that develop advanced mechanical fastening and joining technologies that will increase vehicle reliability and performance. In support of that effort, the committee recommends an additional \$1.5 million for ground vehicle fastening and joining research.

Leadership training simulators

The budget request included \$18.7 million in PE 63015A for next generation training and simulation systems. The committee understands that the Army's Learning with Adaptive Simulation and Training Technology Objective is developing virtual training simulations that incorporate political and cultural effects of the environment and behaviors of adaptive enemies. The committee also notes that the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities heard testimony indicating that leadership training that improves cultural awareness will enhance operational performance in the future. To support efforts to improve leadership training of this type, and in conjunction with efforts at the Army's Institute for Collaborative Technologies, the committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for the development of leadership training models and simulations.

Fuel cells for military applications

The budget request included \$6.8 million in PE 63734A for military engineering advanced technology. The committee notes the Department of Defense's efforts to develop technologies to support continuity of operations missions. The committee also notes that under the Department's Energy and Power Technology Initiative, one of the technical challenges in power distribution technologies is the improvement of component and system reliability and availability. In support of these challenges, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million for the development of fuel cell systems that support continuity of operations missions.

The committee also notes that the Energy and Power Technology Initiative identified an objective of developing fuel cell portable power systems using methanol as a fuel. In support of that objective, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million for the development of direct methanol fuel cells.

Counter rocket, artillery, and mortar radar technologies

The budget request included \$67.0 million in PE 63772A for advanced tactical computer science and technology. The committee understands that the Extended Area Protection and Survivability Army Technology Objective (ATO) has a goal to develop concepts and supporting technologies for a system capable of providing extended area protection and distributed survivability from rocket, artillery, and mortar (RAM) threats. To support this effort, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million to develop radar systems to support counter RAM missions.

Language translation technologies

The budget request included \$67.0 million in PE 63772A for advanced tactical computer science and sensor technology develop-

ment, \$76.3 million in PE 63122D8Z for combating terrorism technology support, and \$137.7 million in PE 61102A for defense research sciences. The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities received testimony highlighting the need for the Department of Defense to significantly improve its language translation capabilities for a variety of operational missions—including intelligence analysis and peace and stability operations. Technologies being developed by the Department include speech and text translators, including handheld and bidirectional systems being designed to assist in translating a growing number of target languages. The committee notes that the Defense Science Board recently emphasized the need to advance these capabilities in its recent “21st Century Strategic Technology Vectors” study. To support these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63772A to continue the development of handheld translation systems, \$2.0 million in PE 63122D8Z for research on Arabic language analyses, and \$3.0 million in PE 61102A for research on document exploitation systems to assist intelligence analysts.

Radiation hardening initiative

The budget request included \$14.4 million in PE 63305A, Army Missile Defense Systems, but no funds for radiation hardening integration. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million for a radiation hardening initiative to improve understanding of radiation transport and effects, modeling and simulation tools, and radiation-hard design approaches. This activity should be closely coordinated with the Joint Radiation Hardened Electronics Oversight Council.

Active protection systems development and integration

The budget request contained \$142.5 million in PE 63653A for the advanced tank armament system, which includes funding for the integration of a suitable active protection system (APS) onto Stryker vehicles. The committee notes a recent December 2006 decision to restructure the Future Combat System (FCS) and designate the APS as a key spin out component, with a plan for fielding available systems on Stryker vehicles first. The committee notes that a recent independent assessment has expressed concern over the Army’s chosen technological approach to APS and the feasibility of its fielding as planned by 2010.

Given the likely acceleration of a number of threats, the committee supports the acceleration of the best possible protection systems to the current force, including tactical vehicles, and considers this a top force protection priority for the Army. Therefore, the committee directs the Army, in conjunction with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, to closely monitor the development and deployment of foreign and domestic APS, including where appropriate through the establishment of data exchange agreements and joint exercises and demonstrations.

To accelerate the fielding of operationally suitable APS onto Stryker vehicles, the committee recommends an increase of \$40.0 million in PE 63653A for technology integration efforts. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a detailed technical plan and schedule for efforts related to the technological mat-

uration of APS technologies and the integration of APS onto current force vehicles, prior to the obligation of any of these additional authorized funds. Further, the committee directs the Army to include sufficient funding in its future years budget, beginning with the fiscal year 2009 budget, to accomplish the stated goal of integration on Stryker by fiscal year 2010, which may require additional funding for both technological maturation of the APS technologies as well as funding for integration issues.

The budget request included \$142.5 million in PE 64660A for FCS manned ground vehicles and common ground vehicle. Given concerns about the maturity of APS currently under development, the committee recommends an increase of \$25.0 million in PE 64660A to support the development and testing of APS for FCS manned ground vehicles.

Undersea chemical weapons assessment program

The budget request included \$6.1 million in PE 63779A for environmental quality technology, but did not provide any funds for the Undersea Chemical Assessment program. This program will provide a comprehensive definition of risks presented by chemical weapons disposed of by the Department of Defense in selected undersea locations. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million in PE 63779A for the Undersea Chemical Assessment program.

Warfighter information network—tactical

The budget request included \$222.3 million in PE 63782A for the continued research and development of the Warfighter Information Network—Tactical (WIN-T) program. The committee notes with concern that this program has been troubled for a number of years, culminating in its January 2007 Nunn-McCurdy unit cost breach.

In title I of this Act, the committee has directed the Secretary of the Army to consolidate the joint network node program and the WIN-T program into one single Army tactical network program. The committee believes the Army can incrementally provide WIN-T capabilities to the warfighter in the near-term. However, the committee believes the Army cannot spin into the force these incremental improvements without funding support. Therefore, the committee recommends a \$100.0 million increase in funding for WIN-T research, development, test, and evaluation.

The committee also directs the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration and the Secretary of the Navy, to report to the committee, no later than 180 days after the enactment of this bill, on whether the Marine Corps should also be part of the single Army tactical network program. The committee is concerned that the two military services are not working in concert on the development of this important and expensive communications technology.

Future medical shelter systems

The budget request included \$12.5 million in PE 63807A for advanced development of medical systems. The committee notes that the Army is in the process of evaluating technologies for advanced combat support hospitals. These systems are vitally important for

the care of military casualties in theater, as well as for responding to domestic natural disasters. The committee recommends an additional \$7.5 million for the next phase of combat support hospital development.

Nickel boron metal coating technology for crew served weapons

The budget request included \$18.2 million in PE 63827 for soldier systems advanced development, but no funding for nickel boron metal coating technology for crew served weapons.

Blowing dust and sand as experienced in Iraq and Afghanistan penetrate weapon mechanisms and contribute to accelerated wear rates and reduced reliability. Worse, these conditions can result in weapons jamming in the middle of combat at great risk to the soldiers. Applying lubricious coatings to selected high-wear parts will significantly reduce or eliminate wear, while doing so to the entire weapon system will allow weapons to be operated without lubrication.

Funding is required to complete development and evaluate performance of nickel boron coatings on the M249 Squad Automatic Weapon to minimize the amount of lubricant needed during weapon functioning.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.3 million for that purpose.

Integrated broadcast service

The budget request included \$38.2 million for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) for the Integrated Broadcast Service program within the Army. This line item funds development of improvements for the Joint Tactical Terminals (JTT) used to receive the broadcast service. The fiscal year 2008 request reflects an increase of \$37.1 million over the fiscal year 2007 funding level, and the projected request for fiscal year 2009 falls back to \$13.7 million. The large single-year rise apparently reflects a decision by the Office of the Secretary of Defense to almost fully fund in 1 year a series of upgrades to all JTT radios. The committee recommends a reduction of \$10.0 million to fund higher priorities because the remaining requirement can be deferred until next year.

Family of heavy tactical vehicles

The budget request included \$2.0 million in PE 64622A for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E), Army for work associated with the family of heavy tactical vehicles, which includes the variants of the heavy expanded mobility tactical truck. This program element will fund the development of the Army's next generation tactical truck, as part of the Army's Tactical Wheeled Vehicle Modernization Strategy. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million to fund the RDT&E of oil and thermal management systems. Oil and thermal management systems have proven to extend the life of vehicle engines and other engine components, particularly in vehicles designed for long-haul missions.

Light Tactical Wheeled Vehicles

The budget request included \$82.3 million in PE 64642A for technology development for Light Tactical Wheeled Vehicles. Under this account, the Army pursues survivability, mobility, communications, energy and power, and autonomous technology improvements for the High Mobility Multi-purpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV) and the next generation HMMWV, known as the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV). The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 64642A for fuel cell vehicle propulsion research. This funding will permit the Army to pursue potential advanced fuel cell technologies and applications in the development of the JLTV.

Future combat systems

The budget request included \$3.6 billion for the Future Combat Systems (FCS). The committee has been, and continues to be, a strong supporter of Army transformation, and believes that the FCS program is the centerpiece of that transformation.

For many years the committee has expressed concern about the lack of strategic mobility for ground combat forces. This issue was illustrated by the problems the Army faced in projecting forces rapidly into the Balkans during the Kosovo crisis, and also by the length of time required to build up ground combat forces and the required logistical stockpiles for both Operation Desert Storm and Operation Iraqi Freedom. These latter operations were aided to some degree by the availability of pre-positioned equipment and by an adversary who failed to take advantage of the risk to U.S. forces from a slow build-up of combat power by launching a pre-emptive strike. Those conditions may not be present the next time ground combat forces must be quickly inserted into a hostile environment.

While strongly supporting the Army's plan to build the Objective Force, which was the term for the transformed force nearly a decade ago, the committee was admittedly skeptical of the Army plan to buy several brigades of interim armored vehicles. The committee believed at the time that the Army should indeed reorganize a number of its units into lighter, more mobile brigades, but believed that could be accomplished using combat vehicles currently in the inventory, such as the upgraded M113A3 armored personnel carrier. The committee was concerned that the added cost of acquiring "off-the-shelf" interim armored vehicles might eventually put the transformation to a new fleet of modern medium-weight combat vehicles at risk.

Responding to committee concerns, the Army did extensive analyses and comparative testing, and reconfirmed its decision, backed by the Secretary of Defense, to build new Interim Brigade Combat Teams with a new family of vehicles—the Strykers.

The committee notes that the Stryker Brigade Combat Teams (SBCT), by all reports, have been very successful in Iraq, and has supported additional funding for Strykers elsewhere in this report. The committee has also expressed concern about the Stryker Mobile Gun System elsewhere in this report, but believes that the SBCTs have provided a hint as to the future potential that the vastly more capable FCS Brigade Combat Teams will bring to the Army. However, adding seven SBCTs has provided only a hint, and

it would be a critical mistake to abandon the Army's core modernization effort, believing that seven Stryker Brigade Combat Teams solve the strategic mobility problem the Army continues to confront, or that marginal modernization of the current force postures the Army for the challenges of the future.

The committee believed that the original FCS program was much too risky, and was fully in agreement with the first program restructure, and in particular supported the addition of previously deferred systems and the spin out of promising FCS technologies to the current force.

Consequently, the committee is concerned about the most recent restructure, which now eliminates or defers four of the systems and stretches the fielding of FCS Brigade Combat Teams over a longer period of time. The committee believes this decision was purely a result of budgetary concerns, and does not reflect either a change in requirements or programmatic difficulties. The committee believes FCS is a well-run program which is well within cost and schedule parameters of the earned value management system.

Most troubling in the latest restructure is the elimination of the Armed Robotic Vehicle (ARV), both the Assault and Reconnaissance, Surveillance, and Target Acquisition (RSTA) variants, which will provide a survivable means for the commander to sense and deliver desired effects on the enemy without jeopardizing the lives of soldiers. The ARV is highly mobile and well suited for both mounted and dismounted forces—the only robotic platform that is capable of maneuvering with the FCS manned ground vehicles, survivable in direct engagements, and lethal enough to defeat the enemy. The committee believes that it is short sighted to eliminate such a capability.

The committee also believes that any proposals or decisions to further curtail or stretch out the FCS program are also extremely short sighted. The Nation cannot afford to mortgage the future to pay current bills by curtailing Army transformation to meet the demands of the current conflict. History teaches that, while we do not know precisely the nature of future conflict, we do know that future conflict will come. If history is a guide, the Americans most at risk will be those who engage in direct ground combat.

The committee believes that the FCS program, the centerpiece of Army transformation and modernization, will provide the American soldier with lethal and survivable systems, and a versatile organization which will allow him to prevail no matter the nature of future conflicts.

The committee recommends an increase of \$90.0 million in PE 64663A to restore the ARV to the FCS program, and encourages the Army to include adequate funding in the future years defense program for that purpose.

Combat identification

The budget request included \$11.3 million in PE 64817A for combat identification. Under this account, the Army seeks to maximize overall combat effectiveness by mitigating incidents of fratricide and maximizing the situational understanding of the warfighter. This is achieved by rapid, reliable identification of friends, foes, and neutrals in the battle space. To accelerate research in this

area, the committee recommends an increase in PE 64817A of \$2.0 million for the research and development of a single channel ground and airborne radio system-based combat identification technology.

High energy laser systems test facility

The budget request included \$2.8 million in PE 65605A for the Department of Defense High Energy Laser Systems Test Facility (HELSTF). The committee understands that this low level of funding will result in a reduction in contractor support personnel and reduces the Department's ability to adequately test planned high energy laser weapon systems such as the Airborne Laser and the High Energy Laser Technology Demonstrator, as well as support for work of the Joint Technology Office for High Energy Lasers. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.5 million for operations at HELSTF.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army, the Director of the Test Resource Management Center, and the Director of the High Energy Laser Joint Technology Office to report jointly to Congress on a plan, including required funding over the Future Years Defense Program, to develop and maintain adequate personnel, resources, and facilities to test current and future high energy laser systems, no later than March 1, 2008.

HIMARS modular launcher communications system

The budget request included \$54.1 million in PE 63778A for the Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS) product improvement program, but no funding for the High Mobility Artillery Rocket System (HIMARS) Modular Launcher Communications System (MLCS).

The HIMARS Operational Requirements Document (ORD) contains a requirement for a sensor-to-effects capability using the M142 HIMARS launchers assigned to active component and National Guard HIMARS units. Sensor-to-effects capability significantly reduces target engagement timelines, improves combat effectiveness, and increases flexibility associated with attacking time-sensitive, high value targets.

The committee notes that work is currently on-going for this system upgrade and additional funding is required in fiscal year 2008 to accelerate this needed capability.

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million in PE 63778A for HIMARS MCLS to accelerate the development, integration, and testing of sensor-to-effects.

Combat vehicle improvement programs

The budget request included \$27.6 million in PE 23735A for combat vehicle improvement programs, but no funding for Vehicle Health Management systems development or for combat vehicle transmission improvement.

Vehicle Health Management is a set of maintenance processes and capabilities derived from real-time assessments of weapon system conditions obtained from embedded sensors and software. The goal of Vehicle Health Management is to perform maintenance only upon evidence of need and to limit the time it takes to troubleshoot failures. Vehicle Health Management represents a conscious effort

to shift equipment maintenance from a reactive, preventive approach at the time of failure to a more routine and predictive approach using real-time vehicle information. It will improve maintenance and readiness, and reduce major sustainability costs.

Funding is needed to support design efforts and to prototype data collection systems on-board the Heavy Brigade Combat Team (HBCT) vehicles, to design and procure network systems to offload the vehicle data, and to analyze the vehicle data to perform failure analysis and failure prediction.

Tank and armored personnel carrier transmissions have not significantly changed in 30 years and are the second largest cost driver in terms of operation and support costs.

Funding is needed for electronic controls for the Abram tank X1100 series transmission. These controls immediately make available a wealth of information and data that can be mined by a Vehicle Health Management system to monitor transmission function and health. Proper diagnosis of faults prior to transmission removal offers one of the most effective means of reducing operating and support costs.

The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million for Vehicle Health Management systems development, and \$4.9 million for combat vehicle transmission improvement, for a total of \$38.5 million.

Helicopter autonomous landing system

The budget request included \$325.6 million in PE 23744A for aircraft modifications and product improvement programs, but no funding for the Helicopter Autonomous Landing System (HALS).

Utility flight operations are accomplished today using best available training, tactics, and procedures to minimize flight in degraded visual conditions. However, this is not always possible—for example, one recent unofficial study of all 251 U.S. Army Class A–B rotary wing mishaps ascribed to “human factors” from fiscal years 1985 to 2005 counted 52 landing mishaps. These 52 landing mishaps involved a total of 8 fatalities and 20 major injuries. All these fatalities and all these major injuries except one occurred in degraded visual conditions (brownout, whiteout, or instrument flight rules). Materiel solutions, to include hover symbology and fully coupled flight directors, are being integrated into the UH–60M helicopter and will significantly improve operations in degraded visual conditions.

The materiel solution to counter brownout conditions consists of a three-phase approach. Phase–1 or Brownout Situational Awareness Upgrade (BSAU) is precision hover symbology cockpit display; Phase–2 is two-axis automated hover hold; Phase–3 or Helicopter Autonomous Landing System (HALS) is a visual based “see-through” capability based on radar and/or forward looking infrared technology. Additional funding is needed to bring the HALS Phase–3 design achieved through funding in fiscal year 2006 to a level capable of production for potential application onto both legacy and modernized UH–60 helicopters.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for HALS, for a total of \$330.6 million.

Joint tactical ground station

The budget request included \$23.5 million in PE 28053A for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) of the Joint Tactical Ground Station (JTAGS). Army and Air Force plans for mobile ground stations to receive and exploit the Space-Based Infrared System (SBIRS) are not synchronized and are not funded across the future-years defense program. The committee recommends a reduction to the request of \$10.0 million, to offset higher funding priorities.

Navy

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY			
		Basic Research			
0601103N	1	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	76,637	9,000	85,637
		Program increase		[9,000]	
0601152N	2	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	16,556		16,556
0601153N	3	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	374,052	1,000	375,052
		Science & technology educational outreach programs		[1,000]	
		Applied Research			
0602114N	4	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	83,419	3,000	86,419
		Infrared materials research		[3,000]	
0602123N	5	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	155,936	13,500	169,436
		Undersea perimeter security systems		[3,500]	
		Port security technologies		[2,000]	
		Unmanned sea surface vessel propulsion & power research		[3,000]	
		Energy systems integration research		[2,000]	
		UAV fuel cell technologies		[2,000]	
		Critical composite technologies for SOF medium range		[1,000]	
0602131M	6	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	26,785	4,500	31,285
		Rapid awareness systems		[4,500]	
0602234N	7	MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY			
0602235N	8	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	93,376		93,376

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0602236N	9	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	88,297		88,297
0602271N	10	RF SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH RF power technologies	45,451	3,000 [3,000]	48,451
0602435N	11	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	49,869		49,869
0602651M	12	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	6,081		6,081
0602747N	13	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH Vector sensor technology development	68,455	3,000 [3,000]	71,455
0602782N	14	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH Advanced Technology Development	59,874		59,874
0603114N	15	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY Excalibur UAV Free electron laser research	49,684	5,000 [1,000]	54,684
0603123N	16	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY Navy manufacturing & repair cell Development of wide-band gap semiconductor materials Navy/USMC fuel cell non tactical vehicle initiative Autonomous superconducting fault current limiting systems Electrochemical field-deployable system for potable water generation Fuel cell manufacturability research Single generator operations lithium ion battery	70,850	29,300 [5,000] [5,000] [4,900] [3,000] [3,000] [3,400] [5,000]	100,150
0603235N	17	COMMON PICTURE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	40,782		40,782

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0603236N	18	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	102,124		102,124
0603271N	19	RF SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	22,676		22,676
0603640M	20	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	70,968	5,000	75,968
		Acoustic combat sensors		[5,000]	
0603651M	21	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMEN	10,938		10,938
0603727N	22	NAVY TECHNICAL INFORMATION PRESENTATION SYSTEM			
0603729N	23	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	12,145		12,145
0603747N	24	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	73,626		73,626
0603758N	25	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	41,196		41,196
0603782N	26	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOL	26,840		26,840
		Advanced Component Development & Prototypes			
0603207N	27	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	47,914		47,914
0603216N	28	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	6,252		6,252
0603237N	29	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	9,475		9,475
0603254N	30	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	16,706		16,706
0603261N	31	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	4,063		4,063
0603382N	32	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	9,331		9,331
0603502N	33	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURE;	91,122		91,122
0603506N	34	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	15,967	1,500	17,467
		Sensor arrays for multiple applications (SAMA)		[1,500]	
0603512N	35	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	84,806		84,806

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0603513N	36	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	9,450	29,400	38,850
		Smart valve		[3,000]	
		Power conversion equipment		[2,500]	
		High temperature superconducting AC synchronous propulsion r		[14,400]	
		Shipboard flywheel energy storage system		[9,500]	
0603525N	37	PILOT FISH	132,131		132,131
0603527N	38	RETRACT LARCH	89,601		89,601
0603536N	39	RETRACT JUNIPER	37,405		37,405
0603542N	40	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	1,546		1,546
0603553N	41	SURFACE ASW	25,560	4,000	29,560
		Improved surface vessel torpedo tube launcher		[4,000]	
0603559N	42	SSGN CONVERSION			
0603561N	43	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	134,882	29,500	164,382
		Undersea missile launch study (ULMS)		[25,000]	
		Twinline thin line towed array		[4,500]	
0603562N	44	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	9,865		9,865
0603563N	45	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	30,858	4,000	34,858
		Next generation shipboard monitoring		[4,000]	
0603564N	46	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	18,736		18,736
0603570N	47	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	166,196		166,196
0603573N	48	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0603576N	49	CHALK EAGLE	211,201		211,201
0603581N	50	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	217,502		217,502
0603582N	51	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	53,427		53,427
0603609N	52	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	8,941		8,941
0603611M	53	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	288,220	-100,000	188,220
		Expeditionary fighting vehicle (EFV)		[-100,000]	
0603612M	54	USMC MINE COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	657		657
0603635M	55	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	80,403	20,000	100,403
		Joint light tactical vehicle (JLTV) - transfer from Title XV		[20,000]	
0603654N	56	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	83,361		83,361
0603658N	57	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	33,283		33,283
0603713N	58	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	5,122		5,122
0603721N	59	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	19,850		19,850
0603724N	60	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	5,335		5,335
0603725N	61	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	4,131		4,131
0603734N	62	CHALK CORAL	28,297		28,297
0603739N	63	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	3,547	4,000	7,547
		Highly integrated optical interconnects for advanced air vehicles		[4,000]	
0603746N	64	RETRACT MAPLE	346,144		346,144
0603748N	65	LINK PLUMERIA	88,748		88,748
0603751N	66	RETRACT ELM	79,144		79,144

165

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0603755N	67	SHIP SELF DEFENSE	10,954		10,954
0603764N	68	LINK EVERGREEN	31,607		31,607
0603787N	69	SPECIAL PROCESSES	40,940		40,940
0603790N	70	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,934		9,934
0603795N	71	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	31,021		31,021
0603851M	72	NONLETHAL WEAPONS	45,892		45,892
0603857N	73	ALL SERVICE COMBAT IDENTIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM			
0603860N	74	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	70,811		70,811
0603879N	75	SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP) SYSTEM ENGINEE	46,450		46,450
0603889N	76	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS			
0603925N	77	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS			
0604272N	78	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURE	27,569	4,000	31,569
		High power fiber laser - base pod		[4,000]	
0604327N	79	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDB	126,434	-126,434	
		Conventional Trident missile (CTM)		[-126,434]	
0604450N	80	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	15,000		15,000
0604707N	81	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/	42,295		42,295
0604787N	82	JOINT WARFARE TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMS			
		System Development & Demonstration			
0604212N	83	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	46,815		46,815
0604214N	84	AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	17,360		17,360

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0604215N	85	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	106,242		106,242
0604216N	86	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	78,151		78,151
0604218N	87	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	5,162		5,162
0604221N	88	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	8,621		8,621
0604230N	89	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	2,911		2,911
0604231N	90	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	86,921		86,921
0604234N	91	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	808,993		808,993
0604245N	92	H-1 UPGRADES	3,608		3,608
0604261N	93	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	18,325		18,325
0604262N	94	V-22A	117,997		117,997
0604264N	95	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	24,267		24,267
0604269N	96	EA-18	272,699		272,699
0604270N	97	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	41,064		41,064
0604273N	98	VH-71A EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	270,971		270,971
0604280N	99	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM - NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	853,676		853,676
0604300N	100	SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING Permanent magnet motor system Advanced wireless encryption module	621,544	15,000 [9,000]	636,544
0604307N	101	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	142,810		142,810
0604311N	102	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	4,300		4,300
0604329N	103	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	9,832		9,832

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0604366N	104	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	231,791		231,791
0604373N	105	AIRBORNE MCM	54,761		54,761
0604378N	106	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL - COUNTER AIR SYSTEM	11,497		11,497
0604501N	107	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	121,494		121,494
0604503N	108	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	114,789	4,400	119,189
		Improved submarine thin line towed array handler & array reliabi		[4,400]	
0604504N	109	AIR CONTROL	4,166		4,166
0604507N	110	ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR			
0604512N	111	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	28,100		28,100
0604518N	112	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	17,139	4,000	21,139
		Combat information center conversion		[4,000]	
0604558N	113	NEW DESIGN SSN	223,958	6,000	229,958
		Submarine electronic chart updates		[6,000]	
0604561N	114	SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	2,457		2,457
0604562N	115	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	53,703		53,703
0604567N	116	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	62,404	4,900	67,304
		LHA[R] design - transfer from NDSF		[4,900]	
0604574N	117	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES			
0604601N	118	MINE DEVELOPMENT	2,092		2,092
0604603N	119	UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS			
0604610N	120	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	27,056		27,056

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0604618N	121	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION			
0604654N	122	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	10,382		10,382
0604703N	123	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	8,830		8,830
0604721N	124	BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTENSION SYSTEM			
0604727N	125	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	24,851		24,851
0604755N	126	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	33,064		33,064
0604756N	127	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	67,366	9,800	77,166
		Phalanx next generation		[9,800]	
0604757N	128	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	34,323	9,000	43,323
		NULKA decoy research & development		[9,000]	
0604761N	129	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	1,959		1,959
0604771N	130	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	7,973	4,000	11,973
		Hemostatic agent research		[4,000]	
0604777N	131	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	42,121		42,121
0604784N	132	DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM			
0604800N	133	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	1,707,372	220,300	1,927,672
		Excessive unearned award fee carry over		[-19,700]	
		Continue alternate engine development		[240,000]	
0604910N	134	SMART CARD			
0605013M	135	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	22,181		22,181
0605013N	136	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	54,098		54,098

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0605172N	137	MULTINATIONAL INFORMATION SHARING (MNIS)			
0605212N	138	CH-53K RDTE	417,161		417,161
0605500N	139	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	880,106		880,106
0304785N	140	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	39,053		39,053
		RDT&E Management Support			
0604256N	141	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	23,924		23,924
0604258N	142	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	32,376		32,376
0604759N	143	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	37,614		37,614
0605152N	144	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	7,516		7,516
0605154N	145	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	49,360		49,360
0605155N	146	FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT			
0605502N	147	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0605804N	148	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	694		694
0605853N	149	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	49,498		49,498
0605856N	150	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,452		3,452
0605861N	151	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	68,180		68,180
0605862N	152	RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	1,423		1,423
0605863N	153	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	184,541		184,541
0605864N	154	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	336,130		336,130
0605865N	155	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	12,176		12,176
0605866N	156	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	2,439		2,439

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0605867N	157	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	29,071		29,071
0605873M	158	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	20,166		20,166
0305885N	159	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	1,508		1,508
0804758N	160	SERVICE SUPPORT TO JFCOM, JNTC	5,078		5,078
0909999N	161	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
		Operational Systems Development			
0603660N	162	ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	[]		[]
0604227N	163	HARPOON MODIFICATIONS	43,470		43,470
0604402N	164	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMF	161,665		161,665
0101221N	165	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	81,398	-6,000	75,398
		RRW Phase 3		[-15,000]	
		LINAC		[9,000]	
0101224N	166	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	33,109		33,109
0101226N	167	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	4,149		4,149
0101402N	168	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	36,531		36,531
0203761N	169	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	44,756		44,756
0204136N	170	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	44,891		44,891
0204152N	171	E-2 SQUADRONS	22,691		22,691
0204163N	172	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	23,108		23,108
0204229N	173	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (	11,405		11,405
0204311N	174	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	27,740		27,740

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0204413N	175	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CI	1,845		1,845
0204571N	176	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	6,987		6,987
0204574N	177	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,443		1,443
0204575N	178	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	34,340		34,340
0205601N	179	HARM IMPROVEMENT	34,762		34,762
0205604N	180	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	5,534		5,534
0205620N	181	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	11,200		11,200
0205632N	182	MK-48 ADCAP	17,941		17,941
0205633N	183	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	100,284	4,000	104,284
		Structural life tracking		[4,000]	
0205658N	184	NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	3,473		3,473
0205675N	185	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	71,720		71,720
0206313M	186	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	280,140		280,140
0206623M	187	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYS	57,177	13,700	70,877
		Ultrasonic consolidation of embedded sensors		[3,900]	
		Anti-sniper infrared targeting system (ASITS)		[9,800]	
0206624M	188	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	12,946		12,946
0207161N	189	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	4,445		4,445
0207163N	190	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	4,579		4,579
0208058N	191	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	18,934		18,934
0301303N	192	MARITIME INTELLIGENCE	[]		[]

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0301323N	193	COLLECTION MANAGEMENT	[]		[]
0301327N	194	TECHNICAL RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEILLANCE	[]		[]
0303109N	195	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	736,572	13,000	749,572
		UHF gap risk reduction		[10,000]	
		IPv6		[3,000]	
0303140N	196	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	28,393		28,393
0303158M	197	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	1,007		1,007
0303158N	198	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	5,015		5,015
0305149N	199	COBRA JUDY	132,679		132,679
0305160N	200	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (ME	4,887		4,887
0305188N	201	JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)			
0305192N	202	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	5,444		5,444
0305204N	203	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	50,185		50,185
0305205N	204	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	116,666		116,666
0305206N	205	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	50,677		50,677
0305207N	206	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	22,488		22,488
0305208N	207	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	19,350		19,350
0307207N	208	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS)	16,606		16,606
0308601N	209	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	7,832		7,832
0702207N	210	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	19,402		19,402
0702239N	211	AVONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,635		1,635

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0708011N	212	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	56,445	2,500	58,945
		Materials stress measurement technologies		[2,500]	
0708730N	213	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)		15,000	15,000
		National Shipbuilding Research Program		[15,000]	
	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,219,225	-1,045,007	174,218
		Total, RDT&E Navy	17,075,536	-779,141	16,296,395

Navy science and technology educational outreach

The budget request included \$374.1 million in PE 61153N for defense research sciences. The committee notes that many expert studies, including efforts by the services and the National Academies of Sciences have concluded that a greater emphasis must be placed on K-12 educational activities in math and science in order to increase the likelihood that the nation will have enough scientific and engineering talent to meet its future needs. The need for a highly qualified pool of technical specialists is particularly acute for the Department of Defense, given its need for clearable scientists and engineers. To support initiatives to stimulate math and science education and outreach efforts by Navy scientists and engineers, the committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million for naval science and technology educational outreach activities.

Infrared materials research

The budget request included \$83.4 million in PE 62114N for applied research in power projection technologies. The committee notes that the Navy and Marine Corps have a number of initiatives developing infrared seeker technologies, and that the Army has official technology objectives in third-generation infrared technologies and low-cost, high-resolution infrared focal plane arrays. In support of these efforts, and in conjunction with ongoing efforts of the Army's small business innovative research program, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million for infrared materials research for military applications.

Undersea perimeter security technologies

The budget request included \$155.9 million in PE 62123N for applied research on force protection technologies. The Navy's Maritime Domain Awareness science and technology focus area has a specific technology objective of improving homeland and port defense monitoring capabilities by developing "new systems and protocols for target identification and tracking using fixed and deployable cueing systems." Consistent with this technology objective, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million for the development of a deployable undersea threat detection, classification, and response system; and an increase of \$2.0 million for the development of deployable, rapid under-hull inspection capabilities.

Navy energy and power technologies

The budget request included \$155.9 million in PE 62123N for applied research on force protection technologies. The committee notes that the Navy is seeking to develop next generation shipborne directed energy weaponry, which will require advanced power and energy systems, as well alternative energy technologies for a variety of platforms. Consistent with the Navy's High Energy and Pulse Power Technology Objective which seeks to develop energy storage power system architectures and pulsed power control systems, the committee recommends an additional \$2.0 million to develop energy delivery technologies for advanced naval weapons systems. Consistent with the Navy's Energy Storage Technology Objective to provide reliable power sources for all non-nuclear systems, the committee recommends an additional \$2.0 million for the

development of fuel cells for unmanned aerial vehicle applications, and an additional \$3.0 million for propulsion systems for unmanned surface vessels.

Composites research for special operations craft

The budget request included \$155.9 million in PE 62123N for applied research on force protection technologies. The committee recommends an additional \$1.0 million for critical composites technologies for special operations forces medium range endurance craft.

Situational awareness processing technologies

The budget request included \$26.8 million in PE 62131M for applied research on force protection technologies. The committee notes that one of the Marine Corps' science and technology objectives is the development of "improved situational awareness for warfighters at all echelons." Consistent with that objective, the committee recommends an additional \$4.5 million for applied research on the distribution of tactical information to individual warfighters.

Navy electronics research

The budget request included \$45.5 million in PE 62271N for radio frequency systems applied research. The committee notes that next generation Navy radars, communications, and electronic warfare systems will all depend on advanced high power microelectronics. The Navy's Power and Energy science and technology focus area includes the specific objective of developing new materials to increase the efficiency and power density of Navy systems. To complement these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million for research on advanced semiconductor radio frequency power technologies.

Undersea sensor arrays

The budget request included \$68.5 million in PE 62747N for applied research on undersea warfare technologies. The committee notes that the Navy's Maritime Domain Awareness science and technology focus area has a vision to "locate and track any target of interest on, under or above the water . . . using integrated networks of persistent sensors." This focus area has a specific technology objective of developing tactical sensor networks that are secure, survivable, self-healing, and adaptable. The committee further notes that the Chief of Naval Operations has indicated that critical anti-submarine warfare enhancements are among the Navy's highest unfunded priorities. Consistent with those priorities and goals, the committee recommends an additional \$3.0 million for the development of advanced sensor arrays to enhance maritime domain awareness.

Tactical unmanned air vehicles

The budget request included \$49.7 million in PE 63114N for advanced power projection technologies. The committee has long supported the efforts of the services to increase the number of unmanned air systems being used for military operations. The com-

mittee notes that the Marine Corps' highly responsive loitering munitions science and technology objective seeks to develop munitions which can be deployed aboard an unmanned air vehicle. In support of this goal, the committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million for development of tactical unmanned air vehicles in coordination with Army efforts in this area.

Free electron laser research

The budget request included \$49.7 million in PE 63114N for advanced technologies for power projection. The committee notes that the Navy has explored the use of free electron lasers as a weapons system, as well as for industrial manufacturing applications. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for research on the use of free electron lasers for manufacturing of military systems.

Force protection advanced technology

The budget request included \$70.8 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology. This program addresses applied research associated with providing force protection capability for all naval platforms.

The budget request included no funding for development of a transportable manufacturing and repair cell. This cell would reduce operating and support costs, while maintaining equipment readiness in theater. The cell would be deployable by ships and large ground vehicles, and would provide precision, on-demand manufacturing of critical parts for the Navy and Marine Corps. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for the development of a transportable manufacturing and repair cell.

The budget request included no funding for continuing the development of wide band gap semiconductor substrate materials. These materials offer capability for higher power and higher frequency operation in high temperature environments across a broad spectrum of applications. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for the continued development of wide band gap semiconductor substrate material.

The budget request included no funding for any initiative to leverage rapidly developing ongoing advances in hydrogen-powered fuel cell vehicle technology to enable revolutionary changes in the Department of the Navy non-tactical vehicle fleet. Fuel cells powered by hydrogen could totally change the present dependence on petroleum as the logistics fuel and could offer the ability to run systems silently and with significantly reduced thermal signatures for missions requiring low probability of detection. In previous years, the Department of the Navy conducted several short-term demonstrations of hydrogen fuel cell powered vehicles. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.9 million for an expanded demonstration of fuel cell vehicles, to include an extended vehicle range refueling capability enhancement to include testing that could establish the basis for a potential full qualification of a hydrogen-powered fuel cell vehicle for fleet operations.

The budget request included no funding for development of autonomous superconducting fault current limiting systems. Modern electric power generation and distribution systems on naval ships

are susceptible to catastrophic high current surges (i.e., fault currents) that may result in permanent equipment damage and total power system shutdowns. Efficient, reliable, and stable shipboard power systems are critical to the operation of present and future naval surface combatants. Conventional hardware systems (e.g., fuses, circuit breakers, etc.) provide some degree of protection, but are insufficient to meet the critical requirements for reliable, uninterrupted power under the most adverse conditions of warfare. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million to develop a current limiting system to help address current and future shipboard power systems issues.

The budget request included no funding for continued development of an electrochemical field-deployable system for generating potable water. The Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–289) provided \$1.0 million to accomplish Phase I objectives to develop, establish, and demonstrate an economical process to make sodium hypochlorite, and team with potential industrial and medical end users. If the program is to succeed, the Navy needs to complete Phase I and begin Phase II of the program which would: (i) conduct long-term testing of sub-scale electrochemical cell membrane modules; (ii) demonstrate a sub-scale technology unit; and (iii) begin concept design of full-scale electrochemical cell membrane modules. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million to complete Phase I and begin Phase II of this activity.

The budget request included no funding for improving the capability to manufacture fuel cells to help accelerate the application of fuel cells for a wide range of Department of Defense electrical power needs, including ships and submarines, ground vehicles, mobile electric power for bases and other field equipment, and aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.4 million to enable the Department of the Navy to advance fuel cell manufacturing feasibility and readiness for field testing.

The budget request included no funding for development of a lithium battery technology that could replace one of the three generators normally in operation or reserve aboard all large Navy ships. The primary purpose would be to save the costs of fuel consumed by the primary reserve generator, which must operate constantly as a back-up source of power for the ship's primary propulsion and electrical systems. Such a battery system could provide a lower cost, higher quality source of electrical power that would replace redundant back-up power sources dedicated to subsystems throughout the ship. The battery would also eliminate the possibility of a ship experiencing a catastrophic loss of power ("going dark") due to a cascading failure of generators and an inability to restart the main engines following a loss of main power. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million to enable the development of such lithium battery technology.

The committee recommends a total authorization of \$100.1 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology.

Ground sensor networks

The budget request included \$71.0 million in PE 63640M for Marine Corps advanced technology demonstrations. The committee

notes that small arms fire accounts for a large number of coalition casualties in Iraq and Afghanistan, and that a number of services and defense agencies are pursuing technological solutions to meet urgent needs of deployed forces. To support these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for the development of ground sensor networks that can detect and locate hostile fire.

Navy sensor arrays

The budget request included \$16.0 million in PE 63506N, but included no funding to develop new technology sensors that would exploit the advantages of these sensors in arrays and integrate them into micro-arrays. The committee understands that there have been some innovative developments in sensor technology that offer significant promise for the fielding of better sensor arrays for torpedo defense and for other potential applications on the battlefield. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.5 million to pursue better array technology.

Shipboard system component development

The budget request included \$9.4 million in PE 63513N for shipboard system component development, but included no funding for Smart Valve development, power conversion equipment for high density power generation packages, high temperature superconductor alternating current (HTS-AC) synchronous marine propulsion motor development, or shipboard flywheel energy storage systems.

Smart Valve is an advancement in control system technology applied to the design for bleed air regulating, control, and relief valves on existing and future gas turbine naval vessels. Existing bleed air valves for gas turbine ships are subject to high maintenance costs and reliability concerns. Smart Valve provides an advanced linear electro-mechanical actuator design for accurate and quick response, and includes self-diagnostic capability for preventive, condition-based maintenance. Increased service life and improved functional design with Smart Valves results in reduced maintenance and reduced life cycle cost. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million to complete development and testing of a prototype Smart Valve.

The development of component technologies for power system management is critical to the success of the Navy's efforts to field the all-electric warship. Power conversion equipment for high density power generation is one of the key enabling capabilities required by the integrated power distribution systems required by the all-electric warship. The committee is aware that ongoing efforts to develop next generation power conversion equipment for the DDG-1000 destroyer and CG(X) cruiser programs requires funding to complete the proof of concept. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million to complete development of power conversion equipment for an advanced high density power generation system.

The Navy has been developing and testing a 36.5 megawatt prototype HTS-AC synchronous propulsion motor. The Navy will take delivery of a prototype of such a motor for final testing during fiscal year 2007. Additional funding is required in fiscal year 2008 to

support full power testing of the prototype motor, and to complete the preliminary design for militarization of the HTS-AC motor and associated drive system for potential application to a future surface combatant. The committee recommends an increase of \$14.4 million to continue development and testing of the HTS-AC synchronous marine propulsion motor.

Flywheels have long been targeted as an energy storage technology for emerging applications, and as such, are included in the Militarily Critical Technologies list. In particular, the Navy has identified a list of critical shipboard applications of flywheel energy storage systems that includes: “Dark Start,” uninterrupted power to essential loads, leveling loads faced by the electrical system, and single generator operation. Additional efforts would develop and test a flywheel energy storage system with greater power density and output that is fully adapted to the shipboard environment. The committee recommends an increase of \$9.5 million to continue development and testing of a flywheel energy storage system.

The committee recommends a total authorization of \$38.8 million in PE 63513N for shipboard system component development.

Surface vessel torpedo tubes

The budget request included no funds in PE 63513N for developing better torpedo tube technology for surface ships. The Navy has been managing a Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) project to develop a modular, gas generator launch canister. This project is employing commercial, off-the-shelf (COTS), automobile-style air bags for launch energy. Employing such long shelf life COTS components could greatly reduce the maintenance burden of keeping air flask-based torpedo tubes in operational condition. Additional funding in fiscal year 2008 would continue fabrication and testing of two advanced development models (ADMs) that could launch lightweight torpedoes from unmanned surface vessels (USV) planned for the Littoral Combat Ship. These ADMs could also serve as the basis for an option to backfit during the Arleigh Burke class destroyer modernization program. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 63513N to continue development of an improved launch capability for surface vessel torpedo tubes.

Advanced submarine system development

The budget request included \$134.9 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine systems development. The design and development efforts in these programs are to evaluate a broad range of system and technology alternatives to directly support and enhance the mission capability of current submarines and future submarine concepts.

The budget request included no funding to begin studies that would lead to developing a replacement for the Ohio class strategic missile submarine program which was designed in the 1970s. The Navy has begun low level studies under a program called the Undersea Launch Missile Study (ULMS). The efforts within ULMS will involve exploring new technologies, conceptual design of ship configurations, supporting ship systems, consideration of strategic payloads, and development of other payloads.

However, there appears to be insufficient work to maintain the skill set among submarine designers until the Navy would otherwise start designing a replacement for the Ohio class. A recent report by the RAND Corporation evaluating the submarine design industrial base concluded that it would be less expensive to sustain some number of workers in excess of those needed to meet the residual design demands during such a gap. One means of achieving this goal would be to begin the more extensive design activities earlier than the Navy would otherwise start them to support a specific date to start building the next class. The committee believes that the Navy should start that effort in fiscal year 2008 and recommends an increase of \$25.0 million for that purpose.

The budget request included \$13.5 million for a variety of advanced submarine sensors, including the twin line, thin line towed array. Twin line towed array geometries lead to improved gain and better target motion analysis by resolving the right-left ambiguity of a single line array without the need for ship maneuvering. This approach would provide an efficient means of achieving significant improvement in detection, fire control, and self-defense capabilities. The committee recommends an additional \$4.5 million to demonstrate twin line, thin line towed array technology.

The committee recommends a total authorization of \$164.4 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine system development.

Next generation shipboard monitoring

The budget request included \$30.9 million in PE 63563N for Ship Concept Advanced Design, but included no funding for next generation shipboard monitoring. The Navy has placed a priority on reducing operating and maintenance costs for in-service and future ship classes, which requires that all ships in the fleet transition to condition-based maintenance. Condition-based maintenance requires ships to be equipped with a system that effectively monitors equipment performance, performs diagnostics, and provides predictive analysis for plant operation and maintenance. Additional funding for next generation shipboard monitoring is necessary to integrate and implement open system diagnostic data infrastructure and monitoring systems for shipboard equipment. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 63563N for next generation shipboard monitoring.

Expeditionary fighting vehicle

The budget request included \$288.2 million in PE 63611M for the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle (EFV). The EFV is a high speed, amphibious, armored tracked vehicle for transporting marines from amphibious ships over the horizon to shore and inland. The Department of Defense Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation directed a reduction to the Marine Corps' acquisition objective, which was reduced from 1,013 to 573 vehicles in fiscal year 2006.

The EFV program entered the system development and design phase in December 2000, and was scheduled to award a Low Rate Initial Production (LRIP) contract late in fiscal year 2006. Operational assessment of the vehicle's performance during 2006 determined that the EFV, while meeting most key performance parameters, fell critically short of requirements for system reliability.

Therefore, the Department deferred LRIP and conducted an independent review, which determined that redesign of the EFV would be required in order to correct significant system engineering deficiencies.

The compounding impacts of a 45 percent reduction to the EFV program's acquisition objective and a 3 or 4 year further delay to the LRIP decision resulted in a critical Nunn-McCurdy breach. The committee is awaiting the Secretary of Defense's determination on whether the EFV program meets the certification requirements under section 2433 of title 10, United States Code.

The Department's reliance upon the EFV test program to reveal failures in fundamental systems engineering for this major program reflects a disturbing trend in systems acquisition. Equally troubling is the belated acknowledgment that the vehicle design has been overly-influenced by performance requirements that are unreasonable and unnecessary.

If the EFV program is certified by the Secretary of Defense, it would resume development in the third quarter of the current fiscal year. The resultant under-execution in fiscal year 2007 provides significant carryover of funding into fiscal year 2008. The committee recommends a reduction of \$100.0 million in fiscal year 2008 in PE 63611M.

The committee is aware that the Department's corrective action plan includes production of new vehicles, which adds significant cost and schedule to the development effort. The committee is concerned that the Department arrived at this decision independent of root cause analysis of the operational assessment results. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees providing the root cause analysis for the EFV reliability failures prior to obligation of funding toward production of a new prototype EFV. The report shall include the Department's assessment correlating the reliability failures to the requirement to produce new test vehicles.

Joint light tactical vehicle

The budget request included \$80.4 million in PE 63635M for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) for Marine Corps Ground Combat/Support Systems. The war-related budget request for fiscal year 2008 also included \$35.8 million for the same program element. Of this \$35.8 million, \$20.0 million is requested for acceleration of the development of the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV). The JLTV development program has nothing to do with ongoing military operations and should be funded exclusively in the base budget. The committee recommends a reduction to the war-related budget request for JLTV of \$20.0 million and an increase of \$20.0 million for JLTV development in the base budget.

Optical interconnect

The budget request included \$3.5 million in PE 63739N for Navy logistics productivity initiatives, but include no funding to develop low cost, high quality fiber optic interconnect technology for military aerospace application. The Department of Defense continues to demand increasing data processing, communication, and system control capabilities. The next generation data and communication

management systems needed for weapons systems will depend upon tightly integrated optical fiber solutions, also known as optical interconnect. This solution optimizes space utilization while achieving high bandwidth, decreased weight, immunity to electromagnetic interference, resistance to corrosion, and improved safety and security. The Navy has requirements for next generation optical interconnect technology for several aircraft platform systems, and anticipates that this technology could be applied to Navy vessels as well. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million to develop this important technology.

Tactical aircraft direct infrared countermeasures development

The budget request included \$27.6 million in PE 64272N for developing and testing airborne electronic attack systems under the tactical aircraft direct infrared countermeasures (TADIRCM) development. The TADIRCM program develops electronic warfare systems for the United States Navy, United States Marine Corps, and the United States Army tactical aircraft, Marine Corps helicopters, Navy surface combatants, data link vulnerability assessments, Navy and Marine Corps jammers, and electronic warfare devices for emerging threats and emergency contingencies. The Navy down selected to one contractor in fiscal year 2005 for the pointer/tracker/laser systems to ensure the project did not exceed the budget. Therefore, the budget request for TADIRCM included no funding for taking advantage of different technical approaches potentially resulting from recent successful testing of a high power fiber laser (HPFL).

Given the seriousness of the threat posed by missiles with infrared seekers, the committee believes that the Department of Defense should pursue promising new approaches whenever such new testing results become available. The committee believes that a demonstration could provide important information to the Navy, which would permit accelerating initial operational capability by several years. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for conducting an HPFL demonstration.

Conventional Trident modification

The budget request included a total of \$175.0 million for the conventional Trident modification (CTM), with \$126.4 million in hard and deeply buried target defeat systems, PE 64327N; \$36.0 million in Trident II modifications, Weapons Procurement, Navy (WPN) line 1; and \$13.0 million in strategic systems missile equipment, Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) line 108. The committee recommends no funding for the CTM and further recommends that all of the funding for CTM be transferred to PE 65104D8Z for common prompt global strike concepts, discussed elsewhere in this title.

Permanent magnet motor

The budget request included \$621.5 million in PE 64300N for DD-1000 destroyer total ship systems engineering. The budget request included no funding for completing the development and testing of the permanent magnet motor (PMM).

Present Navy and Marine Corps electric propulsion and power generation systems are several times larger and heavier than mechanical drive equivalents, limited by very heavy generation equipment and propulsion motors. The PMM was developed to resolve this. Congress provided funding in fiscal year 2006 which the Navy and the contractor team used to complete factory testing, ship the PMM engineering development model to the Navy's land based test site, and begin testing.

Because of the promise of this technology for future ship applications, the committee recommends an increase of \$9.0 million to incorporate changes resulting from land based testing, repackaging PMM design to reflect evolving DDG-1000 requirements, and perform shock analysis.

Wireless encryption technology

The budget request included \$621.5 million in PE 64300N for DD-1000 destroyer total ship systems engineering, but included no funding to develop wireless encryption technology. With the reduced manning planned on the DDG-1000 and other vessels, the Navy will have to place greater reliance on automation and having the crews stay connected to the ships' computing environment. Absent better wireless encryption technology, the goal of being connected to all information systems will be problematic for very sensitive information. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million to develop better wireless encryption technology for use aboard Navy vessels.

Improved towed array handler

The budget request included \$114.8 million for SSN-688 and Trident submarine modernization, but included no funding for developing or testing improved handling gear for submarine towed arrays. The committee understands that additional funding this year would complete the initial phase of the program. The Navy has now gathered data about stresses encountered by arrays during reeling cycles. The next step is to use this data to design engineering changes to both the handling system and the array that would preserve system performance while increasing system reliability and lowering life cycle costs of the combined system.

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.4 million to complete the design, and develop and test prototype system changes to improve thin-line towed array system reliability.

Combat information center conversion

The budget request included \$17.1 million in PE 64518N for Combat Information Center Conversion. The Combat Information Center Conversion is an essential upgrade for Navy anti-submarine warfare (ASW), including development of net-centric capabilities, improved command and control, incorporation of an open architecture computing environment, and upgrades to signal processing and display technologies. The Chief of Naval Operations has included critical ASW enhancements on the Navy's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million to PE 64518N to accelerate the development of the ASW dead-reck-

oning table and other display requirements, in conjunction with the Combat Information Center Conversion.

Submarine electronic chart updates

The budget request included \$224.0 million in PE 64558N, but include no funding for a program to update electronic charts for submarines.

Navy instructions mandate the use of electronic chart display products across the Navy. This requirement was conceived in stand-alone, display workstation applications, which no longer represent the state-of-the-practice of net-ready, web-service environments. The committee is aware that the Navy conducted a Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) effort that focused on the demonstration of net-ready, web-service updates of electronic charts for submarines. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million to: (i) obtain certification of the common geographic display processing improvements already developed for submarines; (ii) adapt the results of this effort to Navy-wide applications; (iii) evaluate Navy instructions on the use of electronic chart systems to compare those requirements with best commercial practices; and (iv) establish a Navy certification benchmark for state-of-the-practice of net-ready, web-service environments.

Next generation Phalanx

The budget request included \$67.4 million in PE 64756N for ship self-defense (hard kill), but included no funding for next generation Phalanx. The Phalanx weapon system is the Navy's principal close-in weapon system for ship self-defense, and has proven to be extremely adaptive for performance against emerging air and surface target sets. The continually evolving nature of the threat, unique challenges posed by operations in the littorals, increased emphasis on single ship probability of raid annihilation, and fact of life technology obsolescence require continued development effort to sustain the superior performance of this critical ship self-defense system. The committee recommends an increase of \$9.8 million in PE 64756N for the continued development of the next generation Phalanx.

NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system

The budget request included \$34.3 million for ship self-defense soft-kill systems development in PE 64757N, including \$6.0 million for various development activities related to the NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system.

The Navy has identified a series of development activities associated with the NULKA system that are required to understand and deal with emerging threats:

- (1) an improved payload that would provide radio frequency coverage of more than one band of the spectrum to deal with anti-ship missiles;
- (2) better countermeasures techniques for advanced anti-ship cruise missiles with advanced seekers;
- (3) an improved guidance and propulsion system to allow more precise positioning of the decoy during operations;
- (4) increased duty cycle; and

(5) additional systems engineering and software support.

The committee recommends an increase of \$9.0 million for the NULKA development program to continue these efforts.

Navy medical research

The budget request included \$8.0 million in PE 64771N for medical development activities. The committee notes that field reports indicate that many battlefield deaths are caused by uncontrolled hemorrhage. The Navy's Warfighter Performance and Protection science and technology focus has a specific objective to improve casualty care and prevention. In support of that effort, the committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for the development of technologies to control internal hemorrhage due to battlefield injuries.

Joint Strike Fighter research and development

The budget request included \$1,707.4 million in PE 64800N and \$1,708.9 million in PE 64800F to continue development and testing of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF).

In recent analysis, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) investigated the size of award fees that the JSF program was not awarding, but retaining to provide additional incentives in future periods. Portions of this "roll over" amount can be awarded to the contractor at the discretion of the Government to provide performance incentives in designated target areas. However, March 2006 Department of Defense (DOD) guidance states that "rolling over" unearned award fees should be the exception rather than the rule. Since the March 2006 guidance, the JSF program has continued the practice of rolling over 100 percent of unearned award fees for the air system contract. The air system contract has a balance of \$58.4 million in its cumulative reserve award fee pool. In addition, there is a balance of \$22.1 million in the cumulative reserve award fee pool for "subjective" criteria for the F135 propulsion contract. The size of the award fee "roll over" has been growing steadily since the first award fee period in 2001, as unearned award fees were rolled over into the cumulative reserve award fee pool.

Given the 2006 DOD guidance and past award fee reserve pool activity for both contracts, GAO believes that a balance of \$36.0 million in the air system contract and \$5.0 million in the F135 propulsion contract cumulative award fee reserve pools would provide sufficient funding for future target areas. Therefore, approximately \$39.5 million in previously unearned award fees should be excess to requirements in fiscal year 2008. The committee recommends a decrease of \$19.7 million in each of these two budget lines.

Navy support of the reliable replacement warhead

The budget request included \$81.3 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy (RD TEN), PE 101221N, for strategic submarine and weapons system support of which \$15.0 million was for phase 3 support to the reliable replacement warhead (RRW). The committee recommends a reduction of \$15.0 million. The committee recommends no funds for RRW activities beyond phase 2A in fiscal year 2008.

Linear accelerator

The budget request included \$81.3 million in PE 11221N, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy (RD TEN), but no funding for the Crane linear accelerator (LINAC). The committee recommends an increase of \$9.0 million for the LINAC to simulate the high radiation environment in space. The committee directs the Navy to develop and use this in conjunction with the Joint Radiation Hardened Electronics Oversight Council.

Structural life tracking

The budget request included \$2.2 million in PE 25633N for the Navy's Aircraft Equipment Reliability and Maintainability Improvement program (AERMIP). The AERMIP effort is the only Navy program that provides engineering support for in-service, out-of-production aircraft equipment, and provides increased readiness at reduced operational and support cost. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 25633N to fund initiatives for parts fatigue tracking for military rotary-wing aircraft through structural life tracking of Navy and Marine Corps helicopters.

Ultrasonic consolidation technology

The budget request included \$57.2 million in PE 26623M for the development of Marine Corps ground combat and supporting arms systems, but no funding for the Sense and Respond Support system. The committee understands that the Marine Corps will be entering the final year of a study to determine whether ultrasonic consolidation technology can be embedded in a variety of components of the Light Armored Vehicle (LAV) as part of a Sense and Respond system for vehicle health monitoring. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.9 million for the LAV Sense and Respond system.

Anti-sniper infrared targeting system

The budget request included \$6.2 million in PE 26623M for the development of joint and Marine Corps unique improvements to infantry weapons technology, but included no funding for the Anti-Sniper Infrared Targeting System (ASITS).

The system employs infrared thermal targeting technology to passively detect and locate sources of fire in real-time, and may be mounted on ground vehicles or low flying aircraft, or permanently emplaced. ASITS is particularly effective against incoming fire from concealed positions, and provides a unique capability to enhance survivability for urban operations and countersniper applications. Funding for accelerated development and fielding of a prototype system has been included on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities list.

The committee recommends an increase of \$9.8 million in PE 26623M for ASITS.

Satellite communications (space)

The budget request included \$746.5 million in PE 33109N for satellite communications (space) including \$611.6 million for the Multiple User Objective System (MUOS) satellite. MUOS is the

Navy's next generation ultra high frequency (UHF) satellite. The first MUOS satellite is currently scheduled to launch in fiscal year 2010. The Ultra High Frequency Follow-on (UFO) satellite, the legacy UHF satellite system, is failing at a somewhat faster pace than anticipated. At the current failure rate, there will be a UHF communications capability gap beginning in January 2008 and continuing for approximately 23 months, until the launch of the first MUOS satellite. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million to evaluate the option to purchase UHF payloads that could be flown on commercial satellites to see if reducing the communications gap would be feasible.

Internet protocol version 6

The budget request included \$736.6 in PE 33109N, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy (RDTEN) for satellite communication space, but no funds for internet protocol version 6 (IPv6). The committee recommends an additional \$3.0 million for IPv6 efforts to determine benchmarks, validate network connectivity, and test next generation warfighter applications in a service orientated architecture for transitioning from the current internet protocol version 4 (IPv4), to IPv6.

Navy manufacturing research

The budget request included \$56.4 million in PE 78011N for industrial preparedness activities. The committee notes that the Navy's Affordability, Maintainability, and Reliability science and technology focus area has a specific objective to develop condition-based maintenance systems in order to reduce acquisition and life cycle costs of Navy platforms through intelligent diagnostics. In support of that goal, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million for systems to measure stress on airframe structures during maintenance and manufacturing.

National Shipbuilding Research Program—Advanced Shipbuilding Enterprise

The budget request included no funding in PE 78730N for maritime technology. The National Shipbuilding Research Program/Advanced Shipbuilding Enterprise (NSRP-ASE) is a collaborative effort between the Navy and industry which has yielded significant productivity improvements for Navy ship construction and repair. Under this program the Navy provides funding which is matched and exceeded by industry investment. Using this approach, the Navy has achieved a high return on investment by providing near-term savings and avoiding significant future costs. The committee believes that continuation of the NSRP-ASE effort is a vital element of the overarching objective of improving the affordability of naval warship construction and maintaining a healthy, innovative shipbuilding industrial base.

The committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million in PE 78730N for the NSRP-ASE.

Air Force

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE			
		Basic Research			
0601102F	1	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	258,259		258,259
0601103F	2	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	104,304	19,000	123,304
		High-energy laser systems research		[3,000]	
		Military decision cycle time research		[3,000]	
		Secure grid research		[3,000]	
		Program increase		[10,000]	
0601108F	3	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	12,636		12,636
		Applied Research			
0602015F	4	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT			
0602102F	5	MATERIALS	122,794	3,000	125,794
		Advanced carbon fiber research & testing initiative		[3,000]	
0602201F	6	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	131,948	1,500	133,448
		Optical connector research		[1,500]	
0602202F	7	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	79,856		79,856
0602203F	8	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	179,161	3,500	182,661
		X-51B scramjet research		[3,500]	
0602204F	9	AEROSPACE SENSORS	108,055	1,000	109,055
		Net centric sensor grid research		[1,000]	
0602500F	10	MULTI-DISCIPLINARY SPACE TECHNOLOGY			

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0602601F	11	SPACE TECHNOLOGY Nuclear test seismic research Rocket payload shielding technologies	109,566	12,200 [11,800] [400]	121,766
0602602F	12	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	57,804		57,804
0602605F	13	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	54,883		54,883
0602702F	14	COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS Cyber situational awareness research	116,705	2,000 [2,000]	118,705
0602805F	15	DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM			
0602890F	16	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	50,303		50,303
0207170F	17	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)			
0301555F	18	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[]		[]
0301556F	19	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[]		[]
		Advanced Technology Development			
0603112F	20	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS Metals affordability initiative Deployable fuel cell processors	39,730	7,000 [5,000] [2,000]	46,730
0603203F	21	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	55,549		55,549
0603211F	22	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO Titanium structures initiative	64,922	2,500 [2,500]	67,422
0603216F	23	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	117,990		117,990
0603231F	24	CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	28,558		28,558

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0603270F	25	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	23,743		23,743
0603311F	26	BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY			
0603400F	27	JOINT UNMANNED COMBAT AIR SYSTEMS (J-UCAS) ADVANC			
0603401F	28	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	78,704	5,000	83,704
		Thin film amorphous solar cells		[5,000]	
0603422F	29	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (GPS) EXTENSION PROGRAM	70,758	-70,758	
		GPS extension		[-70,758]	
0603444F	30	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	5,237		5,237
0603500F	31	MULTI-DISCIPLINARY ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT SPACE TEI			
0603601F	32	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	16,904		16,904
0603605F	33	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	43,999		43,999
0603789F	34	C3I ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	27,357	2,000	29,357
		Optical interconnects research		[2,000]	
0603801F	35	SPECIAL PROGRAMS			
0603924F	36	HIGH ENERGY LASER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	3,815		3,815
0207418F	37	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS			
0301555F	38	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[]		[]
0301556F	39	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[]		[]
		Advanced Component Development & Prototypes			
0603260F	40	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,930		4,930
0603287F	41	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	466		466

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0603421F	42	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III	587,226		587,226
0603430F	43	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	603,179		603,179
0603432F	44	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	178,754		178,754
0603438F	45	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	37,604	50,000	87,604
		Self awareness SSA		[50,000]	
0603742F	46	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	26,054		26,054
0603790F	47	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,280		4,280
0603791F	48	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	619		619
0603845F	49	TRANSFORMATIONAL SATCOM (TSAT)	963,585		963,585
0603850F	50	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	21,192		21,192
0603851F	51	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE	26,519		26,519
0603854F	52	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SYSTEM RDT&E (SPACE)	19,213		19,213
0603858F	53	SPACE RADAR		80,000	80,000
		Space radar technology study		[80,000]	
0603859F	54	POLLUTION PREVENTION	2,838		2,838
0603860F	55	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	7,544		7,544
0604015F	56	NEXT GENERATION BOMBER			
0604327F	57	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDB)			
0604400F	58	JOINT UNMANNED COMBAT AIR SYSTEMS (J-UCAS) ADVANC			
0604855F	59	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE LAUNCH			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0604856F	60	COMMON AERO VEHICLE (CAV) CAV	32,806	-32,806	
0604857F	61	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE ORS	87,032	[-32,806] 15,000	102,032
0207423F	62	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS		[15,000]	
0305178F	63	NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENT ^A System Development & Demonstration	334,871		334,871
0603840F	64	GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE (GBS)	29,407		29,407
0604012F	65	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)			
0604222F	66	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	20,319		20,319
0604226F	67	B-1B	159,126		159,126
0604233F	68	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	12,622		12,622
0604239F	69	F-22			
0604240F	70	B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER Transfer from APAF 23 for restructured radar modernization	244,019	38,000	282,019
0604261F	71	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SYSTEMS CSAR-X	290,059	[38,000] -153,300	136,759
0604270F	72	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	101,649	[-153,300]	101,649
0604280F	73	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO			
0604287F	74	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	34		34
0604329F	75	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	145,191		145,191

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0604421F	76	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	53,412	10,200	63,612
		Space control test		[5,200]	
		RAIDRS Block 20		[5,000]	
0604425F	77	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	187,804	52,300	240,104
		Space based SSA		[35,000]	
		Space fence		[9,800]	
		JSIDS		[7,500]	
0604429F	78	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	20,007		20,007
0604441F	79	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	587,004	100,000	687,004
		SBIRS GEO-4		[100,000]	
0604443F	80	ALTERNATIVE INFRARED SPACE SYSTEM (AIRSS)	230,887	-230,887	
		AIRSS		[-230,887]	
0604600F	81	MUNITIONS DISPENSER DEVELOPMENT	1,985		1,985
0604602F	82	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	1,988		1,988
0604604F	83	SUBMUNITIONS	10,623		10,623
0604617F	84	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT			
0604618F	85	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION			
0604706F	86	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	12,649		12,649
0604735F	87	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	17,657		17,657
0604740F	88	INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)	189		189
0604750F	89	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,469		1,469

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0604762F	90	COMMON LOW OBSERVABLES VERIFICATION SYSTEM (CLO'			
0604800F	91	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	1,780,874	220,300	2,001,174
		Excessive unearned award fee carry over		[-19,700]	
		Continue alternate engine development		[240,000]	
0604851F	92	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE			
0604853F	93	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPAC			
0605011F	94	RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT	17,021		17,021
0605807F	95	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	3,044		3,044
0207434F	96	LINK-16 SUPPORT AND SUSTAINMENT	199,363		199,363
0207443F	97	FAMILY OF INTEROPERABLE OPERATIONAL PICTURES (FIOI			
0207450F	98	E-10 SQUADRONS	39,703		39,703
0207451F	99	SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP)	4,976		4,976
0207701F	100	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	87,096		87,096
0305176F	101	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR			
0401138F	102	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT (JCA)	42,368		42,368
0401318F	103	CV-22	16,688		16,688
		RDT&E Management Support			
0604256F	104	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	39,892		39,892
0604759F	105	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	59,064		59,064
0605101F	106	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	30,999		30,999
0605306F	107	RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY			

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0605502F	108	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH			
0605712F	109	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	30,203		30,203
0605807F	110	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	737,558		737,558
0605860F	111	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	15,145	13,700	28,845
		BMRST		[13,700]	
0605864F	112	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	47,430		47,430
0605976F	113	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION - TEST AND	59,131		59,131
0605978F	114	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT - TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPO	30,865		30,865
0804731F	115	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING			
0909999F	116	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
1001004F	117	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	4,041		4,041
		Operational Systems Development			
0605024F	118	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	10,930		10,930
0605798F	119	ANALYSIS SUPPORT GROUP	[]		[]
0101113F	120	B-52 SQUADRONS	41,916		41,916
0101120F	121	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE			
0101122F	122	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	4,672		4,672
0101313F	123	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM - USSTRATCOM	20,340		20,340
0101314F	124	NIGHT FIST - USSTRATCOM	5,296		5,296
0101815F	125	ADVANCED STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	[]		[]
0102326F	126	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZ	23,495		23,495

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0203761F	127	WARFIGHTER RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS (WRAP) RAPID	14,245		14,245
0205219F	128	MQ-9 UAV	61,069	14,000	75,069
		Upgrade MQ-9 SIGINT payload		[10,000]	
		Predator trainer upgrade		[4,000]	
0207131F	129	A-10 SQUADRONS	1,963		1,963
0207133F	130	F-16 SQUADRONS	90,620		90,620
0207134F	131	F-15E SQUADRONS	101,251		101,251
0207136F	132	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION			
0207138F	133	F-22A SQUADRONS	743,593		743,593
0207141F	134	F-117A SQUADRONS			
0207161F	135	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	7,927		7,927
0207170F	137	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	[]		[]
0207163F	136	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	36,838		36,838
0207224F	138	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY			
0207247F	139	AF TENCAP	11,526		11,526
0207248F	140	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM			
0207253F	141	COMPASS CALL	4,603		4,603
0207268F	142	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	139,042		139,042
0207277F	143	CSAF INNOVATION PROGRAM			
0207325F	144	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	12,152		12,152
0207410F	145	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	111,557		111,557

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0207412F	146	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	16,505		16,505
0207417F	147	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	152,721		152,721
0207418F	148	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROLS SYSTEMS	3,387		3,387
0207423F	149	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	33,584		33,584
0207424F	150	EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM	650,608		650,608
0207433F	151	ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY			
0207438F	152	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	9,961		9,961
0207445F	153	FIGHTER TACTICAL DATA LINK	39,545		39,545
0207446F	154	BOMBER TACTICAL DATA LINK	37,130		37,130
0207448F	155	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,809		1,809
0207449F	156	COMMAND AND CONTROL (C2) CONSTELLATION	45,049		45,049
0207581F	157	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JS JSTARS radar technology insertion program (RTIP) backfit	65,924	275,400 [275,400]	341,324
0207590F	158	SEEK EAGLE	22,969		22,969
0207591F	159	ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION			
0207601F	160	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	23,044		23,044
0207605F	161	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	6,490		6,490
0207697F	162	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	7,522		7,522
0208006F	163	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	105,371		105,371
0208021F	164	INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	12,111		12,111

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0208161F	165	SPECIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM Special evaluation system	760,312	150,000 [150,000]	910,312
0301310F	166	NATIONAL AIR INTELLIGENCE CENTER	[]		[]
0301314F	167	COBRA BALL	[]		[]
0301315F	168	MISSILE AND SPACE TECHNICAL COLLECTION Classified program	[]	[1,500] [1,500]	[]
0301324F	169	FOREST GREEN	[]		[]
0301386F	170	GDIP COLLECTION MANAGEMENT	[]		[]
0302015F	171	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	19,529		19,529
0303112F	172	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS (AIRCOM)	2,022		2,022
0303131F	173	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETV	103,846		103,846
0303140F	174	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	229,657		229,657
0303141F	175	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	10,631		10,631
0303150F	176	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,397		3,397
0303158F	177	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	5,841		5,841
0303601F	178	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	388,491		388,491
0304111F	179	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES Classified program Classified program	[]	[64,100] [20,000] [44,100]	[]
0304260F	180	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	139,627		139,627

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0304311F	181	SELECTED ACTIVITIES Classified program	[]	[206,600] [206,600]	[]
0304348F	182	ADVANCED GEOSPATIAL INTELLIGENCE (AGI)	[]		[]
0305099F	183	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	6,681		6,681
0305110F	184	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	27,256		27,256
0305111F	185	WEATHER SERVICE Operations risk management visualization & integration (ORM-)	39,747	6,000 [6,000]	45,747
0305114F	186	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM	4,672		4,672
0305116F	187	AERIAL TARGETS	7,376		7,376
0305124F	188	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	[]		[]
0305127F	189	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	[]		[]
0305128F	190	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	829		829
0305142F	191	APPLIED TECHNOLOGY AND INTEGRATION	[]		[]
0305159F	192	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIV (SPACE) Classified program	[]	[-1,985,400] [190,000]	[]
		Classified program		[-293,500]	
		Classified program		[-1,131,900]	
		Classified program - prior year savings		[-700,000]	
		Classified program - prior year savings		[-50,000]	
0305160F	193	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (SPACE)			

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0305164F	194	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMEN GPS user equipment	93,267	60,000 [60,000]	153,267
0305165F	195	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CON	120,931		120,931
0305172F	196	COMBINED ADVANCED APPLICATIONS	[]		[]
0305173F	197	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	3,089		3,089
0305174F	198	SPACE WARFARE CENTER	1,678		1,678
0305182F	199	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	27,300		27,300
0305193F	200	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IC	1,134		1,134
0305202F	201	DRAGON U-2			
0305206F	202	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	64,869		64,869
0305207F	203	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	12,672		12,672
0305208F	204	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	107,117		107,117
0305219F	205	MQ-1 PREDATOR A UAV Upgrade MQ-1 SIGINT payload	22,296	10,000 [10,000]	32,296
0305220F	206	GLOBAL HAWK UAV	298,501		298,501
0305221F	207	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING NCCT	8,641	25,000 [25,000]	33,641
0305887F	208	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION WARFARE	5,362		5,362
0305906F	209	NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM	11,882		11,882
0305910F	210	SPACETRACK (SPACE)			
0305913F	211	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	38,974		38,974

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0305917F	212	SPACE ARCHITECT			
0305924F	213	NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE OFFICE NSSO	10,821	7,000 [7,000]	17,821
0305940F	214	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS SAA operations	23,980	16,800 [16,800]	40,780
0307141F	215	NASS, IO TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION & TOOL DEV	15,681		15,681
0308699F	216	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	3,152		3,152
0401115F	217	C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON C-130 de-icing system	188,069	3,000 [3,000]	191,069
0401119F	218	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	203,585		203,585
0401130F	219	C-17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	181,734		181,734
0401132F	220	C-130J PROGRAM	74,223		74,223
0401133F	221	AEROMEDICAL EVACUATION			
0401134F	222	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	19,324		19,324
0401218F	223	KC-135S	8,766		8,766
0401219F	224	KC-10S	36,790		36,790
0401221F	225	KC-135 TANKER REPLACEMENT Use prior year funds for execution	314,454	-140,000 [-140,000]	174,454
0401314F	226	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	4,868		4,868
0401839F	227	AIR MOBILITY TACTICAL DATA LINK			

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0408011F	228	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL Combat casualty management system for AFSOC	5,225	3,600 [3,600]	8,825
0702207F	229	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,510		1,510
0702806F	230	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	22,317		22,317
0708011F	231	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS Laser materials processing	39,906	2,000 [2,000]	41,906
0708012F	232	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
0708610F	233	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	114,176		114,176
0708611F	234	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	11,076		11,076
0804757F	235	JOINT NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER	3,128		3,128
0808716F	236	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	115		115
0901202F	237	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	5,377		5,377
0901212F	238	SERVICE-WIDE SUPPORT (NOT OTHERWISE ACCOUNTED FOR)	6,495		6,495
0901218F	239	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	8,070		8,070
0901220F	240	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	16,832		16,832
0901538F	241	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	47,105		47,105
	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	9,824,956	-1,713,200	8,111,756
		Total, RDT&E Air Force	26,711,940	-1,129,951	25,581,989

Air Force basic research

The budget request included \$104.3 million in PE 61103F for university research initiatives. The committee notes that this is a reduction from the fiscal year 2007 requested levels and is concerned about the commitment of the Air Force to protecting the funding levels of previously devolved science and technology, including the joint high energy laser programs and university research initiatives. At the same time, as the Air Force is reducing its investments in basic research, it is increasing investments in biological sciences, while not sufficiently supporting university research in areas of critical concern to the Air Force including propulsion and information sciences. To enhance investments in the development of necessary future Air Force capabilities and to support the training of the next generation of technical, military, and business leaders, the committee recommends a number of increases to Air Force basic research programs. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million for research on high energy lasers for detection, inspection and non-destructive testing applications; an increase of \$3.0 million for research to improve the security of critical military networks; and an increase of \$3.0 million for research on reducing military decision making cycle times.

Carbon fiber research

The budget request included \$122.8 million in PE 62102F for applied research on materials. The committee notes that there is a growing need for advanced composite materials to support a number of next generation air platforms. As indicated by the 2006 JASON report "Reducing DOD Fossil-Fuel Dependence," reducing vehicle weight through the use of advanced materials such as carbon reinforced polymers could lead to significant enhancements in the fuel efficiency of military platforms. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million for research on advanced carbon fiber materials for Air Force applications.

Optical components for air vehicles

The budget request included \$131.9 million in PE 62201F for applied research on aerospace vehicle technologies. The committee notes that the National Research Council, in its recent study "Future Air Force Needs for Survivability," highlighted the need for better control of electronic emissions as an important element in reducing aircraft signatures. Therefore, consistent with current Air Force Small Business Innovative Research efforts, the committee recommends an additional \$1.5 million in PE 62201F for research on optical components to replace electric components for potential use in onboard aircraft communications and flight control systems.

Scramjet technologies

The budget request included \$179.2 million in PE 62203F for applied research on aerospace propulsion. The committee notes the role that hypersonic technologies can play in future Air Force operations, by enabling capabilities such as prompt global strike and space access. The committee notes the need for robust research funding and flight test schedules, clearly established technical goals for demonstration programs, and well-defined transition

pathways to formal acquisition programs. The committee believes that it is the role of the Hypersonics Joint Technology Office, established in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), to oversee and ensure that all of the Department of Defense’s research, development, test, and evaluation programs in hypersonics are executed in this manner. In order to enhance Department efforts in developing hypersonic strike capabilities, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million for scramjet research.

Network centric collaboration technologies

The budget request included \$108.1 million in PE 62204F for applied research on aerospace sensors. The committee notes that the Chief of Staff of the Air Force’s unfunded priorities list included research on collaboration for sensor technology to allow a network of sensors to work securely in hostile operating environments. To support this need, the committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million for the development of secure collaborative sensor grids for military operations.

Air Force seismic research for nuclear test monitoring

The budget request included \$109.6 million in PE 62601F, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF), for space technology including \$6.8 million for seismic technologies to support national requirements for monitoring nuclear explosions. The committee recommends an additional \$11.8 million to improve operational seismic capability. The recent North Korean nuclear test highlighted a need for additional monitoring capability.

Acoustic shields for rocket payloads

The budget request included \$109.6 million in PE 62601F for space technology. The committee notes the need to develop robust space technologies for use as the Department of Defense tries to develop operationally responsive space systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$400,000 for research on acoustic shielding technology to protect rocket payloads.

Cyber attack mitigation

The budget request included \$116.7 million in PE 62702F for applied research on command, control, and communications. The Information Assurance and Survivability Technology Base Defense Technology Objective includes the specific technical challenge of designing sensors to detect highly sophisticated, stealthy, distributed attacks spread out over time; detecting subtle integrity attacks; and developing algorithms for self-repair. In support of this objective, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million for the development of advanced systems for the detection and defeat of malicious software on military networks and information systems.

Aerospace metals research

The budget request included \$39.7 million in PE 63112F for advanced materials for weapons systems. The committee notes that the Fighter/Attack/Strike Propulsion Defense Technology Objective has identified a technical challenge of improving a number of air-

craft engine performance parameters with advanced materials and designs, as well as with lower cost manufacturing processes. In support of that effort, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million to support advanced aerospace metals research and manufacturing.

Deployable fuel cell processors

The budget request included \$39.7 million in PE 63112F for advanced materials for weapons systems. The committee has supported efforts to develop energy efficient technologies specific to military applications that can increase operational performance while reducing energy costs and reducing logistics burdens on deployed forces. The committee notes that the Department of Defense has a number of ongoing efforts, including the Energy and Power Technology science and technology initiative, that seek to develop deployable energy and power systems. To support those efforts, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million for the development of deployable fuel cell processors as part of systems intended to replace conventional generators and provide efficient, reliable, and environmentally safe power to bare base and Air Expeditionary Force operations.

Aerospace titanium research

The budget request included \$64.9 million in PE 63211F for aerospace technology development and demonstration. The Department of Defense's Materials and Processes Defense Technology Objectives (DTO) include a focus on materials and processes for affordable aircraft structures. The committee notes that the cost of next generation platforms such as the F-35 and unmanned air vehicles will be reduced through the development of low cost, reliable titanium structures. Therefore, in coordination with the Affordable Aircraft Structures DTO, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million for research on affordable aerospace titanium structures.

Thin film amorphous solar arrays

The budget request included \$78.7 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.6 million. Fiscal year 2008 will be the last year of a successful development and demonstration program of advanced solar arrays for space systems using thin film amorphous substrates. These solar arrays are 10 times cheaper, 3 to 5 times lighter, and significantly more efficient than current solar arrays. The recently launched TacSat-2 has included these innovative solar cells as part of its suite of research and demonstration activities. The committee believes these solar cells could be a key element of future TacSats and other small operational responsive satellites where weight and power efficiency are key program requirements.

High integrity global positioning system

The budget request included \$70.8 million for the High Integrity Global Positioning System (IGPS) technology concept demonstrator in PE 63422F. The committee recommends no funding for IGPS in PE 63422F. The budget request also included \$10.0 million for

IGPS in PE 1160403BB. The committee recommends the amount of the budget request in PE 116040BB.

The committee believes that the IGPS, if successful, could provide a limited set of users an enhanced jam resistant and accurate Global Positioning Signal (GPS). The committee is nevertheless concerned that the potential development, transition, and user equipment costs, coupled with a rather limited useful life, make IGPS a low priority given the other demands on space systems funding. If, however, the Department of Defense can identify a specific user community that would share in the development costs and that would make a commitment to the purchase of user equipment, the committee would reconsider a request for IGPS in the future.

Optical interconnects for battlefield communications

The budget request included \$27.4 million in PE 63789F for command, control, communications, and information (C3I) advanced development. The committee notes that the most recent Defense Technology Objectives (DTO) endorsed by the Department of Defense include the development of optical networking technology with a potential payoff of developing networks for controlling vehicle actuators and flight control computing. Consistent with that objective and with efforts in the Air Force Small Business Innovative Research program, the committee recommends an additional \$2.0 million for the development of optical interconnects for battlefield communications.

Space control technology

The budget request included \$37.6 million for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF), PE 63438F, for space control technology. The committee recommends an increase of \$50.0 million for the self-awareness space situational awareness program to develop a suite of sensors to detect and locate threats to a satellite and provide notification and characterization of nearby objects. This program is included on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priority list.

Space radar technology study

The budget request included no funds in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF), PE 63858F. The committee recommends an increase of \$80.0 million for space radar technology evaluation, testing, and development.

The committee supports the need to develop a single common radar system to support space radar capabilities, which would support equally the intelligence community and the warfighter. The committee is concerned, however, that the current program is unaffordable and may not provide the persistent capabilities for surface moving target indications that are desired. Radar options other than the current option may be more affordable and could provide some advantages when compared with the current program in the near-term. The approach to the near-term space radar capability should be joint so that the requirements of both the warfighter and the intelligence community are met, and the concepts of operations and tasking are developed jointly.

Work on the longer-term approach to space radar capabilities is equally important. These longer-term approaches should be based on new radar applications that are affordable and timed to fit within longer-term planning for space budgets and programs. Using the funds recommended, the committee directs that the Secretary of the Air Force and the Director of National Intelligence, acting through the Joint Program Office (JPO) established by the Air Force and the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), explore future radar technologies in a science and technology environment with a focus on reducing the cost of space radars and increasing utility. The JPO should continue to validate operational concepts for both the near- and longer-term space radar systems.

Common aero vehicle

The budget request included \$32.8 million for the Common Aero Vehicle (CAV) in PE 64856F. The committee recommends no funding for the CAV and further recommends that all of the funding for the CAV be transferred to PE 65104D8Z for common prompt global strike concepts, discussed elsewhere in this title.

Operationally responsive space

The budget request included \$87.0 million for Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF), in PE 64857F. The committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million to have a more balanced program. The budget request supports launch and space vehicle work, but the committee believes additional attention is needed on sensor development as well.

The new ORS office is in the process of standing up with good participation by all of the military services and laboratories. This new office will work with the United States Strategic Command to explore fully the potential opportunities for ORS capabilities. Like many new ideas, such as Global Positioning Systems, the uses and benefits are unknown at the outset. The committee continues to believe that the ORS concept holds considerable promise and is encouraged by the increased interest which has developed over the past 2 years. Some recent successes, such as the launch of TacSat 2, have begun to demonstrate potential applications of small, responsive, low cost satellite and launch vehicles.

The committee directs the new ORS program to submit to the congressional defense committees at the conclusion of the first 6 months of operations, a report outlining any issues that the office has encountered, progress made, and highlighting any legislative or other requirements that the office needs in order to be successful.

Combat search and rescue replacement vehicle

The budget request included \$280.0 million in PE 64261F for the Combat Search and Rescue Replacement Vehicle (CSAR-X). The primary mission of the CSAR-X is to recover downed aircrew and isolated personnel from hostile or denied territory.

The Air Force anticipated beginning CSAR-X system integration and demonstration activities in early fiscal year 2007, immediately after awarding the system development contract. However, these activities have been delayed because bid protests by competitors

were sustained, requiring the Air Force to reopen the competition. These delays have affected the program's funding needs in two areas. First, \$165.3 million in fiscal year 2007 funding apparently exceeds current needs as integration and demonstration activities slip into the next fiscal year. This funding, however, will still be available to support activities that occur in fiscal year 2008. Also, many development activities originally planned for fiscal year 2008 are likely to move into future fiscal years, thus making up to \$80.0 million of the fiscal year 2008 request premature to needs. As a result, the fiscal year 2008 budget request could be reduced by \$245.3 million, were it not for the fact that the Air Force already intends to reprogram \$92.0 million of the fiscal year 2007 funds to other high priority programs.

Although the committee strongly supports the CSAR-X program, there is no need to authorize more funding for the program than is necessary to keep it on the revised schedule. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$153.3 million.

Rapid attack identification detection and reporting system

The budget request included \$53.4 million in PE 64221, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF), for counterspace systems, including \$13.8 million for Rapid Attack Identification Detection and Reporting system (RAIDRS) Block 20. The committee recommends an additional \$5.0 million for RAIDRS Block 20. RAIDRS is a sensor system that will be able to detect and assess attacks on satellites. This program is on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priority list.

Space control test capability

The budget request included \$53.4 million in PE 64421F, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF), for counterspace systems, but no funds for the space control test capability. The committee recommends an additional \$5.2 million for the space control test capability to continue the capability to test future space control options and determine costs in a simulated environment.

Space situation awareness systems

The budget request included \$187.8 million for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF), PE 64425F, for Space Situation Awareness. The committee recommends an increase of \$35.0 million for Space-based Space Surveillance (SBSS) Block 10. SBSS is a program to develop a constellation of optical sensing satellites to find and track objects in Earth orbit, primarily those in Geosynchronous Earth Orbit (GEO). The additional funding would support the first SBSS satellite. This program is on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priority list.

Space fence

The budget request included \$187.8 million in Space Situation Awareness systems Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF), PE 64425F, including \$4.1 million to develop and field a new space fence. The committee recommends an increase of \$9.8 million for the space fence. The space fence is a net-

work of ground radars that detect and track small objects in Earth orbit with a primary focus on objects in low Earth orbit. The new system should increase by an order of magnitude the number of space particles that can be detected and tracked to avoid collision and damage to space satellites. This program is on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priority list.

Joint space intelligent decision support

The budget request included \$187.8 million in PE 64425F, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF), for Space Situation Awareness systems, but no funds for joint space intelligent decision support (JSIDS). The committee recommends an additional \$7.5 million for JSIDS to support space situational awareness data analysis.

Space-Based Infrared Satellite System High GEO

The budget request included \$587.0 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF), PE 64441F, for Space-Based Infrared Satellite System (SBIRS) High. The committee recommends an increase of \$100.0 million to address non-recurring and other obsolescence issues to support SBIRS High GEO satellites three and four. As a result of the time elapsed between the acquisition of the SBIRS High GEO satellites one and two and the planned acquisition of satellites three and four, some significant redesign work is necessary. This gap has served to highlight an issue in the allocation between research and development funding for constellations with a small number of satellites. While the committee does not support incremental funding of satellite programs, production or acquisition gaps in these small constellations, in certain limited circumstances may dictate treatment of these later satellites as research and development satellites. This problem is limited to constellations of no more than four satellites and occurs when substantial nonrecurring costs are incurred.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report no later than August 1, 2007 outlining the budgetary and programmatic implications of utilizing Research and Development funds for small constellations of satellites in limited circumstances, including when such a funding approach might be appropriate. The committee also directs the Secretary to address in the report alternative approaches and options to fund satellite development and testing, including the establishment of a single Air Force budget line for space research, development, and testing.

Alternate infrared satellite system

The budget request included \$230.9 million for the Alternate Infrared Satellite System (AIRSS) in PE 64443F. The committee recommends no funding for the AIRSS.

The AIRSS was initiated in fiscal year 2007 to provide an alternative approach for overhead non-imaging infrared (ONIR) for missile attack early warning at a time when the Space-based Infrared Satellite System (SBIRS) was suffering from repeated cost and schedule overruns. When the SBIRS program generated two Nunn-McCurdy breaches in a 2-year period, there was serious concern

about whether the SBIRS-GEO portion of the program was salvageable.

Early missile attack warning is an essential capability that was to be performed by the SBIRS combination of highly elliptical orbit (HEO) and geosynchronous orbit (GEO) satellites as a replacement to the Defense Satellite Program (DSP). With the uncertainty in the SBIRS program, the Air Force wanted to explore alternatives in the event SBIRS-GEO was canceled after the first two GEO satellites. Since that time, and through the significant efforts of Air Force program managers and leadership, the SBIRS-GEO, while still facing a number of technical and cost challenges, has significantly improved.

With the improvement in the SBIRS-GEO program the Air Force started to look at AIRSS as a follow-on to SBIRS. The committee does not believe that AIRSS is appropriately structured at this point to be a follow-on satellite program and that the SBIRS-GEO should be able to provide the necessary missile attack early warning, technical intelligence, and battle space characterization for the next decade. The committee does support the Air Force's desire to explore next generation ONIR technologies in a science and technology environment, and urges the Air Force to include a request for such a technology development program in its fiscal year 2009 budget request.

Ballistic missile range safety technology

The budget request included \$15.1 million in PE 65860F, Research, Development, Testing, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF), for Rocket Systems Launch Program, but no funds for the Ballistic missile range safety technology (BMRST). The committee recommends an additional \$13.7 million for BMRST to continue certification of integration of additional units requested by several space launch ranges, including the Eastern and Western ranges, White Sands Missile Range, Pacific Missile Range, and Wallops Island launch facilities.

MQ-9 Reaper

The budget request included \$61.1 million for development of the MQ-9 Reaper unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) in PE 25219F. Military forces operating in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere today are reliant on a small number of greatly over-taxed airborne systems that are able to provide signals intelligence intercept and precise direction-finding (SIGINT-DF). In addition, some specialized aircraft not designed or intended for direct support to tactical forces currently must be used heavily for this purpose.

The Air Force is completing development of the scaleable Airborne Signals Intelligence Payload (ASIP). The so-called "2-box" configuration provides intercept and DF capabilities. This system would enable the MQ-9 Reaper to conduct area surveillance and use the SIGINT-DF capability to locate targets accurately enough to find them with on-board imaging systems. This in turn would enable the Reaper hunter-killer to prosecute the targets.

The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million to integrate the ASIP 2-box payload on the existing MQ-9s for use in ongoing operations.

Predator trainer upgrade

The budget request included \$61.1 million in 25219F for research and development for the MQ-9 Reaper unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV), including \$0.5 million for developing an operator simulator. The MQ-9 is a derivative of the MQ-1 Predator UAV, and, hence, much of the ground support and training equipment for the MQ-9 will be the same equipment or product-iRTIProved versions of similar Predator equipment. The committee believes that the Air Force should be proceeding more rapidly to develop and field upgrades to the Predator trainer system to ensure that operators and ground support personnel will develop and maintain the necessary skills to conduct effective operations when the MQ-9 systems are delivered. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million to develop an upgraded Predator trainer to support the MQ-9 Reaper with iRTIProved performance, visual systems, and sensors.

Joint surveillance target attack radar system research and development

The budget request included \$65.9 million in PE 27581F for research and development projects for the E-8 joint surveillance target attack radar system (JSTARS) and \$291.6 million requested in fiscal year 2008 war-related research and development for JSTARS. In addition, the budget request included \$39.7 million in PE 27450F for the E-10 aircraft program and \$178.4 million requested in fiscal year 2008 war-related research and development for E-10 development.

The funding requested for the war-related JSTARS research and development included \$251.0 million that would not be needed until fiscal year 2009 or fiscal year 2010. Although the committee strongly supports the JSTARS program, there is no need to authorize more funding for the program than is necessary to maintain the obligation schedule within the Air Force's own plans. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$251.0 million in war-related research and development funding.

The E-10 aircraft was supposed to be a test bed for the multi-platform radar technology insertion program (MP-RTIP). The Air Force intends to field this MP-RTIP sensor suite on a number of air vehicles, including the Global Hawk unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV). The Air Force has now decided to cancel the E-10 program, but has not yet decided what to do instead. One possibility, which the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has discussed, would be to begin a program to modernize some or all of the existing E-8 JSTARS aircraft with an MP-RTIP radar system. In fact, the original Air Force plan was to backfit some number of these aircraft with the iRTIProved radar.

With the cancellation of the E-10 program, the committee believes that the Air Force should pursue another path to fielding the capability that would be provided by having the MP-RTIP radar on a platform larger than the Global Hawk. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$178.4 million in the war-related funding for E-10 research and development and an increase in PE 27851F of \$275.4 million, consisting of \$178.4 million from the cancelled E-10 program and an additional \$97.0 million to begin the

effort to backfit MP-RTIP radar technology to the E-8 JSTARS aircraft.

Weather service research and development

The budget request included \$39.7 million in PE 35111F for research and development projects for the Air Force weather weapon system (AFWWS), but included no funding to develop operations risk management visualization and integration (ORM-VIZ) upgrades for the system.

AFWSS and its warfighter application are charged with providing regional and tactical weather observations and forecasts to Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) systems used by commanders, planners, and operators throughout the world. The Air Force needs to upgrade AFWWS to provide commanders and mission planners with a better appreciation of the uncertainty of weather forecasts and observations. Such an upgrade should enable them to better determine the risk of ongoing and planned operations. The AFWWS is currently capable of calculating the needed uncertainty but is unable to provide computer-to-computer transfer of such information. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million to upgrade the AFWSS and integrate all vital information (terrain, weather, risk assessment) into one visual display.

Classified program

The committee recommends an increase of \$190.0 million to PE 35172F, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF) for a classified item on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priority list.

Global Positioning System user equipment

The budget request included \$120.9 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF), PE 3516F, for Global Positioning System (GPS) user equipment. The committee recommends an increase of \$60.0 million to develop the next generation of GPS user equipment that could utilize the GPS M code. There are already two GPS IIR-M satellites on orbit, there will be a third one launched by the end of fiscal year 2007, and four additional satellites will be launched in fiscal year 2008 and there is no user equipment available to utilize the M code. This program is on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priority list.

MQ-1 Predator signals intelligence direction finding

The budget request included \$22.3 million in PE 35219F for development of the Predator MQ-1 unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV). In another section of this report, the committee presented a rationale for equipping many more tactical reconnaissance and hunter-killer aircraft with signals intelligence (SIGINT) and precise direction-finding (DF). The committee recommended integrating the Airborne Signals Intelligence Payload (ASIP) "2-box" SIGINT-DF on the MQ-9 Reaper UAV. The same logic applies to the Predator UAV.

The MQ-1 Predator that the Air Force is currently procuring does not have the payload capacity to carry the 2-box configuration of ASIP. However, the MQ-1C Warrior that the Army is preparing to produce will be able to support the full 2-box payload. In another section of this report, the committee directs that the Air Force convert the MQ-1 production line to the MQ-1C variant in fiscal year 2008. In conjunction with that changeover, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million to integrate the ASIP 2-box on the MQ-1C.

Network-centric collaborative targeting

The budget request included \$8.6 million in PE 35221F for the Network-Centric Collaborative Targeting (NCCT) program. This innovative program networks airborne and national systems to enable tipping and cueing in near real-time based on commander's guidance to prosecute time-sensitive or otherwise critical targets. This networking program is necessary because it is usually impossible for a single sensor to provide all the data necessary to perform wide-area surveillance, detection, identification, localization, tracking, and support to target attack—but combinations of existing sensors can accomplish these tasks if properly networked. The speed of collaboration required, however, can exceed the ability of human operators to coordinate. Instead, "machine-to-machine" communication and automatic action are necessary, based on rules and guidance established in advance by appropriate authorities.

An example of such interactions might be using one signal's intelligence platform to automatically cue others to tune receivers to assist in geolocating a hostile emitter, then tipping an imagery system to locate and positively identify the target for attack.

The NCCT capability is being fielded to Rivet Joint, Senior Scout, the Distributed Common Ground System, air and space operations centers, and the Airborne Overhead Interoperability Office. Through these systems, many of the most important collection sensors will be able to participate and contribute—but not all. For example, the Joint STARS, Guardrail, EP-3, and Compass Call platforms are not tied into this network. The committee recommends an increase of \$25.0 million to integrate these platforms into the NCCT network. In the future, the signals intelligence and imagery systems on Global Hawk, Predator, and Reaper should be integrated as well.

National Security Space Office

The budget request included \$10.8 million for the National Security Space Office (NSSO) in PE 35924F. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.0 million to increase the capabilities of the NSSO. NSSO is a multidisciplinary multiservice office within the Department of Defense (DOD) that was established to provide independent technical and other advice with respect to space systems and space architectures. All DOD space programs, including the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), were to support and participate in the work of this office to ensure close coordination and integration of white and black space. In the past year the NRO decided not to participate in this office. The committee believes that this decision is shortsighted and in the long run will serve

only to exacerbate the differences between the two space communities. The committee directs the Director of the NRO to resume full participation in the NSSO in fiscal year 2008 and to submit a notification to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2007, describing the participation and the number of NRO personnel who are assigned to the NSSO office.

Space situational awareness operations

The budget request included \$23.9 million in PE 35940F for space situational awareness operations. The committee recommends an increase of \$16.8 million. The increase would provide additional funding for a variety of increases in operating costs for space situational awareness capabilities, including providing funds for the commercial and foreign entities program. This program is on the Commander of the Air Force Space Command's unfunded priority list.

C-130 deicing system

The budget request included \$188.1 million in PE 41115F for the developing and testing modifications to the Air Force's fleet of 434 C-130 aircraft. The C-130 is the primary intra-theater airlift aircraft in the U.S. military's inventory, and its continued viability is critical to the success of current and future operations. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 41115F for ground-based engine testing, flight testing, and certification of metal fiber brushes in the C-130 aircraft's propeller deicing system.

KC-135 tanker replacement

The budget request included \$314.5 million in PE 41221F for a KC-135 replacement, called the KC-X. This program is intended to produce the Air Force's next generation aerial refueling aircraft.

The committee notes that prior year unobligated appropriations of \$173.5 million are available for the execution of the KC-X development program. The Air Force's request for proposals issued to industry on January 30, 2007, identified \$250.0 million as the likely funding level available for KC-X developmental activities in fiscal year 2008. The committee fully supports the recapitalization of the KC-135 fleet and understands that a reduced funding request for fiscal year 2008 should not have a significant effect on the program execution.

The committee recommends a decrease of \$140.0 million in PE 41221F for KC-X development.

Combat casualty management system

The budget request included \$5.2 million in PE 48011F for research and development projects for improving the capability of the battlefield airman, but included no funding to improve the ability of combat medical personnel to operate more effectively within the personnel recovery system. The improvements needed to operate on today's battlefield include the capability to remotely activate communications links to tactical command centers or from low flying aircraft such as unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs). Such improvements would involve providing combat medical personnel with on-

going situational awareness of the total battle space and aid in: minimizing the risk of exposure of personnel recovery aircraft and crews to battlefield threats; providing the ability to bring supplies to a medic where needed; increasing signal strength for distance and non-line-of-sight detection; and locating and tracking multiple survivors within the battle space.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.6 million to develop such improvements to the combat casualty management system.

Laser processing of materials

The budget request included \$39.9 million in PE 78011F for industrial preparedness activities. The committee notes that advanced aircraft will incorporate advanced composite materials. Reducing the manufacture and processing costs of these materials can reduce the life cycle costs of many future major acquisition programs. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional \$2.0 million for development of advanced laser manufacturing tools for polymer composite materials.

Defense-wide

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE					
Basic Research					
0601000BR	1	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	5,000		5,000
0601101E	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	152,622		152,622
0601111D8Z	3	GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY Semiconductor Focus Research Center program		5,000	5,000
0601114D8Z	4	DEFENSE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPE	5,878	[5,000]	5,878
0601120D8Z	5	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	44,372		44,372
0601384BP	6	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM Superstructural particle evaluation	72,003	3,000	75,003
				[3,000]	
Applied Research					
0602000D8Z	7	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	15,542		15,542
0602227D8Z	8	MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER Program increase		8,000	8,000
0602228D8Z	9	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU		[8,000]	
0602234D8Z	10	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	15,150		15,150
0602303E	11	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	29,524		29,524
0602304E	12	COGNITIVE COMPUTING SYSTEMS	229,739		229,739
0602383E	13	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	179,728		179,728
			99,137		99,137

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0602384BP	14	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM Chem-bio IR detector Chem-bio protective textile fabric Chemical agent fate model verification	305,327	4,500 [2,000] [1,500] [1,000]	309,827
0602670D8Z	15	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCE	7,300		7,300
0602702E	16	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	374,717		374,717
0602715E	17	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	306,022		306,022
0602716BR	18	WMD DEFEAT TECHNOLOGY			
0602716E	19	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	213,529		213,529
0602717BR	20	WMD DEFENSE TECHNOLOGIES			
0602718BR	21	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIE: Blast mitigation & protection analysis Comprehensive national incident management system Classified program	182,416	31,500 [1,000] [4,000] [26,500]	213,916
0303153K	22	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER			
1160401BB	23	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT Foliage penetration (FOPEN) radar technologies	21,282	2,500 [2,500]	23,782
1160407BB	24	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT Advanced Technology Development	2,388		2,388
0603000D8Z	25	INSENSITIVE MUNITIONS - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	6,000		6,000
0603002D8Z	26	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY			

23
38

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0603121D8Z	27	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	32,669		32,669
0603122D8Z	28	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	76,276	2,000	78,276
		Arabic language analysis systems		[2,000]	
0603160BR	29	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES - PROLIFERATION PF	213,240		213,240
0603175C	30	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	118,569	4,000	122,569
		Directly printed electronic components		[4,000]	
06032225D8Z	31	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	23,488		23,488
0603286E	32	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	86,385		86,385
0603287E	33	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	224,551		224,551
0603364BP	34	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANC	232,302	8,000	240,302
		Semiconducting metal oxide sensors		[2,000]	
		Improved CBR filters		[2,000]	
		Raman chemical ID system		[4,000]	
0603618D8Z	35	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	9,219		9,219
0603648D8Z	36	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	194,352		194,352
0603662D8Z	37	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES	40,000		40,000
0603665D8Z	38	BIOMETRICS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	8,000	4,000	12,000
		Standoff biometrics technology		[4,000]	
0603670D8Z	39	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCE	9,000		9,000

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0603680D8Z	40	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY High performance defense manufacturing technology research Disruptive manufacturing technologies research	10,000	20,000 [10,000] [10,000]	30,000
0603711D8Z	41	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM/AUTONOMOUS SYSTEMS	11,256		11,256
0603712S	42	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS Emerging critical interconnect technology program UAV battery technologies Vehicle fuel cell & hydrogen logistics program Solid hydrogen storage initiative Biofuels program	18,736	28,000 [4,000] [2,000] [10,000] [6,000] [3,000] [3,000]	46,736
0603713S	43	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY			
0603716D8Z	44	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM Enhanced water remediation research	68,874	2,500 [2,500]	71,374
0603720S	45	MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT			
0603727D8Z	46	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	11,060		11,060
0603739E	47	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	220,548		220,548
0603745D8Z	48	SYNTHETIC APERTURE RADAR (SAR) COHERENT CHANGE DETECTION	6,500		6,500
0603750D8Z	49	ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS			
0603755D8Z	50	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM High performance computing modeling & simulation	187,587	2,000 [2,000]	189,587

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0603760E	51	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	256,868		256,868
0603764E	52	LAND WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	24,711		24,711
0603765E	53	CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	188,188		188,188
0603766E	54	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	151,641		151,641
0603767E	55	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	196,462		196,462
0603768E	56	GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	127,777		127,777
0603769SE	57	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,282		13,282
0603781D8Z	58	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	29,851		29,851
0603805S	59	DUAL USE TECHNOLOGY			
0603826D8Z	60	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	109,514	17,500	127,014
		Small craft integrated common operating picture		[1,500]	
		APS comparative testing		[15,000]	
		APS technical assessment		[1,000]	
0603828D8Z	61	JOINT EXPERIMENTATION	112,017	6,200	118,217
		Asymmetric warfare initiative		[1,500]	
		Cultural & societal modeling & simulation		[3,200]	
		Joint Urban Fires Prototype		[1,500]	
0603832D8Z	62	JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	37,837		37,837
0603941D8Z	63	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	62,889	1,000	63,889
		Test range & resource analysis		[1,000]	
0603942D8Z	64	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	2,234		2,234

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1160402BB	65	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT Advanced generator technologies Portable power sources development Standoff precision guided munitions Advanced tactical airborne C4ISR systems	29,935	14,000 [2,000] [3,000] [6,000] [3,000]	43,935
		Advanced Component Development & Prototypes			
0603161D8Z	66	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	38,060		38,060
0603228D8Z	67	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT			
0603527D8Z	68	RETRACT LARCH	22,365		22,365
0603709D8Z	69	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	11,860		11,860
0603714D8Z	70	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM Fund ongoing programs - Transfer from RDDW 999		20,000 [20,000]	20,000
0603851D8Z	71	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	33,199		33,199
0603881C	72	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT THAAD Arrow Short-range ballistic missile defense	962,585	165,000 [105,000] [35,000] [25,000]	1,127,585
0603882C	73	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT European 3rd site construction	2,520,064	-85,000 [-85,000]	2,435,064
0603883C	74	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE BOOST DEFENSE SEGMENT BMD boost (ABL)	548,759	-200,000 [-200,000]	348,759

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0603884BP	75	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM Real-time viral agent detectors	57,160	4,000 [4,000]	61,160
0603884C	76	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	778,163		778,163
0603886C	77	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM INTERCEPTOR	227,499		227,499
0603888C	78	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST & TARGETS	586,150		586,150
0603889C	79	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PRODUCTS			
0603890C	80	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS CORE BMD systems core	482,016	-50,000 [-50,000]	432,016
0603891C	81	SPECIAL PROGRAMS - MDA BMD special programs	323,250	-150,000 [-150,000]	173,250
0603892C	82	AEGIS BMD Aegis BMD	1,059,103	75,000 [75,000]	1,134,103
0603893C	83	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM Space tracking & surveillance system	331,525	-55,000 [-55,000]	276,525
0603894C	84	MULTIPLE KILL VEHICLE	271,151		271,151
0603895C	85	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS BMD space testbed	27,666	-10,000 [-10,000]	17,666
0603896C	86	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BA	258,913		258,913
0603897C	87	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE HERCULES	53,658		53,658
0603898C	88	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	48,787		48,787
0603904C	89	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT NATIONAL INTEGRATION	104,012		104,012

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0603905C	90	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE CONCURRENT TEST, TRAINING			
0603906C	91	REGARDING TRENCH	2,000		2,000
0603920D8Z	92	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	14,013		14,013
0603923D8Z	93	COALITION WARFARE	14,047		14,047
0604016D8Z	94	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	4,983		4,983
0604648D8Z	95	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	2,960		2,960
0604670D8Z	96	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCE	5,700		5,700
0604787D8Z	97	JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION COMMAND (JSIC)	19,375		19,375
0604828D8Z	98	JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM	16,596		16,596
0605017D8Z	99	REDUCTION OF TOTAL OWNERSHIP COST	25,225		25,225
0303191D8Z	100	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	3,482		3,482
		System Development & Demonstration			
0603713S	101	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOX	25,000		25,000
0604051D8Z	102	DEFENSE ACQUISITION CHALLENGE PROGRAM (DACP)	28,970		28,970
0604161D8Z	103	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPI	3,281		3,281
0604384BP	104	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	247,935		247,935
0604618D8Z	105	MANPADS DEFENSE PROGRAM			
0604709D8Z	106	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	2,911		2,911
0604764K	107	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPC	9,832		9,832
0604771D8Z	108	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTII	16,527		16,527
0605000BR	109	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	15,394		15,394

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0605013BL	110	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0605015BL	111	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT-STANDARD PR	11,297		11,297
0605016D8Z	112	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS			
0605018BTA	113	DEFENSE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYS	79,300		79,300
0605018SE	114	DEFENSE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYS			
0605019D8Z	115	ACQUISITION DOMAIN			
0605020BTA	116	BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY R&D ACTIVITIES	127,970		127,970
0605021SE	117	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	1,800		1,800
0605140D8Z	118	TRUSTED FOUNDRY	43,604		43,604
0605648D8Z	119	DEFENSE ACQUISITION EXECUTIVE (DAE) PILOT PROGRAM	5,838		5,838
0303129K	120	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM			
0303141K	121	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	18,129		18,129
0303158K	122	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	70,283		70,283
0305840K	123	ELECTRONIC COMMERCE			
0901200D8Z	124	BMMP DOMAIN MANAGEMENT AND SYSTEMS INTEGRATION			
		RDT&E Management Support			
0603704D8Z	125	SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT			
0603712S	126	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	4,000		4,000
0603757D8Z	127	TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (T2)	51,752		51,752
0604140D8Z	128	CAPITAL ASSET MANAGEMENT SYSTEM-MILITARY EQUIPME			
0604774D8Z	129	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	11,886		11,886

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0604875D8Z	130	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	14,437		14,437
0604940D8Z	131	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT SAM hardware simulators	133,772	4,000 [4,000]	137,772
0604942D8Z	132	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	1,645		1,645
0604943D8Z	133	THERMAL VICAR	7,822		7,822
0605100D8Z	134	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	6,925		6,925
0605104D8Z	135	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS Prompt global strike	31,263	208,200 [208,200]	239,463
0605110D8Z	136	USD(A&T)--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	4,021		4,021
0605117D8Z	137	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	52,683		52,683
0605124D8Z	138	DEFENSE TRAVEL SYSTEM			
0605126J	139	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	53,653		53,653
0605128D8Z	140	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)			
0605130D8Z	141	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	32,919		32,919
0605161D8Z	142	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	4,513		4,513
0605170D8Z	143	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	11,152		11,152
0605200D8Z	144	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	4,574		4,574
0605384BP	145	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	99,053		99,053
0605502BR	146	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH			
0605502C	147	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH - MDA			
0605502D8Z	148	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0605502E	149	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0605790D8Z	150	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH/CHALLENGE AD	2,162		2,162
0605798D8Z	151	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	11,927		11,927
0605798S	152	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS			
0605799D8Z	153	FORCE TRANSFORMATION DIRECTORATE	20,585		20,585
0605801KA	154	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	51,800		51,800
0605803SE	155	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVAL	9,326		9,326
0605804D8Z	156	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	18,712		18,712
0605898E	157	MANAGEMENT HQ - R&D	52,992		52,992
0606100D8Z	158	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	5,750		5,750
0301555G	159	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[]	[]	[]
0301556G	160	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[]	[]	[]
0303166D8Z	161	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	28,652		28,652
0303169D8Z	162	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RAPID ACQUISITION	5,197		5,197
0305193D8Z	163	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IC	9,932		9,932
0305193G	164	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IC	[]	[]	[]
0305400D8Z	165	WARFIGHTING AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED SUPPORT	827		827
0901585C	166	PENTAGON RESERVATION	6,058		6,058
0901598C	167	MANAGEMENT HQ - MDA	85,906		85,906
0901598D8W	168	IT SOFTWARE DEV INITIATIVES			
0909999E	169	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	888		888

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operational Systems Development			
0604130V	170	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR SECURITY (DISS)	34,417		34,417
0605127T	171	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE (PFP) INFORMATION MANAGEM	2,000		2,000
0607384BP	172	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYST	7,716		7,716
0607828D8Z	173	JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	53,892		53,892
0204571J	174	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	7,744		7,744
0208043J	175	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,694		1,694
0208045K	176	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	76,179		76,179
0301011G	177	CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	[]	[558,525]	[]
		Classified programs		[558,525]	
0301144K	178	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	26,321		26,321
0301301L	179	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	[]		[]
0301318BB	180	HUMINT (CONTROLLED)	[]	[400]	[]
		Classified program		[400]	
0301398L	181	MANAGEMENT HQ - GDIP	[]		[]
0301555BB	182	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[]		[]
0301556BB	183	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[]		[]
0302016K	184	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	713		713
0302019K	185	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEC	5,548		5,548
0303126K	186	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS - DCS	16,487		16,487
0303131K	187	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETV	9,482		9,482

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0303135G	188	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	9,389		9,389
0303136G	189	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	52,090		52,090
0303140D8Z	190	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	13,256		13,256
0303140G	191	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	394,314	31,000	425,314
		ISSP tech base		[30,000]	
		Software assurance & education research		[1,000]	
0303140K	192	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	2,300		2,300
0303148K	193	DISA MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS			
0303149J	194	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	3,624		3,624
0303149K	195	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR			
0303150K	196	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	47,237		47,237
0303153K	197	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	18,653		18,653
0303170K	198	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	43,424		43,424
0303610K	199	TELEPORT PROGRAM	5,798		5,798
0304210BB	200	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	15,687		15,687
0304345BQ	201	NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (NGP)	[]	[600]	[]
		Commercial imagery		[200,000]	
		Classified program		[-199,400]	
0305102BQ	202	DEFENSE GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	[]		[]
0305125D8Z	203	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	12,667		12,667
0305127BZ	204	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	[]		[]

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0305146BZ	205	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	2,951		2,951
0305183L	206	DEFENSE HUMAN INTELLIGENCE (HUMINT) PROGRAM (DHIP	[]		[]
0305186D8Z	207	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	4,627		4,627
0305193L	208	INTEL SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS	[]		[]
0305199D8Z	209	NET CENTRICITY	10,243		10,243
0305202G	210	DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)	[]		[]
0305206G	211	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	[]		[]
0305207G	212	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	[]		[]
0305208BQ	213	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	[]		[]
0305208G	214	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	[]		[]
0305208K	215	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	15,800		15,800
0305208L	216	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	[]		[]
0305219BB	217	MQ-1 PREDATOR A UAV	13,100		13,100
0305866L	218	DIA SUPPORT TO SOUTHCOM INTEL ACTIVITIES			
0305880L	219	COMBATANT COMMAND INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS	[]		[]
0305883L	220	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET (HDBT) INTEL SUPPORT ¹	[]		[]
0305884L	221	INTELLIGENCE PLANNING AND REVIEW ACTIVITIES	[]		[]
0305885G	222	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES	[]	[69,200]	[]
		Classified program		[69,200]	
0305889G	223	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT	[]		[]
0307141G	224	NASS, IO TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION AND TOOL DEV	[]		[]

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0307207G 0708011S	225	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS)	[]		[]
	226	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS Manufacturing supply chain research Castings research Military high pressure packaging program Defense fuel cell manufacturing Industrial base innovation fund	20,114	42,000 [3,000] [2,000] [4,000] [3,000] [30,000]	62,114
0708012S	227	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	2,846		2,846
0902298J	228	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS)	3,210		3,210
1001018D8Z	229	NATO JOINT STARS	41,466		41,466
1130435BB	230	STORM	27,107		27,107
1160279BB	231	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH/SMALL BUS TECH			
1160403BB	232	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AVIATION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVI	60,750		60,750
1160404BB	233	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	42,262		42,262
1160405BB	234	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPM	35,783		35,783
1160408BB	235	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	53,418		53,418
1160421BB	236	SPECIAL OPERATIONS CV-22 DEVELOPMENT	23,473		23,473
1160425BB	237	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AIRCRAFT DEFENSIVE SYSTEMS	5,195		5,195
1160426BB	238	OPERATIONS ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS) D	20,292		20,292
1160427BB	239	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS (MTPS)	6,405		6,405
1160428BB	240	UNMANNED VEHICLES (UV)	1,500		1,500

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1160429BB	241	MC-130J SOF TANKER RECAPITALIZATION	12,701		12,701
	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,483,300	608,725	4,092,025
		Transfer to PE 63714D8Z (RDDW 70)		[-20,000]	
		Other classified adjustments		[628,725]	
		Total, RDT&E Defense-Wide	20,559,850	771,625	21,331,475

Title II-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE			
		RDT&E Management Support			
0605118D8Z	1	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION			253
0605118OTE	2	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	48,627		48,627
0605131D8Z	3	LIVE FIRE TESTING			
0605131OTE	4	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	11,133		11,133
0605804D8Z	5	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION			
0605814OTE	6	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	120,504		120,504
		Total, Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	180,264		180,264
		TOTAL RDT&E	75,117,194	-458,167	74,669,027

Semiconductor focus center research program

The budget request included no funding in PE 61111D8Z for Government/Industry Cosponsorship of University Research (GICUR) in semiconductor technology. This is despite the fact that in the January 2007 report to Congress entitled “Response to Findings and Recommendations of the Defense Science Board Task Force on High Performance Microchip Supply,” the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics indicated that the GICUR program “is a shared commitment between industry and the Department to sponsor next generation semiconductor electronics research,” which “capitalizes on university-based research, education, and training in technologies of strategic importance to national defense and also to industry.” The committee recommends an additional \$5.0 million in PE 61111D8Z for the semiconductor focus center research program. The committee directs that the Director of Defense Research and Engineering ensures that this funding is combined with an adequate cost-sharing investment from industry partners, and is executed in coordination with similar authorized funding requested in PE 61101E.

Further, the committee directs the Director of Defense Research and Engineering to comply with the recommendation of the Defense Science Board Task Force on High Performance Microchip Supply to develop an “. . . estimate of Department of Defense 5- and 10-year future microelectronics needs (including processes and design methods)” as well as to “collect and organize known and projected technology requirements.” This estimate shall be delivered to the congressional defense committees no later than October 1, 2008.

Superstructural particle evaluation

The budget request included \$72.0 million in PE 61384BP for chemical and biological defense basic research. This basic research improves the understanding of the scientific processes for protecting against chemical and biological agents. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 61384BP to continue work in superstructural particle evaluation and characterization with targeted reaction analysis. This program shows potential as an enabling technology for other efforts in the chemical and biological defense area.

Medical free electron laser

The budget request included no funding for the Medical Free Electron Laser (MFEL) program. The Department of Defense describes the program as developing “advanced, medical laser-based technology applications focusing on rapid diagnosis and treatment of battlefield medical problems,” while addressing “military mission and unique medical challenges on the battlefield.” The Department further noted that “most laser-based medical procedures used in surgery . . . for Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom casualties have a research base and lineage” from the MFEL program. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional \$8.0 million in PE 62227D8Z for the continuation of competitive research awards under the MFEL program. Further, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategic plan

for the continuation of militarily relevant medical laser research, technology development, and technology transition to operational users, and to deliver that plan to the congressional defense committees along with the fiscal year 2009 budget request.

Chemical and biological infrared detector

The budget request included \$305.3 million in PE 62384BP for chemical and biological defense applied research, but did not include any funds to develop miniaturized infrared detection technology. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62384BP to continue development and miniaturization of an advanced infrared detection system for chemical and biological agents. The objective is to demonstrate a functional prototype that operates at high speed and sensitivity with minimal false alarm rates. This technology may provide an end product with significantly lower logistical burden than other technologies.

Chemical and biological protective textile fabric

The budget request included \$305.3 million in PE 62384BP for chemical and biological defense applied research, but included no funds for research and development of protective fabrics based on advanced molecular matrices. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.5 million in PE 62384BP for development of novel textile fabrics for protection against exposure to chemical and biological warfare agents. The committee notes that development of novel protective fabric concepts is currently a major thrust of the Department of Defense Chemical and Biological Defense Program, and this research could lead to important contributions in future protective fabric development.

Verification and validation of chemical agent persistence models

The budget request included \$305.3 million in PE 62384BP for chemical and biological defense applied research, but included no funding for the verification and validation of chemical agent persistence models. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in PE 62384BP, to complete verification and validation of chemical agent persistence models to help ensure U.S. forces are capable of operating effectively in a chemically contaminated environment.

The committee notes that the agent fate program is a joint service program that focuses on the acquisition of chemical warfare agent data and the development of models from that data. The continuation of the agent fate effort to validate and verify chemical agent persistence models meets a Defense Technology Objective, and will help U.S. military forces protect themselves and their equipment in a chemically contaminated environment.

Blast mitigation and protection

The budget request included \$182.4 million in PE 62718BR for technologies to defeat weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in PE 62718BR for blast mitigation and protection analysis and software development to improve the Vulnerability Assessment and Protection Op-

tion analytic tool used by the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to predict the effects of explosive blasts on buildings, and to design mitigation and protection options for military facilities. Terrorist attacks using high explosives have become more sophisticated and powerful. This requires improved analytic and predictive capabilities for external and internal blast effects, identification of critical vulnerabilities, and designing protective measures against blast.

Comprehensive national incident management system

The budget request included \$182.4 million in PE 62718BR for technologies to defeat weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 62718BR for the Comprehensive National Incident Management system being developed by the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) to improve national capabilities to analyze potential catastrophic events such as pandemic influenza and terrorist attacks using weapons of mass destruction. This technology has the potential to significantly improve the ability of the Department of Defense to analyze and plan for such catastrophic events, including its ability to provide support to civil authorities for consequence management of such events.

Advanced technologies for special operations

The budget request included \$21.3 million in PE 1160401BB, \$2.4 million in PE 1160407BB, and \$29.9 million in PE 1160402BB for science and technology efforts to support the development of special operations capabilities. The committee notes that United States Special Operations Command (SOCOM) has highlighted “tagging, tracking, and locating” as a key technology challenge and plans to invest \$17.6 million in the fiscal year 2008 budget in related research. The committee recommends an additional \$2.5 million in PE 1160401BB for the development of multi-sensor data fusion systems to enhance detection and discrimination of targets hidden in foliage.

Special Operations Command has also highlighted the development of “alternative and advanced lightweight power sources” as a priority technology challenge. Consistent with that assessment, and with efforts in the SOCOM Small Business Innovative Research program, the committee recommends an additional \$2.0 million in PE 1160402BB for research on systems to produce mobile electric power from a variety of fuels. Further, the committee recommends an additional \$3.0 million in PE 1160402BB for the development of portable fuel cell systems for battlefield communications equipment. Special Operations Command has identified the development of systems that can reduce signatures across the spectrum without mission impact to enhance clandestine operations capability as a major technology challenge. To support efforts to address this challenge, the committee recommends an additional \$3.0 million in PE 1160402BB to reduce antenna signatures and improve performance on airborne platforms. To support SOCOM’s urgent need to enable precision fires in urban terrain and other operational settings, the committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in PE 1160402BB for development of standoff precision guided munitions.

Directly printed electronic components

The budget request included \$118.6 million in PE 63175C for ballistic missile defense technology development. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 63175C for development of directly printed electronic components for missile defense applications. Such components could have increased performance, greater reliability, and smaller size than currently available technology.

Semi-conducting metal oxide sensors

The budget request included \$232.3 million in PE 63384BP for chemical and biological defense advanced technology. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63384BP to develop miniaturized semi-conducting metal oxide sensor array technology for chemical warfare agents and toxic industrial chemicals. This technology effort meets the Department of Defense Chemical and Biological Defense Program objective to develop small, integrated chemical vapor sensors by targeting permissive exposure levels.

Improved chemical, biological, and radiological filters

The budget request included \$232.3 million in PE 63384BP for chemical and biological defense advanced technology development, but included no funds for developing improved chemical, biological, and radiological (CBR) filtration capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63384BP for design, engineering, and prototyping of improved CBR filters. Improved filters would fill a requirement for enhanced collective protection capability against a wider spectrum of threat agents. Such filters would be multi-use and multi-platform configurable, for use in buildings, ships, and shelters.

Raman chemical identification system

The budget request included \$232.2 million in PE 63384BP for chemical and biological defense advanced technology development, but included no funding to develop a miniaturized Raman chemical agent identification system. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 63384BP for development of a handheld Raman chemical identification system that is smaller and more reliable than existing systems, in order to improve the ability of U.S. forces to rapidly identify unknown chemical agents and substances.

Biometrics technologies

The budget request included \$8.0 million in PE 63665D8Z for biometrics science and technology. The 2007 "Report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on Defense Biometrics" highlighted the need for improvements in the ability to perform biometric identification at standoff ranges, and recommended support of research efforts into "extended-range human biometric identifiability and tracking." Therefore, the committee recommends an additional \$4.0 million for the development of systems to perform clandestine identification of moving subjects at variable distances.

Manufacturing technologies

The budget request included \$10.0 million in PE 63680D8Z for defense-wide manufacturing science and technology programs. The committee commends the Department of Defense for understanding the need to advance manufacturing technologies to support the defense industrial base, improve the performance of defense systems, and reduce life cycle costs. In title II, subtitle D of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), the committee established the high performance defense manufacturing technology research and development program with a goal to identify and transition advanced manufacturing processes and technologies whose utilization would create significant productivity and efficiency gains in the defense manufacturing base. The committee notes that this legislation has been endorsed by the Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force on the Manufacturing Technology Program. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 63680D8Z to continue activities under this program, including development of test beds and prototypes of advanced manufacturing technologies, diffusion of advanced manufacturing processes throughout the industrial base, and the development of technology roadmaps to ensure that the Department can access required manufacturing and technology capabilities in critical defense technologies.

The committee notes that the DSB recommended an increased investment in research on “disruptive” manufacturing technologies, which can radically alter traditional manufacturing processes and change the industrial base. These types of innovations would allow the Department to gain easier access to affordable low-volume, state-of-the-art production capabilities, as is often needed in the acquisition of defense unique technologies of low density, high demand systems. The DSB indicated that investments in areas such as nanomanufacturing and flexible manufacturing processes would be of high value to the Department. To support these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 63680D8Z for longer-term research into disruptive manufacturing techniques.

Printed circuit board technologies

The budget request included \$18.7 million in PE 63712S for generic logistics research and development technology demonstrations. The committee notes that the National Research Council Committee on Manufacturing Trends in Printed Circuit Technology recommended that the Department of Defense “should ensure access to new printed circuit board (PrCB) technology by expanding its role in fostering new PrCB design and manufacturing technology.” In support of that recommendation the committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for the development of emerging critical interconnect and printed circuit board technology.

Energy efficiency technologies

The budget request included \$18.7 million in PE 63712S for generic logistics research and development (R&D) technology demonstrations. The committee is aware of a growing number of studies from organizations including the JASONs technical study

group, the Defense Science Board, and the Energy Security Task Force that highlight the need for the Department of Defense to closely examine its energy use and technologies for improving energy efficiency. The use of energy efficient technologies by the Department can result in cost savings, enhanced operational performance, and reduce dependence on foreign oil. The committee also notes that the Marine Corps submitted an urgent request for renewable energy systems to be deployed in Iraq. Finally, the committee notes that Executive Order 13423 calls on federal agencies to increase their use of renewable energy for power, and for federal fleets to increase their consumption of non-petroleum-based fuels by 10 percent annually.

The committee supports efforts by the Department to invest in energy efficient and alternative energy technologies. To support these efforts the committee recommends increases of \$10.0 million to continue the Vehicle Fuel Cell Program established in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314), \$6.0 million for research on solid hydrogen storage materials and systems appropriate for military applications, \$3.0 million for research on the production and use of biofuels for military operations, and \$3.0 million for the development of deployable microgrid systems that can utilize a variety of energy sources to produce installation and vehicle power.

Unmanned air vehicle batteries

The budget request included \$18.7 million in PE 63712S for generic logistics technology demonstrations. The committee has strongly endorsed the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) for a growing number of military missions. The committee notes that one limiting factor in the use of UAVs on the battlefield is the limited power available on the platforms, which can limit both UAV flight range as well as the specific missions of each platform. In order to address this issue, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million for research on advanced battery technologies for UAVs.

Water remediation research

The budget request included \$68.9 million in PE 63716D8Z for the strategic environmental research program. The committee understands that the Department of Defense has identified a large number of active and formerly used defense sites with issues of groundwater contamination. Many of these sites will require environmental remediation. To support those efforts, the committee recommends an additional \$2.5 million for water remediation research.

High performance computing modeling and simulation

The budget request included \$187.6 million in PE 63755D8Z for the high performance computing modernization program. The committee notes that one of the Army's major future force technology areas is advanced simulation technologies. These technologies are being developed to provide increasingly realistic training and mission rehearsal environments to support military operations and acquisition efforts. In order to support those efforts, the committee

recommends an increase of \$2.0 million for high performance computing modeling and simulation research.

Small craft common operating picture technology

The budget request included \$109.5 million in PE 63826D8Z for quick reaction special projects. The committee notes that the Navy's assymetric and irregular warfare science and technology focus area has a specific technical objective of improving riverine surveillance capabilities, through the development of a "common and persistent maritime picture on and below the surface and shore." To support those efforts, the committee recommends an increase of \$1.5 million for the development of technology to provide a common tactical operating picture to riverine craft.

Active protection systems comparative testing

The budget request included \$109.5 million in PE 63826D8Z for quick reaction special projects. The committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million for the comparative testing of foreign and domestic active protection systems as required elsewhere in this report. The committee further recommends an increase of \$1.0 million for the assessment of current and future active protection systems as described elsewhere in this report.

Joint warfare experimentation

The budget request included \$112.0 million in PE 63828D8Z for joint experimentation. The committee notes that Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) is playing the lead role in the development of joint operational concepts and in the development of joint experiments and wargames to test new operational concepts, capabilities, and technologies. The committee notes that JFCOM is conducting experiments to understand how multiple federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, should interact with each other and state and local entities in carrying out homeland defense missions. To support these efforts the committee recommends an increase of \$1.5 million for wargaming and experimentation to simulate terrorist attacks against domestic military facilities. The committee also is supportive of JFCOM efforts to enhance Department language and cultural awareness capabilities and recommends an increase of \$3.2 million to continue the development of cultural and societal modeling and simulation tools. The committee also commends JFCOM efforts in the development of urban operations concepts and capabilities and recommends an increase of \$1.5 million to fund the JFCOM unfunded requirement for the development of a joint urban fires prototype.

Range readiness analyses

The budget request included \$62.9 million in PE 63941D8Z for test and evaluation science and technology. The committee notes that the "Annual Report of the Test Resource Management Center" highlighted the fact that Department of Defense test facilities and ranges need to be protected against diminution in mission capability as an unintended consequence of environmental laws and encroachment. The committee recommends an additional \$1.0 million

for analysis of issues that may affect military mission readiness and test activities on and between installations and ranges.

Terminal High Altitude Area Defense

The budget request included \$858.3 million in PE 63881C for the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system. The committee recommends an increase of \$105.0 million in PE 63881C, of which \$40.0 million is to begin development of the Evolved THAAD Interceptor, \$40.0 million is to increase the missile production rate to four per month, and \$25.0 million is to conduct additional flight testing of the THAAD system.

The THAAD system is expected to have significant capability to defend against short-, medium-, and intermediate-range ballistic missiles, including potential Iranian missiles that could be launched at Europe. With evolutionary upgrades to the THAAD interceptor, the system would increase significantly its defensive area and its capability, to include the possibility of defending against some intercontinental ballistic missiles. The additional funding recommended would permit the Evolved THAAD Interceptor upgrade to begin development so that it could be tested and demonstrated on an accelerated schedule. This is not intended to interfere with the existing THAAD program of record.

The committee notes that the THAAD system is designed to have nine launchers per fire unit, but that initially the system will have only three launchers per fire unit, with eight interceptors per launcher. The Commander of the Joint Force Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense told the committee in April 2007 that recent analyses indicate a need to nearly double the number of planned THAAD interceptors, currently 96. The committee believes that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) should plan and budget for a significantly larger number of THAAD interceptors to meet the needs of regional combatant commanders, as well as for a robust flight test program. The additional funding recommended to increase the interceptor production rate would permit production at rates that better meet the needs of combatant commanders.

The committee is disappointed that the MDA eliminated three flight tests from the THAAD testing program for budget reasons and because of difficulty delivering targets on time. This reduction is contrary to the direction provided by Congress last year for the Department of Defense to place priority on the development, testing, fielding, and improvement of effective, near-term ballistic missile defense systems, specifically including the THAAD system.

The testing reduction adds risk to the THAAD program, and increases the number of critical factors that must be accomplished in individual tests. It also eliminates two near-term flight tests. The additional funding recommended by the committee is intended to restore a THAAD flight test to reduce risk and allow a more measured pace of demonstrating critical factors in each test.

The committee is disappointed that the THAAD flight test program has suffered from target failures and target delivery delays, despite the availability to MDA of considerable sums of money for the targets program. The committee urges MDA to improve its performance on supplying reliable targets to the THAAD program and other element and system flight tests.

Arrow missile defense program

The budget request included \$73.6 million in PE 63881C for the Israeli Arrow missile defense program, including \$55.0 million for the Arrow System Improvement program, and \$12.4 million for co-production of the Arrow interceptor missile. The committee recommends an increase of \$35.0 million in PE 63881C for the Arrow missile defense program, including \$25.0 million for increased co-production of the Arrow interceptor missile, and \$10.0 million for the United States and Israel to conduct a detailed analysis of the potential for the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system to serve as a follow-on to the Arrow system to provide an upper tier defense of Israel against longer-range and more advanced ballistic missiles armed with unconventional warheads.

The Arrow co-production program provides a means to increase the near-term inventory of operational Arrow interceptors. The Arrow system provides defense of Israel and defense of U.S. forces deployed in the region, thus allowing U.S. freedom of action in future contingencies. The Arrow system is designed to be interoperable with deployed U.S. missile defense assets.

The committee notes that the THAAD system is planned to have the capability to defend an area the size of Israel against regional ballistic missiles that could leak through Israel's improved Arrow weapon system. The committee believes that Israel should consider seriously the option of purchasing the THAAD system, rather than beginning a development program for a new upper tier interceptor system that would replicate the capabilities of THAAD. The committee urges the Department of Defense to assist in this effort.

Short-range ballistic missile defense

The budget request included \$962.6 million in PE 63881C for terminal-phase missile defense efforts, of which \$7.0 million is for short-range ballistic missile defense (SRBMD) research and development cooperation between the United States and Israel on the Israeli "David's Sling" weapon system. The committee recommends an increase of \$25.0 million in PE 63881C for acceleration of the SRBMD development effort.

The short-range missile and rocket attacks by Hezbollah against Israel in the summer of 2006 reinforced the importance of developing affordable and effective short-range ballistic missile defense capabilities. The Missile Defense Agency wants to ensure that the technology developed for the David's Sling weapon system can be fully interoperable with the U.S. Ballistic Missile Defense system. The program seeks to produce an interceptor missile costing \$350,000, which is less than 15 percent of the cost of a Patriot missile.

This program development objective is on an accelerated schedule to allow rapid demonstration and fielding of an initial capability by Israel starting as early as 2009.

Ground-based midcourse defense in Europe

The budget request included \$2.5 billion in PE 63882C for midcourse ballistic missile defense, including \$85.0 million for construction of facilities in Europe for the proposed deployment of Ground-based Interceptors in Poland and a midcourse X-band

radar in the Czech Republic. As noted elsewhere in this report, the committee believes this proposed deployment request is premature. The committee recommends a reduction of \$85.0 million in PE 63882C, the entire amount for site activation and construction activities for the proposed European deployment.

Should the international agreements be reached before or during fiscal year 2008, the Department of Defense could then seek a re-programming request to fund site activation and construction activities.

Airborne Laser

The budget request included \$548.8 million in PE 63883C for the Airborne Laser boost-phase missile defense technology demonstration program. The committee recommends a reduction of \$200.0 million to PE 63883C for the Airborne Laser. The committee notes that the Airborne Laser (ABL) program has had a history of schedule delays and cost overruns since its inception in 1996. The Department of Defense previously told Congress that the system would be available for an emergency capability in 2003. The current schedule has delayed the first demonstration shoot-down flight test until 2009 and, if all the technology worked as hoped, the system would likely not be operational until 2018, or later.

The committee has concerns about the many technical challenges still facing the Airborne Laser program, as well as its operational constraints and very considerable cost. For example, the ABL demonstration program is expected to cost \$5.0 billion dollars to get through the first demonstration of the proof of principle in a shoot-down flight test in 2009. Even if that flight test were to work, it would not demonstrate that the system could be made operationally effective. And it is unclear that the system would be affordable. The Congressional Budget Office has provided an initial estimate that an operational ABL system of 7 aircraft could cost as much as \$36.0 billion.

Although the MDA says that the ABL program is a knowledge-based program, it did not meet all its knowledge points in 2006 before moving forward to the next knowledge point. This indicates too high a degree of technical risk, and an undue effort to meet a schedule for the flight test demonstration, rather than demonstrating all necessary knowledge point steps before proceeding to the next step.

The committee notes that near-term capabilities to defend against existing threats are a higher priority than far-term, high risk technology demonstrations. The committee urges the Department to consider restructuring the ABL program as a technology demonstrator.

Real-time non-specific viral agent detector

The budget request included \$57.2 million in PE 63884BP for chemical and biological defense advanced component development and prototypes, but included no funds for development of a mobile non-specific viral agent detector. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 63884BP for development of a mobile real-time non-specific viral agent detector that would improve current capabilities. The committee notes that this effort would pro-

vide a significant upgrade to the current Joint Biological Agent Identification and Diagnostic system (JBAIDS). This technology, which would add the capability to detect infectious diseases, would be useful both for forward-deployed forces and for domestic consequence management missions.

Ballistic missile defense reductions

The budget request included \$482.0 million in PE 63890C for Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) systems Core; and \$323.3 million in PE 63891C for Missile Defense Agency (MDA) Special Programs. The committee recommends a decrease of \$50.0 million in PE 63890C for BMD systems Core; and a decrease of \$150.0 million in PE 63891C for MDA Special Programs to partially offset the additional funding needed for the Patriot PAC-3, Aegis BMD, and THAAD programs, described elsewhere in this report. The committee notes that the proposed funding reductions are for projects that are of lower priority than the near-term capabilities provided by these three near-term programs, which meet the needs of combatant commanders to defend against existing short-range and medium-range missile threats to forward-deployed U.S. forces.

Aegis ballistic missile defense

The budget request included nearly \$1.1 billion in PE 63892C, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) system, including the Standard Missile-3 (SM-3) interceptor. The committee recommends an increase of \$75.0 million in PE 63892C for the Aegis BMD system, of which \$20.0 million is for increasing the SM-3 interceptor production rate to four per month; \$45.0 million is for long lead production of an additional 15 SM-3 interceptors; and \$10.0 million is for accelerating the development of the Aegis BMD Signal Processor (BSP) and Open Architecture software for the Aegis weapon system.

The committee notes that the Aegis BMD system, and its SM-3 interceptor, is deployed today and provides an important missile defense capability against short- and medium-range missiles deployed widely in theaters where U.S. forces are forward deployed. The system is planned for significant capability improvements in the future.

The Missile Defense Agency (MDA) increased the planned funding for SM-3 missiles in fiscal year 2008 to fund missiles it had previously cut for budget reasons. Currently MDA plans to procure only some 147 SM-3 missiles of all Block I varieties. The Commander, Joint Forces Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense (JFCC-IMD) testified in April 2007 that recent analyses indicate a need to nearly double the number of planned SM-3 interceptors. The committee urges MDA to plan and budget for increased numbers of SM-3 interceptors to meet the needs of regional combatant commanders, as indicated by the Commander, JFCC-IMD.

Space tracking and surveillance system

The budget request included \$331.5 million in PE 63893C for the Space Tracking and Surveillance System (STSS). The committee

recommends a reduction of \$55.0 million in PE 63893C for STSS, the amount requested for product development of the follow-on satellites that will not be deployed until 2016. The committee notes that the STSS program is preparing to deploy two experimental STSS satellites to learn how the system works, and what changes or improvements are needed for the operational system. It is premature to plan to spend funds on developing the follow-on operational satellites before the Missile Defense Agency knows how the experimental satellites work, and what changes are needed in the follow-on satellites.

Space test-bed

The budget request included \$27.7 million in PE 63895C for Ballistic Missile Defense system space programs, including \$10.0 million for a new “space test-bed.” The committee recommends a decrease of \$10.0 million in PE 63895C, the entire amount requested for the space test-bed.

The committee notes that the space test-bed is intended to be the initial step toward deploying space-based interceptors. There is no threat that justifies such a deployment, and therefore no justification to create such a test-bed. There are, however, numerous real missile threats for which near-term missile defense capabilities are needed, as Congress made clear in section 223 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). The committee believes it is more appropriate to support funding for those effective, near-term systems that meet current combatant commander needs against existing threats.

Surface-to-air missile threat simulators

The budget request included \$133.8 million in PE 64940D8Z for central test and evaluation investment development. The committee notes the need to develop simulators for the large variety of threats that may face warfighters in the future. The fiscal year 2006 annual report of the Director of the Test Resource Management Center identified digital modeling and simulation of targets and threats as a test and evaluation gap. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional \$4.0 million for the development of surface-to-air missile hardware simulators.

Prompt global strike

The budget request included a total of \$175.4 million for the Conventional Trident Modification (CTM), with \$126.4 million in hard and deeply buried target defeat systems, PE 64327N; \$36.0 million in Trident II modifications, Weapons Procurement, Navy (WPN) line 1; and \$13.0 million in strategic systems missile equipment, Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) line 108. The budget request also included \$32.8 million for the Common Aero Vehicle, PE 64856F.

The committee believes that a coordinated look at a variety of kinetic non-nuclear concepts is necessary to address the feasibility of a prompt global strike (PGS) capability and to review, in a coordinated fashion, technologies that would be common to such a capacity, including thermal protection, guidance navigation, and control issues. The committee recommends that the funds identified above be transferred to technical studies, support, and analysis, PE

65104D8Z, to be used to establish an integrated PGS research program. Requirements for the program should be provided by the United States Strategic Command as informed by the ongoing analysis of alternatives for PGS and the PGS technology roadmap.

In addition to the research areas mentioned above, research should include advanced propulsion, payload delivery and dispensing mechanisms, weapon system command and control, and advanced non-nuclear, kinetic, and other enabling capabilities.

The committee is aware of several potential options for non-nuclear prompt global strike, including the Army's advanced hypersonic weapon technology demonstrator program, which is included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priority list in the amount of \$41.7 million. The committee recommends that of the funds provided for PGS, \$41.7 million be provided to begin sounding rocket and flight vehicle tests, and to support booster development for the Army's advanced hypersonic weapon.

Other service program elements, including PE 63216F, aerospace propulsion and power technology, also include research and development areas that could be applied to the PGS mission. Included in the propulsion research and development efforts is the versatile, affordable advanced turbine engine high speed turbine engine demonstrator (HiSTED). The budget request included \$2.5 million for this effort. The committee recommends an additional \$10.0 million to allow the PGS effort to coordinate research and development activities with the Air Force HiSTED project.

The committee continues to believe that it is essential to maintain a bright line between legacy nuclear capabilities and any future PGS capability, and therefore recommends no funds for the CTM or other similar capability that could raise any nuclear ambiguity issues. The committee believes that PGS should be clearly and unambiguously non-nuclear.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Commander of the Strategic Command, to submit a research plan for PGS for fiscal year 2008, including a funding plan, prior to initiating any PGS research.

Information systems security program technology development

The budget request included \$394.3 million in PE 33140G for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) for the Information Systems Security program at the National Security Agency (NSA). The committee is concerned that the NSA information assurance program does not have a dedicated program for developing a technology base for future requirements for advanced products like high-speed encrypters for space and terrestrial applications.

Multiple Department of Defense and national intelligence major acquisition programs have been adversely affected by delays in the development of security features. These delays are in part the result of NSA security technology lagging behind the constant, rapid advance of communications technology.

The committee believes it is unwise for a critical mission area such as this to receive no tech base funding, especially in the current era when the communications technology that must be protected is growing relentlessly.

Accordingly, the committee directs the establishment of an anticipatory technology development program for advanced information assurance capabilities. The committee recommends an authorization of \$30.0 million for this purpose.

The committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Network and Information Integration to develop a technology development plan that describes key challenges, critical capabilities, and technical goals for information assurance over the future-years defense program. This plan must delineate how the Department intends to structure the anticipatory development program, and to utilize commercial expertise and investments. This plan, as well as a spending plan for fiscal year 2008, must be submitted to the congressional defense committees prior to obligation and expenditure of authorized funds.

Software assurance education and research

The budget request included \$394.3 million for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) in PE 33140G for the Information Systems Security program (ISSP), but no funds for the development and integration of secure software design practices in curricula of higher education institutions that teach computer science and software engineering.

The committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million for this purpose at one of the institutions designated as a national Center of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education by the National Security Agency.

Defense Logistics Agency manufacturing research

The budget request included \$20.1 million in PE 78011S for industrial preparedness programs of the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA). The committee notes that efforts to adopt fuel cell technology by the military are inhibited by cost barriers. The reduction of fuel cell cost is a specific technical goal of the Department of Defense's Energy and Power Technology Initiative. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional \$3.0 million for the improvement of manufacturing processes to reduce the cost of fuel cells for use in military applications. The committee directs that these activities will be undertaken in coordination with the efforts of the Joint Defense Manufacturing Technology Panel. The DLA has indicated that a disproportionate share of equipment backorders are due to an unavailability of critical cast parts. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million to develop systems to accelerate the manufacturing and procurement of high priority castings. Further, the committee notes that the DLA has set an objective to improve supply chain performance through a number of improvements including supply chain integration. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million for continued improvements in supply chain integration and accelerating response times to equipment backorders. Finally, the committee notes that DLA and the Army have a need for shelf stable combat rations, especially items sensitive to heat, such as produce and eggs, and recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for development of equipment to improve processing of rations to enhance their produceability, quality, and shelf life.

Manufacturing processes to support surge requirements

The budget request included \$20.1 million in PE 78011S for Defense Logistics Agency manufacturing technology programs. The committee notes that this is part of the overall Department of Defense manufacturing technology program which has total funding of \$193.3 million in the budget request. The committee notes that the 2006 Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force on the Manufacturing Technology Program called for increased funding levels for the program over a 5-year period to a level of “one percent of the RDT&E budget,” to align the Department with the level of manufacturing technology investments in the early 1980s. The committee notes that 1 percent of the requested RDT&E budget in fiscal year 2008 would be approximately \$750.0 million.

The committee recommends that the Department seriously consider implementing the DSB recommendations for increased manufacturing research funding and has recommended a series of investments throughout this bill to support the ramp up in this important area.

As part of that effort the committee recommends an increase of \$30.0 million in PE 78011S for the establishment of an industrial base innovation fund. The committee directs that these funds be executed in coordination with the Joint Defense Manufacturing Technology Panel and the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Industrial Policy to ensure that investments are made to develop manufacturing processes and technologies to support both long-term and short-term needs of the Department. The committee has noted that the surge production requirements of current operations have stressed the industrial base and lead to intolerable wait times for the delivery of some much needed materiel to the battlefield. The committee believes that this recommended increased investment should be used to begin the development of advanced manufacturing technologies that can reduce the time required to produce high demand items during surges in military operations.

Items of Special Interest

Adaptive optics

The committee notes that adaptive optics are an important enabling technology for a wide variety of military applications, including laser weapons and space surveillance systems. The committee is concerned that the domestic research and industrial base may not be able to meet the innovation and production demands of the Department of Defense in the future. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a report not later than September 1, 2008, analyzing and recommending a multiyear funding requirement and a set of technical challenges for research to maintain a viable domestic manufacturing base for adaptive optics that can support the meeting of military requirements.

Advanced cruise missile threats

The committee is concerned about the limited effort that the Navy is undertaking in developing test resources that can adequately simulate emerging advanced cruise missile threats to Navy platforms. The committee is aware that the lack of this test capa-

bility has been raised specifically by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation as potentially impacting the operational testing of a number of major Navy acquisition programs. The committee also notes that the Deputy Secretary of Defense is currently reviewing Navy plans to address this shortfall.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, jointly with the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation and the Director of the Test Resource Management Center to report on plans to develop test resources to adequately test naval assets against advanced cruise missile threats. The report should include a classified analysis of the current and projected future threat, required funding and schedule for the development and acquisition of relevant test resources, and impacts on test schedules and adequacy of testing for specific relevant Navy systems. Further, the Secretary of the Navy shall provide the committee with a report containing an assessment of international advanced cruise missile capabilities relative to the United States' capabilities and the feasibility, cost, and schedule for developing similar capabilities for the Navy. The committee directs that these two reports shall be delivered to the congressional defense committees no later than April 15, 2008.

Analyses of the Air Force test and evaluation proposals

The committee notes that both the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–289) and the statement of managers accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) expressed concern over proposed realignments and closures of Air Force test and evaluation facilities. In response to these concerns, the Air Force has delivered an analysis of one such proposal to Congress, and has undertaken a second overall assessment of Air Force test and evaluation activities.

The committee continues to monitor this situation and the iterations of Air Force proposals and strategies to appropriately resource critical test and evaluation functions within a constrained budget. The committee has been concerned in the past with the preservation of a robust test and evaluation capability, leading to establishment of the Test Resource Management Center in the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), to provide oversight over proposed budgets and expenditures for the Major Range and Test Facility Base and to be cognizant of other test and evaluation facilities and resources.

In order to ensure that any reductions in test and evaluation workforce or capabilities are only undertaken after comprehensive and careful analyses of the costs, benefits, and impacts of such decisions on the Department of Defense, the committee directs the Air Force to provide planned actions, criteria used to determine acceptable risk, and supporting data to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Director of the Test Resource Management Center. The committee directs the Director of the Test Resource Management Center to review and analyze existing and ongoing test and evaluation studies being conducted by the Air Force after their completion and to submit a report that provides the committee with any appropriate conclusions and recommendations on the studies, findings, or planned actions

that affect the capabilities and capacity of the Major Range and Test Facility Base. The committee directs that this report shall be delivered to the congressional defense committees as soon as practicable after the completion of the Air Force studies, and that no implementation of proposed plans be initiated before 60 days after receipt of the Director of the Test Resource Management Center's report by Congress.

Director of Operational Test and Evaluation workforce study

The committee notes that the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation plays a critical role in determining that weapons systems are operationally effective. The Director's efforts help ensure that acquisition programs deliver systems that provide deployed forces with battlefield superiority. The committee notes that the duties of the office of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation have expanded into areas such as information assurance, force protection, and non-lethal weapons, while continuing the extensive oversight and reporting functions required by statute and regulation. The committee is concerned that the office may not have the workforce required to perform its assigned duties.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to undertake a comprehensive review and analysis of his workforce requirements and report back to the congressional defense committees no later than April 1, 2008. The report shall include an assessment of projected future workforce requirements, resources required to meet those requirements, and recommendations on additional personnel hiring and retention authorities that would support the Director in the conduct of his required duties.

Ground/air task-oriented radar

The budget request included \$104.4 million in PE 26313M to develop a multi-function radar that would replace five existing single-purpose Marine Corps radar systems used for air defense surveillance and weapons engagement, counter-battery fire, and air traffic control.

The committee is aware that the Marine Corps requirements specified for this system resulted in selection of an S-band radar, and that the first of the four planned increments of the ground/air task-oriented radar (G/ATOR) program includes weapon cueing. S-band radar can do many tasks well, but it is not optimal for weapons engagement. Furthermore, the Marine Corps has terminated its planned weapons engagement system, the Complementary Low-Altitude Weapons System based on the Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missile.

The committee is concerned that the Department of the Navy has embarked on the development of a new radar system which may be poorly suited for the system's primary functions. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to conduct an independent assessment and submit a report to the congressional defense committees, with the fiscal year 2009 budget request, on the Marine Corps acquisition of the G/ATOR system. The report shall address: (1) the Marine Corps requirement for weapons engagement, and verify that the planned S-band radar design will support

that requirement; (2) an assessment of the phasing for planned increments, recognizing that the Marine Corps does not yet have a defined weapons engagement requirement (other than cueing of terminal weapons such as Stinger); and (3) an examination of the technical and program management resources needed to effectively execute this complex state-of-the-art development program.

National Security Agency acquisition management

The National Security Agency (NSA) has experienced significant problems over the last decade in transforming itself from the Cold War era to operate effectively in today's global information environment. The Congress and the executive branch concluded that poor acquisition management was a major cause of the NSA's relative lack of success, and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136) prohibited the delegation of Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) to the NSA Director and designated the ongoing transformation program, TRAILBLAZER, as a major defense acquisition program (MDAP).

The Congress intended this action to cause the Senior Acquisition Executives (SAEs) in the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) to take vigorous action to improve the Agency's acquisition management capabilities, and to enforce acquisition discipline and accountability through process controls and milestone reviews.

Although some progress is evident, the TRAILBLAZER program was essentially abandoned, and its successor has significant problems. One of the most serious problems is that the NSA chose to structure the TURBULENCE architecture, a major element of its new Transformation 3.0 activity, as a series of loosely connected projects, not one of which met the threshold for designation as a major systems acquisition. This decision, while permitting the NSA to avoid external acquisition oversight, exacerbated the Agency's weaknesses in systems engineering and systems integration. The Department and the ODNI have tolerated this situation for almost 1.5 years.

The committee directs that TURBULENCE be designated as a major systems acquisition requiring milestone review and approval, and formal oversight, by the DOD and DNI MDAs. In addition, the committee directs that the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation exercise oversight over all major elements of the Agency's Transformation 3.0 architecture, including TURBULENCE and the remaining activities under TRAILBLAZER.

The committee supports the Agency's recent decision to create the position of Chief Technology Officer (CTO), whose responsibilities will include ensuring that all the major elements of the Transformation 3.0 effort are integrated at the enterprise level. The committee is concerned, however, that the Agency still lacks the skills necessary to manage a systems engineering and integration challenge of this size and complexity.

The committee directs that the TURBULENCE program may not proceed to Milestone B without a certification to the congressional defense and intelligence committees from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)), and the Deputy Director of National Intelligence for Acquisition

(DDNI(A)), that: (1) the program managers for TURBULENCE and TRAILBLAZER are qualified and have the authority and resources necessary to carry out effective program management; and (2) the CTO has the authorities, personnel, funding, and plans necessary to effectively integrate the Agency's Transformation 3.0 activities.

Open Architecture

The Navy has made considerable investments over the past several years in an effort to transition development of surface ship systems to an open business model, commonly referred to as Open Architecture (OA). OA systems are characterized by modular design, public access to design specifications, software reuse, common interface standards, and seamless interoperability between system hardware and software applications. By rejecting proprietary and closed solutions, OA promises to bring to bear the critical elements of competition and innovation to achieve improved system performance and affordability.

Absent an open business model, the ability to modernize the surface force effectively, affordably, and routinely to keep pace against future threats becomes highly problematic. This is well exemplified by the challenges confronting the Navy with a protracted, 20-year plan to modernize the weapon system for Aegis cruisers and destroyers. However, the challenges with implementing OA for surface ship systems are highly problematic in their own right. Absent a comprehensive OA implementation plan that keeps faith with underlying OA principles, the Navy will expend critical financial, technical, and management resources without achieving measurable improvement to system performance or life cycle cost.

The Navy's success in building a future force of 313 ships, and with that, the Navy's ability to meet its long-range warfighting requirements, is directly linked to its success in implementing OA. However, despite having made significant OA investments to date, the Navy's overall progress in transitioning into OA business processes is disappointing. In view of the criticality of this overall effort, Congress needs a clear understanding of the full scope of the effort, the investment required, and the progress achieved towards the objectives outlined above.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, commencing with the fiscal year 2009 budget request, to be updated quarterly, that outlines the Navy's plan and progress with implementing OA. The report shall include: (i) an integrated schedule outlining OA development and the related surface ship fielding plan; (ii) an assessment of OA development, test, procurement, installation, and operating and support costs; (iii) the Navy's acquisition strategy for leveraging competition in software development; and (iv) the Navy's performance to the plan. Additionally, the report shall: (i) identify software that is intended to be available for reuse by third parties in support of the OA implementation plan; (ii) describe the Navy's progress in making that software and related documentation available through the Navy's Software, Hardware Asset Reuse Enterprise (SHARE) Library; (iii) describe how the Navy is assuring quality for software and related documentation deposited in the SHARE Library; (iv) describe how the Navy

is driving reuse of SHARE Library software; (v) outline contracts which have reused third party software from the SHARE Library; and (vi) identify the impediments to entering outstanding Navy system software into the SHARE Library and the plan for managing these impediments.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Explanation of tables

The following tables provide the program-level detailed guidance for the funding authorized in title III of this Act. The tables also display the funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2008 budget request for operation and maintenance programs, and indicate those programs for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the Department of Defense may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense), without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in this report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

Title III - Operation and Maintenance (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Operation and Maintenance, Army	28,924,973	800,300	29,725,273
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	33,334,690	-27,000	33,307,690
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	4,961,393	37,100	4,998,493
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	33,655,633	-688,418	32,967,215
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	22,574,278	-177,125	22,397,153
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	2,508,062	4,000	2,512,062
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,186,883		1,186,883
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	208,637		208,637
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	2,692,077	129,740	2,821,817
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	5,840,209	21,200	5,861,409
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	5,041,965	427,403	5,469,368
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	434,879		434,879
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	300,591		300,591
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	458,428		458,428
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	12,751		12,751
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	250,249	20,000	270,249
US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	11,971		11,971
OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	5,000		5,000
OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	103,300	-40,000	63,300
FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION	348,048	100,000	448,048
GRAND TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE	142,854,017	607,200	143,461,217

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operation and Maintenance, Army			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>LAND FORCES</u>			
2020a	010	MANEUVER UNITS	887,030	216,700	1,103,730
2020a	010	Extended cold weather clothing system		[4,000]	
2020a	010	Grow the Force Transfer from Title XV		[212,700]	
2020a	020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	93,630		93,630
2020a	030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	693,513		693,513
2020a	040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	771,074		771,074
2020a	050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,242,988		1,242,988
2020a	060	AVIATION ASSETS	848,171		848,171
		<u>LAND FORCES READINESS</u>			
2020a	070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,051,266	5,000	2,056,266
2020a	070	Manufacturing engineering training outreach program (METOP)		[5,000]	
2020a	080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	555,405		555,405
2020a	090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	804,892	86,000	890,892
2020a	090	Transfer from Aircraft Procurement, Army, Line 3, ARH		[86,000]	
		<u>LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT</u>			
2020a	100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	6,802,278		6,802,278
2020a	110	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	2,031,173	15,000	2,046,173
2020a	110	Training range improvement		[15,000]	
2020a	120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	285,198		285,198
2020a	130	UNIFIED COMMANDS	113,872		113,872

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2020a	140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	233,035		233,035
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	17,413,525	322,700	17,736,225
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION</u>			
		<u>MOBILITY OPERATIONS</u>			
2020a	150	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	288,063		288,063
2020a	160	ARMY PREPOSITIONING STOCKS	156,318		156,318
2020a	170	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS			
		TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	444,381		444,381
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u>			
		<u>ACCESSION TRAINING</u>			
2020a	180	OFFICER ACQUISITION	116,804		116,804
2020a	190	RECRUIT TRAINING	47,608		47,608
2020a	200	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	50,796		50,796
2020a	210	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	364,863		364,863
		<u>BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING</u>			
2020a	220	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	574,212		574,212
2020a	230	FLIGHT TRAINING	695,377		695,377
2020a	240	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	113,769		113,769
2020a	250	TRAINING SUPPORT	706,416		706,416

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<u>RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING</u>			
2020a	260	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	603,498	82,000	685,498
2020a	260	Grow the Force Transfer from Title XV		[82,000]	
2020a	270	EXAMINING	152,793		152,793
2020a	280	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	238,457		238,457
2020a	290	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	199,956		199,956
2020a	300	JUNIOR ROTC	147,203		147,203
		TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	4,011,752	82,000	4,093,752
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>SECURITY PROGRAMS</u>			
2020a	310	SECURITY PROGRAMS	757,874	900	758,774
2020a		Classified program		[900]	
		<u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS</u>			
2020a	320	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	686,899		686,899
2020a	330	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	642,906		642,906
2020a	340	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	506,679		506,679
2020a	350	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	476,807		476,807
		<u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u>			
2020a	360	ADMINISTRATION	775,819		775,819
2020a	370	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,192,413		1,192,413

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2020a	380	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	269,420		269,420
2020a	390	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	217,872	394,700	612,572
2020a	390	Grow the Force Transfer from Title XV		[394,700]	
2020a	400	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	841,825		841,825
2020a	410	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	233,786		233,786
2020a	420	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	48,170		48,170
		<u>SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS</u>			
2020a	430	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS	362,159		362,159
2020a	440	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	42,686		42,686
		<u>CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT</u>			
2020a	450	FSRM, CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT			
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	7,055,315	395,600	7,450,915
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Army	28,924,973	800,300	29,725,273

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operation and Maintenance, Navy			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>AIR OPERATIONS</u>			
1804n	010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	3,607,384		3,607,384
1804n	020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	937,648		937,648
1804n	030	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	50,805		50,805
1804n	040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	127,578		127,578
1804n	050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	479,941		479,941
1804n	060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,017,876	77,000	1,094,876
1804n	060	Increased funds		[77,000]	
1804n	070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	152,464		152,464
		<u>SHIP OPERATIONS</u>			
1804n	080	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	3,463,690		3,463,690
1804n	090	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	671,029		671,029
1804n	100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	4,416,438		4,416,438
1804n	110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,081,734		1,081,734
		<u>COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT</u>			
1804n	120	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	564,929		564,929
1804n	130	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	74,888		74,888
1804n	140	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	159,521		159,521
1804n	150	WARFARE TACTICS	390,335		390,335
1804n	160	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	260,736		260,736

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1804n	170	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,105,254		1,105,254
1804n	180	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	176,743		176,743
1804n	190	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,925		3,925
		<u>WEAPONS SUPPORT</u>			
1804n	200	CRUISE MISSILE	138,447		138,447
1804n	210	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	974,235		974,235
1804n	220	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	99,435		99,435
1804n	230	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	486,603	29,500	516,103
1804n	230	Mk45 Mod 5" gun overhaul		[29,500]	
1804n	240	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	315,141		315,141
		<u>BASE SUPPORT</u>			
1804n	250	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	610,899		610,899
1804n	260	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,246,489		1,246,489
1804n	270	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	3,826,778	5,000	3,831,778
1804n	270	Supplemental environmental impact statement		[5,000]	
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	26,440,945	111,500	26,552,445
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION</u>			
		<u>READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES</u>			
1804n	280	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	541,656		541,656

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<u>ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS</u>			
1804n	290	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	7,166		7,166
1804n	300	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	192,440		192,440
		<u>MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS</u>			
1804n	310	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	29,880		29,880
1804n	320	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,043		2,043
1804n	330	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	21,538		21,538
		TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	794,723		794,723
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u>			
		<u>ACCESSION TRAINING</u>			
1804n	340	OFFICER ACQUISITION	135,602		135,602
1804n	350	RECRUIT TRAINING	11,308		11,308
1804n	360	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	112,185		112,185
		<u>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</u>			
1804n	370	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	486,138		486,138
1804n	380	FLIGHT TRAINING	475,655		475,655
1804n	390	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	161,017		161,017
1804n	400	TRAINING SUPPORT	161,647		161,647
		<u>RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION</u>			
1804n	410	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	264,309		264,309

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1804n	420	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	144,828		144,828
1804n	430	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	74,991		74,991
1804n	440	JUNIOR ROTC	47,515		47,515
		TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	2,075,195		2,075,195
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u>			
1804n	450	ADMINISTRATION	759,691		759,691
1804n	460	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	5,448		5,448
1804n	470	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	104,347		104,347
1804n	480	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	151,915		151,915
1804n	490	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	275,033		275,033
1804n	500	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	578,999		578,999
1804n	510	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES			
		<u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT</u>			
1804n	520	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	237,202		237,202
1804n	530	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS			
1804n	540	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	243,861		243,861
1804n	550	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	559,214		559,214
1804n	560	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	58,963		58,963
1804n	570	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	17,205		17,205
1804n	580	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	77,793		77,793

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<u>INVESTIGATIONS AND SECURITY PROGRAMS</u>			
1804n	590	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	421,887		421,887
		<u>SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS</u>			
1804n	640	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	11,290		11,290
1804n	650	PRESIDENTIAL DRAWDOWN AUTHORITY			
		<u>CANCELLED ACCOUNTS</u>			
1804n	660	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
		<u>OTHER PROGRAMS</u>			
1804n	999	OTHER PROGRAMS	520,979	2,100	523,079
1804n		Classified program		[2,100]	
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	4,023,827	2,100	4,025,927
		Unobligated balances		-60,600	
		WCF excess balances		-80,000	
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy	33,334,690	-27,000	33,307,690

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>EXPEDITIONARY FORCES</u>			
1106n	010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	867,734	22,000	889,734
1106n	010	Extended Cold Weather Clothing System		[6,000]	
1106n	010	Family of combat equipment support and services		[10,000]	
1106n	010	Rapid deployable shelter		[6,000]	
1106n	020	FIELD LOGISTICS	502,437	15,100	517,537
1106n	020	Mobile corrosion protection		[15,100]	
1106n	030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	71,240		71,240
1106n	040	BASE SUPPORT			
		<u>USMC PREPOSITIONING</u>			
1106n	050	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	73,870		73,870
1106n	060	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	5,681		5,681
		<u>BASE SUPPORT</u>			
1106n	070	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	517,701		517,701
1106n	080	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	1,742,906		1,742,906
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	3,781,569	37,100	3,818,669
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u>			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<u>ACCESSION TRAINING</u>			
1106n	090	RECRUIT TRAINING	13,242		13,242
1106n	100	OFFICER ACQUISITION	520		520
		<u>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</u>			
1106n	110	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	54,185		54,185
1106n	120	FLIGHT TRAINING	318		318
1106n	130	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	16,751		16,751
1106n	140	TRAINING SUPPORT	284,071		284,071
		<u>RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION</u>			
1106n	150	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	141,378		141,378
1106n	160	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	57,523		57,523
1106n	170	JUNIOR ROTC	17,080		17,080
		<u>BASE SUPPORT</u>			
1106n	180	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	56,590		56,590
1106n	190	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	146,254		146,254
		TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	787,912		787,912
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u>			
1106n	200	SPECIAL SUPPORT	257,131		257,131
1106n	210	SERVICE-WIDE TRANSPORTATION	81,548		81,548

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1106n	220	ADMINISTRATION	36,078		36,078
		BASE SUPPORT			
1106n	230	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, AND MODERNIZATION	3,039		3,039
1106n	240	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	14,116		14,116
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	391,912		391,912
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	4,961,393	37,100	4,998,493
		Operation and Maintenance, Air Force			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		AIR OPERATIONS			
3400f	010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	4,260,831		4,260,831
3400f	020	PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	279,759		279,759
3400f	030	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	673,384		673,384
3400f	040	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,502,472		1,502,472
3400f	050	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	1,839,006		1,839,006
3400f	060	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,277,479		2,277,479
3400f	070	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,041,719		1,041,719
3400f	080	BASE SUPPORT	2,202,105		2,202,105

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS			
3400f	090	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	1,318,235	3,300	1,321,535
3400f	090	National Security Space Institute		[3,300]	
3400f	100	NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	258,712		258,712
3400f	110	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	776,893		776,893
3400f	120	JCS EXERCISES	27,261		27,261
3400f	130	MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HQ	327,494		327,494
3400f	140	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	485,784		485,784
		SPACE OPERATIONS			
3400f	150	LAUNCH FACILITIES	321,465		321,465
3400f	160	LAUNCH VEHICLES	51,072		51,072
3400f	170	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	233,190		233,190
3400f	180	SATELLITE SYSTEMS	87,993		87,993
3400f	190	OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	329,184		329,184
3400f	200	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	184,632		184,632
3400f	210	BASE SUPPORT	645,518		645,518
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	19,124,188	3,300	19,127,488
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
		MOBILITY OPERATIONS			
3400f	220	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,932,076		2,932,076
3400f	230	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	49,152		49,152

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
3400f	240	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	190,395		190,395
3400f	250	PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA	300,000		300,000
3400f	260	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	337,741		337,741
3400f	270	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	214,720		214,720
3400f	280	BASE SUPPORT	656,828		656,828
		TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	4,680,912		4,680,912
<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u>					
		<u>ACCESSION TRAINING</u>			
3400f	290	OFFICER ACQUISITION	85,528		85,528
3400f	300	RECRUIT TRAINING	11,704		11,704
3400f	310	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	98,631		98,631
3400f	320	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	69,047		69,047
3400f	330	BASE SUPPORT	92,671		92,671
		<u>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</u>			
3400f	340	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	378,009		378,009
3400f	350	FLIGHT TRAINING	911,673		911,673
3400f	360	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	173,051		173,051
3400f	370	TRAINING SUPPORT	96,679		96,679
3400f	380	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	14,309		14,309
3400f	390	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	182,756		182,756
3400f	400	BASE SUPPORT	621,550		621,550

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<u>RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION</u>			
3400f	410	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	138,895		138,895
3400f	420	EXAMINING	4,820		4,820
3400f	430	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	189,568		189,568
3400f	440	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	133,167		133,167
3400f	450	JUNIOR ROTC	70,798		70,798
		TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	3,272,856		3,272,856
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS</u>			
3400f	460	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	812,935		812,935
3400f	470	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	650,478		650,478
3400f	480	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	274,722		274,722
3400f	490	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	66,246		66,246
3400f	500	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	290,267		290,267
3400f	510	BASE SUPPORT	1,133,524		1,133,524
		<u>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
3400f	520	ADMINISTRATION	221,139		221,139
3400f	530	SERVICE-WIDE COMMUNICATIONS	578,644		578,644
3400f	540	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	229,575		229,575
3400f	550	ARMS CONTROL	39,300		39,300
3400f	560	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	845,771	525	846,296
3400f		Mobile shear		[525]	

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
3400f	570	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	36,195		36,195
3400f	580	CIVIL AIR PATROL	23,753		23,753
3400f	590	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	29,772		29,772
3400f	600	BASE SUPPORT	308,771		308,771
		SECURITY PROGRAMS			
3400f	610	SECURITY PROGRAMS	1,001,198	-600	1,000,598
3400f		Classified program		[-600]	
		SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS			
3400f	620	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	35,387		35,387
		CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT			
3400f	630	FSRM, CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT			
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	6,577,677	-75	6,577,602
		CAM transfer to O&M, Air Force Reserve		-129,740	
		CAM transfer to O&M, Air National Guard		-413,903	
		Unobligated balances		-60,000	
		WCF excess balances		-88,000	
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	33,655,633	-688,418	32,967,215

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
0100d	010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	597,309		597,309
0100d	020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	3,277,640	8,700	3,286,340
0100d	020	Language training		[8,700]	
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	3,874,949	8,700	3,883,649
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u>			293
		<u>DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
0100d	030	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	104,596		104,596
		<u>RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION</u>			
0100d	040	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	91,099		91,099
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	195,695		195,695
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
0100d	050	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	149,631		149,631

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0100d	060	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	107,347		107,347
0100d	090	DEFENSE BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY	148,028		148,028
0100d	100	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	396,578		396,578
0100d	110	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	432		432
0100d	120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	945,594		945,594
0100d	140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES	36,350		36,350
0100d	150	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	299,778		299,778
0100d	160	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	16,400		16,400
0100d	170	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY AGENCY	23,671		23,671
0100d	180	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	333,548		333,548
0100d	190	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY	1,833,431		1,833,431
0100d	200	DOD HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	376,292		376,292
0100d	210	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,044,139		1,044,139
0100d	220	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	673,400	-212,400	461,000
0100d	220	Center for international issues research		[-7,400]	
0100d	220	Global train and equip program		[-200,000]	
0100d	220	Stability operations fellowship program		[-5,000]	
0100d	230	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	372,457		372,457
0100d	250	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	57,176		57,176
0100d	260	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	1,093,742		1,122,742
0100d	260	Defense Readiness Reporting System management tools		29,000	
0100d	260	Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative		[12,000]	
0100d	260	Strategic communications and integration		[20,000]	
0100d	270	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE	439,277	[-3,000]	439,277

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<u>OTHER PROGRAMS</u>			
0100d	999	OTHER PROGRAMS	10,156,363	41,575	10,197,938
0100d		Classified program		[41,575]	
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	18,503,634	-141,825	18,361,809
		Impact aid		35,000	35,000
		Impact aid for children with severe disabilities		5,000	5,000
		Special assistance to local education agencies		10,000	10,000
		Unobligated balances		-54,000	-54,000
		WCF excess balances		-40,000	-40,000
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	22,574,278	-177,125	22,397,153
		Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>LAND FORCES</u>			
2080a	010	MANEUVER UNITS	4,465		4,465
2080a	020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	15,706		15,706
2080a	030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	443,577		443,577
2080a	040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	154,575		154,575
2080a	050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	514,510		514,510

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2080a	060	AVIATION ASSETS	63,133		63,133
		<u>LAND FORCES READINESS</u>			
2080a	070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	230,699		230,699
2080a	080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	84,725	4,000	88,725
2080a	080	Mobile corrosion protection		[4,000]	
2080a	090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	130,683		130,683
		<u>LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT</u>			
2080a	100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	502,679		502,679
2080a	110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	222,856		222,856
2080a	120	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	11,367		11,367
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	2,378,975	4,000	2,382,975
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u>			
2080a	130	ADMINISTRATION	67,309		67,309
2080a	140	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	10,427		10,427
2080a	150	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	8,321		8,321
2080a	160	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	43,030		43,030

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT			
2080a	170	FSRM, CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT			
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	129,087		129,087
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	2,508,062	4,000	2,512,062
		Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		AIR OPERATIONS			
1806n	010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	561,550		561,550
1806n	020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	17,029		17,029
1806n	030	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	3,169		3,169
1806n	040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	121,186		121,186
1806n	050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	393		393
		SHIP OPERATIONS			
1806n	060	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	49,766		49,766
1806n	070	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	573		573
1806n	080	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	41,616		41,616
1806n	090	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	559		559

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<u>COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT</u>			
1806n	100	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	15,344		15,344
1806n	110	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	121,531		121,531
		<u>WEAPONS SUPPORT</u>			
1806n	120	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	2,141		2,141
		<u>BASE SUPPORT</u>			
1806n	130	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	90,262		90,262
1806n	140	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	52,000		52,000
1806n	150	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	94,642		94,642
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	1,171,761		1,171,761
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u>			
1806n	160	ADMINISTRATION	3,260		3,260
1806n	170	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	8,509		8,509
1806n	180	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	2,936		2,936
1806n	190	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS			
		<u>CANCELLED ACCOUNTS</u>			
1806n	210	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<u>OTHER PROGRAMS</u>			
1806n	999	OTHER PROGRAMS	417		417
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	14,705		14,705
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,186,883		1,186,883
		Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>EXPEDITIONARY FORCES</u>			
1107n	010	OPERATING FORCES	49,487		49,487
1107n	020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	11,229		11,229
1107n	030	TRAINING SUPPORT	27,131		27,131
		<u>BASE SUPPORT</u>			
1107n	040	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	14,827		14,827
1107n	050	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	69,998		69,998
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	172,672		172,672

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
1107n	060	SPECIAL SUPPORT	12,417		12,417
1107n	070	SERVICE-WIDE TRANSPORTATION	826		826
1107n	080	ADMINISTRATION	9,422		9,422
1107n	090	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,690		8,690
		<u>BASE SUPPORT</u>			
1107n	100	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,610		4,610
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	35,965		35,965
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	208,637		208,637
		Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>AIR OPERATIONS</u>			
3740f	010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,709,952		1,709,952
3740f	020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	99,253		99,253
3740f	030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	399,573		399,573
3740f	040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	83,405		83,405

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
3740f	050	BASE SUPPORT	276,854		276,854
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	2,569,037		2,569,037
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
3740f	060	ADMINISTRATION	70,152		70,152
3740f	070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	22,704		22,704
3740f	080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	22,995		22,995
3740f	090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,505		6,505
3740f	100	AUDIOVISUAL	684		684
		<u>CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT</u>			
3740f	110	FSRM, CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT			
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	123,040		123,040
		CAM transfer from O&M, Air Force		129,740	
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	2,692,077	129,740	2,821,817

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>LAND FORCES</u>			
2065a	010	MANEUVER UNITS	638,508	4,000	642,508
2065a	010	Extended Cold Weather Clothing System		[4,000]	
2065a	020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	423,443		423,443
2065a	030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	555,457		555,457
2065a	040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	627,343	1,300	628,643
2065a		National Guard Interoperability Upgrades		[1,300]	
2065a	050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	34,721		34,721
2065a	060	AVIATION ASSETS	361,885		361,885
		<u>LAND FORCES READINESS</u>			
2065a	070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	309,655	6,900	316,555
2065a	070	Integrated Disaster & Rapid Data Management Systems		[6,900]	
2065a	080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	109,561	4,000	113,561
2065a	080	Mobile corrosion protection		[4,000]	
2065a	090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	466,452		466,452
		<u>LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT</u>			
2065a	100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	828,418		828,418
2065a	110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	486,341		486,341
2065a	120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	551,675		551,675

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2065a	130	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES			
2065a	130	Operator driving simulator	92,517	5,000 [5,000]	97,517
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	5,485,976	21,200	5,507,176
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u>			
2065a	140	ADMINISTRATION	119,227		119,227
2065a	150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	52,250		52,250
2065a	160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	7,396		7,396
2065a	170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	175,360		175,360
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	354,233		354,233
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	5,840,209	21,200	5,861,409
		Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>AIR OPERATIONS</u>			
3840f	010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,049,334	6,000	3,055,334
3840f	011	Controlled humidity protection		[6,000]	
3840f	020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	540,633	7,500	548,133

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
3840f	020	Weapons skills trainer (WST)			
3840f	030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	587,485	[7,500]	587,485
3840f	040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	285,227		285,227
3840f	050	BASE SUPPORT	525,149		525,149
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	4,987,828	13,500	5,001,328
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
3840f	060	ADMINISTRATION	30,716		30,716
3840f	070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	23,421		23,421
		<u>CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT</u>			
2080a	080	FSRM, CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT			
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	54,137		54,137
		CAM transfer from O&M, Air Force		413,903	
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	5,041,965	427,403	5,469,368
		<u>TRANSFER ACCOUNTS</u>			
0810a	010	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	434,879		434,879
0810n	020	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	300,591		300,591

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0810n	020	CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT			
0810f	030	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	458,428		458,428
0810f	030	CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT			
0810d	040	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	12,751		12,751
0810d	040	CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT			
0811d	050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	250,249	20,000	270,249
0811d	050	Increased funds		[20,000]	
0811d	050	CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT			
		TOTAL, O&M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS	1,456,898	20,000	1,476,898
		MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
0104d	060	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	11,971		11,971
0838d	070	SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS			
0118d	080	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	5,000		5,000
4965d	090	AFGHAN DEFENSE FORCES			
4965d	100	IRAQ DEFENSE FORCES			
4965d	110	IRAQ INTERIOR FORCES			
4965d	120	IRAQ QUICK RESPONSE			
4965d	130	IRAQ TRAINING FACILITY			
0833d	140	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE			
0833d	150	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE			
0141d	160	IRAQ FREEDOM FUND, DEF			
0819d	170	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	103,300	-40,000	63,300
0819d	170	Building partnership capacity for humanitarian assistance		[-40,000]	
1236d	180	KAHO'OLAWE			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0134d	190	FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION	348,048	100,000	448,048
0134d	190	Increased funds		[100,000]	
		TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS	468,319	60,000	528,319
		TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:	142,854,017	607,200	143,461,217

Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions

Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for certain costs in connection with Moses Lake Wellfield Superfund Site, Moses Lake, Washington (sec. 311)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse the Environmental Protection Agency for its costs incurred in connection with the former Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake Superfund Site, Moses Lake, Washington, as requested by the Department of Defense.

Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for certain costs in connection with the Arctic Surplus Superfund Site, Fairbanks, Alaska (sec. 312)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse the Environmental Protection Agency for costs incurred in connection with the Arctic Surplus Superfund Site, Fairbanks, Alaska, as requested by the Department of Defense.

Payment to Environmental Protection Agency of stipulated penalties in connection with Jackson Park Housing Complex, Washington (sec. 313)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay a stipulated penalty assessed by the Environmental Protection Agency against the Jackson Park Housing Complex, Washington, as requested by the Department of Defense.

Subtitle C—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

Availability of funds in Defense Information Systems Agency Working Capital Fund for technology upgrades to Defense Information Systems Network (sec. 321)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) to use up to \$500,000 of working capital funds to pay for any project directly related to technology upgrades to the Defense Information System Network (DISN). The committee appreciates that the rate of technological advances in information systems challenges the ability of DISA to keep pace with the opportunities to upgrade the system and provide better service to its users. Increasing the level of authorized investment from the working capital fund would allow DISA greater flexibility to technically refresh the system. The committee notes, however, that this increased authority is not intended to fund major technical insertions that substantially change the form, fit, or function of the DISN, which should continue to be funded through appropriated accounts.

Extension of temporary authority for contract performance of security guard functions (sec. 322)

The committee recommends a provision that would continue the orderly phase-out of the temporary authority for contract perform-

ance of security guard functions under section 332 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314). Under the provision, the Department of Defense would be required to continue reducing the number of contract security guards employed under section 332 from the baseline number of such personnel as of October 1, 2006. In 2010, the Department would be permitted to employ 70 percent of the baseline number; in 2011, 60 percent of the baseline number; and in 2012, 50 percent of the baseline number.

Report on incremental cost of early 2007 enhanced deployment (sec. 323)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 323 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) to include a reporting requirement on the incremental increase in reset costs related to the deployment of additional forces to Iraq. The committee remains concerned that the services accurately capture the costs and fully fund the reconstitution or reset of forces committed to the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. This provision requires the military departments to identify and project the increase in costs of reset based on the increase of forces under the new strategy in Iraq.

Individual body armor (sec. 324)

The committee notes the continuing controversy over the technical capabilities of commercially available individual body armor and whether it fails, meets, or exceeds the military’s ballistic protection requirements. This kind of controversy can undermine peoples’ confidence in the quality of the equipment we provide our troops. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would require, within 90 days of enactment of this Act, a joint technical assessment and classified and unclassified reports by the Director, Defense Research and Engineering (DDRE) and the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (DOTE) of individual body armor systems currently available in the domestic market.

Subtitle D—Workplace and Depot Issues

Extension of authority for Army industrial facilities to engage in cooperative activities with non-Army entities (sec. 341)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 4544 of title 10, United States Code, to extend, until September 30, 2014, the authority for any working capital funded Army industrial facility to enter into a contract or cooperative arrangement with a non-Army entity to carry out specified military or commercial projects. The committee encourages and supports public-private industrial cooperation and partnerships to increase efficiency, reduce costs, and get the most out of public industrial capacity. However, the Army does not appear to have effectively used existing authority upon which to base a business case assessment of potential costs, benefits, or risks associated with these partnerships at its manufacturing facilities. Accordingly, the committee recommends extending the current authority for 5 years, al-

lowing the Army additional time to enter into no more than eight long-term cooperative arrangements or partnerships. The provision would also provide for an annual report by the Secretary of the Army explaining how the Army is using this extended authority. The committee further recommends that not later than September 30, 2012, the Army submit a business case analysis on the advisability of making this authority permanent.

Two-year extension of Arsenal Support Demonstration Program (sec. 342)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 343 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-398), to extend until September 30, 2010 the Arsenal Support Program Initiative. The committee notes that this demonstration program was created in fiscal year 2001 and was extended to fiscal year 2008. The committee recommends a 2-year extension of this program to allow for consideration of a report from the Secretary of the Army, due not later than July 1, 2007, on the results of the demonstration program. The Secretary's report will include the Army's views regarding the benefits of the program as well as an assessment of the success of the program in achieving the purposes specified in section 343. The report will also contain a comprehensive review of contracting at the Army manufacturing arsenals covered by the program and such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate regarding changes to the program. The committee recommends an extension of the Arsenal Support Program Initiative demonstration to allow for consideration of the Secretary of the Army's report and suggested changes.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Enhancement of corrosion control and prevention functions within Department of Defense (sec. 351)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2228 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for a permanent Director of the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight reporting directly to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD-ATL). The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense continues to place a low priority on the management, oversight, and funding of corrosion control policies and programs. The fiscal year 2008 budget request included only \$12.0 million for projects to address the Department's estimated \$380.0 million corrosion prevention and control-related requirements. With aggressive investment in corrosion control the Department could realize an industry standard 49 to 1 return on investment. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) reports that many Department weapons systems experience significant corrosion-related cost, readiness, and safety problems. Corrosion prevention and control planning is the most effective way to reduce these problems. However, the committee is concerned that the Department and military services have not comprehensively or effectively incorporated corrosion control planning in major defense acquisition or maintenance programs for both older and new systems.

The committee believes that the establishment of a Director for the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight and placing this function directly under the USD–ATL will result in a more comprehensive and aggressive approach to corrosion prevention and control throughout the Department. The committee also recommends provisions that would give the Director additional authorities for oversight of corrosion-related training, development of directives, and interaction with non-Department activities including taking advantage of opportunities for cooperative efforts in science and technology research and development. Finally, the committee recommends that the Department submit an annual report on the implementation of its corrosion control strategy.

Reimbursement for National Guard support provided to Federal agencies (sec. 352)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 377 of title 10, United States Code, to require federal agencies that receive law enforcement support or support to a national special security event provided by National Guard personnel performing duty under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, to reimburse the Department of Defense for the costs of that support. The provision would continue to exempt from the requirement for reimbursement support that is provided in the normal course of military training or operations, or when the support results in an operational or training benefit to the element of the Department providing the support.

Reauthorization of Aviation Insurance Program (sec. 353)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 44310 of title 49, United States Code, relating to the expiration of chapter 443, Aviation Insurance program. The provision would extend the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to provide insurance and reinsurance which would otherwise expire during fiscal year 2008. This government-provided insurance program for commercial air carriers supporting Department of Defense transportation activities is an essential requirement for activating the Civil Reserve Air Fleet during wartime.

Property accountability and disposition of unlawfully obtained property of the Armed Forces (sec. 354)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 661 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to prescribe regulations for the accounting of Navy and Marine Corps property and to fix responsibility for such property. The provision would also add a new section for the Navy and Marine Corps similar to existing laws applicable to the Army and Air Force that prohibit improper disposition of military equipment and authorize seizure of such unlawfully transferred government property. The provision would also modify sections 4836 and 9836 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the meaning and intent of those sections pertaining to property accountability in the Army and Air Force.

Authority to impose reasonable conditions on the payment of full replacement value for claims related to personal property transported at Government expense (sec. 355)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2636a(d) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to require compliance with reasonable conditions for a military member or civilian employee of the Department of Defense to receive full replacement value for personal property lost or damaged while being transported at government expense.

The committee believes that the Office of the Secretary of Defense, U.S. Transportation Command, and the military departments must take more effective measures to ensure that accurate data about the performance of household goods movers is collected from service members and civilian employees of the Department of Defense following permanent change of station moves. Imposing a duty on service members and civilian employees to complete simple surveys about the quality of the moves is a key factor in measuring the relative merits of household goods movers and should be monitored and enforced.

Authority for individuals to retain combat uniforms issued in connection with contingency operations (sec. 356)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the secretary of a military department to authorize members of the armed forces under their jurisdiction to retain combat uniforms issued as organizational clothing and individual equipment in connection with their deployment in support of contingency operations.

Modification of requirements on Comptroller General report on readiness of Army and Marine Corps ground forces (sec. 357)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend and expand the assessment and report required of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) by section 345 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364). The committee notes that in January of this year the President announced a new strategy for Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) that requires the deployment of additional combat and support forces to Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee remains concerned about the impact of sustained high operational tempo due to ongoing operations on the readiness of our ground forces and their ability to respond to other threats or contingencies.

The committee notes that the GAO has nearly completed its analysis and report as directed by section 345. The GAO has provided the committee with useful interim reviews of their initial findings. The committee looks forward to receiving the next report on June 1, 2007. However, the decision to increase the commitment of U.S. ground forces to OIF and OEF and the subsequent deployment of additional combat brigades and support units to Iraq and Afghanistan indicate that the GAO should continue its assessment to account for these changes to the underlying reality of ground forces commitment.

The committee directs the GAO to include in its continuing analysis an assessment of the Army and Marine Corps ability to provide forces to meet specific contingency plans of the regional combatant commands. While detailed information on readiness and contingency plans are classified, the issues being assessed in this report are of enormous importance to the Department of Defense and the Congress and should be available for open discussion to the extent that classification rules allow. Therefore, this report should be provided in both classified and unclassified form. The various elements required by this report, as with the report required in section 345, may be provided separately, as long as all the required elements are submitted before March 1, 2008, and the information used to satisfy the reporting requirement is current.

The committee expects that the Department of Defense will cooperate fully with the Government Accountability Office throughout its assessment of ground forces readiness.

Budget Items—Army

Extended cold weather clothing system

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA) for the Extended Cold Weather Clothing system (ECWCS). The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in OMA for the ECWCS.

Manufacturing engineering training outreach program

The budget request included \$2.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA) for force readiness operations support, but no funds were provided for the Manufacturing Engineering Training Outreach program (METOP). This program assists the Department of Defense to meet the challenge of finding and preparing the next generation of manufacturing engineers. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in OMA for the METOP.

Live fire ranges modernization and improvements

The budget request included \$2.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA) for operating forces facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization. The committee notes that the Army will continue to depend upon home station ranges to prepare units for deployment to Iraq and Afghanistan. The heavy use of existing range and training support equipment accelerates wear and tear, undermining the quality of pre-deployment training. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million in OMA for live fire training range upgrades.

Budget Items—Navy

Naval aircraft depot maintenance

The budget request included \$40.0 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN) but only \$1.1 billion for aircraft depot maintenance. The Chief of Naval Operations identified a shortage of resources for aircraft depot maintenance as an unfunded priority for fiscal year 2008. The committee recommends an increase of

\$77.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy for aircraft depot maintenance.

Mk45 mod 5" gun depot overhaul

The budget request included \$486.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN) for weapons maintenance. The committee recommends an increase of \$29.5 million in OMN for Mark-45 gun system overhauls.

Environmental impact assessment, outlying landing field

The committee is aware of growing opposition to the placement of an outlying landing field (OLF) at the Washington County, North Carolina site proposed by the Navy as the preferred alternative in their environmental impact statement. At the same time, the committee appreciates the need to establish an OLF within a suitable range of both Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia and Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, North Carolina. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million to fund a follow-on supplemental environmental impact statement to assess the feasibility of alternative sites in the region.

Unobligated balances

The Department of Defense continues to underexecute its Operation and Maintenance (O&M) appropriations for the active and reserve components. According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Department returned an annual average of \$185.7 million in unexpended balances to the U.S. Treasury for fiscal years 1997 through 2001. The Department had \$180.4 million in average yearly unobligated balances for fiscal years 2002 through 2006. The military departments, including their reserve components, returned an average of \$1.0 billion in unexpended balances to the U.S. Treasury for fiscal years 1997 through 2001. The military departments had \$942.8 million in average yearly unobligated balances for fiscal years 2002 through 2006. While the trend continues to improve, the committee remains concerned about the Department's inability to manage the funds which it is authorized and appropriated.

The committee recalls that 2 years ago the Department began to reduce the O&M portion of its annual funding request and future-years defense program before submission to Congress based, in part, on the GAO analysis of unobligated balances. The Department did not, however, reduce the fiscal year 2008 amounts in full accordance with the analysis, or as significantly in the out-years.

The committee notes that the challenges associated with the increased scope and pace of ground force operations in Iraq and Afghanistan create an unusually difficult fiscal management situation, especially for the Army and Marine Corps. This does not, however, relieve the Department or the services from their obligation to provide the best possible stewardship of taxpayer dollars. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$174.6 million to the Department's O&M accounts, as follows: Operation and Maintenance, Navy, \$60.6 million; Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, \$60.0 million; and Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, \$54.0 million.

Excess cash balances

An analysis of the defense working capital fund budgets shows that the Department of Defense significantly underestimated its fiscal year 2006 ending cash balance. Although the Army, Navy, Air Force, and defense-wide fiscal year 2007 budgets estimated that the year-end cash balance would be \$3.4 billion, the actual cash balance, as reported in the fiscal year 2008 budget, was \$4.9 billion—a difference of \$1.5 billion, or 44 percent. These working capital funds provide important financial flexibility for critical defense support activities. When working capital fund activities earn a profit—revenues exceeding expenses—fund activities are supposed to adjust future rates charged to customers to reduce the excess. The working capital fund, however, needs sufficient levels of cash in order to meet its obligations and ensure its ability to provide uninterrupted services to the military departments and agencies. Department of Defense policy requires the working capital fund to maintain 7 to 10 days of cash.

Last year, the committee noted that the global war on terror, and especially operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, had created increased workflow in and out of working capital funds well over peacetime projections. This was especially true for the Army and defense-wide working capital fund activities that had high end-of-year positive operating balances and excess cash balances.

The committee's analysis of last year's budgets shows that the military departments significantly underestimated their fiscal year 2006 working capital fund cash balances. Specifically, the Army, Navy, Air Force, and defense-wide working capital funds reported actual cash balances in excess of the estimated budgeted cash balances by at least \$300.0 million for each of the four funds—or a total of \$1.2 billion. For example, while the Air Force estimated that it would end fiscal year 2006 with a cash balance of \$1.0 billion, the reported actual cash balance was \$1.4 billion. This indicates that the Department continues to base projections of their net operating result for fiscal year 2008 on low revenue estimates.

To ensure proper management of the funds, the committee recommends a decrease of \$208.0 million in Operation and Maintenance accounts as follows: Operation and Maintenance, Navy, \$80.0 million; Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, \$88.0 million; and Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, \$40.0 million.

Budget Items—Marine Corps

Extended cold weather clothing system

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC) for the Extended Cold Weather Clothing system (ECWCS). The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in OMMC for the ECWCS.

Family of combat equipment support and services

The budget request included \$867.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC) for operational forces. The Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified an unfunded requirement in this account for the Family of Combat Equipment Support and Services. The committee recommends an increase of

\$10.0 million in OMMC for the Family of Combat Equipment Support and Services.

Rapid deployable shelters

The budget request included \$876.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC) but does not include funds for rapid deployable shelters. Tents and shelters are an essential deployable element of an expeditionary force. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in OMMC for rapid deployable shelters.

Mobile corrosion protection and abatement USMC

The budget request included \$502.4 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC) for field logistics activities. The committee recommends an increase of \$15.1 million in OMMC for mobile corrosion protection and abatement.

Budget Items—Air Force

National Security Space Institute

The budget request included \$17.3 million for the National Security Space Institute (NSSI) in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) line 90, Global C3I and Early Warning. The committee recommends an additional \$3.3 million for the NSSI. The NSSI is the Air Force school for space professionals, serving Air Force and other military services' space training requirements. The additional funding will allow the NSSI to expand the number of classes and students, accelerate development of the advanced space course, and undertake other educational activities. This program is on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priority list.

Mobile shear

The budget request included \$845.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) for other service wide activities, but provides no funding for Mobile Shear. This equipment will assist Air Force installations to comply with environmental and Department of Defense demilitarization regulations. The committee recommends an increase of \$525,000 in OMAF for Mobile Shear.

Transfer of funds from Air Force centralized asset management program to Air Guard and Air Force Reserve

The budget request included \$41.4 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force. Within this amount the Air Force consolidated \$543.6 million of Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Operation and Maintenance funds into a "Centralized Asset Management" (CAM) initiative.

The committee is concerned that consolidation of funds that support Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve operations, readiness, and facilities denies the Congress required visibility into the distribution and utilization of reserve component resources. Therefore, the committee recommends the transfer of \$129.7 million to Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve, and \$413.9 million to Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard from Operation and Maintenance, Air Force.

Budget Items—Defense-wide

Language training shortfalls

The budget request did not include any funding to cover costs associated with improving the language and cultural awareness training of Special Operations Forces (SOF).

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$8.7 million for U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) language training needs in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, Budget Activity 1.

\$6.4 million of the total amount would fund a shortfall at the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School to pay for instructor hours, homework books, and reproduction of language and culture training CDs and books. The training programs are components of the Special Forces Qualification Course and are already operated on a very lean basis. This funding will allow for an increase in student load from 772 (Special Forces, Civil Affairs, and Psychological Operators) in 2004, to 1,500 personnel over several years, trained at a higher standard. This funding ensures that the growing training population in Special Forces, Civil Affairs, and Psychological Operations, authorized in the Quadrennial Defense Review, will continue to be trained to the higher 1/1/1 standard. This standard was raised in 2004 by the Commander of U.S. Army Special Operations Command (USASOC) and validated by the Commander of SOCOM as necessary in direct response to global war on terrorism-related capability shortfalls.

\$526,000 of the total would be used to fund the foreign language proficiency sustainment training for USASOC units. This includes maintaining proficiency in unit core languages via unit-run training (classroom and live environmental training (LET)). All language requirements directly support SOCOM and regional combatant commander requirements. The 4th Psychological Operations Group (Airborne) and the 95th Civil Affairs Brigade require \$526,000 to fund sustainment training. This includes: \$277,600 for Foreign Language Training Center Europe and LET events in Bahrain, Colombia, China, Peru, Korea, Russia, France, Indonesia, and Costa Rica; \$158,000 for additional instructor contract hours in unit language training facilities; \$68,200 for training aids, books, supplies, and internet services; and \$21,800 for travel to attend SOCOM training seminars. Without this funding, the command will be unable to fully support training of SOF for unconventional warfare missions, which are a critical SOF core competency. This funding allows units to conduct mission language training in support of operational deployments, and helps ensure that soldiers maintain and increase their language proficiency (part of the SOF for Life/Region for Life concept).

\$950,000 of the total amount would fund language training for joint SOF personnel in tailored internet classes. Funding would be used to train about 16 students in full-length 1/1/1 courses and about 56 students in tailored sustainment and enhancement courses. This training would help SOCOM increase its ability to sustain and increase the proficiency of SOF across their careers regardless of their location, and it facilitates full-time courses for SOF teams that are “remissioned” and need a different language

capability. Without this funding many operators would have little or no access to language training conducted by a qualified instructor due to geographic location and work schedule. These regionally-focused operators, preparing for deployment often, are faced with adding a lengthy temporary duty/temporary additional duty in front of a long mission deployment in order to take language classes. This further increases time away from family. Funding internet classes and similar initiatives begins to address this issue.

Defense Security Cooperation Agency

The budget request included \$673.4 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency. Of this amount, \$500.0 million was requested for the Global Train and Equip program to build the capacity of foreign forces. The committee notes that the amount requested for the Global Train and Equip program exceeds the existing authority under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163), as amended by section 1206 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), which is limited to \$300.0 million of Operation and Maintenance funds in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.

The committee also notes that the request for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency included \$7.4 million for the Center for International Issues Research (CIIR) program, which provides updates of open-source media reports. The committee recommends the elimination of this program as an unnecessary duplication of reporting available from other sources.

The request for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency included \$5.0 million for the Stability Operations Fellowship program (SOF). The committee notes that no authority currently exists for the Department of Defense to conduct this fellowship program.

Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$212.4 million to the Department's Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide account for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, as follows: Global Train and Equip—decrease of \$200.0 million; CIIR—decrease of \$7.4 million; and SOFP—decrease of \$5.0 million.

Defense readiness reporting system and management tools

The budget request included \$4.9 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide for the Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS). The committee recommends an increase of \$12.0 million for DRRS including \$2.0 million only for the acceleration of the Global Force Management Visibility Toolkit in support of U.S. Joint Forces Command requirements.

The committee notes the challenges associated with the accurate, reliable, and timely measurement and reporting of the readiness of military forces. The current readiness reporting system, Global Status of Resources and Training System (GSORTS), is inadequate to the demands of the force rotation strategy that supports operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Department of Defense, Joint Staff, and U.S. Joint Forces Command, the joint force provider, lack the visibility of deployed and non-deployed forces' capabilities and readiness required to manage global military commitments.

The committee supports the Department's development of DRRS as a management modernization and replacement for the current system. DRRS is scheduled to achieve full operational capability at the end of fiscal year 2007. Additional funds will accelerate the delivery of the basic system, programmed functionality expansion, support for system operations, training, and sustainment. The committee recommendation also supports the development and fielding of capabilities within the system that allow near real-time force management for contingencies including capability-gap analysis, risk mitigation, and the Global Force Management Visibility Toolkit.

Readiness and environmental protection initiative

The budget request included \$30.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI). The committee is encouraged that this is \$10.0 million more than requested in fiscal year 2007.

The committee believes that the military departments should continue to pursue voluntary agreements with other public and private entities as authorized under section 2684a of title 10, United States Code, to prevent the development or use of property that would be incompatible with the mission of an installation, and preserve habitat that is compatible with environmental requirements that might otherwise result in current or anticipated environmental restrictions on military bases.

The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million in OMDW for the REPI and directs that the military departments should give priority to projects that benefit critical mission training sites that have the greatest potential to prevent or reduce encroachment through the creation of a compatible use buffer zone.

Strategic communication and integration

The budget request included \$3.0 million for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for Strategic Communication and Integration. This funding would support a contractor to help institutionalize strategic communications and complete the implementation of the Strategic Communication Execution Roadmap.

Responsibility for strategic communication and public diplomacy rests with the President and Secretary of State, and any Department of Defense efforts to formulate a message should be informed and framed by those efforts. Moreover, public diplomacy, public affairs, and information operations are separate and distinct functions, with different purposes and guidelines for their use. Any attempt to integrate them could compromise the integrity of each of these functions. Nonetheless, the committee supports the use of the Operation and Maintenance funds of the respective offices conducting communications activities in order to improve the Department's communication efforts, including updating regulations and other activities being conducted as part of the strategic communication and integration effort. The level of funding requested is unjustified. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$3.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide.

Budget Items—Army Reserve**Mobile corrosion protection and abatement USAR**

The budget request included \$84.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve (OMAR) for land forces readiness support activities. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in OMAR for mobile corrosion protection and abatement.

Budget Items—Army National Guard**Extended cold weather clothing system**

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG) for the Extended Cold Weather Clothing system (ECWCS). The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in OMARNG for the ECWCS.

National Guard interoperability upgrades

The budget request included no funds for command and control interoperability upgrades for the Army National Guard. The committee notes that interoperable communications are required for adequate command and control of federal, state, and local responses to domestic emergencies. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.3 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard for command and control interoperability upgrades.

Integrated disaster and rapid data management systems

The budget request included \$309.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG) for force readiness operations support, but did not include funds for the Integrated Disaster Management system (IDMS) or Rapid Data Management system (RDMS). These systems provide near real-time data management and analysis to and from field operators through deployable hand-held and cellular devices. The integration of IDMS and RDMS increases speed and efficiency of command and control during domestic emergencies. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.9 million in OMARNG for IDMS and RDMS.

Mobile corrosion protection and abatement USARNG

The budget request included \$109.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG) for land forces systems readiness activities. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in OMARNG for mobile corrosion protection and abatement.

Operator driving simulator

The budget request included no funding for operator driving simulators for the Army National Guard. The committee notes that a number of casualties have occurred in Iraq and Afghanistan as a result of vehicle accidents, including single vehicle accidents. Ensuring vehicle operators have quality training is vital to the readiness of the armed forces as well as their safety. These driving simulators would ensure that training time for soldiers is maximized, even with limited vehicle assets. The fielding plan includes 79 simulator units at 27 sites, including Army National Guard sites at

nine states. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard, for operator driving simulators.

Budget Items—Air National Guard

Controlled humidity protection

The budget request included \$3.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (OMANG) for aircraft operations, but included no funds for controlled humidity protection. The committee notes the high readiness costs associated with corrosion and that it is particularly harmful to sensitive and expensive aircraft components. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in OMANG for controlled humidity protection.

Weapons skills trainer

The budget request included \$540.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (OMANG) for mission support operations, but included no funds for the Weapons Skills Trainer (WST). The committee notes the high mobilization rates of members of the Air National Guard and their occasional use in non-traditional ground force roles. Individual and unit weapons training is enhanced by the availability of a multilevel weapons simulator such as the WST. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.5 million in OMANG for the Weapons Skills Trainer.

Budget Items—Transfer Accounts

Funding for formerly used defense sites

The budget request included \$250.2 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for environmental restoration of Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS). The committee notes that the budgeted amount is below the level authorized for this program in fiscal year 2007. The committee understands that it is the Department of Defense's goal to achieve a remedy in place or response complete at all FUDS by 2020 under the Installation Restoration program for hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants. It is also the Department's goal to complete preliminary assessments at all FUDS by 2007, and complete site inspections at all FUDS by 2010, under the Military Munitions Response program for clean-up of unexploded ordnance.

The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million in OMDW to expedite the clean-up of FUDS and to move more aggressively to achieve the Department's goals. The committee expects the Department to demonstrate its commitment to these goals, and improve on them where it is possible to do so, by steadily increasing the amount of funding budgeted for this effort.

Budget Items—Miscellaneous Appropriations

Building partnership capacity for humanitarian assistance

The budget request included \$103.3 million for Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid (OHDACA). Of this amount, \$40.0 million was included for building partnership capacity for humani-

tarian assistance. However, no authority was requested by the Department of Defense for this new program.

Therefore, the committee recommends that Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, Budget Activity 4 be decreased by \$40.0 million.

Items of Special Interest

Comptroller General report on depot work

Section 2466 of title 10, United States Code, requires the Department of Defense to report annually on the expenditures for service contract and organic depot maintenance. This report contains the actual expenditures for the previous fiscal year, as well as projections for the current and future years. The committee directs the Comptroller General to review and make recommendations with respect to the current system of reports, assessments, analysis, or documents required by law or regulation to determine the compliance of the Department of Defense and military departments with the percentage limitation in section 2466(a) of title 10, United States Code. The committee is particularly interested to learn if there are better methods than the current system for meeting its oversight responsibilities of Department compliance with the requirements of this section. This report is due not later than March 1, 2008.

Department of Defense foreign language training

The budget request included \$10.4 million for the Defense Language Institute in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), specifically for satellite communications language training activities (SCOLA).

SCOLA is a unique and innovative satellite-based language training activity that provides television programming in a variety of languages from around the world. SCOLA also has an internet-based streaming video capability that greatly increases the availability of this training medium to military and civilian linguists, virtually anywhere they can obtain an internet connection. In addition, SCOLA is developing a digital archive that will allow users anywhere to review and sort language training on demand.

In the Senate report accompanying S. 2744 (S. Rept. 109–254) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), the committee commended the Department of Defense for increasing investment in language technology. That report noted that SCOLA can help sustain and improve foreign language skills and cultural understanding of military and civilian linguists in the Department.

The committee understands, unfortunately, that the Department has failed to obligate the funds that were authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2007. There are indications that the Department may intend to wait until the last month of the fiscal year before doing so. The committee fails to understand what could have caused a delay in obligating funds for this important activity and encourages the Department to move more expeditiously to do so with the fiscal year 2008 funds.

Fee-for-service air refueling services

The committee remains concerned about the ability of the Department of the Air Force to provide adequate air refueling services to support all operational and training requirements. While the average age of the KC-135 fleet is more than 45 years old, the next generation KC-X aircraft is not scheduled to begin low-rate initial production until 2011. The committee is concerned about our ability to meet our air refueling requirements in the immediate future. At a time of historically low readiness levels, the Air Force cannot afford further degradation in air refueling capacity.

The committee is aware of several commercial providers of fee-for-service air refueling. Such an option was one of the alternatives considered in the analysis leading to the release of the KC-X request for proposals. In fact, Air Force officials have indicated a desire to investigate using fee-for-service air refueling services for some portion of their mission. They have referred to this as “Part B” of the KC-X acquisition strategy. This potential commercial capability has been estimated by some to save the Air Force up to 50 percent over current methods of organic air refueling operations. Due to the technological maturity of commercial concepts, the promising business cases presented by several of the commercial providers, and the growing capability gap in the air refueling arena, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to initiate a competitive fee-for-service air refueling pilot program, utilizing currently available Operation and Maintenance funds. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to seek “Part B” proposals to determine the practicality of relying on fee-for-service air refueling services for satisfying some portion of the Air Force refueling mission.

Next generation enterprise network

The committee understands that the Department of the Navy is attempting to develop the Next Generation Enterprise Network (NGEN) as a follow-on to the Navy/Marine Corps Intranet. This endeavor depends on seamless coordination between the Department of Defense’s Chief Information Officers, the Department’s Senior Acquisition Executives, the Navy and Marine Corps, and various other elements of the Department of Defense. Accordingly, the committee directs that the Secretary of the Navy coordinate the NGEN initiative with these relevant entities. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, jointly with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration; the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics; and the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation; to produce a report for Congress describing the plans and schedule, including planned funding for the NGEN initiative. The report should include a description of NGEN’s compliance with the policies and architectures of the Business Transformation Agency, testing plans and procedures, and review and coordination mechanisms with all relevant oversight agencies. The report should be delivered to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2008.

Report on Department of Defense personnel access to the internet

The committee is concerned with the recent Department of Defense policy changes that seek to limit the access of military personnel to certain popular internet web sites. While the committee understands the need to preserve available bandwidth for military needs and the necessity of ensuring operational security, the potential negative effects on morale must also be carefully considered. Those deployed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere around the world, sometimes for more than a year, deserve every opportunity to connect with their friends and family on a frequent basis. Social networking web sites facilitate that communication for this generation, in the same way letters, phone calls, and telegrams did for previous ones. The committee believes that access to the commercial internet can promote strong morale among personnel in the field as well as family members on the home front.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a report that includes a detailed description of the measurable effect that the use of these sites has had on operations and a detailed analysis of any bandwidth or security challenges that their use poses, as well as a description of any policies and procedures in place for the provision of internet access for deployed personnel when operational security requires denial of access via Government systems. The report should be delivered to the congressional defense committees no later than September 1, 2007.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Active Forces

End strengths for active forces (sec. 401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize active-duty end strengths for fiscal year 2008, as shown below:

	Fiscal year		
	2007 authorization	2008 request	2008 recommendation
Army	512,400	489,400	525,400
Navy	340,700	328,400	328,400
Marine Corps	180,000	180,000	189,000
Air Force	334,200	328,600	328,600

The John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) authorized active-duty end strength for the Army at 512,400 and for the Marine Corps at 180,000. Additional authority was also provided in section 403 of that Act to increase active-duty end strength for the Army by up to 20,000 and for the Marine Corps by up to 4,000 above the fiscal year 2007 authorized levels of 512,400 and 180,000, respectively.

The committee recommends combining the base budget end strength with the end strength funded in recent years in emergency supplementals. Although the Department of Defense has again divided its fiscal year 2008 end strength request between its base and war-related budget requests, the committee believes that it is more appropriate to authorize the total end strengths available to the military services in an integrated manner without regard to whether they are “permanent” or war-related. In the committee’s view, the total end strength that is needed to accomplish the military mission should be authorized in this section in a way that does not obscure the true cost that the actual end strength presents.

The committee remains concerned that the planned growth in ground forces will come too late to impact the war in Iraq, and 5 years from now, when the planned growth is scheduled to be complete, the requirements for a larger force may not remain. Nevertheless, the committee supports the planned increases in the ground forces for the coming fiscal year, but will continue to assess this growth on a year-to-year basis. The committee recommends an active-duty end strength for fiscal year 2008 for the Army and Marine Corps of 525,400 and 189,000, respectively.

The Navy and the Air Force continue large manpower reductions achieved through major changes in organizational structure, including deleting redundancies, retiring manpower-intensive platforms, incorporating new technology, and shifting non-core military functions from military personnel to civilians. These efforts con-

tinue to be challenging and will be monitored closely by the committee. The committee is concerned that the Navy and the Air Force may be cutting personnel too far and too fast, opting to spend money on procurement programs and weapons systems to the detriment of personnel. The committee recommends an active-duty end strength for the Navy and Air Force of 328,400 and 328,600, respectively.

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2008, as shown below:

	Fiscal year		
	2007 authorization	2008 request	2008 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	350,000	351,300	351,300
The Army Reserve	200,000	205,000	205,000
The Navy Reserve	71,300	67,800	67,800
The Marine Corps Reserve	39,600	39,600	39,600
The Air National Guard of the United States	107,000	106,700	106,700
The Air Force Reserve	74,900	67,500	67,500
The Coast Guard Reserve	10,000	10,000	10,000

End strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize full-time support end strengths for fiscal year 2008, as shown below:

	Fiscal year		
	2007 authorization	2008 request	2008 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	27,411	29,204	29,204
The Army Reserve	15,416	15,870	15,870
The Navy Reserve	12,564	11,579	11,579
The Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	2,261
The Air National Guard of the United States	13,291	13,936	13,936
The Air Force Reserve	2,707	2,721	2,721

The committee recommends increases of 1793 in the Army National Guard, 454 in the Army Reserve, 645 in the Air National Guard, and 14 in the Air Force Reserve over levels approved for fiscal year 2007. The committee supports increases in full-time support manning consistent with requested levels to increase readiness in the reserve components.

The committee also recommends a decrease from the fiscal year 2007 level of 985 in the Navy Reserve, consistent with reductions in both active Navy and Navy Reserve end strength. The committee recommends an end strength for the Marine Corps Reserve equal to the fiscal year 2007 level, consistent with the budget request.

End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize end strengths for military technicians (dual status) for fiscal year 2008, as shown below:

	Fiscal year		
	2007 authorization	2008 request	2008 recommendation
The Army Reserve	7,912	8,249	8,249
The Army National Guard of the United States	26,050	26,502	26,502
The Air Force Reserve	10,124	9,909	9,909
The Air National Guard of the United States	23,255	22,553	22,553

Fiscal year 2008 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish limits on the number of non-dual status technicians who may be employed in the Department of Defense as of September 30, 2008, as shown below:

	Fiscal year		
	2007 authorization	2008 request	2008 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	1,600	1,600	1,600
The Army Reserve	595	595	595
The Air National Guard of the United States	350	350	350
The Air Force Reserve	90	90	90

Maximum number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support (sec. 415)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish limits on the number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support under section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, as of September 30, 2008, as shown below:

	Fiscal year		
	2007 authorization	2008 request	2008 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	17,000	17,000	17,000
The Army Reserve	13,000	13,000	13,000
The Navy Reserve	6,200	6,200	6,200
The Marine Corps Reserve	3,000	3,000	3,000
The Air National Guard of the United States	16,000	16,000	16,000
The Air Force Reserve	14,000	14,000	14,000

Subtitle C—Authorizations of Appropriations

Military personnel (sec. 421)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the following amounts for military personnel for fiscal year 2008: (1) for the Army, \$34,952,762,000; (2) for the Navy, \$23,300,841,000; (3) for the Marine Corps, \$11,065,542,000; (4) for the Air Force, \$24,091,993,000; (5) for the Army Reserve, \$3,701,197,000; (6) for the Navy Reserve, \$1,766,408,000; (7) for the Marine Corps Re-

serve, \$593,961,000; (8) for the Air Force Reserve, \$1,356,618,000; (9) for the Army National Guard, \$5,914,979,000; and (10) for the Air National Guard, \$2,607,456,000.

The total authorized amount of \$109,351,757,000 is \$3,948,059,000, or 3.7 percent, above the base budget request. This increase includes a shift of funds from the supplemental budget to the base budget for the end strength requested in the supplemental budget, and an additional \$302,000,000 for an across-the-board 3.5 percent pay raise, versus the budget request of 3 percent.

The Department of Defense has consistently underexecuted its military personnel funding authorization and appropriation since fiscal year 1995 for the active and reserve components. According to the Government Accountability Office, from fiscal years 2002 through 2005, the lowest annual unobligated balance was \$271.2 million and the highest was \$2,169.0 million. The committee recommends a decrease of \$507.2 million to military personnel accounts to reflect anticipated unobligated balances, as described in the following table.

Title IV - Military Personnel Funding Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
MILITARY PERSONNEL ARMY (Direct)	31,623,865		31,623,865
Military Pay Raise Increase		103,655	103,655
Unobligated Balances		-139,640	-139,640
Accumulated leave carryover		1,000	1,000
Active Duty Overstrength Transfers from Title XV:			
BASIC PAY		152,123	152,123
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL		44,116	44,116
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING		51,770	51,770
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE		5,665	5,665
RECRUITING AND RETENTION (Total AC)		62,000	62,000
SPECIAL PAYS		26,582	26,582
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX		11,637	11,637
BASIC PAY		1,047,717	1,047,717
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL		303,838	303,838
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING		386,219	386,219
RECRUITING AND RETENTION (Total AC)		958,120	958,120
SPECIAL PAYS		111,751	111,751
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX		80,150	80,150
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE		122,194	122,194
TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL ARMY	31,623,865	3,328,897	34,952,762

Title IV - Military Personnel Funding Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
MILITARY PERSONNEL NAVY (Direct)	23,305,233		23,305,233
Military Pay Raise Increase		58,528	58,528
Unobligated Balances		-63,920	-63,920
Accumulated leave carryover		1,000	1,000
TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL NAVY	23,305,233	-4,392	23,300,841
MILITARY PERSONNEL MARINE CORPS (Direct)	10,278,031		10,278,031
Military Pay Raise Increase		29,414	29,414
Unobligated Balances		-27,310	-27,310
Accumulated leave carryover		1,000	1,000
Active Duty Overstrength Transfers from Title XV:			
BASIC PAY		97,595	97,595
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL		28,303	28,303
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING		32,823	32,823
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE		3,075	3,075
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX		7,466	7,466
BASIC PAY		206,354	206,354
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL		59,843	59,843
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING		87,381	87,381
INCENTIVE PAYS		219,881	219,881
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX		15,786	15,786
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE		25,900	25,900

Title IV - Military Personnel Funding Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL MARINE CORPS	10,278,031	787,511	11,065,542
MILITARY PERSONNEL AIR FORCE (Direct)	24,097,354		24,097,354
Military Pay Raise Increase		66,049	66,049
Unobligated Balances		-72,410	-72,410
Accumulated leave carryover		1,000	1,000
TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL AIR FORCE	24,097,354	-5,361	24,091,993
RESERVE PERSONNEL ARMY (Direct)	3,734,620		3,734,620
Military Pay Raise Increase		9,377	9,377
Unobligated Balances		-42,800	-42,800
TOTAL RESERVE PERSONNEL ARMY	3,734,620	-33,423	3,701,197

Title IV - Military Personnel Funding Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
RESERVE PERSONNEL NAVY (Direct)			
Military Pay Raise Increase	1,797,685		1,797,685
Unobligated Balances		4,443	4,443
		-35,720	-35,720
TOTAL RESERVE PERSONNEL NAVY	1,797,685	-31,277	1,766,408
RESERVE PERSONNEL MARINE CORPS (Direct)			
Military Pay Raise Increase	594,872		594,872
Unobligated Balances		1,549	1,549
		-2,460	-2,460
TOTAL RESERVE PERSONNEL MARINE CORPS	594,872	-911	593,961
RESERVE PERSONNEL AIR FORCE (Direct)			
Military Pay Raise Increase	1,370,479		1,370,479
Unobligated Balances		3,569	3,569
		-17,430	-17,430
TOTAL RESERVE PERSONNEL AIR FORCE	1,370,479	-13,861	1,356,618

Title IV - Military Personnel Funding Authorizations (Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL ARMY (Direct)			
Military Pay Raise Increase	5,959,149	18,230	5,959,149
Unobligated Balances		-63,400	18,230
Accumulated leave carryover		1,000	-63,400
			1,000
TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL ARMY	5,959,149	-44,170	5,914,979
NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL AIR FORCE (Direct)			
Military Pay Raise Increase	2,642,410	7,186	2,642,410
Unobligated Balances		-42,140	7,186
			-42,140
TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL AIR FORCE	2,642,410	-34,954	2,607,456
TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS	105,403,698	3,948,059	109,351,757
TRICARE FOR LIFE ACCRUALS	10,876,204		10,876,204
TOTAL DISCRETIONARY SPENDING	116,279,902	3,948,059	120,227,961
MANDATORY SPENDING: CURRENT LAW	2,640,500		2,640,500
TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL BUDGET AUTHORITY	118,920,402	3,948,059	122,868,461

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy

Increase in authorized strengths for Army officers on active duty in the grade of major to meet force structure requirements (sec. 501)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the table in section 523(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to increase the authorized strength limits for active-duty Army officers in the grade of major to meet the Army's requirement for additional majors in its new modular structure.

Increase in authorized strengths for Navy officers on active duty in grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain to meet force structure requirements (sec. 502)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the table in section 523(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, to increase the authorized strength limits for active-duty Navy captains, commanders, and lieutenant commanders to meet the Navy's force structure requirements for additional officers in these grades.

Expansion of exclusion of military permanent professors from strength limitations for officers below general and flag grades (sec. 503)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 523 of title 10, United States Code, to increase from 50 to 85 the number of permanent professors for each of the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy and professors of the United States Navy who are career military professors who may be excluded from the authorized number of commissioned officers who may be serving on active duty in that grade.

Mandatory retirement age for active-duty general and flag officers continued on active duty (sec. 504)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 637(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, relating to deferral of retirement and continuation on active duty of regular officers to conform with recently enacted extended age limits for mandatory retirement of general and flag officers serving on active duty included in section 502 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364).

Authority for reduced mandatory service obligation for initial appointments of officers in critically short health professional specialties (sec. 505)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 651 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive the 8-year minimum service obligation for initial appointments of commissioned officers in critically short health professional specialties. The minimum period of service under such a waiver would be the greater of 2 years or the period of obligated service associated with receipt of an accession bonus or special pay.

Increase in authorized number of permanent professors at the United States Military Academy (sec. 506)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 4331(b) of title 10, United States Code, to increase from 22 to 28 the authorized number of permanent professors at the United States Military Academy. Although the Military Academy has made numerous changes to the structure of the academic departments, the authorized number of permanent professors has not been increased since 1978. The additional authorization for permanent professors would allow assignment of a permanent professor as deputy department head for each academic department and as Vice-Dean.

The committee understands that the performance of permanent professors at the Military Academy is formally reviewed every 5 years. The committee is concerned that a formal review every 5 years is not sufficient to document the quality of performance and potential for increased responsibility expected of officers in their positions. The committee directs that permanent professors receive a formal evaluation at least annually, consistent with the practice for evaluating other Army officers.

Expansion of authority for reenlistment of officers in their former enlisted grade (sec. 507)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 3258 and 8258 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize regular Army and Air Force officers to reenlist under certain conditions in their former enlisted grade. Under current law, only reserve officers are authorized to reenlist in their former grade.

Enhanced authority for reserve general and flag officers to serve on active duty (sec. 508)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 526(d) of title 10, United States Code, to exclude from the limitations on the number of general and flag officers on active duty certain reserve general and flag officers serving on active duty for not more than 365 days. The total number of these officers could not exceed 10 percent of the number of reserve component general and flag officers authorized to be in an active status under section 12004 of title 10, United States Code.

Promotion of career military professors of the Navy (sec. 509)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize promotion of Navy permanent professors to the grade of captain or colonel pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy. The regulations would include a competitive selection board process to identify those permanent professors best qualified for promotion. The promotion would be effective not earlier than 3 years after the selection of the officer as a permanent professor.

Subtitle B—Enlisted Personnel Policy

Increase in authorized daily average of number of members in pay grade E-9 (sec. 521)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 517(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an increase to the upper limit on the authorized daily average of active-duty enlisted members in pay grade E-9 from the current 1 percent of the enlisted force to 1.25 percent.

Subtitle C—Reserve Component Management

Revised designation, structure, and functions of the Reserve Forces Policy Board (sec. 531)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 10301 of title 10, United States Code, to redesignate the Reserve Forces Policy Board as the Reserve Policy Advisory Board and restructure it to provide the Secretary of Defense with independent advice and recommendations on matters relating to the reserve components.

This provision implements a recommendation of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves to reconstitute the Reserve Forces Policy Board with a goal of generating and providing the best possible advice to the Secretary of Defense on reserve policy matters.

Charter for the National Guard Bureau (sec. 532)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 10503 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to prescribe a charter for the National Guard Bureau.

This provision implements a recommendation of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves that the Secretary of Defense be responsible for drafting the charter for the National Guard Bureau to accurately reflect the full scope of the Bureau's required duties and activities.

The committee recognizes that the role of the National Guard in performing federal missions at home and overseas and in assisting governors in responding to State and local emergencies has grown significantly. This dual role and the competing demands for National Guard forces underscores the vital role of the National Guard Bureau as a channel of communication with the States, and of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau as an advisor to the Sec-

retary of Defense, the Secretaries and Chiefs of Staff of the Army and Air Force, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Commander, U.S. Northern Command, and State governors on National Guard matters. The committee believes that an updated charter which takes into account the various missions being performed by the National Guard is essential and urges the Secretary to complete this at the earliest possible time.

Appointment, grade, duties, and retirement of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau (sec. 533)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 10502(d) of title 10, United States Code, to increase the grade of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau from lieutenant general to general and to require that an officer appointed to this position be recommended by his or her Governor and by the Secretary of the Army or the Air Force, have at least 10 years of federally recognized commissioned service in an active status in the National Guard, be in the grade of major general or above, have significant joint duty experience, and have successfully completed such other assignments and experiences so as to possess a detailed understanding of the status and capabilities of National Guard forces and the missions of the National Guard Bureau. The provision would also designate the Chief of the National Guard Bureau as an advisor to the Secretary of Defense, through the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on matters involving the National Guard not employed in a federal status and would amend section 14512(a) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to defer the mandatory retirement age of an officer serving as Chief of the National Guard Bureau until age 68.

This provision implements a recommendation of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves to increase the grade of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to general and serve as a senior advisor to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and, through the Chairman, to the Secretary of Defense, for matters pertaining to the National Guard in its non-federal role.

The committee believes that this provision reflects the increasing importance of the role of the National Guard in homeland defense and civil support missions, as well as an operational force. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau would be able to provide the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and the Secretary of Defense with valuable advice across a broad spectrum of issues related to the use of non-federalized National Guard forces in these missions.

Mandatory separation for years of service of Reserve officers in the grade of lieutenant general or vice admiral (sec. 534)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 14508 of title 10, United States Code, to require transfer of reserve officers to the Retired Reserve or discharge from the officer's reserve appointment 30 days after completion of 38 years of commissioned service. This change is consistent with the requirement for mandatory separation for years of service of regular officers in the grade of lieutenant general or vice admiral.

Increase in period of temporary Federal recognition as officers of the National Guard from six to twelve months (sec. 535)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 308(a) of title 32, United States Code, to increase from 6 to 12 months the period of temporary federal recognition as an officer of the Army or Air National Guard that can be granted to an individual during the period that the individual's appointment as a reserve officer of the Army or Air Force is pending. This provision would allow additional time for processing of appointments for permanent federal recognition and avoid hardships resulting from delays in appointment.

Subtitle D—Education and Training

Grade and service credit of commissioned officers in uniformed medical accession programs (sec. 551)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2114(b) and 2121(c) of title 10, United States Code, to require that medical students at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences and persons participating in the armed forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Programs who have prior commissioned service, serve, while on active duty, in pay grade 0–1, or in pay grade 0–2 if they meet specified promotion criteria prescribed by the service secretary. The provision would also amend section 2004a of title 10, United States Code, to impose the same limitations regarding the pay grade and service credit exclusion on officers on active duty with prior commissioned service who are detailed as students at medical schools under section 2004a.

The committee believes that limiting the amount of prior service commissioned officer credit for purposes of rank for medical students in military-sponsored programs is necessary in order to achieve career progression objectives. The limitations should be uniformly applied in various programs for medical students. The committee notes that the services have not implemented the authority extended in section 2004a of title 10, United States Code, despite ongoing difficulty in achieving health professional recruiting goals. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of all health professional commissioning programs with the objective of identifying and remedying impediments to successful recruiting of the most highly qualified students.

Expansion of number of academies supportable in any State under STARBASE program (sec. 552)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2193b(c) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to support, with Department of Defense funds, the establishment and operation of up to four STARBASE academies in a State.

The committee recognizes the Department of Defense STARBASE program as an effective educational program focused on science, math, technology, and engineering. It has reached over 350,000 youths at 54 locations associated with active, guard, and

reserve commands throughout the United States. The STARBASE program seeks to heighten the interest of students in pursuing careers requiring skills in science, technology, math, and engineering that are in high demand in the Department of Defense. Raising the limit on the number of Department of Defense-funded STARBASE academies per state would enable expansion of this program in States where there is a particularly strong justification for establishing new STARBASE programs.

Repeal of post-2007-2008 academic year prohibition on phased increase in cadet strength limit at the United States Military Academy (sec. 553)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 4342 of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Army to increase by up to 100 cadets per year the size of the Corps of Cadets at the United States Military Academy to a maximum of 4,400 cadets. This would afford the Secretary of the Army the flexibility to respond to the Army's requirement for additional company grade officers to support the Army's projected increased end strength and force structure.

Treatment of Southold, Mattituck, and Greenport High Schools, Southold, New York, as single institutions for purposes of maintaining a Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit (sec. 554)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Southold, Mattituck, and Greenport High Schools, located in Southold, New York, to be treated as a single institution for the purposes of maintaining a Navy Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) unit. This provision would allow the Navy to continue a very successful JROTC program in a unique setting.

Subtitle E—Defense Dependents' Education Matters

Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 561)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$35.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for continuation of the Department of Defense assistance program to local educational agencies that are impacted by enrollment of dependent children of military members and civilian employees of the Department of Defense. The committee also recommends authorization of \$10.0 million in OMDW, for assistance to local educational agencies with significant changes in enrollment of military and civilian school-aged dependent children due to base closures, force structure changes, or force relocations.

Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 562)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for impact aid payments for children with disabilities under section 8003(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

(20 U.S.C. 7703(d)), using the formula set forth in section 363 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), for continuation of the Department of Defense’s assistance to local educational agencies that benefit dependents with severe disabilities.

Inclusion of dependents of non-Department of Defense employees employed on Federal property in plan relating to force structure changes, relocation of military units, or base closures and realignments (sec. 563)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 574(e)(3) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), to include dependents of personnel who work on federal property but are not members of the armed forces or civilian employees of the Department of Defense in the plan and annual reports required to identify and assist local educational agencies experiencing growth in enrollment due to force structure changes, relocation of military units, or base closure and realignments. The provision would make the definition of “military dependent students” consistent with the definition used for purposes of computation of payments under the Federal Impact Aid program authorized in section 7703 of title 20, United States Code.

Authority for payment of private boarding school tuition for military dependents in overseas areas not served by Department of Defense dependents’ schools (sec. 564)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to pay tuition for attendance at private boarding schools in the United States for military dependents in overseas areas not served by Department of Defense schools. Under current law, such dependents are sent to other overseas schools rather than to boarding schools in the United States.

Subtitle F—Military Justice and Legal Assistance Matters

Authority of judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces to administer oaths (sec. 571)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 936 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces to administer oaths.

Military legal assistance for Department of Defense civilian employees in areas without access to non-military legal assistance (sec. 572)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the authority of the service secretaries to provide legal assistance to civilian employees of the Department of Defense in locations where legal assistance from non-military legal assistance providers is not reasonably available.

Modification of authorities on senior members of the Judge Advocate Generals' corps (sec. 573)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that the Judge Advocates General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force serve in the grade of lieutenant general or vice admiral, and would exclude them from the authorized number of officers serving in grades above major general or rear admiral. The provision would also authorize the position of Legal Counsel to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and would require that the officer appointed to this position serve in the grade of brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half) and be recommended by a board of officers convened by the Secretary of Defense.

The need for enhanced authority and independence by the most senior military attorneys of the services has become increasingly apparent during the global war on terrorism. The committee believes that the Judge Advocates General and the Legal Counsel to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should serve in higher grades than presently assigned, commensurate with the vital importance of their duties and responsibilities.

Subtitle G—Military Family Readiness

Department of Defense Military Family Readiness Council (sec. 581)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a Department of Defense Military Family Readiness Council to review and make recommendations on Department of Defense policy and plans for the support of military family readiness; to monitor requirements for the support of military family readiness; and to evaluate and assess the effectiveness of military family readiness programs and activities of the Department of Defense. The council would consist of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, who would serve as chair, one representative from each of the services, and three individuals from representatives of military family organizations.

The committee has received testimony of senior leaders from throughout the Department of Defense stressing the importance of support for military families. Yet, from a Department-wide perspective, many of these efforts appear to be independent and ad hoc. Creation of the council authorized by this provision would facilitate a coordinated approach across all services for the development and sustainment of such programs and improved oversight by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The committee strongly recommends that the Department move toward the creation of structures similar to the Army Family Action Plan, which has proven to be singularly successful in identifying family readiness needs at the highest levels of Army leadership in a systematic and effective manner.

Department of Defense policy and plans for military family readiness (sec. 582)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a policy and plans for the support of military family readiness. The policy would ensure that military family readiness programs and activities are comprehensive, effec-

tive, and supported; continuously available to military families in peacetime and in war; available to military families of the regular and reserve components; included in Department of Defense plans, programs, and budgeting activities; and that they undergo continuous evaluation. The plans would include an ongoing identification and assessment of the effectiveness of military family readiness programs and activities; a description of the resources required to support them; an ongoing identification of gaps in the programs and activities and resources required to address those gaps; and a summary of the allocation of funds for major categories of military family readiness programs and activities. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to conduct surveys of service members, family members, and survivors beginning in fiscal year 2009, and not less frequently than once every 3 years thereafter.

The committee has received testimony on numerous Department of Defense and service-specific programs which support military families in important and effective ways. However, these programs appear to be independent and ad hoc.

The committee believes that family readiness is an enduring need and is concerned that many support programs, such as non-medical counseling and family support services, are funded primarily, or completely, by supplemental appropriations.

The committee expects that the policy and plans required by this provision will ensure that effective family readiness support programs will be included in the basic planning, programming, and budgeting activities of the Department of Defense.

Subtitle H—Other Matters

Enhancement of carryover of accumulated leave for members of the Armed Forces (sec. 591)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 701 of title 10, United States Code, to increase for all service members the number of days of accumulated leave they may carry over from one fiscal year to the next from 60 to 90 days. The provision would also increase by 1 year the amount of time available to service members to use leave accumulated under the special leave accrual provisions of section 701(f) of title 10, United States Code. Finally, the provision would amend section 501(b) of title 37, United States Code, to allow enlisted service members who have accumulated more than 120 days of leave under section 701(f)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to sell back, on a one-time basis, up to 30 days of such leave in excess of 120 days.

The committee recognizes that the ongoing high operations tempo has resulted in many service members accumulating more leave than they can use or carry over into the next fiscal year. In section 542 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), Congress authorized service members deployed in certain areas to accumulate up to 120 days of leave and allowed those service members 3 additional years to use that leave. Unfortunately, even under these conditions, some service members eligible for this benefit have lost leave. This provision would enable these members, on a one-time basis, to sell back up to 30 days of that leave in excess of 120 days.

The committee believes it is essential for military and civilian leaders to ensure that their subordinates maintain adequate leave balances for emergencies but that they are encouraged, if not required, to take leave whenever possible for their good and the good of their service. While the enhanced leave carryover authorized by this provision is needed in today's operational environment, the committee expects the services to ensure that all officer and enlisted personnel understand the need to plan to use their excess leave so as to avoid losing this important benefit or to adversely affect their unit's mission.

Uniform policy on performances by military bands (sec. 592)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide uniform policy for Department of Defense bands regarding when public performances are permitted, the conditions under which band members may perform in their personal capacities, and recording of music for distribution to the public.

Waiver of time limitations on award of medals of honor to certain members of the Army (sec. 593)

The committee recommends a provision that would waive the statutory time limits and authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Woodrow W. Keeble for valor during the Korean War; Leslie H. Sabo, Jr., for valor during the Vietnam War; Philip G. Shadrach for valor during the Civil War; Henry Svehla for valor during the Korean War; and George D. Wilson for valor during the Civil War.

Items of Special Interest

Army company-grade officer retention

The committee is concerned about the increasing attrition rate among company-grade officers in the Army, particularly graduates of the United States Military Academy and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps scholarship program, and the potential effects of this trend on the capabilities of the officer corps. This trend is particularly alarming as the Army strives to increase its end strength in a time of war.

The committee applauds the Army's initiatives to improve retention of high caliber company-grade officers, and particularly notes the promising response to the Army's advanced civilian education program. This program has value beyond increased officer retention, expanding the intellectual and professional growth of officers, allowing respite from operational demands, and laying the foundation for the future senior leaders of the Army. The committee urges the Army to continue this program and to explore expanding its use.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to review the programs and incentives in place to increase company-grade officer retention, including identifying additional opportunities to increase the use of advanced civilian education options in exchange for increased service obligations and the use of the critical skills retention bonus to retain officers serving in designated critical branches.

The committee further directs the Secretary to report on this review to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2008.

Comptroller General study of implementation by the military departments of sexual assault policies and mental health issues related to sexual assault

The committee is concerned about reports of sexual assaults on service members during deployment and the impact on the mental health of victims of such assaults. The committee expects the military departments to continue to examine ways to ensure that applicable policies aimed at preventing and rapidly and effectively responding to sexual assault are properly executed at all levels of command, in deployed areas as well as on installations in the United States.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to conduct a review of the policies and systems in place within the military departments in response to section 577 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375) and in response to the comprehensive policies on sexual assault put in place by the Department of Defense. In particular, the Comptroller General should assess the adequacy of mental health resources available to victims of sexual assault, both in deployed environments and on installations in the United States, and whether current Department of Defense policies, surveys, assessments, and training of military and civilian personnel are effective and adequate to identify and respond to such needs. The Comptroller General should report on this review by August 2008.

Counter-remote controlled improvised explosive device systems

The committee is concerned that the Joint Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Defeat Office has become too dependent on a single source of supply for counter-Remote Controlled IED (RCIED) jamming systems and system components, thereby limiting innovation and potentially preventing more effective systems from being fielded. The committee further believes the Joint IED Defeat Office (JIEDDO) should consider identifying and qualifying additional sources for counter-RCIED systems. The committee therefore directs the JIEDDO and the military departments to identify and, as appropriate, qualify additional sources for counter-RCIED systems and system components.

Explosive ordnance disposal personnel

The committee recognizes the strains experienced by explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) personnel in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee applauds the professionalism, dedication, and skill of these highly proficient technicians and acknowledges the tremendous danger associated with bomb disposal missions. The committee notes that, in addition to frequent combat tours with limited dwell time in the United States, EOD personnel are performing backfill requirements at military installations, as well as supporting the United States Secret Service in their mission to protect the President and other officials. The committee is concerned,

however, that EOD personnel are being stretched too thin for their various missions.

The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on the health and viability of the EOD force by March 1, 2008. The report shall: (1) evaluate whether the EOD force is properly sized, trained, and equipped for the tasks assigned; (2) analyze the sufficiency of pays and incentives available to EOD personnel in light of force requirements and recruiting and retention trends; (3) identify means to reduce operational demands on EOD units; (4) evaluate the need, feasibility, and costs associated with increasing the number of EOD units and personnel in the National Guard; and (5) evaluate the current placement of EOD units within each respective service, specifically evaluating whether EOD units and personnel are more properly organized under a joint command or the U.S. Special Operations Command.

Feasibility of expanding access to mental health professionals in military units

The committee is concerned about the stigma associated with seeking mental health services in the military, the availability of mental health care to service members, and the ability of military leaders to identify service members with mental health conditions. Access to mental health care is generally not available at the unit level, requiring service members to go to a military hospital or to a combat stress control team to receive such care.

The committee is interested in the potential value of embedding military mental health professionals in units in a manner similar to the current utilization of military chaplains. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess the efficacy of creating positions within subordinate military organizations, particularly at the battalion level, in which mental health care professionals would serve. The Secretary's assessment shall include, but not be limited to, an evaluation of: (1) the impact on force structure of such a program; (2) the potential value of increasing the number of military mental health professionals; (3) the value of embedding military mental health professionals in subordinate units, particularly at the battalion level; (4) the appropriate professional skills that would be required of mental health professionals placed in such positions; (5) whether such a program would reduce the stigma for service members seeking mental health care; and (6) whether such a program would increase the capability of unit leaders to identify service members with mental health needs. The committee directs the Secretary to submit the results of the assessment, including findings and recommendations, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2008.

Implementation of clarifying changes to jurisdiction under the Uniform Code of Military Justice

Section 552 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) amended section 802(a)(10) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the application

of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) to persons serving with or accompanying an armed force in the field.

Prior to the enactment of section 552, section 802(a)(10) provided that “[i]n time of war, persons serving with or accompanying an armed force in the field” would be subject to the UCMJ. In the 1970 case of *United States v. Averette*, 19 U.S.C.M.A. 363, the United States Court of Military Appeals interpreted the phrase “in time of war” to mean a war formally declared by Congress. Section 552 modified the provision to apply “in time of declared war or a contingency operation.”

A number of contractor groups have expressed the view that this provision is “both broad and vague.” According to these groups:

The Secretary of Defense is unilaterally authorized to declare any military activity a ‘contingency operation,’ in addition, national disaster declarations made by the President also trigger the ‘contingency operation’ function. Hurricane Katrina was a military ‘contingency operation.’ Most of the homeland security operations of the Defense Department’s Northern Command are considered ‘contingency operations.’

In fact, section 101(13) of title 10, United States Code, authorizes the Secretary of Defense to declare a military operation a “contingency operation” only if members of the military are or may become involved in “military actions, operations, or hostilities against an enemy of the United States or against an opposing military force.” A national emergency may also trigger a “contingency operation,” but only if it results in the call or order to active duty (in federal status) of the reserve components. This authority was not used in the response to Hurricane Katrina and has never been used in the case of any other natural disaster. Moreover, section 802(a)(10) applies, by its terms, only to persons accompanying an armed force “in the field.” The phrase “in the field” has been consistently interpreted to mean in the face of an enemy force. None of the hypothetical situations raised by contractor groups meet any of these tests.

The contractor groups have also expressed concern that the Department of Defense has yet to issue guidance or regulations as to which provisions of the UCMJ will apply to contractor employees accompanying an armed force in the field, and under what circumstances. This issue is appropriately addressed through revisions to the Manual for Courts Martial implementing the new legislation. The committee urges the Department of Defense to expeditiously issue such revisions. The committee expects that the Manual for Courts Martial will implement the provision in a manner that is consistent with the longstanding definitions of terms such as “contingency operations” and “in the field” and mindful of U.S. Supreme Court precedent regarding the application of the UCMJ to civilians.

Report on programs assessing feasibility of hotlines and video surveillance in recruiting stations

In response to a requirement contained in the statement of managers accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authoriza-

tion Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), the Secretary of Defense submitted a report on programs designed to prevent recruiter misconduct. Two methods for preventing incidents of recruiter misconduct used by individual services include use of “hot-line” numbers for recruits to call and report violations and employment of video surveillance in recruiting stations.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review these programs to determine their efficacy in preventing recruiter misconduct, increasing safety and comfort of potential recruits visiting recruiting stations, and improving the performance and security of military recruiters. The Secretary should also assess the cost of the programs and their impact, if any, on recruiting success. The committee directs the Secretary to submit the results of this review and assessment, including findings, conclusions and recommendations, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2008.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

Fiscal year 2008 increase in military basic pay (sec. 601)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a pay raise for the members of the uniformed services of 3.5 percent effective on January 1, 2008. This across-the-board pay raise is 0.5 percent above the budget request.

The committee believes that the 3 percent requested in the budget should be increased by half a percent in order to recognize the outstanding service and sacrifice of the men and women of the armed forces and their families.

Allowance for participation of Reserves in electronic screening (sec. 602)

The committee recommends a provision that would create a new section 433a in title 10, United States Code, authorizing the military services to pay a member of the Individual Ready Reserve a stipend for participation in electronic screening performed pursuant to section 10149 of title 10, United States Code. The aggregate amount of the stipend paid to a member may not exceed \$50 in any calendar year.

The provision would also prohibit a member of the Individual Ready Reserve from receiving compensation under section 206 of title 37, United States Code, for screening for which the member received a stipend under the new section 433a. Finally, the provision would clarify that members may not receive retirement credit for participating in screening, regardless of whether the member received a stipend.

Midmonth payment of basic pay for contributions of members participating in Thrift Savings Plan (sec. 603)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1014 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Department of Defense to make twice monthly payments to the Thrift Savings Plan on behalf of participating service members.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

Extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus; the Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus; the special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high priority units; the Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior serv-

ice; the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service; and the Selected Reserve enlistment bonus for persons with prior service.

Extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals (sec. 612)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the nurse officer candidate accession bonus; the repayment of education loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve; the accession bonus for registered nurses; incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists; special pay for Selected Reserve health professionals in critically short wartime specialties; the accession bonus for dental officers; the accession bonus for pharmacy officers; the accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties; and the accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties.

Extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending their period of active service; the nuclear career accession bonus; and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus.

Extension of authorities relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays (sec. 614)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the aviation officer retention bonus; the reenlistment bonus for active members; the enlistment bonus; the retention bonus for members with critical military skills or assigned to high priority units; the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills; the incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage; and the accession bonus for officer candidates.

Increase in incentive special pay and multiyear retention bonus for medical officers of the Armed Forces (sec. 615)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the authorized limits on incentive special pay and the multiyear retention bonus for medical officers from \$50,000 to \$75,000.

Increase in dental officer additional special pay (sec. 616)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 302b of title 37, United States Code, to increase the amount of additional special pay for dental officers. Under current law, a dental officer with less than 3 years of creditable service is eligible for a \$4,000 bonus, and a dental officer with more than 3 but less than 10 years of creditable service is eligible for a \$6,000 bonus. This provision would increase the maximum authorized amounts for those officers to \$10,000 and \$12,000, respectively.

Enhancement of hardship duty pay (sec. 617)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 305 of title 37, United States Code, to raise the maximum monthly amount of hardship duty pay to \$1,500. The provision would also authorize the payment of hardship duty pay in a lump sum, subject to the member executing a written agreement.

Inclusion of service as off-cycle crewmember of multi-crewed ship in sea duty for career sea pay (sec. 618)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 305a of title 37, United States Code, to authorize off-cycle crewmembers of multi-crewed ships to be eligible for career sea pay.

Modification of reenlistment bonus for members of the Selected Reserve (sec. 619)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 308b of title 37, United States Code, to provide the Department of Defense with more flexibility in administering the reenlistment bonus.

The provision would eliminate the 3- and 6-year options currently in law, and require only that the period of reenlistment be at least 3 years. Similarly, the provision would eliminate the tiered bonus structure and require only that the bonus not exceed \$15,000.

Increase in years of commissioned service covered by agreements for nuclear-qualified officers extending periods of active duty (sec. 620)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 312 of title 37, United States Code, to extend the eligibility for the nuclear officer continuation pay from 26 to 30 years of commissioned service.

Authority to waive 25-year active duty limit for retention bonus for critical military skills with respect to certain members (sec. 621)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 323 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, to waive the 25-year service limitation on eligibility to receive the retention bonus for certain members with designated critical military skills.

Codification and improvement of authority to pay bonus to encourage members of the Army to refer other persons for enlistment in the Army (sec. 622)

The committee recommends a provision that would create a new section 331 in title 37, United States Code, that would codify section 645 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended by section 624 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), which authorized a bonus to encourage

Army personnel to refer other persons for enlistment in the Army. The provision would extend the authority for the program to December 31, 2008.

Authority to pay bonus to encourage Department of Defense personnel to refer other persons for appointment as officers to serve in health professions (sec. 623)

The committee recommends a provision that would add a new section 331a to title 37, United States Code, that would authorize the payment of up to \$2,000, paid in two installments of not more than \$1,000, to certain individuals who refer a person to a military recruiter, when such referral leads to an appointment as a commissioned officer in a health profession. The provision would authorize such payments through December 31, 2008.

Accession bonus for participants in Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance program (sec. 624)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2127 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to pay an accession bonus of not more than \$20,000 to participants in the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program (HPSP).

The committee remains concerned that the Army and Navy continue to underfill their HPSP quotas, having failed to achieve recruiting goals in both fiscal years 2005 and 2006. This bonus, in conjunction with existing benefits, is intended to make the HPSP more attractive to prospective medical and dental school students who desire military service.

Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances

Payment of expenses of travel to the United States for obstetrical purposes of dependents located in very remote locations outside the United States (sec. 641)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1040 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to pay travel expenses for purposes of childbirth to a location in the United States of a pregnant dependent of a service member assigned to a very remote location outside the United States.

Under current law, payment of travel expenses is authorized for travel to the nearest medical facility in which adequate medical care is available. In many cases, dependents of service members assigned to very remote locations outside the United States are afforded travel expenses to Germany or Japan, but not to the United States where they might receive support from extended family during childbirth.

Payment of moving expenses for Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps instructors in hard-to-fill positions (sec. 642)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2031 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Depart-

ment of Defense to reimburse moving expenses for certain Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) instructors. The instructor would receive reimbursement from the institution concerned, which would then receive reimbursement from the military department concerned. To be eligible to receive the reimbursement, an instructor must execute a written agreement to serve a minimum of 2 years.

The committee supports the Department's efforts to maximize enrollment and enhance administrative efficiency in the management of the JROTC program. This provision is intended to attract highly qualified instructors to geographically or economically hard-to-fill positions.

Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits

Modification of scheme for payment of death gratuity payable with respect to members of the Armed Forces (sec. 651)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, to allow a service member to designate in writing any individual to receive the death gratuity benefit.

The committee believes that service members must receive adequate pre-deployment counseling on survivor benefits, including counseling on the options available to them in order to ensure that their decisions with respect to beneficiaries are well informed and properly recorded. As service members prepare to deploy, their focus may understandably be drawn away from the long-term planning that is necessary to ensure their families are taken care of in the event of serious injury or death. The military departments must focus on providing accurate, timely, and effective pre-deployment counseling.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review pre-deployment counseling and services provided by the military departments to members of the armed forces and to identify best practices among such counseling and services. The committee directs the Secretary to review specifically the counseling and services directed toward unmarried service members with one or more dependent children. The review should include an assessment of counseling and services related to survivor benefits; dependency and indemnity compensation benefits; Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance; traumatic injury protection under section 1980A of title 38, United States Code; the Survivor Benefit Plan; and Social Security benefits. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report on this review to the congressional defense committees by May 1, 2008.

Annuities for guardians or caretakers of dependent children under Survivor Benefit Plan (sec. 652)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1448 of title 10, United States Code, to allow an unmarried service member with a dependent child or children to elect a guardian or caretaker of that dependent child or children as the beneficiary of the service member's Survivor Benefit Plan annuity.

Expansion of combat-related special compensation eligibility for chapter 61 military retirees (sec. 653)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1413a of title 10, United States Code, to expand eligibility of combat-related special compensation to all service members eligible for retirement pay who have a combat-related disability, including service members who were retired under chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code.

Clarification of application of retired pay multiplier percentage to members of the uniformed services with over 30 years of service (sec. 654)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1402 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize, in the case of a member who became a member of the armed services prior to September 8, 1980, and who was recalled to active duty for a period of more than 2 years, recomputation of that member's retirement pay according to the provisions of section 1409 of title 10, United States Code.

The provision would also amend section 6333 of title 10, United States Code, to conform that section to the provisions of section 1409 of title 10, United States Code.

Commencement of receipt of non-regular service retired pay by members of the Ready Reserve on active Federal status or active duty for significant periods (sec. 655)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 12731 of title 10, United States Code, to reduce the age at which a member of the Ready Reserve could draw retired pay below the age of 60 by 3 months for every aggregate 90 days of active duty performed under certain mobilization authorities. Under this provision, a member of the Ready Reserve could not reduce the age at which they draw retired pay below the age of 50. The provision would apply to service after the date of enactment.

Subtitle E—Education Benefits

Tuition assistance for off-duty training or education (sec. 671)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2007 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the authority to pay tuition and related expenses to members of the Ready Reserve, whether enlisted or officer, who agree to serve for 4 years after completion of the education or training for which tuition or expenses are paid. The provision would also authorize the secretaries of the military departments to pay tuition and related expenses of members of the Individual Ready Reserve, in designated military occupational specialties.

Expansion of Selected Reserve education loan repayment program (sec. 672)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 16301 of title 10, United States Code, to include additional types of loans incurred for educational purposes by members of the

Selected Reserve that would be eligible for repayment by the Department of Defense. The provision would also make both officer and enlisted personnel eligible for loan repayment under this program.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Enhancement of authorities on income replacement payments for Reserves experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for active-duty service (sec. 681)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 910 of title 37, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility criteria for payments under the reserve income replacement program. The provision would change the method for measuring cumulative periods of qualifying service by counting cumulative days, rather than months.

In order to qualify for income replacement payments under current law, a service member must complete 24 out of the previous 60 months. The provision would substitute the equivalent number of days for the number of months in current law. This would correct an inequity affecting reservists who serve a month's worth of days, but who do not actually complete an entire calendar month of service.

The provision would also authorize the continuation of income replacement payments in the case of service members who are retained on active duty to receive authorized medical care or to be evaluated for disability.

Overseas naturalization of military family members (sec. 682)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 319 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1430), to allow certain permanent-resident spouses and children of members of the armed forces who reside in foreign countries to be naturalized. Under the provision, upon compliance with other requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the spouse or child's physical presence in a foreign country while accompanying the member would be treated as residence in the United States or any State for the purpose of satisfying the continuous presence requirements of the Act.

Items of Special Interest

Implementation of limitations on terms of consumer credit extended to service members and dependents

The committee notes the progress of the Department of Defense in drafting rules to implement section 670 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), which provided protections for service members and their dependents against predatory lending. The rules were published on April 11, 2007, in the Federal Register (72 Fed. Reg. 18,157). Eliminating predatory lending is a complex problem, and the committee recognizes the need for sound discretion in ensuring service mem-

bers have access to credit while also ensuring that barriers to predatory lending practices are implemented as Congress intended.

The rules proposed by the Department excluded military installment loans, a form of predatory lending singled out in the Department's "Report on Predatory Lending Practices Directed at Members of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents" of August 9, 2006. The committee expects the Department to carefully consider the risks involved in its approach as it finalizes its rules, to make regulatory changes when appropriate, and to recommend statutory changes when needed to eliminate predatory lending.

The committee is also concerned about the Department's heavy reliance on the States for enforcement in its proposed rules. The committee will look to the Department to monitor enforcement nationally to ensure consistent treatment of service members regardless of where they are stationed. The Department should continue to work with State legislatures to achieve fair and uniform enforcement for the benefit of military personnel and their dependents.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2008 on the Department's implementation of section 670 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), including any recommendations for regulatory or statutory change.

Survivor Benefit Plan/Dependency and Indemnity Compensation recoupment procedures

The committee is concerned about reports that many survivors of deceased military personnel are experiencing inadequate service and adverse financial consequences associated with the Defense Finance and Accounting Service's (DFAS) procedures for implementing offsets of Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) annuities and Dependency and Indemnity Compensation (DIC), including refunds of SBP premiums. Survivors have reported extended delays in notification by DFAS of the deduction requirement, resulting in larger than necessary recoupment amounts. Some beneficiaries report receiving virtually no explanation from DFAS of the complicated calculation process for the offset and no statements detailing the deductions recouped versus premiums refunded. They report receiving multiple different recoupment notices, while premium refunds have been processed separately, so that widows first had to pay one or two large recoupment bills and later received large premium refunds, rather than being allowed to deal with much more modest net payments or refunds that would have caused far less disruption to their finances.

Of greatest concern, some beneficiaries report that their inquiries to DFAS have required extended waiting times that led to unhelpful and occasionally rude feedback from representatives who could not answer their specific questions about what was happening to their annuities and why. Many SBP beneficiaries believe they are subjected to an automated and impersonal process that imposes dramatic financial consequences on them at a time when they already are undergoing great emotional and financial stress.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the processes and resources in place for managing the collection of SBP/

DIC recoupments and issuing refunds of SBP premiums. As part of this review, the committee directs the Secretary to survey annuitants who have experienced offsets of their SBP benefits by DIC in order to determine what shortcomings were experienced, what improvements can be made, and to perform an independent evaluation of the adequacy of the system in place for these dependents to receive timely, courteous assistance. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report the results of this study to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2008.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Inclusion of TRICARE retail pharmacy program in Federal procurement of pharmaceuticals (sec. 701)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1074g of title 10, United States Code, stating that with respect to any prescription filled on or after October 1, 2007, the TRICARE retail pharmacy network will be covered by the federal pricing limits applicable to covered drugs under section 8126 of title 38, United States Code.

Surveys on continued viability of TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra (sec. 702)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through 2011 the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to conduct surveys to determine health care and mental health care provider acceptance of the TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra benefit. The provision would require surveys of beneficiaries in addition to surveys of health care and mental health care providers and would require the Secretary of Defense to establish benchmarks for primary and specialty care providers, including mental health care providers, to determine the adequacy of providers available to TRICARE-eligible beneficiaries. The provision would also require the Comptroller General to review the processes, procedures, and analyses used by the Department of Defense (DOD) to determine the adequacy of the number of health care and mental health care providers available to TRICARE-eligible beneficiaries and to submit a report on the results of this review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on a bi-annual basis.

The committee is pleased that DOD surveys in 2005 and 2006 have consistently found a high level of awareness by physicians of the TRICARE program, and relatively high acceptance of new TRICARE Standard patients in many areas. However, the committee believes that DOD needs additional information about the relationship between acceptance of TRICARE and Medicare, as required by section 711 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), to fully assess options for increasing provider participation in TRICARE. The committee remains concerned about reports by military families that mental health services are difficult to access under the TRICARE program.

The committee is also concerned about the availability of TRICARE Standard to members of the Selected Reserve. According to DOD, more than 40 percent of eligible members of the Selected Reserve reside beyond TRICARE Prime service areas in the United States. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on its implementation of the program known as

TRICARE Reserve Select for members of the Selected Reserve, as authorized by section 706 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), with the first report due by March 1, 2008. This report should describe programs and activities to inform members of the Selected Reserve of the option to enroll in TRICARE, the number of enrollees, and the actual DOD costs for implementation of TRICARE for members of the Selected Reserve in fiscal years 2006 and 2007. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to submit additional reports by March 1 of each subsequent year that update the original report and include the projected DOD costs for the TRICARE Reserve Select benefit for the next fiscal year.

Items of Special Interest

Comptroller General study of post-deployment health reassessment

The committee commends the Department of Defense for directing the military departments, in March 2005, to conduct a post-deployment reassessment of health status, with a specific emphasis on mental health, between 3 and 6 months after a service member returns from deployment. However, the committee is concerned that there is a need for further evaluation of the effectiveness of this reassessment and its implementation by the military departments. In particular, the committee is concerned about the effectiveness of the web-based Post-Deployment Health Reassessment (PDHRA), and whether the services are consistently providing face to face followup, referrals for further evaluation, and completion by the service members of follow-on evaluations if applicable. The committee is also concerned about the extent to which the PDHRA is included in the Department's quality assurance program for medical tracking, required by section 1074f of title 10, United States Code.

The committee is aware that the Comptroller General intends to include analysis of the PDHRA in ongoing Comptroller General studies to assess compliance by the Department of Defense with requirements in law and policy concerning pre- and post-deployment medical examinations of military personnel who served in Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee directs that the analysis of the PDHRA include members of the active and reserve components and those service members who served in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom and have subsequently separated from military service.

Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs Joint Executive Council Strategic Plan and Joint Incentive Fund

The committee believes that it is imperative that the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) include in their joint strategic planning process the identification of specific goals, strategies, and initiatives designed to better understand effective ways to diagnose and treat traumatic brain injury and urges the Secretaries of Defense and Veterans Affairs to work together toward this end.

The committee strongly urges the Departments to revise the Joint Strategic Plan and guidelines for the DOD-VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund and to place a priority on programs to improve the diagnosis and treatment of traumatic brain injury. In particular, the Departments should consider a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of using telehealth technology to assess cognitive functioning of members and former members of the armed forces who have sustained head trauma. In addition, the committee recognizes that there is a great need for clinical data on effective treatment approaches for brain-injured patients and strongly urges the Departments to establish a high priority for funding such projects under its Joint Incentive Fund program for fiscal years 2008 through 2010.

Mental Health Advisory Team IV findings

The committee commends the Army medical department for conducting a fourth assessment of the mental health and well-being of soldiers and marines in Iraq, the Mental Health Advisory Team (MHAT) IV, and for including, at the request of the Commanding General, Multi-National Force-Iraq, uniquely developed questions addressing attitudes toward the treatment of insurgents and battlefield ethics.

The committee is especially concerned over the MHAT findings that (1) multiple deployments directly correlate with higher levels of acute stress, and that lengthy deployments lead to higher rates of mental health and marital problems; (2) suicide rates for soldiers in Operation Iraqi Freedom from 2003–2006 are 16.1 per 100,000 soldiers versus an Army average of 11.6 per 100,000; (3) approximately 10 percent of soldiers and marines reported mistreating non-combatants, or damaging their property unnecessarily; (4) soldiers who experienced high levels of combat, or screened positive for mental health problems, were nearly twice as likely to mistreat non-combatants; and (5) although the majority of soldiers and marines surveyed reported receiving ethical training, nearly one third reported encountering ethical situations in Iraq in which they did not know how to respond.

The committee urges the Department of Defense to continue to assess the mental health of the force and to explore ways to address mental health issues that arise from military service, including the impact on families. The committee is concerned that extending Army deployments to 15 months while failing to meet necessary dwell times for returning units may exacerbate the mental health issues facing our soldiers and marines. The committee also believes the Department should do more to address the risk of soldiers and marines under combat stress, or who are already at risk for mental health problems, to violate battlefield ethics.

The committee directs the Department of Defense to study and develop a plan to address the MHAT IV findings, and their implications, on all Department policies concerning length and frequency of deployment, and resources needed to address the mental health issues the MHAT IV identified. The committee expects the Department's plan to include specific strategies to improve battlefield ethics and training. The committee directs the Department to report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2008 the re-

sults of this study and its plan to address the MHAT IV findings and recommendations.

The committee notes with great concern that nearly 6 months elapsed from the date of completion of the report, November 17, 2006, until public release of the report's findings on May 4, 2007. During that period, on April 11, 2007, Secretary Gates announced that tours of duty for soldiers serving in Iraq would be extended from 12 to 15 months. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by June 20, 2007 on the extent to which the MHAT IV findings that deployment length was related to higher rates of mental health and marital problems were taken into consideration by the Department in the decision to extend Army tours.

Reduction in Navy medical personnel and medical efficiency wedge

The committee is deeply concerned about proposed reductions in Navy military medical end strength. The committee is aware that Navy military end strength is projected to decline in future years by approximately 30,000 personnel. However, the Department of Defense has announced an increase of 22,000 personnel for the Marine Corps. As the Navy medical department will continue to have responsibility for medical care for Navy and Marine Corps personnel and their families, it is essential that the Navy medical military manpower authorization and funding for Navy hospitals be increased to ensure quality health care for the additional marines and their families. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to reevaluate its previous decision to eliminate more than 900 medical billets during fiscal years 2008 through 2012. The same formula used by the Department to calculate reduced requirements for downsizing the Navy should be used to determine new requirements to appropriately fund operation and maintenance for Navy medical treatment facilities and restore up to 900 billets in Navy medical end strength in support of the Marine Corps growth. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees no later than July 1, 2007 on the results of that evaluation.

The committee continues to be very concerned about the Department's policy of reducing Operation and Maintenance funding of military medical treatment facilities by use of an "efficiency wedge." According to the Department of Defense, an efficiency wedge of \$486.0 million was assessed against the budgets of military hospitals and clinics for fiscal year 2008. Although the committee agrees that efficiency in health care delivery is desired, it strongly disagrees with an arbitrary reduction of funding for military hospitals and clinics during a time of war. Shortages of equipment, supplies, and personnel in military medicine cannot be alleviated by further funding reductions. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to reassess the validity of the proposed efficiency wedge and any other decrement in funding for fiscal year 2008 and to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by June 30, 2007, on plans to fund military treatment facilities in fiscal year 2008.

TRICARE program cost sharing increases

Section 711 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) established a Department of Defense Task Force on the Future of Military Health Care. The task force is required to assess and make recommendations on the beneficiary and Government cost structure required to sustain military health benefits over the long-term. An interim report addressing this issue is required by May 31, 2007.

Section 713 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) required the Comptroller General to conduct audits of Department health care costs and cost saving measures proposed by the President's budget request for fiscal year 2007 in an initiative known as "Sustain the Benefit." The Comptroller General is required to submit a report on the audits conducted under this authority to the congressional defense committees no later than June 1, 2007.

The Department of Defense requested that legislation be included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 that would give the Department broad authority to increase TRICARE program cost sharing amounts for military retirees and their dependents, after first considering the recommendations of the Task Force on the Future of Military Health Care.

During his nomination hearing to become the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs on March 27, 2007, S. Ward Casscells, M.D., acknowledged the concern that "increasing copays and deductibles, particularly at this time, runs the risk of making it harder for us to recruit and retain the very best." Dr. Casscells also stated his belief that "there are other efficiencies which can be sought," such as disease management and prevention.

The committee concluded that this legislative proposal is premature and believes that any increase in TRICARE program cost sharing should be made on the basis of the comprehensive analyses required by Congress and after implementation of efficiencies in the health care program.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to consult with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives on reasonable adjustments in TRICARE program cost sharing following receipt of the final reports required in Public Law 109–364 and following consultation with military beneficiary advocates.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs

Substantial savings under multiyear contracts (sec. 801)

The committee recommends a provision that would define the term “substantial savings” for the purposes of authorizing multiyear contracts and require the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on an annual basis on the savings actually achieved under such contracts. The provision would also require the head of the agency seeking the multiyear contract to report to the congressional defense committees, prior to legislative authorization, the specific facts demonstrating that the statutory criteria for entering such a contract have been met.

Section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, authorizes the Department of Defense to enter into multiyear contracts for the purchase of property, but only if six statutory criteria are met. One of these criteria is that the use of a multiyear contract must result in “substantial savings” compared to the anticipated costs of carrying out the program through annual contracts.

Under the provision recommended by the committee, savings that exceed 10 percent of total anticipated program costs would be considered to be substantial. Savings that exceed 5 percent of total anticipated program costs, but do not exceed 10 percent of such costs could be considered substantial, but only if the agency head makes an exceptionally strong case that the statutory criteria have been met and a multiyear contract is in the interest of the Department and the taxpayers. Savings that do not exceed 5 percent of total anticipated program costs would not qualify as a basis for entering a multiyear contract.

Changes to Milestone B certifications (sec. 802)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the program manager for a major defense acquisition program (MDAP) that has received Milestone B certification under section 2366a of title 10, United States Code, to immediately notify the milestone decision authority of any changes to the program that are: (a) inconsistent with such certification; or (b) deviate significantly from the material provided to the milestone decision authority in support of such certification. The provision would also require that the milestone decision authority receive a business case analysis prior to making a certification under section 2366a.

Section 2366a prohibits Milestone B approval for an MDAP until the milestone decision authority certifies that the technology in the program has been demonstrated in a relevant environment and certain other key criteria have been met. However, many MDAPs un-

dergo significant changes in technology, funding, or requirements after Milestone B approval. In some cases, such changes could result in the continuation of the program on a basis that would be inconsistent with the certification of the milestone decision authority.

The provision recommended by the committee would ensure that the milestone decision authority is promptly notified of any such changes and is in a position to take appropriate action including, if necessary, withdrawal of the certification or rescission of Milestone B approval.

Comptroller General report on Department of Defense organization and structure for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 803)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General to report to the congressional defense committees on potential modifications to the organization and structure of the Department of Defense for the acquisition of major weapon systems.

Investment strategy for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 804)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on Department of Defense organizations, procedures, and approaches for the allocation of funds and other resources under major defense acquisition programs.

The Secretary's report should specifically address the Department's strategy for allocating funds in the cases of joint requirements and requirements that could be met by more than one military department or defense agency. In a March 2007 report, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) recommended that the Department implement an enterprise-wide portfolio management approach to making weapon system investments that integrates the assessment and determination of warfighting needs with available resources and cuts across the services by functional or capability area. The GAO report recommends that the Secretary establish a single point of accountability at the department level with the authority, responsibility, and tools to ensure that portfolio management for weapon system investments is effectively implemented across the Department.

In this regard, the committee notes that the Department has already developed a portfolio management process for certain capability areas, including Joint Command and Control, Joint Net Centric Operations, Battlespace Awareness, and Joint Logistics. In each area, the Department has designated an enterprise-wide capability portfolio manager, who is charged with developing strategic objectives, projected capability mixes, performance metrics, and actions required to meet objectives and mitigate risk. The capability portfolio managers have direct access to the Deputy's Advisory Working Group, the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, and the Defense Acquisition Board. They also provide input to the Concept Decision Tri-chair (which includes the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, the Vice Chairman of

the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation) on capability issues.

The committee urges the Department to consider expanding the portfolio management process to include additional portfolios of joint requirements and requirements that could be met by more than one military department or defense agency. The committee expects the Secretary's report to specifically address GAO's recommendations regarding portfolio management.

Report on implementation of recommendations on total ownership cost for major weapon systems (sec. 805)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on the extent to which the Department of Defense has implemented the recommendations set forth in the February 2003 report of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) entitled "Setting Requirements Differently Could Reduce Weapon Systems' Total Ownership Costs".

The GAO report states that some major weapon systems, such as the Apache helicopter and the Abrams tank, have experienced costly maintenance problems and low readiness rates, which persisted even after the systems were fielded. The report recommends that the Department address this problem by: incorporating operating and support costs and weapon system readiness rates as key performance parameters in the requirements development process; requiring product developers to establish firm estimates of a weapon system's reliability by no later than the end of the system integration phase; and structuring contracts for major weapon systems so that at Milestone B, the product developer has incentives to ensure that proper trades are made between reliability and performance prior to the production decision.

The GAO report indicates that the Department "partially concurred" with each of these recommendations, but "for the most part, found no further action was needed to lower total ownership cost." The elimination of readiness problems and the reduction of total ownership costs for major weapon systems would yield significant benefits for the Department. Accordingly, the provision recommended by the committee directs the Secretary to report to the congressional defense committees on specific measures taken to implement the GAO recommendations.

Subtitle B—Amendments Relating to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

Enhanced competition requirements for task and delivery order contracts (sec. 821)

The committee recommends a provision that would: (1) require that task or delivery order contracts for or on behalf of the Department of Defense (DOD) in excess of \$100.0 million be awarded to multiple contractors, with certain exceptions; and (2) establish enhanced competition requirements (including requirements for debriefings and authorization of bid protests) for task or delivery orders in excess of \$5.0 million under such multiple award contracts.

At the committee's April 19, 2007 hearing on DOD's management of costs under the Logistics Civil Augmentation Program (LOGCAP) contract in Iraq, Senator Levin asked why the Army had waited 5 years to split the LOGCAP contract among multiple contractors, allowing for the competition of individual task orders. The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics responded: "I don't have a good answer for you." The provision recommended by the committee would ensure that future contracts of this type provide for the competition of task and delivery orders unless there is a compelling reason not to do so.

The committee notes that the enhanced task and delivery order competition requirements in the provision would implement the recommendations of the Acquisition Advisory Panel chartered pursuant to section 1423 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136).

Clarification of rules regarding the procurement of commercial items (sec. 822)

The committee recommends a provision that would address recent Inspector General reports regarding the use of questionable commercial item designations to deny the Department of Defense information that it needs to determine price reasonableness for sole-source purchases. The provision would: (1) clarify the circumstances in which a subsystem, component, or spare part for a major weapon system may be purchased as a commercial item; (2) clarify that the terms "general public" and "nongovernmental entity" do not include federal, state, local or foreign governments, or contractors acting on behalf of such governments for the purpose of determining whether an item qualifies as a commercial item; and (3) require the contractor offering a major weapon system, subsystem, component, or spare part as a commercial item to provide information other than certified cost or pricing data that is adequate for evaluating the reasonableness of the proposed price.

Clarification of rules regarding the procurement of commercial services (sec. 823)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the use of time and materials contracts to purchase commercial services for or on behalf of the Department of Defense (DOD).

Time and materials contracts for commercial services are potentially subject to abuse because the limited information the Department receives under commercial contracts makes it very difficult to ensure that prices are fair and reasonable. Section 1432 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136) authorized the following categories of commercial services to be purchased under time and materials contracts: (1) commercial services procured in support of a commercial item; and (2) any other category that is designated by the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) based on a determination that the commercial services in such category are commonly sold to the general public through time and materials contracts and it is in the best interest of the Federal Government to use time and materials contracts for such purchases.

OFPP determined that “a few types of services are sold predominantly on a [time and materials] basis—specifically, emergency repair services.” OFPP determined that other categories of commercial services are commonly sold to the general public on a time and materials basis only “when requirements are not sufficiently well understood to complete a well-defined scope of work and risk can be managed by maintaining surveillance of costs and contractor performance.” OFPP did not determine that these circumstances commonly occur in sales to the general public. Nonetheless, a final rule was published in the December 12, 2006 Federal Register, designating “all categories of services (i.e., any service) as being available for acquisition on a [time and materials] basis.”

The committee concludes that the December 12, 2006 rule exceeds the authority provided by Congress in section 1432. Accordingly, the provision recommended by the committee would authorize the purchase of only the following categories of commercial services under time and materials contracts: (1) services procured in support of commercial items; and (2) emergency repair services. Under the provision, other categories of services may be purchased under time and materials contracts for or on behalf of the Department of Defense only if such contracts are entered in accordance with rules applicable to non-commercial items.

Modification of competition requirements for purchases from Federal Prison Industries (sec. 824)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the competition requirements for Department of Defense (DOD) purchases from Federal Prison Industries (FPI).

Section 2410n of title 10, as added by section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) and amended by section 819 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), gives DOD procurement officials discretion whether to purchase a product from FPI. If DOD officials conclude that an FPI product is not comparable to the best products available from the private sector in terms of price, quality, and time of delivery, the product may be purchased only on a competitive basis.

Despite the enactment of this legislation, FPI officials continue to argue that DOD is required to purchase FPI products on a sole-source basis. The provision recommended by the committee would clarify the competition requirements in section 2410n to ensure that DOD purchases from FPI are made on a competitive basis.

Five-year extension of authority to carry out certain prototype projects (sec. 825)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 5 years the authority to carry out transactions other than contracts and grants in accordance with section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160).

Multiyear procurement authority for electricity from renewable energy sources (sec. 826)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into contracts for a period not to ex-

ceed 10 years for the purchase of electricity from sources of renewable energy, as defined in section 203(b)(2) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852(b)(2)).

Subtitle C—Acquisition Policy and Management

Joint Requirements Oversight Council (sec. 841)

The committee recommends a provision that would: (1) establish that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) serve as advisors to the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) on matters within their authority and expertise; and (2) require the Secretary of Defense to consult with the JROC on matters relating to program requirements before certifying a program to Congress under section 2433(e)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

Management structure for the procurement of contract services (sec. 842)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to establish Contract Support Acquisition Centers to serve as executive agents for the acquisition of contract services, should they choose to do so. The provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to accept the transfer of all or part of any organizational unit from another department or agency that is primarily engaged in the acquisition of contract services on behalf of the Department of Defense (DOD) to help staff such centers.

The committee understands that DOD has considered the possibility of accepting transfer of a unit of the Department of the Treasury engaged in the acquisition of contract services on behalf of DOD, but determined that it did not have the legal authority to do so. The provision recommended by the committee would provide the legal authority to accept such a transfer, if DOD determines that it is in the Department's best interest.

Specification of amounts requested for procurement of contract services (sec. 843)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense to clearly and separately identify in its budget justification materials the amounts requested in each budget account for the procurement of contract services.

Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund (sec. 844)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish an Acquisition Workforce Development Fund (the "Fund") to ensure that the Department of Defense (DOD) has the workforce capacity, in both personnel and skills, needed to properly perform its mission, provide appropriate oversight of contractor performance, and provide the best value for the expenditure of public resources. The fund would be financed through quarterly remittances by the military departments and de-

fense agencies, based on amounts spent for contract services in the previous fiscal quarter.

Earlier this year, the Acquisition Advisory Panel chartered pursuant to section 1423 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) reported that “curtailed investments in human capital have produced an acquisition workforce that often lacks the training and resources to function effectively.” As a result, “The Federal Government does not have the capacity in its current acquisition workforce necessary to meet the demands that have been placed on it.” The failure of DOD and other federal agencies to adequately fund the acquisition workforce, the Panel concluded, is “‘penny wise and pound foolish,’ as it seriously undermines the pursuit of good value for the expenditure of public resources.”

During the same period in which the acquisition workforce has been allowed to atrophy, DOD contracts for services have grown without constraint. Over the last 5 years, DOD has almost doubled its spending on service contracts, while the number of procurement personnel available to oversee these contracts has dropped by more than 25 percent. As a result, the Department has become increasingly reliant upon contractors to help manage and oversee the work of other contractors. The provision recommended by the committee would endeavor to reverse this trend by taking money currently spent to hire service contractors and spending it instead to reinvigorate the DOD acquisition workforce.

Inventories and reviews of contracts for services based on cost or time of performance (sec. 845)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the secretary of each military department and the head of each defense agency to maintain an inventory of activities performed pursuant to contracts for services (other than contracts that provide a fixed price for specific tasks to be performed). Within a reasonable time after an inventory is compiled, the military department or defense agency compiling the inventory would be required to review the inventory and develop a plan to ensure that the activities listed are performed in a manner consistent with the interests of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the taxpayers.

Section 802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) required DOD to conduct spending analyses of its purchases of contract services. As explained in the committee’s report on this provision: “[T]he Department has never conducted a comprehensive spending analysis of its services contracts and has made little effort to leverage its buying power, improve the performance of its services contractors, rationalize its supplier base, or otherwise ensure that its dollars are well spent.” Five years later, the Department’s expenditures for contract services have nearly doubled, but DOD still has not conducted a comprehensive analysis of its spending on these services. The specific criteria and timelines established in this provision for the inventory and review of activities performed by contractors would ensure that such analyses are conducted.

The committee notes that DOD and other federal agencies are already required to maintain inventories of activities performed by

federal employees and to review those inventories and develop plans to conduct public-private competitions for appropriate activities on those lists. The provision recommended by the committee would require the Department to develop a comparable inventory, and conduct a comparable review and planning effort, for activities performed for the Department by service contractors.

Internal controls for procurements on behalf of the Department of Defense by certain non-defense agencies (sec. 846)

The committee recommends a provision that would: (1) prohibit the Department of Defense (DOD) from making purchases through a non-defense agency unless the head of the other agency certifies that the agency will comply with defense procurement requirements; and (2) require joint reviews to determine whether procurements conducted by non-defense agencies on behalf of DOD have been conducted in compliance with defense procurement requirements.

Section 802 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375), section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163), and section 817 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) required joint reviews by the DOD Inspector General and the inspectors general of non-defense agencies to determine whether procurements conducted by those agencies were conducted in compliance with defense procurement requirements.

These joint reviews revealed significant deficiencies in inter-agency procurements conducted by other agencies on DOD's behalf. They also resulted in increased attention to these problems by both DOD and other agencies, leading to a number of improvements. The provision recommended by the committee would require follow-up reviews and certifications, to ensure continued progress in compliance with defense procurement requirements.

Subtitle D—Department of Defense Contractor Matters

Protection for contractor employees from reprisal for disclosure of certain information (sec. 861)

The committee recommends a provision that would strengthen the statutory protections available to contractor employees who disclose fraud, waste, and abuse with regard to Department of Defense contracts. The provision would establish a private right of action for contractor employees who are subject to reprisal for their efforts to protect the taxpayers' interests.

Requirements for defense contractors relating to certain former Department of Defense officials (sec. 862)

The committee recommends a provision that would require contractors that receive defense contracts in excess of \$10.0 million, other than contracts for the procurement of commercial items, to report to the Department of Defense on an annual basis on certain former senior Department officials who receive compensation from the contractor.

Report on contractor ethics programs of major defense contractors (sec. 863)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General to report to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the internal ethics programs of major defense contractors. The report would address the extent to which major defense contractors have internal ethics programs in place, the content of such ethics programs, the extent to which the Department of Defense monitors or approves the programs, and the advantages and disadvantages of legislation requiring the implementation of such programs.

Report on Department of Defense contracting with contractors or subcontractors employing members of the Selected Reserve (sec. 864)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on contracting with companies who employ members of the Selective Reserve. The report would address: (1) the extent to which companies contracting with the Department of Defense employ members of the Selective Reserve; (2) the extent to which such companies are disadvantaged when members of the Selective Reserve are mobilized as a part of U.S. military operations overseas; and (3) actions that could be taken by the Department to address any such disadvantage.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Contractors performing private security functions in areas of combat operations (sec. 871)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations on the selection, training, equipment, and conduct of personnel performing private security functions in an area of combat operations. The provision would also require that the Federal Acquisition Regulation be revised to ensure that all contractors and subcontractors in a combat area are subject to such regulations.

Section 1205 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) required the Secretary of Defense to issue guidance for contractor personnel who support deployed forces. This requirement was implemented through Department of Defense Instruction 3020.41, “Contractor Personnel Authorized to Accompany the U.S. Armed Forces,” dated October 3, 2005. However, section 1205 and DOD Instruction 3020.41 apply only to Department of Defense contractors.

Many contractors perform private security functions in Iraq and elsewhere under contracts or subcontracts with the Department of State, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and other federal agencies. The presence of armed contractor employees on the battlefield can have a direct impact on military operations, regardless of the agency that employs them. Since the beginning of the Iraq war, there have been several reported incidents in which contractor employees have exchanged fire, or threatened to exchange fire, with U.S. forces. Moreover, misconduct by even a few

armed contractor employees may reflect badly on the United States and could undermine the chances of success for military missions.

The provision recommended by the committee would address this problem by ensuring that the Department of Defense and its combatant commanders are in a position to regulate the conduct of all armed contractors in the battlespace, regardless whether they are employed under contracts of the Department of Defense or other federal agencies.

Enhanced authority to acquire products and services produced in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 872)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a preference for the acquisition of products and services that are produced in Iraq and Afghanistan, if the Secretary determines that: (1) the product or service is to be used by military forces, police, or other security forces in Iraq or Afghanistan; (2) the preference is necessary to provide a stable source of jobs and employment in Iraq or Afghanistan; and (3) the preference will not have an adverse effect on U.S. military operations or the U.S. industrial base.

Defense Science Board review of Department of Defense policies and procedures for the acquisition of information technology (sec. 873)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to direct a Defense Science Board review of Department of Defense (DOD) policies and procedures for the acquisition of information technology.

The Clinger-Cohen Act (Division E of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104-106)) and the Paperwork Reduction Act (chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code) form the statutory framework for the management of information resources in the Federal Government. These statutes have not been significantly modified for more than 10 years. In addition, the DOD acquisition and testing regulations for major defense acquisition programs do not always allow for the most effective acquisition of information technology systems. The committee believes that it is appropriate to reexamine these statutes and regulations in light of rapid advances in commercial information technology and evolving Department of Defense requirements.

At the same time, the Department's structure and organization do not always appear to be well-suited to the effective planning and administration of information technology acquisition programs. The committee is particularly concerned about the roles and responsibilities of the acquisition executives and chief information officers of the Department in the acquisition of information technologies that are embedded in weapon systems. The Defense Science Board review should specifically examine the issue of whether the acquisition officials who have overall responsibility for the acquisition of weapons and weapon systems might be better able to develop and implement information technology policies for such weapons and weapon systems than the Department's chief information officers.

The committee is also concerned about future policies and procedures for ensuring information security in commercial microelec-

tronics, software, and networks. While it would be prohibitively expensive for the Department to rely upon defense-unique suppliers to replicate commercially available technologies, there may be some applications for which it is necessary for the Department to develop “trusted” suppliers. The Defense Science Board study should specifically examine the trade-offs between the Department’s needs for information security and its continued reliance upon commercial sources for information technology.

Enhancement and extension of acquisition authority for the unified combatant command for joint warfighting experimentation (sec. 874)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the acquisition authority provided to the U.S. Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) by: (1) providing for both the acquisition and sustainment of equipment; and (2) extending the authority for an additional 2 years.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) requested that JFCOM acquisition authority be made permanent. In April 2007, however, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that shortly after Congress provided JFCOM acquisition authority, the Secretary of Defense created the Joint Rapid Acquisition Cell (JRAC). According to GAO, JRAC and JFCOM acquisition authority may be redundant. By a letter dated April 11, 2007, the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy concurred with the GAO recommendations and agreed to “reassess JFCOM acquisition authority in light of the expanding Joint Rapid Acquisition Cell process.”

The provision recommended by the committee would extend JFCOM acquisition authority to ensure that the authority does not expire before DOD completes its reassessment and Congress has an opportunity to consider the results of that reassessment.

Repeal of requirement for identification of essential military items and military system essential item breakout list (sec. 875)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 813 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), which requires the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report to the congressional defense committees listing essential items, assemblies, and components of military systems and identifying where they are produced.

Items of Special Interest

Exceptional circumstance waivers under the Truth in Negotiations Act

Section 817 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) permits the use of an “exceptional circumstances” waiver to the Truth in Negotiations Act (section 2306a of title 10, United States Code) only if the property or services could not reasonably be obtained without the waiver. Under section 817, the Department’s belief that sufficient information could be obtained to support the contractor’s prices without

complying with the Truth in Negotiations Act is not sufficient to support a waiver.

Earlier this year, the Department of Defense reported that the Navy had exercised an exceptional-circumstances waiver for a multi-year contract, valued at more than \$8.0 billion, for the procurement of F/A-18E/F and EA-18G airframes. The report did not indicate that the Navy would not have been able to obtain F-18 airframes without a waiver, as required by section 817. As a result, the Navy failed to obtain cost or pricing data and put itself at risk of paying higher prices on an \$8.0 billion contract because of its failure to obtain the most recent and relevant cost and pricing information.

On March 23, 2007, the Director for Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy issued a memorandum addressing exceptional-circumstances waivers under the Truth in Negotiations Act. The memorandum states that “it is DOD policy to apply this waiver authority only to situations where the Government could not otherwise obtain the needed product or service without the waiver.” In addition, the memorandum also establishes a schedule of regular meetings within the Department to assist in the early identification of potential waiver issues and to ensure that the policy is applied appropriately.

The committee concludes that the March 23, 2007 memorandum appropriately addresses the use of exceptional-circumstances waivers and, if consistently applied throughout the Department, should preclude the need for further legislation on this issue.

Guidance on award and incentive fees

Section 814 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) required the Secretary of Defense to issue regulations linking award and incentive fees to acquisition outcomes.

On April 24, 2007, the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy issued a memorandum for the secretaries of the military departments and directors of the defense agencies requiring that, whenever possible, the Department use objective criteria to measure contract performance. The memorandum establishes specific criteria for linking award fees to performance. The memorandum states that the policies included in the memorandum will be incorporated into the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS).

The committee concludes that the Director’s memorandum, together with guidance previously issued by the Department of Defense on award and incentive fees, appropriately reflects the requirements of section 814. Accordingly, the incorporation of the principles reflected in section 814, the Director’s memorandum, and previously issued guidance into the DFARS should preclude the need for further legislation on this issue.

Program manager empowerment and accountability

Section 853 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) requires the Secretary of Defense to develop a comprehensive strategy for enhanc-

ing the role of Department of Defense program managers in carrying out defense acquisition programs.

Section 853(c) requires that the Secretary issue guidance on, among other things, the authority available to program managers to object to the addition of new program requirements. The statement of managers accompanying the conference report states the conferees' view that the Secretary's guidance should include "the assurance that program requirements will not be modified in a way that would be inconsistent with the business case, the Milestone B decision, and any performance agreement entered without a written determination by a senior Department official that the modifications are necessary in the interest of the national defense" and "program manager authority to make trade-offs between cost, schedule, and performance or to redirect funding within the program, provided that such tradeoffs or redirections of funds are consistent with the parameters established for the program and with applicable requirements of law."

A September 4, 2001 memorandum signed by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development, and Acquisition) states that "Program Managers are responsible for developing budgets that fully fund their programs, and reasonably reflect the projected cost of incorporating necessary contract modifications." The memorandum states that change proposals have introduced unplanned new scope and capability improvements on shipbuilding programs, contributing to unbudgeted cost growth on those programs. The memorandum seeks to address this problem by requiring program managers to reject change orders that would increase program cost, except in narrowly defined circumstances.

The committee believes that this memorandum may serve as a helpful model for the Department of Defense as it implements the requirements of section 853. The committee directs the Secretary to report to the congressional defense committees on how the guidance required by section 853(c) addresses the matters discussed in the memorandum.

Protection of strategic materials critical to national security

Section 842 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) modified statutory requirements for the procurement of specialty metals from domestic sources and codified these requirements in a new section 2533b of title 10, United States Code. Section 2533b contained a non-availability exception to address circumstances in which compliant materials are not available in the required form when and as needed for the national defense.

On January 17, 2007, the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy issued a memorandum implementing the non-availability exception in section 2533b. The January 17, 2007 memorandum states:

Several factors can and should be taken into consideration in making a determination that compliant specialty metal is not available. Are compliant parts, assemblies or components available in the required form as and when needed? What are the costs and time delays if requalification of certain parts of the system is required? What will

be the impact on the program's delivery schedule, program costs and mission needs?

On April 10, 2007, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics applied this exception to make a determination of non-availability of specialty metals in fasteners in certain federal stock classes. The April 10, 2007 determination states:

[The Defense Contract Management Agency] verified that lead times for compliant material is long, ranging in length from 50 weeks for stainless steel to over 100 weeks for titanium. The lead times for procuring compliant fasteners are similarly lengthy These delays are impacting the Department's ability to meet requirements.

The committee expects the Department to take advantage of the flexibility provided in section 2533b, including the non-availability exception in that provision, when and as needed to ensure that it can purchase weapon systems and parts in a timely manner for the national defense. For this reason, the committee supports the interpretation of this provision in the January 17, 2007 memorandum of the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy and the application of the exception in the April 10, 2007 determination of non-availability.

Regulations on excessive pass-through charges

Section 852 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) required the Secretary of Defense to modify Department of Defense (DOD) regulations to prohibit excessive pass-through charges on contracts or subcontracts that are entered into for or on behalf of the Department.

On April 26, 2007, DOD published an interim regulation in the Federal Register to implement this requirement. The interim regulation: (1) prohibits the payment of excessive pass-through charges; (2) requires contractors to identify in its proposal the percentage of work it intends to perform and the percentage it expects subcontractors to perform; (3) requires the contractor to demonstrate that its charges are consistent with the amount of value-added in any case where the contractor expects subcontractors to perform more than 70 percent of the work on the contract; (4) provides for these requirements to apply at the subcontractor level; and (5) provides for the recovery of excessive pass-through charges in appropriate cases.

The committee concludes that the interim regulation appropriately reflects the requirements of section 852 and, if effectively implemented, should protect DOD against the payment of excessive pass-through charges. The committee notes that the Department received approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to implement this rule until the end of the fiscal year. Should DOD fail to request, or OMB fail to grant, an extension of this approval, further legislation may be required.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management

Repeal of limitation on major Department of Defense headquarters activities personnel (sec. 901)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 130a of title 10, United States Code, which imposes a limitation on the number of Department of Defense (DOD) headquarters activities personnel.

Section 130a, which limits the number of DOD headquarters personnel to 85 percent of the number of such personnel as of October 1, 1999, was enacted in section 921 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). Since that time, the events of September 11, 2001 and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have resulted in a doubling of the defense budget and substantial new demands on DOD headquarters personnel.

Because section 130a precludes DOD from meeting these new demands by increasing the number of headquarters personnel, the Department has turned to contractor employees to meet these demands. The administration's legislative proposal notes that section 130a limits the Department's ability to "manage its workforce based upon workload" and ensure that it has "the most cost-effective workforce" to respond to the challenges posed by the current security environment. The committee concludes that section 130a is outdated and should be repealed.

Chief management officers of the Department of Defense (sec. 902)

The committee recommends a provision that would designate the Deputy Secretary of Defense the Chief Management Officer (CMO) of the Department of Defense (DOD). The provision would also: (1) establish a new position of Under Secretary of Defense for Management (Deputy Chief Management Officer); and (2) designate the under secretaries of the military departments the CMOs of those departments.

The Comptroller General has testified on numerous occasions that DOD is unlikely to successfully address the management challenges facing it without a CMO to lead the effort. In November 2006, the Comptroller General told the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support:

DOD lacks the sustained leadership at the right level needed to achieve successful and lasting transformation. Due to the complexity and long-term nature of DOD's business transformation efforts, we continue to believe DOD

needs a chief management officer (CMO) to provide sustained leadership and maintain momentum.

Section 907 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) required DOD to provide for one or two independent studies of the feasibility and advisability of establishing a CMO to oversee the Department's business transformation process. In May 2006, the Defense Business Board endorsed the concept of a CMO. In January 2007, the Institute for Defense Analysis (IDA) recommended that the Deputy Secretary of Defense be designated as CMO, with a full-time deputy devoted to management issues. The provision recommended by the committee would take the approach recommended by IDA.

Modification of background requirement of individuals appointed as Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (sec. 903)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the background requirement for the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to delete the requirement that a nominee have extensive management background "in the private sector." The committee concludes that management experience in the Department of Defense and other federal agencies can be as valuable as management experience in the private sector.

Department of Defense Board of Actuaries (sec. 904)

The committee recommends a provision that would consolidate the Department of Defense Retirement Board of Actuaries and the Department of Defense Education Benefits Board of Actuaries into the Department of Defense Board of Actuaries.

Assistant Secretaries of the military departments for acquisition matters; principal military deputies (sec. 905)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the appointment of a three-star principal military deputy for the service acquisition executive in each of the military departments. The provision would require that the principal military deputy be appointed from among officers who have significant experience in the areas of acquisition and program management and that they keep the respective chiefs of staff informed of the progress of major defense acquisition programs.

At present, the acquisition executives for the Army and the Air Force have military deputies. However, the officers selected to serve in these positions often lack significant experience in the key areas of acquisition and program management. The acquisition executive for the Navy does not have a military deputy.

The appointment of qualified principal military deputies for the service acquisition executives should: (1) strengthen the performance of the service acquisition executives; (2) improve the oversight provided to military officers serving in acquisition commands; and (3) strengthen the acquisition career field in the military.

Flexible authority for number of Army Deputy Chiefs of Staff and Assistant Chiefs of Staff (sec. 906)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3035(b) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to determine the number of Deputy Chiefs of Staff and Assistant Chiefs of Staff on the Army Staff, not to exceed eight total positions. Current law provides for up to five Deputy Chiefs of Staff and three Assistant Chiefs of Staff.

Sense of Congress on term of office of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (sec. 907)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that the term of office of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation should be not less than 5 years. The committee believes that this minimum term will strengthen the statutorily intended independence of the position, ensuring adequate operational testing of weapons systems and thereby saving lives and resources.

Subtitle B—Space Matters

Space posture review (sec. 921)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, to conduct a comprehensive review of the space posture of the United States. The review would cover a 10-year period beginning February 1, 2009. The Secretary would be required to submit the report on December 1, 2009.

The committee is concerned that most military space capabilities are being modernized simultaneously. All of these modernization programs have exceeded their schedule and cost estimates, some significantly. The growth in and demands on the space budget are occurring at a time when Air Force Space Command is trying to improve its space situational awareness capabilities, and the military and commercial space community in general is concerned about possible threats to space systems. The review in the recommended provision would emphasize the increased focus on space awareness and control activities. In completing the review the committee directs the Secretary and the Director to look at the comparative funding levels for both the space situational awareness and satellite protection programs and the satellite modernization programs.

Additional report on oversight of acquisition for defense space programs (sec. 922)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the due date for the report on the oversight of defense space acquisition programs required by section 911 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314).

Subtitle C—Other Matters

Department of Defense consideration of effect of climate change on Department facilities, capabilities, and missions (sec. 931)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense to assess the risks of projected climate change to the Department's facilities, capabilities, and missions.

Board of Regents for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (sec. 932)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2113 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to appoint the members of the Board of Regents for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS) without a requirement for the advice and consent of the Senate. The provision would also redesignate the Dean of USUHS as the President of USUHS, consistent with current practice, and would amend section 2114 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the \$100 per day limit on per diem for members of the Board of Regents when they perform their duties.

The committee believes that the Board of Regents should play a key advisory role to the Secretary of Defense through the President of USUHS and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs. There is a need for a rapid and flexible process for the identification and appointment of highly qualified civilian experts in fields relating to military medicine and medical education who are willing to voluntarily serve. This requirement would be better accomplished by giving the Secretary of Defense the authority to appoint the members of the Board.

United States Military Cancer Institute (sec. 933)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a United States Military Cancer Institute in the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. The center would be authorized to establish a data clearinghouse on the incidence of cancer among members and former members of the armed forces, and to conduct research that contributes to early detection or treatment of cancer among military personnel. The committee recognizes that the United States Military Cancer Institute is currently operated and funded by the Department of Defense. In the committee's view, this institution should be authorized in statute in order to ensure its continued viability and service to military members and their families.

Western Hemisphere Center for Excellence in Human Rights (sec. 934)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a Western Hemisphere Human Rights Center to continue and expand the work begun under U.S. Southern Command's Human Rights Initiative.

The U.S. Southern Command established a human rights policy in 1990, a human rights office in 1995, and began to promote a human rights initiative, "Measuring Progress in Respect for

Human Rights,” with the military forces of the nations in its area of responsibility in 1997. By 2002, every Western Hemisphere nation except Cuba had contributed to the initiative’s consensus statement that respect for human rights is a fundamental component of a democracy and a precondition for true security. Since then, the ministers of defense of eight Western Hemisphere nations have committed to implement the Human Rights Initiative within their military forces.

The Department of Defense requested this authority. The committee understands that this center would not duplicate any work that the Command or the U.S. Government is already conducting.

Inclusion of commanders of Western Hemisphere combatant commands in Board of Visitors of Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (sec. 935)

The Board of Visitors (BOV) of the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC), established in 2001 as mandated by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) includes in its membership the Commander of the U.S. Southern Command, which has responsibility for the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. On October 1, 2002 the United States Northern Command (NORTHCOM) was established. This command has responsibility for the continental United States, Canada, Mexico, and adjoining waters to approximately 500 nautical miles (including Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Cuba, and the Bahamas). NORTHCOM is also responsible for theater security cooperation with Canada and Mexico. Participation by Mexican military personnel in classes at WHINSEC is part of the military-to-military contact between the United States and Mexico, and since NORTHCOM was established, a component of the command’s security cooperation with Mexico.

In order to reflect the fact that there are now two geographic commands with responsibility in the Western Hemisphere, the committee recommends a provision that would ensure that all combatant commanders with responsibility for the Western Hemisphere are members of the WHINSEC BOV.

Comptroller General assessment of proposed reorganization of the office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (sec. 936)

Last year the committee was informed that the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy had approved a reorganization of his office. In support of his reorganization, the Department of Defense (DOD) requested authority from Congress to establish an additional Assistant Secretary position. In section 901 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), Congress granted this authority. However, the conference report noted the committee’s concerns regarding several components of the proposed reorganization.

These concerns included: (1) the role of a global war on terrorism task force that reports directly to the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy; (2) the placement of “Strategic Capabilities” under the Assistant Secretary of Defense (ASD) for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict (SOLIC); (3) the placement of “Forces Trans-

formation and Resources” under the ASD for SOLIC; (4) the very large span of responsibilities for a Deputy ASD (DASD) for “Counternarcotics, Counterproliferation, and Global Threats”; (5) the potential impact on the counternarcotics program execution; (6) the unique placement of both functional and regional issue responsibilities under one ASD for Homeland Defense and Americas’ Security Affairs; and (7) the role of the DASD for “Building Partnership Capacity Strategy,” relative to a DASD for “Security Cooperation Operations.” The committee directed the Secretary of Defense to submit to the defense committees by February 1, 2007, a report on the reorganization.

On February 1, 2007, the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy provided the report mandated by the conferees. Although the report provides additional detail on the background and rationale for the reorganization, it does not fully address the committees’ concerns about whether the reorganization will improve oversight of issues within the purview of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, nor does it dispel all of the specific concerns enumerated in the conference report regarding section 901.

On March 26, 2007, the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a briefing on the reorganization, focusing primarily on the impact on the Office of the ASD SOLIC and U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM). The briefing raised further questions regarding whether the Department’s policy management of special operations and low intensity conflict activities is currently consistent with the intent, if not the letter, of section 138(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, which mandates the principal duty of the ASD SOLIC.

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Governmental Accountability Office to assess the impact of the reorganization of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. This report should assess:

- (1) Whether the reorganization furthers its stated purpose, in the short- and long-term—namely the Department’s ability to address current security priorities including the war in Iraq and the global war on terrorism in Afghanistan and elsewhere, the management of geopolitical defense relationships, and to anticipate future strategic shifts;

- (2) Whether, and to what extent, the proposed reorganization adheres to generally accepted principles of effective organization such as establishing clear goals, identifying clear lines of authority and accountability, and developing an effective human capital strategy;

- (3) The extent to which DOD has developed detailed implementation plans, and the status of the implementation of all aspects of the reorganization;

- (4) The extent to which DOD has worked to mitigate congressional concerns and address other challenges that have arisen since the reorganization was announced;

- (5) How the Department plans to evaluate progress in achieving the stated goals of the proposed reorganization and what metrics, if any, it has established to assess results;

- (6) the impact on the ability of the ASD SOLIC to carry out his/her principal duty as mandated by title 10; and

(7) the impact of the seven issues identified in the conference report for the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Conference Report 109–702).

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

General transfer authority (sec. 1001)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the transfer of up to \$5.0 billion of funds authorized in Division A of this Act to unforeseen higher priority needs in accordance with normal reprogramming procedures. This is the amount proposed in the administration's fiscal year 2008 budget request. Transfers of funds between military personnel authorizations would not be counted toward the dollar limitation in this provision.

Authorization of additional emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2007 (sec. 1002)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional supplemental appropriations for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, and for other purposes, for fiscal year 2007.

Modification of fiscal year 2007 general transfer authority (sec. 1003)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the transfer authority provided in section 1001 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) by exempting the transfer of funds previously approved by the committee for the training of Iraqi security forces (FY07–07–R PA) and for the Joint Improvised Explosives Defeat Device Fund (FY7–11 PA), and the future transfer of funds to restore the sources used in those two reprogrammings, from the dollar limitation in that provision. The transfers of funds in these reprogrammings were intended to advance funding for these purposes pending the passage of a supplemental appropriations act.

United States contribution to NATO common-funded budgets in fiscal year 2008 (sec. 1004)

The resolution of ratification for the Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic contained a provision (section 3(2)(c)(ii)) requiring a specific authorization for U.S. payments to the common-funded budgets of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) for each fiscal year, beginning in fiscal year 1999, in which U.S. payments exceed the fiscal year 1998 total. The committee recommends a provision to authorize the U.S. contribution to NATO common-funded budgets for fiscal year 2008, including the use of unexpended balances from prior years.

Financial management transformation initiative for the Defense Agencies (sec. 1005)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense to carry out an initiative for financial management transformation in the defense agencies.

The Department initiated a Defense Agencies Initiative (DAI) for this purpose in October 2006. The provision recommended by the committee would codify the DAI, to ensure that this effort does not lapse at the end of the current administration.

Repeal of requirement for two-year budget cycle for the Department of Defense (sec. 1006)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the requirement enacted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986 (Public Law 99-145) for the Department of Defense to submit a biennial budget as part of the President's budget request for even-numbered fiscal years.

While the committee remains supportive of the concept of biennial budgeting and the potential it has to improve congressional oversight, the committee also recognizes that for biennial budgeting to deliver these potential benefits, there must be a comprehensive biennial federal budget process, including biennial budget resolutions and appropriations acts. Although the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives have produced biennial defense authorization bills, most notably in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (Public Law 100-180), no progress has been made on the conversion of the entire federal budget process to biennial budgeting during the two decades since the enactment of this requirement for a biennial defense budget. Under these circumstances the committee believes the existing requirement no longer serves a useful purpose.

Extension of period for transfer of funds to Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense account (sec. 1007)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend from 2 to 5 fiscal years the length of time by which funds can be transferred back to the "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense" (FCFD) appropriation account to offset losses caused by fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates. This would better align the time frame for the transfer of funds to the FCFD appropriation with the time frames needed for the completion or close-out of contracts and projects.

Section 2779 of title 10, United States Code, authorizes the Department of Defense to transfer funds to the FCFD account to offset losses caused by fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates. Funds previously transferred out of the FCFD account to pay such obligations may be transferred back into the FCFD when those funds are not needed. Unobligated amounts of funds appropriated for operation and maintenance and military personnel also may be transferred to the FCFD account. Current law authorizes the Secretary of Defense to transfer funding for no more than 2 years prior to the current fiscal year.

Projects and contracts may take longer than 2 years to complete. As a result, it may not be possible to determine, with any degree of certainty, that funds previously transferred out of the FCFD account will no longer be needed to meet obligations associated with foreign currency fluctuations. This provision would expand the time frame to 5 years, thus allowing additional time for the completion or close-out of projects and contracts and the identification of funds available for return to the FCFD account.

Similarly, because more than 2 years may be needed to complete contracts and liquidate claims, 2 years may not be sufficient to identify unobligated amounts of funds appropriated for operation and maintenance and military personnel funds that would be available for transfer to the FCFD account. Therefore, this provision would also extend the transfer time frame to 5 years for these funds. This would allow for more certainty in the identification of funds available for transfer and reduce the risk that there will be insufficient funds to cover foreign currency fluctuation requirements.

Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities

Expansion of Department of Defense authority to provide support for counter-drug activities to certain additional foreign governments (sec. 1011)

The committee recommends a provision to extend authority to the Department of Defense to provide support to Mexico and the Dominican Republic for their counterdrug activities.

According to the Department of Defense, over 90 percent of the drugs entering the United States come from or via Mexico. Mexican President Felipe Calderon has made fighting the drug cartels and corruption a focus of his administration. The Mexican military lacks the ability to monitor and control air, maritime, and land approaches to Mexico and the security forces need better intelligence-sharing capabilities, among other things.

The Dominican Republic has become, over the last 2 years, a more significant transshipment point for cocaine traveling to the United States from Venezuela. The Dominican security forces lack air, land, and sea mobility, as well as communications and information processing.

The committee, therefore, recommends that counterdrug training and equipment be provided for Mexico and Venezuela under the existing law governing such Department of Defense activities.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations

Enhancement of authority to pay rewards for assistance in combating terrorism (sec. 1021)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase, for 1 year, the amounts of the monetary rewards that are available to the Department of Defense for assistance in combating terrorism. The maximum reward amount available to the Secretary of Defense or a delegated Under Secretary of Defense would be \$5.0 million, and the maximum amount available to combatant commanders would increase to \$1.0 million. The Secretary of Defense

would be required to consult with the Secretary of State regarding a reward over \$2.0 million.

Repeal of modification of authorities relating to the use of the Armed Forces in major public emergencies (sec. 1022)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 1076 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) and revive the provisions amended by that section as they were in effect prior to the effective date of that act. Section 1076 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act clarified the Insurrection Act, section 333 of title 10, United States Code; authorized the provision of supplies, services, and equipment necessary for the immediate preservation of life and property under chapter 152 of title 10, United States Code; and amended section 12304(c) of title 10, United States Code, to remove a restriction on the use of the Presidential Selected Reserve Callup Authority in chapter 15 or natural disaster situations.

The intent of section 1076 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act was to clarify and update the so-called Insurrection Act. Section 1076 was never intended to provide additional authority to the President to employ the armed forces inside the United States to restore public order when domestic violence occurred to such an extent that State authorities were not able to enforce the laws and protect the legal rights of its people beyond what existed under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, that were updated. However, concerns have been expressed by governors of the States and others that this provision expanded the President's authority to federalize the National Guard during certain emergencies and disasters. The committee recommends repeal of this provision to allow further examination of this issue.

The committee directs the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves to examine the clarity of section 333 of title 10, United States Code, and the related provisions of law amended by section 1076, as they would be restored by this provision, and assess whether section 1076 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act inadvertently expanded this authority in any way. The Commission should include its findings and any recommendations in its final report to Congress, which is due no later than January 31, 2008.

Procedures for Combatant Status Review Tribunals; modification of military commission authorities (sec. 1023)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005 (title X of Public Law 109–148) by requiring the Secretary of Defense to conduct Combatant Status Review Tribunals to determine the status of detainees who have been held by the Department of Defense as unlawful enemy combatants for more than 2 years. The provision would establish requirements for the procedures to be used by such tribunals.

In addition, the provision recommended by the committee would amend the Military Commissions Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–366) to clarify: (1) the definition of the term “unlawful enemy combatant”;

(2) the rules regarding statements in which the degree of coercion is disputed; and (3) the admissibility of hearsay evidence.

Gift acceptance authority (sec. 1024)

The committee recommends a provision that would: (1) make permanent the gift acceptance authority in section 2601(b) of title 10, United States Code; and (2) require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations prohibiting the solicitation of any gift by the Department of Defense (DOD) if the nature or circumstances of the solicitation would compromise the integrity or the appearance of integrity of any DOD program or official.

Section 374 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) added a new subsection (b) to section 2601, authorizing DOD to accept gifts on behalf of wounded members of the military, civilian employees, and their dependents. This authority is scheduled to expire on December 31, 2007. The provision recommended by the committee would make the new gift acceptance authority permanent, while requiring the issuance of regulations regarding the solicitation of gifts to ensure that the authority is not abused.

Expansion of cooperative agreement authority for management of cultural resources (sec. 1025)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that the authority of the Secretary of Defense or the secretary of a military department to enter into a cooperative agreement for the preservation, management, maintenance, and improvement of cultural resources extends to cultural resources located off a military installation, if the cooperative agreement would relieve or eliminate current or anticipated restrictions on military training, testing, or operations.

Minimum annual purchase amounts for airlift from carriers participating in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (sec. 1026)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Department of Defense to guarantee higher minimum levels of business than are currently authorized by law to United States air carriers participating in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF). Awarding sufficient guaranteed amounts of the Department's peacetime business has been an essential method of strengthening the Department's partnership with industry participants in the CRAF program. Opportunities to increase the long-term viability of the CRAF program are possible through low risk increases to guaranteed minimum levels of business. This provision would authorize the Department to guarantee a minimum level of peacetime business for the CRAF participants, based on annual forecast needs, capped at a maximum of 80 percent of the annual average expenditures of peacetime airlift for the prior 5-year period.

Provision of Air Force support and services to foreign military and state aircraft (sec. 1027)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of the Air Force permanent authority to provide supplies and services to military and state aircraft of a foreign country. Sup-

plies and services would be provided to a foreign country on a reimbursable basis without an advance of funds if similar supplies and services are furnished to U.S. military or other state aircraft by that country. The provision would provide that routine airport services may be provided on a non-reimbursable basis at no cost to the foreign country if providing those services does not result in any direct costs to the Air Force, or the services are provided under an agreement by which the foreign country has agreed to provide on a reciprocal basis routine airport services to U.S. military or other state aircraft without reimbursement. The provision would stipulate that if routine airport services are provided by a working capital fund activity of the Air Force to a foreign country on a non-reimbursable basis under an agreement with that country, the working capital fund activity will be reimbursed for the costs of those services out of Air Force Operation and Maintenance funds.

**Participation in Strategic Airlift Capability Partnership
(sec. 1028)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into a multilateral memorandum of understanding authorizing the Strategic Airlift Capability Partnership for the purposes of acquiring, operating, and supporting strategic airlift aircraft. The provision would permit the Secretary of Defense to pay the U.S. share of the costs of the activities and operations of the Partnership from funds available to the Department of Defense for this purpose. The provision provides that the Secretary of Defense, in carrying out the terms of the memorandum of understanding, is authorized to waive reimbursement of the United States for the cost of certain functions performed by Department personnel for the Partnership and waive imposition of surcharges for administrative services provided by the United States that otherwise would be charged to the Partnership. The provision would also authorize the payment of salaries and other expenses of Department personnel assigned to the Partnership without reimbursement or cost sharing for those expenses. The provision provides for the crediting of amounts received by the United States in carrying out the memorandum. The provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer one strategic airlift aircraft to the Strategic Airlift Capability Partnership under the terms and conditions to be agreed to in the memorandum of understanding. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days before transferring a strategic airlift aircraft to the Partnership. The report would include information on the type and tail number of the aircraft to be transferred.

The committee notes the growing strategic airlift requirements of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members and coalition partners, including those resulting from NATO's International Security Assistance Force mission in Afghanistan. The NATO Supreme Allied Commander Europe's Minimum Military Requirements study for the NATO Response Force (NRF) identifies an NRF requirement for the equivalent of eight C-17 aircraft to meet airlift needs. The committee expects the Strategic Airlift Capability

Partnership to give priority to meeting airlift requirements associated with NATO missions.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees evaluating the alternatives for strategic airlift aircraft to be transferred to the Partnership not later than 30 days prior to the transfer of a strategic airlift aircraft under this section. The report should include the extent to which each aircraft would meet the Partnership requirements, and the total cost to the United States Government associated with the transfer of each aircraft. The committee believes that total cost should be determined based on procurement, operating, and support costs. The committee further believes that for aircraft that are excess to United States Transportation Command inventory requirements, procurement costs should be limited to those costs necessary to refurbish and upgrade the aircraft to meet the Partnership's requirements.

The committee notes that establishment of the Strategic Airlift Capability Partnership would require the creation of new organizational structures within NATO. The committee expects to be kept informed on the progress of negotiating and concluding the memorandum of understanding authorized under this provision and any agreement establishing a subsidiary body within NATO to carry out that memorandum.

Responsibility of the Air Force for fixed-wing support of Army intra-theater logistics (sec. 1029)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to prescribe directives or instructions to provide that the Air Force will be responsible for the missions and functions of fixed-wing support for Army intra-theater logistics.

The budget request included \$157.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA, line 1) for buying the Joint Cargo Aircraft (JCA). The budget request also included \$42.4 million in PE 41138F for Air Force activities related to joint Live Fire Test and Evaluation (LFT&E) and Initial Operational Test and Evaluation (IOT&E) programs, initiating an Air Force mission equipment integration design/development program, buying test aircraft, and engineering, training, and logistics support studies and analysis. The budget request did not include any funding in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) for the JCA program.

The Army and the Air Force established the JCA program to correct operational shortfalls to cargo mission requirements, provide commonality with other aviation platforms, and replace multiple retiring aircraft systems. In the Senate report accompanying S. 2744 (S. Rept. 109-254) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), the committee noted that the appropriate aircraft mix and the number of intra-theater aircraft assets required for this mission had not been determined and had not been addressed in the Mobility Capabilities Study. The Department of Defense has been conducting an Intra-Theater Lift Capability Study and Force Mix Study to identify the right mix and number of intra-theater aircraft assets required, but has not yet produced any results from those efforts.

Whatever those analyses show, however, the more fundamental question is whether this should be a joint program between the Army and the Air Force, or whether this fixed-wing, intra-theater lift mission should be assigned solely to the Air Force.

The committee has heard frequent anecdotes from Army officials about the lack of logistics support they feel has been provided by the Air Force operating the C-130 aircraft in Iraq and Afghanistan. However, when invited to provide concrete examples that would give substance to the assertions, the Army was not forthcoming. Without concrete examples, there is no way to tell if the perceived shortage of support was due to other Air Force priorities, or whether the Air Force operators were fully engaged in supporting the priorities of the overall ground component commander. If there were a pattern of the joint forces air component commander (JFACC) providing support that did not match the priorities of the joint forces land component commander (JFLCC), that would certainly argue for intervention of the joint forces commander to correct the situation. It would not be a persuasive argument that the JFLCC should have his own air force.

Unfortunately, these arguments have a familiar ring—"I can't count on it in wartime if I don't own it all the time." These were among the loudest arguments against making the reforms included in the Goldwater-Nichols Act.

The committee believes that the Air Force is better positioned to provide this type of support in wartime and in peacetime, and believes that the Army would be better served to focus its scarce resources on those missions and functions for which it is uniquely qualified and which are demonstrably underfunded.

The committee, therefore, recommends this provision, a decrease of \$157.0 million in APA, and an increase of \$157.0 million in APAF to continue the JCA program in the current schedule.

Prohibition on sale of parts for F-14 fighter aircraft (sec. 1030)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the sale of F-14 fighter aircraft parts, with an exception for sales to museums or other such organizations involved in restoring F-14 aircraft for historical purposes.

The provision would also prohibit the issuance of any export license for such parts.

Subtitle D—Reports

Renewal of submittal of plans for prompt global strike capability (sec. 1041)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 3 fiscal years—2007, 2008, and 2009—the annual report on prompt global strike capabilities required by section 1032 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136).

Report on threats to the United States from ungoverned areas (sec. 1042)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, to report on the threat posed to the United States by ungoverned areas, especially as they relate to terrorist groups and individuals who aim their activities at the United States and its allies.

The report should describe the intelligence capabilities and the skills that the U.S. Government must have to support U.S. policy aimed at managing these threats, the extent to which the Departments of Defense and State already have these capabilities, and what if anything needs to be done to improve the two departments' capabilities in this area.

The committee notes, on a related subject, that section 1035 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) directed the President to submit a report on improving interagency civil-military support for U.S. national security missions, including peace and stability operations. The report was due on April 1, 2007, but the Senate Committee on Armed Services has not received it.

Study on national security interagency system (sec. 1043)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into an agreement with an independent, non-profit, non-partisan organization to conduct a study on the national security interagency system.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Revised nuclear posture review (sec. 1061)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to conduct a review of the nuclear posture of the United States for the next 5 to 10 years. The new nuclear posture review (NPR) would be submitted to Congress in December 2009.

The last NPR was conducted at the outset of the Bush administration in December 2001. The committee believes that it is imperative that the next administration clearly articulate its nuclear policy at the outset of its tenure. The new NPR would include a review of the policy objectives with respect to nuclear forces and weapons and include the relationship among United States nuclear deterrence policy, targeting strategy, and arms control objectives. In addition the new NPR would look at the role that missile defense capabilities and conventional strike forces play in determining the size and role of nuclear forces.

The elements in the provision recommended by the committee are identical to the elements that were required to be addressed in the December 2001 NPR. The committee notes that the provision would also direct the Secretary of Defense to submit the new NPR in an unclassified form with a classified annex as necessary. Although the Secretary of Defense was directed to submit the December 2001 NPR in an unclassified form, unfortunately this never happened.

Termination of Commission on the Implementation of the New Strategic Posture of the United States (sec. 1062)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 1051 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). The provision directed the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to provide for the organization, management, and support of the commission on the implementation of the new strategic posture. The commission was charged with looking at the programmatic requirements of the Department of Defense (DOD) to achieve the goals of the December 2001 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), including the requirements process, and the ability of the current nuclear stockpile to address the evolving strategic threat environment through 2008. The commission's report was originally due on June 30, 2007, and in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) the due date was extended to November 2007.

The DOD has not yet entered into this contract. The committee believes that the intended scope and focus of the report, which are actions of this administration and threats through 2008, the fact that the commission has not yet started its work, and the short time remaining until the term of the commission expires, means that the commission's report would no longer be timely or meaningful. In lieu of this commission the committee has recommended a provision that would direct the next administration to prepare a new NPR. This document will provide forward-looking policy guidance for the actions of the next administration.

Communications with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives (sec. 1063)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that the organizations within the U.S. intelligence community provide timely responses to requests by the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives for intelligence assessments, reports, estimates, legal opinions, and other information. The provision would also require that intelligence officials be able to provide testimony before the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives without having to seek approval or clearance of such testimony as a way of ensuring that Congress receives the independent views of such officials.

Repeal of standards for disqualification from issuance of security clearances by the Department of Defense (sec. 1064)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 986 of title 10, United States Code, which establishes mandatory standards for the disqualification of individuals from the issuance of security clearances. The Department of Defense requested the repeal of this provision on the basis that the mandatory standards “unduly limit the ability of the Department to manage its security clearance program and may create unwarranted hardships for individuals who have rehabilitated themselves as productive and trustworthy citizens.”

Advisory panel on Department of Defense capabilities for support of civil authorities after certain incidents (sec. 1065)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish an advisory panel to carry out a 12 month assessment of the capabilities of the Department of Defense to provide support to civil authorities in the event of a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or high-yield explosive (CBRNE) incident.

The committee notes that although the Department has met the U.S. Northern Command requirements for forces to be made available to support civil authorities should a domestic CBRNE incident occur, the Department acknowledges that it has become increasingly difficult to meet all expected requirements because of the high pace of current military operations overseas. These operations may include the forces that would be directed to support civil authorities for CBRNE incidents. In addition, the Government Accountability Office recently reported that even though 12 of the 15 National Planning Scenarios issued by the Homeland Security Council involve CBRNE response, the ability of Army chemical and biological units, especially National Guard and reserve units, to concurrently perform both their original warfighting mission and their homeland defense mission is doubtful.

Sense of Congress on the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (sec. 1066)

The committee recommends a provision that expresses the sense of Congress that the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC) is an invaluable training and education facility.

WHINSEC was established in 2001 by the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-398) to provide training and education for eligible military personnel, law enforcement officials, and civilians from the United States and other nations of the Western Hemisphere. The primary language of instruction is Spanish, which makes the institute potentially accessible to a broader group of officials in Latin America and the Caribbean than most other U.S. professional military education institutions. The institute supports military-to-military and political-military relations between the United States and the governments of the Western Hemisphere, which today, with the exception of Cuba, are all democratic. The new institute, established when the School of the Americas closed in December 2000, incorporates issues of human rights and democracy in its curriculum, and has a Board of Visitors providing oversight, as mandated by the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-398).

Technical amendments to title 10, United States Code, arising from enactment of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (sec. 1067)

The committee recommends a provision that would make technical amendments to title 10, United States Code, to reflect

changes made in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004.

Establishment of National Foreign Language Coordination Council (sec. 1068)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a National Foreign Language Coordination Council to develop and monitor the implementation of a comprehensive national foreign language strategy. The strategy shall include: (1) an identification of priorities to expand foreign language skills in the public and private sectors; (2) recommendations for improving coordination of foreign language programs and activities among federal agencies, enhancing foreign language programs and activities, and allocating resources appropriately to maximize the use of resources; (3) effective ways to increase public awareness of the need for foreign language skills and career paths in the public and private sectors that can employ those skills; (4) recommendations for incentives for developing related educational programs, including foreign language teacher training; and (5) effective ways to coordinate public and private sector efforts to provide foreign language instruction and acquire foreign language and area expertise. The Council shall prepare and transmit the strategy to the President and the relevant committees of Congress not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

The committee recognizes that deficits in foreign language and regional expertise undermine U.S. national security. On January 5, 2006, the President launched the National Security Language Initiative (NSLI) to increase the number of Americans learning critical foreign languages through new and expanded programs from kindergarten through university and into the workforce. The committee acknowledges that the NSLI is a positive step toward immediately expanding critical foreign language skills to strengthen national security. However, the committee believes that a longer-term strategic effort is needed to increase language and cultural competency in the United States, and that NSLI needs to be administered by a formalized council in order to ensure continued progress.

Qualifications for public aircraft status of aircraft under contract with the Armed Forces (sec. 1069)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of Defense the flexibility to determine whether an operational support mission can be conducted as a civil operation in compliance with the Federal Aviation Regulations. The applicable part of the current definition of public aircraft under section 40102 of title 49, United States Code, would be expanded to include such operational missions. These could include flights involving activities such as parachute training, carriage of sling loads, or target towing.

The provision would also amend section 40125 of title 49, United States Code, to reference such missions. The Secretary of Defense currently has the authority to determine when chartered transportation is a civil or public aircraft operation through a designation under section 40125(c)(1)(C).

With adoption of this provision, the Secretary of Defense would have the same authority regarding operational support missions. If the Secretary were not to designate an aircraft chartered to provide operational support as being in the national interest (and thus a public aircraft operation), such operation would be a civil operation and would have to comply with applicable Federal Aviation Administration civil safety regulations.

Items of Special Interest

Certification of no pecuniary interest

The committee notes that the Legislative Transparency and Accountability Act of 2007 (S. 1) would require a Senator who requests an earmark to certify that neither the Senator (nor his spouse) has a pecuniary interest in such earmark in violation of Senate Rule XXXVII(4). Although S. 1 has not yet been enacted, the committee has requested that each member requesting funds in this bill provide the certification that would be required by S. 1. The committee has received the requested certification from each Senator requesting funding for a program, project, or activity that is provided in this bill.

The committee takes no position as to which of these items, if any, constitute earmarks under the definition in S. 1 or any other definition. The committee directs the Department of Defense to use all applicable competitive, merit-based procedures in the award of any new contract, grant, or other agreement entered into with funds authorized to be appropriated by this bill. No provision in the bill or report shall be construed to direct funds to any particular location or entity unless the provision expressly so provides.

Intelligence community operations

In March 2005, and April 2006, respectively, the Department of Defense (DOD) established the Joint Functional Component Command for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (JFCC-ISR) and the Defense Joint Intelligence Operations Center (DJIOC). These organizations are co-located at the Defense Intelligence Agency's (DIA) headquarters and are becoming highly integrated. Together they serve as a "J-3" (operations) for DOD intelligence. They perform collection management, asset allocation, situational awareness, intelligence campaign planning, assessments of intelligence operations, tasking, and coordination with the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) and other elements of the U.S. Government.

The capabilities of these organizations appear to be maturing rapidly, but there is a major impediment to the full realization of their potential: the lack of any similar organization under the DNI. The DNI has tasking authority by law and executive order for both collection and analysis of national intelligence, but has limited and fragmented resources for exercising this vital role.

As a result of intelligence reforms since 9/11, the DNI has established additional community centers and a series of "mission managers" to focus resources on specific missions or targets and to integrate activities and capabilities across the intelligence agencies and disciplines (e.g., signals intelligence, human intelligence, and im-

agery intelligence). However, there does not appear to be a structure or a process for allocating scarce resources among these joint entities. Analysis and collection similarly only come together at the level of the DNI himself. Single-discipline tasking organizations are located within individual agencies, and in some cases are further fragmented.

The Commander of United States Strategic Command (STRATCOM) has expressed concern that the absence of a coherent and integrated operations structure on the DNI side makes the job of the DJIOC and JFCC-ISR more difficult.

The DNI now has representation at the DJIOC, and his staff is gaining an understanding of the value of such structures and the role they are playing. However, much more needs to be done to enable the national intelligence community to operate more efficiently, effectively, and jointly, both across the national intelligence community and with the Department of Defense.

The committee requests that the DNI, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and the Commander of STRATCOM, examine ways to enhance the effectiveness of the DNI's tasking authorities by creating a joint operations organization that centralizes and integrates community tasking operations, resource allocations, situational awareness, collection management, and crisis response. This operations organization could build on the DOD DJIOC/JFCC-ISR model and organization. The committee requests that a summary of the DNI's conclusions on this matter be provided to the congressional defense and intelligence oversight committees by January 15, 2008.

Language and cultural awareness initiatives review

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities received testimony which highlighted the growing need for our operational forces to have improved language and cultural awareness capabilities. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has undertaken a set of high level studies on this issue, including through the Defense Science Board, and established initiatives in this area—including the Defense Language Roadmap and a number of training and technology development programs. The committee is supportive of these efforts in general and believes that a combination of training and education and research and technology will have the best chance of producing deployable forces with the requisite language and cultural awareness skills. The committee remains concerned that the Department's efforts are not as effective as they could be and may be underresourced.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General to review Department plans for the development of language and cultural awareness capabilities and report to the congressional defense committees no later than December 31, 2008. The review should include an assessment of Department long- and short-term programs and plans; funding allocations; establishment and use of metrics for success; and plans for training, acquisition, and research programs to address needs in current operations. The review should examine the consistency of Department efforts with high level vision and mission statements and validated require-

ments, as well as recommendations by major independent studies of the Department's language and cultural awareness capabilities.

Nuclear cruise missiles

In fiscal year 2007 the Department of Defense decided to retire the Air Force's Advance Cruise Missile (ACM) and a portion of the Air-Launched Cruise Missiles (ALCM). These are two of three types of cruise missiles that carry the same nuclear warhead. The third nuclear cruise missile is the Navy's nuclear Tomahawk (TLAM-N). The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the remaining nuclear cruise missiles and submit a plan with a time line to retire these remaining missiles. The plan should be submitted with the budget request for fiscal year 2009.

Reporting and remediation of Anti-Deficiency Act violations

On January 17, 2007, the Acting Inspector General of the Department of Defense (DOD) testified before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support that his office had identified 107 potential Anti-Deficiency Act (ADA) violations in DOD contracting through four non-defense agencies. As of the date of the hearing, a follow-up audit of DOD contracting through the Department of the Interior had identified at least 250 additional potential ADA violations, 189 of which occurred after officials had been warned against the continued use of expired funds.

The committee is concerned about the volume of potential ADA violations in these interagency transactions, the pace and transparency of investigations of these potential violations, and the procedures used to elevate findings of initial investigations. For example, the committee understands that the preliminary investigation of a potential violation may be carried out by personnel within the organizational unit responsible for the violation.

The committee directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review DOD procedures for identifying, reporting, preventing, and investigating potential ADA violations, including: (1) the adequacy of current procedures utilized for preliminary and formal investigations of potential ADA violations; (2) the transparency both inside and outside DOD of the investigation process; (3) the independence and qualifications of personnel utilized at each stage of an investigation of potential ADA violations; (4) the timeliness of investigations of potential ADA violations; (5) the adequacy of ADA training provided to the Department's military and civilian personnel; (6) the effectiveness of existing measures for the prevention of ADA violations; and (7) the use and adequacy of available disciplinary measures for ADA violations. The committee expects GAO to report its findings and recommendations to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Ship disposal

Section 231 of title 10, United States Code, requires that the Secretary of Defense submit an annual report on the long-range plan for Navy shipbuilding. This naval vessel construction plan is to include a description of the necessary naval vessel force structure to meet the requirements of the national security strategy of the

United States. The “Annual Long-Range Plan for Construction of Naval Vessels” report to Congress submitted with the President’s budget request for fiscal year 2008, describes the Department of the Navy’s requirements for a force of “about 313 ships.” The report identifies that the Navy will experience shortfalls to expeditionary warfare, aircraft carrier, attack submarine, and surface combatant ship classes for various durations throughout the 30-year period of the long-range plan.

Section 7308 of title 10, United States Code, requires the Chief of Naval Operations to certify, prior to disposal of a combatant vessel of the Navy, that the combatant vessel to be disposed is not essential to the defense of the United States. In calendar year 2006, the Navy conducted sinking exercises on two recently-decommissioned major combatant ships, the ex-*Valley Forge* (CG-50) and the ex-*Belleau Wood* (LHA-3). The decision for decommissioning these ships reflected the Navy’s determination that the operating and support cost for maintaining these ships in the active fleet could not be justified based on their respective contributions to national security requirements. However, the Navy’s decision to sink these ships, each with relatively significant remaining service life and measurable mission relevance, while older and less relevant combatant ships are maintained as mobilization assets, raises concerns regarding the decision process used to manage the Navy’s inactive ships.

In view of these concerns, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to include, as an addendum to the annual report on the construction of naval vessels, commencing with submission of the report for fiscal year 2009, the future-years defense program for the Navy’s inactive ships. The addendum shall address: (i) hull numbers of ships that are to be disposed by dismantling or sinking within the future-years defense plan; (ii) hull numbers of ships that are to be decommissioned within the future-years defense program; (iii) gaps in capability that will occur upon the decommissioning of each ship, including duration of that capability gap; and (iv) disposition proposed for each ship upon decommissioning.

In view of the Navy’s current inability to meet amphibious lift requirements in support of the Marine Corps, the committee directs the Navy to maintain decommissioned LHA-1 class amphibious assault ships in a reduced operating status until such time that the active fleet can deliver 2.0 Marine Expeditionary Brigade forcible entry lift capability in response to a national emergency. Total forcible lift entry capability shall be assessed under the assumption that no less than 10 percent of the force will be unavailable due to extended duration maintenance availabilities.

Transparency of earmarks for additional funding

The committee notes that section 2304(k) of title 10, United States Code, states that it is the policy of Congress that any new contract for a program, project, or technology identified in legislation be entered into through merit-based selection procedures. Section 2374 of title 10, United States Code, establishes the same policy for the award of any new grant for research, development, test, or evaluation to a non-federal entity. Under each statute, the presumption in favor of competitive, merit-based awards may only be

overcome by a provision of law that specifically refers to section 2304 or section 2374, that specifically identifies the particular non-Federal Government entity involved, and that specifically states that award to the entity is required notwithstanding the policy favoring merit-based selection.

Although the statutory policy requiring the Department of Defense to use merit-based selection processes and the presumption in favor of competitive awards for new contracts and grants date from 1989 and 1994, respectively, these statutes have done little to stem the growing number of earmarked projects requested by Congress since their enactment. Moreover, these statutes do not address a common form of earmark, which is additional funding for existing procurement or research and development programs beyond what was requested in the President's budget or included on the unfunded priorities lists of the military services.

Therefore, the policy of this committee shall be one of disclosure of additional funding for projects and items that were not requested in the President's budget, in supplemental requests for emergency funding, or on the unfunded priorities lists of the military services that are included in the bill and conference report. Disclosure shall not be required for additional funding that is consistent with the criteria for additional funding for military construction projects in section 2856 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337) or for additional funding directed to pay, bonuses, pensions, or other personnel or health care benefits for service members or that have a direct benefit for service members' families. Information on such additional funding shall be provided in the committee report on the bill and in the conference report, by electronic means easily accessible by the public, and shall include, if applicable: the budget account, a description of the project or item, the authorized amount, and the name of the requesting member for any funding included in the bill as reported by the committee, or agreed to by the conferees. Such information shall be made available to the general public in an electronically searchable format at least 48 hours before consideration of the bill or conference report.

The information provided in this report does not include the intended location or intended recipient of such additional funding because the committee does not have a complete database of that information at this time. It is the committee's intent to collect such information from members and to provide it with regard to items funded in the conference report on this Act and for future years' National Defense Authorization Acts.

By collecting and reporting information on the locations and recipients intended by requesting members, the committee does not intend in any way to require that funding be directed to such locations or entities. The committee intends that the Department comply with all applicable competitive and merit-based procedures.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

Compensation for Federal wage system employees for certain travel hours (sec. 1101)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 5544(a) of title 5, United States Code, to authorize compensation of federal wage system employees for hours spent traveling while returning from an event that cannot be scheduled or controlled administratively. Under current law, these employees can be compensated for time spent traveling to the event, but not for the return because return travel can be scheduled.

Retirement service credit for service as cadet or midshipman at a military service academy (sec. 1102)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 8331(13) and 8401(31) of title 5, United States Code, to clarify an existing practice of awarding retirement service credit for time in service as a cadet or midshipman at a military service academy.

Continuation of life insurance coverage for Federal employees called to active duty (sec. 1103)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 8706(b) of title 5, United States Code, to authorize federal civilian employees who are members of a reserve component of the armed forces called or ordered to active duty to continue coverage under Federal Employees Group Life Insurance for a period not to exceed 24 months.

Department of Defense National Security Personnel System (sec. 1104)

The committee recommends a provision that would revise the National Security Personnel System (NSPS) authorized by section 1101 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) by: (1) excluding wage-grade employees of the Department of Defense from NSPS; (2) accelerating by 2 years the expiration of the Department's authority to modify statutory labor relations requirements; and (3) clarifying the treatment of rates of pay established or adjusted in accordance with the requirements of the statute.

Authority to waive limitation on premium pay for Federal civilian employees working overseas under areas of United States Central Command (sec. 1105)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the head of an executive agency to waive limitations on total compensation to an employee who performs certain work while in an overseas location within the area of responsibility of the Commander of the United States Central Command. The total com-

pensation payable to an employee pursuant to such a waiver would be limited to \$212,100 per calendar year.

Authority for inclusion of certain Office of Defense Research and Engineering positions in experimental personnel program for scientific and technical personnel (sec. 1106)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Director of Defense Research and Engineering (DDR&E) to utilize more flexible hiring practices to recruit and retain high quality scientific talent. The committee notes that this authority has been used very successfully by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to preserve a world-class technical government workforce. The committee notes that the Defense Science Board (DSB) in its study entitled “Roles and Authorities of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering” noted that its “serious concern . . . about DDR&E being able to fulfill its responsibilities stems . . . from the thinness of the staff.” The DSB recommended fostering “an initiative to improve the technical competence and industrial management experience of the leadership and staff in the office . . .,” and recommended that this could be accomplished by using the authority created by the recommended provision, as well as other mechanisms.

Items of Special Interest

Increase in authorized number of employees in the Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service

Section 1102 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) required the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategic plan to shape and improve the senior management, functional, and technical workforce of the Department of Defense (DOD), including persons serving in the Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service (DISES). The provision required DOD to submit a report on this strategic plan to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2007. The required report has not yet been provided.

The DOD legislative proposal for fiscal year 2008 included a provision that would increase by 100 the number of DISES billets. The requested legislation was justified by the observation that civilian personnel levels in the defense intelligence components have increased substantially since September 11, 2001, while the number of DISES billets has not.

The assertion that the ratio between DISES billets and overall civilian employment numbers should be closer to former levels is not alone sufficient to justify the increase. The committee notes that the ratio of DISES billets to civilian employees on September 11 may not be the appropriate benchmark. The increase in civilian employment in the defense intelligence components since September 11 followed a decade of decline in such employment, but DOD has provided no figures about ratios between DISES billets and civilian employment during that period.

In addition, there is a wide variation across the intelligence components in the ratio of DISES billets to civilian employees. The Na-

tional Geospatial Intelligence Agency (NGA) and the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), with civilian populations comparable to that of the National Security Agency, have only two-thirds the number of DISES that NSA does. NSA has a far higher percentage of DISES than any other component, and yet would receive a majority of the additional billets requested by DOD.

Moreover, civilian employment has increased throughout DOD since September 11, 2001. The number of contractor employees performing functions that have previously been performed by federal employees has increased even more dramatically. Yet, DOD has not proposed any significant increase in the number of senior executive personnel outside the intelligence community. The committee believes that any increase in the senior management, functional, and technical workforce of the Department should be made on the basis of sound data and strategic planning, not on a piecemeal basis with limited data.

Accordingly, the committee concludes that it would be premature to approve the Department's request for additional DISES billets until the Department: (1) provides the strategic plan required by section 1102; (2) presents a comprehensive proposal that addresses the need for senior personnel across the entire Department, rather than addressing the needs of a single community; and (3) justifies the proposed allocation of DISES billets within the intelligence community.

Recruitment, hiring, and retention of Department of Defense civilian medical personnel and faculty and staff of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences

The committee recognizes that the total force capability of military medicine is a combination of uniformed medical personnel needed for medical readiness, government civilian health care providers, and civilian providers under Department of Defense contracts. Military hospital staff at numerous locations report that their goal of hiring government civilian employees whenever possible is frequently frustrated by low salaries and antiquated hiring procedures. For example, one Navy facility reported that, while waiting more than 7 months for approval to hire a civilian medical professional, qualified candidates sought private sector employment elsewhere. This pattern, which is repeated throughout military hospitals in the United States, hurts military medical readiness and compounds shortfalls in uniformed medical personnel. The committee is concerned that in many cases, hospital commanders are not aware of the civilian hiring tools available to them. The committee commends the Office of Personnel Management for promptly responding to the Department's request for direct hiring authority for certain positions at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, but believes that the need for such authority is greater than one facility.

The committee is also concerned by reports that the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS) is experiencing significant challenges in recruitment and retention of high quality faculty and staff because of a cap on civilian salaries. The committee believes that recruitment and retention of high quality faculty and staff for USUHS is essential to ensure that future mili-

tary physicians are adequately prepared to provide quality medical care and services for military members and their families, in peacetime and in war.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director, Office of Personnel Management, to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than September 15, 2007, on all hiring authorities currently available to the Department of Defense for the hiring of government civilian medical personnel and faculty and staff for USUHS. The report should identify specific salary, allowance, and bonus levels that can be offered for each skill level and provide an analysis of the appropriateness of such compensation levels when compared to compensation offered by the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Health and Human Services, and private sector employers. In particular, the report should address the appropriateness of amounts available for physicians comparability allowances under section 5948 of title 5, United States Code, and whether expansion of such allowance to additional categories of health care professionals and to faculty and staff at USUHS would be beneficial to the Department of Defense. The report should include an analysis of hiring challenges at USUHS, its impact on the mission of the University, how USUHS salary caps compare to other federal agency salaries for medical faculty and staff, and recommendations for addressing the recruiting and retention challenges USUHS is experiencing. The report should assess whether additional direct hiring authority for certain medical and related positions is needed and include a plan to inform medical leadership and human resource personnel in the military departments of all available hiring authorities and best practices in efficient hiring of civilian medical personnel.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

Subtitle A—Assistance and Training

Authority to equip and train foreign personnel to assist in accounting for missing United States personnel (sec. 1201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to equip and train foreign personnel to assist in the recovery of, and accounting for, missing U.S. personnel.

The U.S. Pacific Command's Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command (JPAC) is an operational agency responsible for worldwide research, investigation, evacuations, and remains identifications relating to those unaccounted for from past conflicts. Since 2001, JPAC has identified the remains of over 400 missing service members from previous conflicts. Of the approximately 88,000 missing from World War II to Vietnam, about 19,000 can be recovered. In some instances, foreign governments will not allow U.S. personnel to conduct recovery and identification missions on their territory. In these cases, foreign nations are asked by the United States to assist in recovery and accounting efforts, provided the nations have trained and equipped personnel.

No more than \$1.0 million in assistance may be provided per fiscal year for this purpose.

Extension and enhancement of authority for security and stabilization assistance (sec. 1202)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend and enhance the authority for security and stabilization assistance provided under section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). That section authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide the Secretary of State with services, defense articles, or funding to facilitate the provision by the Secretary of State of reconstruction, security, or stabilization assistance to a foreign country.

The provision recommended by the committee would extend the authority of section 1207 for 1 year until September 30, 2008, and increase the aggregate value of all services, defense articles, and funds that may be provided or transferred under this section to \$200.0 million. The provision would also add a requirement for the Secretary of State to coordinate with the Secretary of Defense in the formulation and implementation of assistance programs that involve the provision of services or transfer of defense articles or funds under the authority of this section.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has the authority to build the capacity of partner nations' military forces under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended by section 1206 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). Section 1206 authorizes the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to use up to \$300.0 million of Operation and Maintenance funds to conduct or support a program to build the capacity of foreign nations' military forces to conduct counterterrorism operations or to participate in or support military or stability operations in which the United States is a participant.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has stated a need to build the capacity of foreign security forces other than military forces, such as gendarmerie, constabulary, and internal defense forces. The committee notes that the Department of State has existing authority to provide assistance for these purposes. To date, the Department of Defense and the Department of State have failed to coordinate in using the authority provided in section 1207 except in a limited number of programs. The committee believes that assistance for foreign countries to build the capacity of their security forces other than military forces could be facilitated by the authorities provided in section 1207, and encourages the Department of Defense and Department of State to improve coordination between the departments to use this authority more effectively in the future.

The committee notes that the authorities of sections 1206 and 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 were provided in the spirit of a pilot program. Consistent with the statement of managers accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, the committee intends to review the implementation of these authorities carefully to determine whether, and if so, in what manner, to reauthorize these or provide other authorities at the conclusion of the pilot program.

The committee stresses that an important factor in its consideration of these matters will be the report required by subsection 1206(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. That report addresses recommended changes, if any, to current laws governing the provision of capacity building assistance; any organizational or procedural changes required to improve the conduct of such assistance programs; and the resources and funding mechanisms required to adequately fund such programs. The committee emphasizes that this report is overdue and directs that it be provided expeditiously.

Commanders' Emergency Response Program (sec. 1203)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use up to \$977,441,000 in Operation and Maintenance funding in fiscal year 2008 for the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP), under which commanders in Iraq receive funds for use in small humanitarian and reconstruction projects in their areas of responsibility that provide immediate assistance to the Iraqi people, and for a similar program in Afghanistan. The provision would require the Secretary to provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the source, allocation, and use of funds pursuant to this authority. The com-

mittee expects the quarterly reports to include detailed information regarding the amount of funds spent, the recipients of the funds, and the specific purposes for which the funds were used.

The committee directs that funds made available pursuant to this authority be used in a manner consistent with the CERP guidance issued by the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) in a memorandum dated February 18, 2005. This guidance directs that CERP funds be used to assist the Iraqi and Afghan people in the following representative areas: water and sanitation; food production and distribution; agriculture; electricity; healthcare; education; telecommunications; economic, financial and management improvements; transportation; irrigation; rule of law and governance; civic cleanup activities; civic support vehicles; repair of civic and cultural facilities; and other urgent humanitarian or reconstruction projects. The provision would require the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees any modification to the February 18, 2005, guidance.

Government Accountability Office report on Global Peace Operations Initiative (sec. 1204)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Government Accountability Office, not later than March 1, 2008, to examine the President's Global Peace Operation Initiative (GPOI). The report would include an assessment of whether, and to what extent, the initiative has met the goals set by the President at the inception of the program in 2004, and recommendations as to any additional measures that could be taken to enhance the program in terms of: (1) achieving its stated goals; and (2) ensuring that GPOI-trained individuals and units are regularly participating in peace operations.

The GPOI is a 5-year presidential initiative that was unveiled at the June 2004 G-8 summit at Sea Island, Georgia and is aimed at increasing the number of capable peacekeepers and stability police units, to develop means to help countries deploy to peace operations. The goal was to train, over 5 years, 75,000 personnel from various countries—initially focused on Africa. At its inception, the committee was informed that for each year about 10 battalions would be trained in Africa and about five in the Western Hemisphere, Europe, and Asia. Follow-on training to maintain skills would also be planned, a new transportation and logistics support arrangement would be created, and a constabulary training center would be established. Fifty-six to seventy percent of the funding would come from non-U.S. international resources, solicited via the G-8.

In 2005 the existing African Contingency Operations Training and Assistance (ACOTA) program (a successor program to the African Crisis Response Initiative, or ACRI) was subsumed into GPOI and the Italian Government established an international training center—the Center of Excellence for Stability Police Units—in Vincenza, Italy. As of December 2006, about 15,000 peacekeepers had been trained under the program, and according to the Department of State about 21,000 have been trained as of April 2007. An additional 54,000 must be trained by the end of 2009, when authority for the program will expire.

It is unclear whether the readiness of these troops is being monitored or maintained. No depot for caching equipment has been established, though this was a program objective and there is no transportation logistics support arrangement, as originally planned. GPOI appears to remain heavily U.S.-funded, focused on the old ACRI-ACOTA program. Participation among the G-8 members is uneven and there appears to be no effort to solicit partnership with non-G-8 countries such as India, which has rich peacekeeping experience and the resources to participate in training and other activities. One possible challenge to obtaining greater contributions or participation in GPOI may be the fact that at the Department of State, GPOI appears to be mainly administered by the Africa Bureau, rather than the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs.

Given the increasing demand for peacekeeping troops—especially for the United Nations Mission in Sudan—and the likelihood that new missions will emerge in the near future, it is especially critical to have trained forces in Africa ready to respond. The committee's expectation is that troops trained by the United States and its partners under GPOI should be volunteered by their states to the United Nations, and that they would be trained and equipped to deploy, with GPOI partners ready to assist via a transportation-logistics support arrangement. When the Department of Defense originally sought authority and funding for GPOI from the committee, its officials asserted that past U.S. training programs—mainly focused on African militaries—have resulted in better-trained militaries who are also more likely to participate in subsequent peace operations. The committee hopes to strengthen the likelihood that GPOI will be administered in such a fashion and that there will be an expectation, if not a requirement, that GPOI training recipient countries contribute troops to U.N. missions in the near-term, and that GPOI will increase the number of peacekeepers who can remain ready via sustained training and equipping programs.

Subtitle B—Other Authorities and Limitations

Cooperative opportunities documents under cooperative research and development agreements with NATO organizations and other allied and friendly foreign countries (sec. 1211)

The committee recommends a provision that would make technical corrections to the statute governing the development of international cooperative research and development agreements. The committee notes that the provision would make the statutory language more consistent with current acquisition program terminology and enable the Department of Defense to evaluate appropriate international cooperative opportunities at an early stage in an acquisition program.

Extension and expansion of temporary authority to use acquisition and cross-servicing agreements to lend military equipment for personnel protection and survivability (sec. 1212)

The committee recommends a provision that would expand and extend the authority provided under section 1202 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). Under current law, section 1202 provides the Secretary of Defense temporary authority to treat certain significant military equipment as logistical support, supplies, and services under Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreements in order to lend such equipment to military forces of foreign nations participating in combined operations with the United States in Iraq or Afghanistan. The military equipment provided under the authority of that section may be used by the foreign military forces solely for personnel protection or to aid in the personnel survivability of those forces.

The provision would expand the temporary authority provided by that section to permit the use of such equipment by military forces of a nation participating in combined operations with the United States as part of a peacekeeping operation under the Charter of the United Nations or another international agreement, such as the Multinational Force and Observers under the Treaty of Peace Between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the State of Israel of March 26, 1979. The provision would also extend the authority provided under that section until September 30, 2008.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has expressed an interest in making the temporary authority provided under section 1202 permanent. The committee does not believe it is desirable to change the definition of the term “logistic support, supplies, and services” as that term applies to Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreements, which are not intended to facilitate the transfer of significant military equipment.

Acceptance of funds from the Government of Palau for costs of military Civic Action Teams (sec. 1213)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to accept from the Government of Palau \$250,000 to defray Department of Defense (DOD) Civic Action Team costs, provided it is credited to the specific appropriation or account available for the DOD Civic Action Teams.

Under current law, the United States makes available U.S. military Civic Action Teams to help Palau and the Marshall Islands, in recognition of their development needs. Additionally, the Government of Palau was authorized to use \$250,000 annually of the current account funds provided under section 211, title 2 of the Compact of Free Association with the Marshall Islands to defray expenditures attendant to the operation of the Civic Action Teams. This \$250,000 is currently returned, annually, to the U.S. Treasury. This provision would ensure that the funds would be returned to the DOD Civic Action Team account.

Extension of participation of the Department of Defense in multinational military centers of excellence (sec. 1214)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through fiscal year 2008 the authority provided under section 1205 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), permitting Department of Defense civilian and military personnel to participate in North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) multinational military centers of excellence. The provision would also modify the reporting provisions under that section to require the Secretary of Defense to provide the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives an annual report on the use of this authority not later than October 31 of each of 2007 and 2008.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has proposed expanding the authority to participate in multinational centers of excellence beyond those accredited and approved by NATO. To further consider this request, the committee urges the Department to provide additional information regarding what would constitute a “center of excellence” outside the NATO context; where such centers exist or would be established; what their purpose would be; and what additional amount of funds would be required to facilitate U.S. participation in such centers.

Limitation on assistance to the Government of Thailand (sec. 1215)

On September 19, 2006, the Royal Thai Commander-in-Chief led a bloodless coup against the democratically elected prime minister. The new leaders of Thailand declared their intent to hold parliamentary elections in December 2007.

The coup automatically triggered section 508 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–102), which suspends U.S. Department of State assistance to “the government of any country whose duly elected head of government is deposed by military coup or decree.” Department of Defense (DOD) funds for operations appropriated under section 1206 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) were also suspended, because the limitations on that funding include a ban on funding to any country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving military assistance under any other provision of law. These programs can be reinstated after the President determines and certifies that a democratically elected government has again taken office.

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit DOD funding to Thailand in fiscal year 2008 until the President certifies to the defense committees that a democratically elected government has taken office in Thailand. The provision would exclude humanitarian or emergency assistance to Thailand, and provide a national security interest waiver to the President.

Presidential report on policy objectives and United States strategy regarding Iran (sec. 1216)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from obligating more than 75 percent of the

funds available for fiscal year 2008 to the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy until the report on United States policy for Iran, required by section 1213(b) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), is submitted to Congress.

Limitation on availability of certain funds pending implementation of requirements regarding North Korea (sec. 1217)

Section 1211 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) directed by the President to appoint a senior coordinator on U.S. policy towards North Korea by December 16, 2006. The President has not made this appointment. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from obligating or expending any funds authorized to be appropriated under section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) until the administration has fully implemented section 1211 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

Subtitle C—Reports

Reports on United States policy and military operations in Afghanistan (sec. 1231)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the President to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on U.S. policy and military operations in Afghanistan not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter through the end of fiscal year 2009.

The provision would require each report to include detailed information on: (1) a comprehensive, interagency strategy for achieving the objectives of U.S. policy and military operations in Afghanistan; (2) efforts to train and equip Afghan Security Forces, including key criteria for measuring the capability and readiness of such forces; (3) efforts by the United States to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)-led International Security Assistance Force; (4) efforts to improve governance and expand economic development in the provinces of Afghanistan, including through Provincial Reconstruction Teams; (5) current counternarcotics efforts in Afghanistan, including a description of the U.S. counternarcotics plan for Afghanistan and a statement of priorities among U.S. counterdrug activities within that plan; (6) efforts to aid the Government of Afghanistan in fighting public corruption and strengthening the rule of law; and (7) diplomatic and other efforts to encourage and assist the Government of Pakistan in eliminating safe havens for the Taliban, Al Qaeda, and other violent extremists within the territory of Pakistan which threaten the stability of Afghanistan. Each report would be submitted in unclassified form to the maximum extent practicable, but may include a classified annex.

Strategy for enhancing security in Afghanistan by eliminating safe havens for violent extremists in Pakistan (sec. 1232)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the President to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, a report describing the U.S. strategy for engaging with the Government of Pakistan to prevent the movement of Taliban, Al Qaeda, and other violent extremist forces across the Afghanistan-Pakistan border and to eliminate their safe havens on the territory of Pakistan. The provision would, for each fiscal quarter of fiscal years 2008 and 2009, prohibit reimbursement of the Government of Pakistan for logistical, military, or other support provided to the United States unless the President certifies to the congressional defense committees that for that fiscal quarter the Government of Pakistan is making substantial and sustained efforts to eliminate safe havens for the Taliban, Al Qaeda, and other violent extremists in areas under Pakistan's sovereign control. The certification would be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex. The provision would allow the President to waive the limitation on reimbursements under this section if the President determines and certifies to the congressional defense committees that doing so is important to U.S. national security interests.

One-year extension of update on report on claims relating to the bombing of the Labelle Discotheque (sec. 1233)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a report on the status of negotiations between the Government of Libya and United States claimants in connection with the bombing of the Labelle Discotheque in Berlin, Germany that occurred in April 1986, regarding resolution of their claims. The reporting requirement is an extension of section 1225 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163).

On April 5, 1986, Libya directed its agents to execute a terrorist attack in West Berlin for the sole purpose of killing as many American military personnel as possible. Libya's agents selected the Labelle Discotheque because it was known to be frequented by large numbers of U.S. military personnel. Libya's agents placed a bomb in the discotheque at a time when 260 people, including U.S. military personnel, were present. When the bomb detonated, two U.S. soldiers were killed and over 90 soldiers were severely injured.

In 2002, the victims and the families of deceased soldiers filed a lawsuit in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Since that time, the Libyan Government has settled the claims of the German victims of the LaBelle bombing and the claims of the victims of the Libyan bombing of Pan Am flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland.

The committee continues to closely monitor the details surrounding the case of Labelle claimants against the Libyan Government.

Items of Special Interest

Iraqi refugee crisis

The committee continues to monitor closely the ongoing refugee crisis in Iraq, a crisis resulting from the U.S. invasion of Iraq. According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), there are approximately 1.9 million Iraqis displaced internally and 2.0 million more in neighboring states, particularly Jordan and Syria.

The committee notes that the continuing violence across much of Iraq is forcing thousands more to leave their homes every month. Shiites in Sunni controlled areas, Sunnis in Shiite controlled areas, and non-Kurds in Iraqi Kurdistan are particularly susceptible to displacement, and stateless individuals and Iraqi Christians are vulnerable throughout the country. Given its role and its stake in the conflict, the committee believes the United States must play an international leadership role to promote a responsibility sharing approach to address the plight of displaced Iraqis. As noted by the Iraq Study Group (ISG), events in Iraq were set in motion by U.S. decisions and actions. The committee concurs with the ISG's conclusion which stated that if this refugee crisis is not addressed, Iraq and the region could further destabilize.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense has a special responsibility in the case of Iraqis that have assisted the United States to sustain and manage its presence. To date, the Department has not provided any information to the committee to quantify the size of this group, but the committee remains interested in learning how many Iraqis are currently working for the United States, how many Iraqis are currently working for contractors and subcontractors on U.S. contracts, and how many Iraqis have served in either capacity but who no longer work with the United States or its contractors. The committee fears these groups are particularly vulnerable given their support of the United States.

Further, the committee directs the Department, in coordination with the U.S. Department of State and UNHCR, to report, no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, on: (1) what work, if any, has been done with the Government of Iraq and neighboring countries to protect internally displaced people that were forced to flee their homes; (2) how it is working with the Department of State to promote safe passage and resettlement to protect those refugees in the region who remain vulnerable, as well as to promote family reunification for those refugees with parents, sons, daughters, grandparents, grandchildren, and siblings who are lawfully residing in the United States; and (3) what contingency planning is being done to promote refugee protection in the region once there has been a draw down of U.S. troops from Iraq.

Joint Forces Command support to NATO International Security Assistance Force

The committee recognizes that the United States Joint Forces Command has developed advanced capabilities, including innovative technologies that may enhance battle management, command and control, intelligence analysis, and communications. Many of

these capabilities would be useful to the U.S. forces assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF-X) in Afghanistan, including modeling and simulation tools and the ability to conduct operational net assessments. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense, to the maximum extent practicable, to provide the NATO-led ISAF-X in Afghanistan with these capabilities and, on a temporary basis, to provide appropriate training support to ensure fielded forces sustain these capabilities, as required by the Commander of ISAF-X.

United States Africa Command

The committee supports the efforts of the Department of Defense to stand up a new United States Combatant Command for the continent of Africa (AFRICOM). The committee commends the Department for its acknowledgment of the strategic and humanitarian importance of Africa to the interests of the United States. Currently, three U.S. regional commands—U.S. European Command, U.S. Central Command, and U.S. Pacific Command—share responsibility for U.S. security issues in Africa. The committee agrees that one combatant command for Africa will promote greater unity of effort across the Government.

The committee understands that the Department is still in the process of determining the allocation of military and civil functions within AFRICOM. It is the committee's understanding that AFRICOM will be led by a four star general officer, but that the Department may also seek to designate a Department of State official at a senior level within the command.

While the Department has discussed with the committee its plans for incorporating staff from other agencies into the new command, the Department has not provided the committee with details on the planned staffing levels and funding mechanisms for inter-agency staff, or on the authorities to be exercised by such staff. The committee urges the Department to inform it if new authorities will be needed to stand up and staff AFRICOM. The committee also expects to be consulted early and often on the matter of potential locations for the command's headquarters and the anticipated costs associated with establishing the command.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds (sec. 1301)

The committee recommends a provision that would define the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs; define the funds as authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this bill; and authorize CTR funds to be available for obligation for 3 fiscal years.

Funding allocations (sec. 1302)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$448.0 million, an increase of \$100.0 million above the budget request, for the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program. This provision would also authorize specific amounts for each CTR program element, require notification to Congress 30 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2008 funds, and require notification to Congress 15 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2008 funds in excess of the specific amount authorized for each CTR program element.

The committee recommends an additional \$25.0 million for strategic offensive arms elimination in Russia, \$50.0 million for biological threat reduction, \$14.0 million for weapons of mass destruction proliferation prevention to support the Black Sea Initiative, \$10.0 million for new activities in states outside the former Soviet Union, and \$1.0 million for additional expenses associated with Russian chemical weapons destruction activities.

The committee recommends an additional \$25.0 million for strategic offensive arms elimination in Russia to accelerate the completion of activities at sites in Russia where the materials and weapons are stored—and to address potential threats while these materials are moving to facilitate consolidation, dismantlement, and disposition.

The committee recommends an additional \$50.0 million for biological threat reduction to support threat reduction programs throughout the former Soviet Union and accelerate the highest priority programs. One of the key efforts is to consolidate, or destroy as appropriate, various strain collections and provide safe and secure storage of the consolidated collection. The committee notes the expansion of this work is one area where the Department of Defense (DOD) would like to expand its work beyond the former Soviet Union. The committee expects DOD to provide a cost-effective plan for this expansion with the fiscal year 2009 budget request.

The committee recommends an additional \$14.0 million for proliferation prevention initiative efforts to support the Black Sea and other regional initiatives to detect and prevent weapons of mass destruction that might be smuggled across international borders. Smuggling across remote and unprotected borders is particularly

difficult and must involve the joint efforts of many nations to stop. The proliferation prevention effort must also be coordinated with other elements of the DOD as well as other agencies of the U.S. Government. The committee is interested in the plan that will coordinate the CTR efforts with other activities and directs the Secretary to include in the CTR annual report for fiscal year 2008 DOD's plan for synchronizing the various areas of activity.

The committee believes that one of the highest priorities in the CTR programs is to ensure that the facility to destroy Russian chemical munitions in Shchuch'ye, Russia is completed, the workforce is adequately trained, and the new facility successfully passes initial systems integration and startup testing. Once startup is successful, the Russian Government will assume all responsibility for completing destruction of the chemical munitions. To reach the goal of facility hot startup in 2009, the committee urges the Secretary to ensure the project is appropriately managed and funded, and to report promptly to the congressional defense committees any indication that the 2009 startup date will not be met.

Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs in states outside the former Soviet Union (sec. 1303)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1501 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104-201) by adding a new subsection that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs in states outside of the former Soviet Union. The programs authorized would include elimination, transportation, and storage of biological or chemical weapons or materials, or related materials or components; nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons proliferation prevention programs; and programs to facilitate detection and reporting of certain pathogenic diseases that could impact the armed forces of the United States or its allies.

The committee believes that the CTR program has been key to preventing the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons within and from the states of the former Soviet Union and that the CTR model should be expanded to address threats beyond the states of the former Soviet Union. The committee recommends \$10.0 million in section 1302 of this Act to allow the Secretary to begin to address emerging threats through cooperative programs with new state partners. The committee notes that this new authority would be subject to the CTR notification requirements, which require the Secretary to notify Congress 30 days in advance of obligation of any fiscal year 2008 funds.

Modification of authority to use Cooperative Threat Reduction funds outside the former Soviet Union (sec. 1304)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1308 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136) to allow the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to exercise the emergency authority to use prior year balances in the Cooperative Threat Reduction program (CTR) for a proliferation threat reduction project or activity outside of the former Soviet Union. Section 1308 cur-

rently requires a presidential certification. The committee believes that secretarial certification would allow a more rapid response in an emergency situation.

Repeal of restrictions on assistance to states of the former Soviet Union for cooperative threat reduction (sec. 1305)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal certain provisions of the Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–228), the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (22 U.S.C. 5952), and section 1305 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) that require a number of annual certifications before any Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) funds can be obligated in any fiscal year. In addition, the provision would also repeal section 1303 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, which authorized the President to waive the annual certification requirements.

These certifications are no longer meaningful and serve only to delay the implementation of the CTR programs.

National Academy of Sciences study of prevention of proliferation of biological weapons (sec. 1306)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) under which the NAS would carry out a study to identify areas for cooperation with states other than states of the former Soviet Union under the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program to prevent the proliferation of biological weapons and dual-use materials. A report on the study would be due to the United States Senate and House of Representatives Committees on Armed Services on December 31, 2008. The report would also include the Secretary's assessment of the study and any recommendations for action. If the Secretary determines that legislation is necessary to implement any actions, the committee urges the Secretary to include in the report a description of the necessary legislation.

The NAS study recommended in this provision would be a follow-on study to the NAS study required by section 1304 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). The original study focused on actions under the CTR program that could be taken to address biological weapons and dual-use materials in the states of the former Soviet Union.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

Summary and explanation of table

This title contains funding authorizations for working capital and revolving funds, the Defense Health program, the destruction of chemical munitions, drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, and funding for the Department of Defense Inspector General and other programs which contain elements of more than one type of traditional funding account (such as procurement or operation and maintenance) inside a single account.

This title also reflects savings from lower inflation that affect multiple accounts and titles within this Act, legislative proposals regarding the national defense stockpile, and authorizes trust fund expenditures for the Armed Forces Retirement Home, which is outside the national defense budget function.

The following table provides the program-level detailed guidance for the funding authorized in title XIV of this Act. The table also displays the funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2008 budget request for these programs, and indicates those programs for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the Department of Defense may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the table or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense), without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in this report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

TITLE XIV -- OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

	<u>FY2008</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
MILITARY PROGRAMS			
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
Defense Health Program, O&M	20,182,381		20,182,381
Legislative Proposal scorekeeping adjustment	1,862,000		1,862,000
Subtotal O&M	22,044,381		22,044,381
Defense Health Program, RDTE	134,482	2,000	136,482
Motor vehicle crash study		[2,000]	
Defense Health Program, Procurement	362,261		362,261
Continuing Resolution Adjustment			
Subtotal Defense Health Program	22,541,124	2,000	22,543,124
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES			
Drug Enforcement and Policy Support	936,822	22,500	959,322
Project Athena		[7,500]	
Surveillance technology ACTD		[15,000]	
Subtotal Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities	936,822	22,500	959,322
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
Office of the Inspector General, O&M	214,995	10,000	224,995
Program increase		[10,000]	
Office of the Inspector General, RDTE			
Office of the Inspector General, Procurement	1,000		1,000
Subtotal Office of the Inspection General	215,995	10,000	225,995

TITLE XIV -- OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION			
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, O&M	1,162,452	24,000	1,186,452
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, RDTE	274,846		274,846
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Procurement	18,426	12,000	30,426
Subtotal Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction	1,455,724	36,000	1,491,724
 REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS			
Defense Working Capital Funds	102,446		102,446
Defense Working Capital Funds - DeCA	1,250,300		1,250,300
Defense Coalition Support Fund	22,000	-22,000	
National Defense Sealift Fund	1,079,094	-34,900	1,044,194
Transfer to RDT&E Navy		[-4,900]	
Rephasing of MPF(F) R&D effort		[-30,000]	
Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund			
SUBTOTAL REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS	2,453,840	-56,900	2,396,940
 SUBTOTAL OTHER PROGRAMS - MILITARY	27,603,505	13,600	27,617,105
 CIVIL PROGRAMS			
Armed Forces Retirement Home	61,624		61,624
 SUBTOTAL OTHER PROGRAMS - CIVIL	61,624		61,624
 TOTAL OTHER PROGRAMS	27,665,129	13,600	27,678,729

Subtitle A—Military Programs**Reduction in certain authorizations due to savings from lower inflation (sec. 1407)**

The Office of Management and Budget assumed an inflation rate of 2.4 percent in its fiscal year 2008 budget submission. However, the Congressional Budget Office's March 2007 estimate of inflation for 2008 is 1.8 percent, or 0.6 percentage points lower than the administration's estimate. The Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008 (S. Con. Res. 21) adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives on May 17, 2007, was based on the economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office. The committee recommends a provision that would reduce the amounts authorized in division A of this Act by \$1.6 billion to bring the inflation assumptions applicable to purchases by the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2008 in line with the economic assumptions previously adopted by the Senate.

Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile**Disposal of ferromanganese (sec. 1411)**

The committee recommends a provision that would place limitations on the amount of ferromanganese that can be sold by the Department of Defense from the Defense National Stockpile. The provision grants the Secretary of Defense authority to sell ferromanganese beyond specified limitations, provided that the United States Senate and House of Representatives Committees on Armed Services receive certification that certain national security and market conditions were met. The committee believes that this provision would ensure steady and predictable prices on global markets, while continuing stockpile sale levels that are in keeping with the mission and goals of the Defense National Stockpile.

Disposal of chrome metal (sec. 1412)

The committee recommends a provision that would place limitations on the amount of chrome metal that can be sold by the Department of Defense from the Defense National Stockpile. The provision grants the Secretary of Defense authority to sell chrome metal beyond specified limitations, provided that the United States Senate and House of Representatives Committees on Armed Services receive certification that certain national security and market conditions were met. The committee believes that this provision would ensure steady and predictable prices on global markets, while continuing stockpile sale levels that are in keeping with the mission and goals of the Defense National Stockpile.

Modification of receipt objectives for previously authorized disposals from the national defense stockpile (sec. 1413)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3402(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) to increase the Department of Defense's stockpile commodity disposal authority from \$600.0 million to \$729.0 million. The committee understands that the National Defense Stockpile Center anticipates that under current market

conditions, it will exceed its current authority before the end of fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2009 for various commodities. Without these additional authorizations, the Department will stop selling from the stockpile and no longer generate revenues. Moreover, uncertainty about the Department's reliability as a supplier of materials will drive buyers to other sources, thereby jeopardizing future revenue goals. Uncertainty about whether or not the Department will be able to remain in the market could also lead to market disruption and instability.

Subtitle C—Civil Programs

Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1421)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$61,624,000 to be appropriated for fiscal year 2008 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Subtitle D—Chemical Demilitarization Matters

Modification of termination requirement for Chemical Demilitarization Citizens' Advisory Commissions (sec. 1431)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the requirements for terminating the chemical demilitarization Citizens' Advisory Commissions that were authorized in section 172(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484). Instead of terminating a commission after the chemical weapons stockpile in a State has been destroyed, the provision would allow a commission to remain in existence, at the discretion of the Governor of the State, until after completion of closure activities of that State's chemical agent destruction facility, or upon the request of the Governor, whichever is earlier. The provision would also provide a technical correction to an outdated reference to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology.

The committee notes that the Citizens' Advisory Commissions have served an important purpose in permitting public involvement in the issues related to chemical demilitarization in their States. This provision would allow such citizen involvement to continue until the closure of each chemical demilitarization facility.

Repeal of certain qualifications requirement for director of chemical demilitarization management organization (sec. 1432)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the requirement that the Army's Director of the Chemical Materials Agency must be trained in chemical warfare defense operations. The committee believes this requirement is no longer essential to the position of managing the chemical demilitarization program for the Army, acting as executive agent for the Department of Defense. It is important to allow the best qualified individuals to be considered for this critical position, which requires senior program management and acquisition experience. Perpetuating the requirement

for training in chemical warfare defensive operations would limit the ability of the Secretary of the Army to select from among the most qualified individuals.

Sense of Congress on completion of destruction of United States chemical weapons stockpile (sec. 1433)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that the United States is, and must remain, committed to making every effort to safely dispose of its entire chemical weapons stockpile by the Chemical Weapons Convention extended deadline of April 29, 2012, or as soon thereafter as possible, and that the Secretary of Defense should request adequate funding for chemical demilitarization to complete the elimination of the United States chemical weapons stockpile in accordance with U.S. obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a biannual report to Congress providing: (1) the anticipated schedule for completion of chemical weapons destruction at each of the chemical demilitarization facilities in the United States; (2) a description of options and alternatives for accelerating the completion of chemical weapons destruction, particularly to meet the Chemical Weapons Convention destruction deadline; (3) a description of the level of funding that would be required to achieve those accelerated options; and (4) a description of steps being taken to accelerate the completion of destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents, munitions, and materiel.

The committee is disappointed that the administration does not expect to meet the United States' obligation under the Chemical Weapons Convention to destroy all its chemical weapons by even the extended deadline of April 29, 2012. In order to meet the destruction deadline under the Chemical Weapons Convention at most of its chemical demilitarization facilities, the United States would need to consider options for accelerated destruction and increased funding levels.

It appears that Department of Defense funding limits for the chemical demilitarization program currently preclude the possibility of meeting the destruction deadline at facilities that might be able to meet the deadline with additional funding. Furthermore, shortly before submitting the President's budget request to Congress, the Department of Defense reduced the planned level of funding for the Chemical Materials Agency in the fiscal year 2008 budget request by \$53.6 million, thus risking further delay to the destruction schedule. This calls into question the priority the Department places on meeting, or making every reasonable effort to meet, United States treaty obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention.

The committee notes that in a letter to Congress dated April 10, 2006, the Secretary of Defense made a commitment to "continue working diligently to minimize the time to complete destruction without sacrificing safety and security" and to "continue requesting resources needed to complete destruction as close to April 2012 as practicable." The committee urges the Department to fulfill this commitment by requesting increased funding in future budget requests to accelerate the chemical weapons stockpile destruction

schedule to meet the United States' legal obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Budget Items

LHA(R) research and development

The fiscal year 2008 budget request included \$96.6 million within the National Defense Sealift Fund (NDSF) for various research and development activities, including \$67.8 million for the Maritime Prepositioning Force (Future), MPF(F). This amount includes \$4.9 million for amphibious assault replacement ships which are to be assigned to the MPF(F), designated MPF(F) LHA(R).

The Navy's concept for MPF(F) operations indicates that these ships will be multi-mission vessels capable of afloat prepositioning, sea basing operations in support of amphibious assault, and routine operations in support of lesser contingencies. MPF(F) ships are planned to be operated by a Military Sealift Command crew. However, the MPF(F) concept of operations differs sharply from current maritime prepositioning ships as a result of the MPF(F) contribution to the Navy's sea basing capability.

The MPF(F) role to embark and deploy marines ashore while sustaining expeditionary warfare operations potentially exposes these ships and embarked marines to hostile fire. The Navy plans to protect the MPF(F) ships through employment of the naval "sea shield," and therefore the Navy does not plan to outfit MPF(F) ships with self defense features. The committee has expressed concern regarding the Navy's MPF(F) survivability concept and, in particular, the Navy's proposal to eliminate the self defense features for the MPF(F) LHA(R). The restoration of the ship's combat system would allow the MPF(F) LHA(R) to fill current shortfalls to the Navy's forcible entry lift capability.

The committee is aware that the Department of the Navy is continuing to review the military features for the MPF(F), and that the Navy expects to present the program plan to the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) later in fiscal year 2007. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 30 days of the JROC MPF(F) decision outlining the findings of the JROC. The report shall include a detailed vulnerability assessment of MPF(F) for major combat operations.

The committee has been advised by the Navy that the Department of the Navy will need to rephase into fiscal year 2009 certain MPF(F) research and development efforts. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$30.0 million for MPF(F) research and development. Furthermore, the committee does not agree with funding development and procurement for amphibious assault ships within the NDSF.

This ship type is specifically not included within the scope of sealift vessels eligible for NDSF, defined within section 2218 of title 10, United States Code. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$4.9 million in PE 48042N, and a corresponding increase of \$4.9 million in PE 64567N for MPF(F) LHA(R).

The committee recommends a total authorization of \$32.9 million in PE 48042N for MPF(F).

Defense health program research

The budget request included \$34.8 million in PE 63115HP for medical development within Defense Health program research, development, test, and evaluation activities. The committee notes that these programs are vitally important in their development of new processes, technologies, and systems that improve combat casualty care capabilities, as well as care for injured service members, retired military personnel, and the general populace.

The committee understands that motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of non-combat accidental deaths in theater, and the leading cause of accidental death for active-duty personnel in the continental United States. The committee recommends an additional \$2.0 million to study military motor vehicle crashes and resulting injuries for the purpose of developing new safety technologies, tactics, techniques, and operational procedures.

Funding for chemical weapons demilitarization

The budget request included \$1.5 billion for chemical agents and munitions destruction, defense, including \$1.2 billion for operation and maintenance; \$274.8 million for research, development, test, and evaluation; and \$18.4 million for procurement. The committee notes its disappointment that funding for the Chemical Materials Agency was reduced by \$53.6 million shortly before the submission of the budget request. This reduction will increase the risk of delaying the destruction of chemical weapons, which are required under the terms of the Chemical Weapons Convention to be destroyed no later than April 29, 2012. In order to increase the possibility of maintaining the best possible destruction schedule, and thus to meet United States obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention, the committee recommends an increase of \$36.0 million for the Chemical Materials Agency, including \$24.0 million in operation and maintenance, and \$12.0 million in procurement.

The committee notes that in a letter to Congress dated April 10, 2006, the Secretary of Defense committed to “continue working diligently to minimize the time to complete destruction without sacrificing safety and security” and to “continue requesting resources needed to complete destruction as close to April 2012 as practicable.” The budget request calls into question the priority assigned by the Department of Defense to meeting the commitment of the Secretary. The committee urges the Department to fulfill this commitment by planning and budgeting sufficient funds to maintain the most timely chemical weapons destruction schedule, consistent with the requirement to protect public health, safety, and the environment, in order to meet the Chemical Weapons Convention destruction deadline, or to come as close thereto as possible. This issue is also addressed elsewhere in a separate legislative provision.

Counterdrug advanced concept technology demonstration

The fiscal year 2008 budget request included \$936.8 million for Department of Defense Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities. However, it did not include any funding for an Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration (ACTD) to support drug interdiction efforts in the Western Hemisphere. The committee rec-

ommends an increase of \$15.0 million for Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities for a counterdrug ACTD. The ACTD would have the following capabilities: (1) electro-optical/infrared/radar to detect and identify small high-speed craft in open water; (2) an extended dwell time of more than 10 to 12 hours; (3) detection of small-to-medium craft wake patterns or variances; (4) geo-location of high frequency and very high frequency low power emitters and other special communications devices; (5) detection and monitoring of semi-submersibles; (6) tracking and monitoring; (7) long-range detection and monitoring of mother-ship operations; (8) on-station airborne early warning for 1,280 hours; and (9) on-station maritime patrol aircraft for 1,420 hours. A successful counterdrug ACTD with these capabilities will allow the U.S. Government to get closer to achieving its goal of disrupting 40 percent of the drugs headed to the United States in the Western Hemisphere transit zone.

Project Athena

The fiscal year 2008 budget request included \$936.8 million for Department of Defense Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities, including \$2.5 million for Project Athena, a domain awareness system that provides a common operational picture (COP) to national, regional, and local users.

Project Athena fuses real-time downlinks from surveillance sensors, multiple databases, and other sources of intelligence reporting into a COP that can be unclassified, or tailored to multiple security levels. It is therefore capable of providing a COP to the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Coast Guard, first responders, and partnered nations in a relatively timely and simultaneous manner. The Department of Defense Counternarcotics Technology Program Office is responsible for the project and has successfully tested Project Athena in maritime tracking in the United States. In fiscal year 2006, Project Athena was used at the Joint Interagency Task Force South in Florida and jointly with the Colombian Navy and the Sri Lankan Navy.

The committee recommends an increase of \$7.5 million to Defense Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities for Project Athena.

Department of Defense Inspector General

The budget request included \$214.9 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Office of the Inspector General (OIG). This is slightly less than the \$216.3 million requested and the \$218.0 million provided for fiscal year 2007. The committee is concerned that funding levels for this important independent audit and investigative function is not keeping pace with the demands for the Inspectors' General services in the global war on terror.

The OIG audits, investigates, inspects, and evaluates the programs and operations of the Department of Defense (DOD), and recommends policies and process improvements that promote economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity in DOD programs and operations. For the last 3 years, the OIG has achieved \$27.5 billion in savings and \$1.7 billion in recovery for the nation. The committee notes that in that same 3 years the exponential growth in

the number and cost of Department contracts for operations, procurement, research, and construction within the United States and around the world. The nation's annual defense costs have crossed the \$500.0 billion mark, well beyond the annual budgets of just over \$200.0 billion before the start of the global war on terror in 2001. Despite this growth, the personnel strength of the OIG has remained nearly constant. The committee is concerned that the capabilities of the OIG are not keeping pace, in terms of qualified personnel, with the growth in the size of the defense budget and the numbers of contracts.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in OMDW for the OIG to start and accelerate the growth of the OIG. The committee directs the Inspector General to provide to the defense committees, by March 31, 2008, an analysis of the current and future personnel, organization, technology, and funding requirements of the OIG. This report shall also include a comprehensive and detailed master plan, with annual objectives and funding requirements, that will provide the fastest possible increase in audit and investigative capabilities.

Item of Special Interest

National Defense Sealift Fund report

The fiscal year 2008 budget request included \$96.6 million within the National Defense Sealift Fund (NDSF) for various research and development activities. The Navy could use this Fund to conduct research and development for investigating promising technologies or developing capabilities, such as:

- (1) agile port, rapid deployment and distribution, and agile sustainment process transformation;
- (2) high speed strategic sealift mobility;
- (3) advanced cargo and passenger vessel hull design, alternative propulsion systems, and construction employing national defense features;
- (4) global logistics network and expeditionary warfare security;
- (5) net-centric warfare and logistics, including sense and respond logistics; and
- (6) dual use technologies, including information management technology and security employing best practices from the commercial sector.

The committee also understands that there may be opportunities to join with industry or academia to explore or develop these technologies. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, not later than January 1, 2008, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the future viability and availability of defense-related university-based research and development capabilities and the future opportunities for industry collaboration in support of military strategic sealift mobility.

TITLE XV—OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

Subtitle A—Authorization of Additional War-Related Appropriations

Overview

The President's budget requested \$141.8 billion in emergency funding in the National Defense budget function for Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), and for other purposes, including some of the "grow the force" costs of increasing Army and Marine Corps active-duty personnel levels.

The Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008 adopted by the Senate on March 23, 2007, fully funded these requested amounts. However, the budget resolution adopted by the Senate concurred with the committee's recommendation to the Committee on the Budget that these costs no longer be treated as "emergency" spending.

The administration's budget proposal met the requirements of section 1008 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), which required an estimate of the full-year costs to be incurred during the fiscal year to support these operations. The committee believes that subjecting these expenditure requests to the full authorization and appropriation process will improve the effectiveness and the accountability of spending on these operations.

The committee believes that treating these requests as non-emergency funding complies with both the spirit and the letter of section 1008. The committee's views and estimates letter to the Committee on the Budget stated the committee's intent to differentiate carefully between the cost of war and the so-called "base budget". That letter stated, in part:

Because we intend to keep the "base" budget clearly delineated from the "war" budget, it is important that costs be accurately assigned to these categories.

The bill reported by the committee carries out this commitment. Where appropriate, the committee has transferred funding requested in the base budget that is directly related to operations in Iraq and Afghanistan (for example, the costs of running the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization) to this title. As described later in this title, the committee has also transferred funding (for example, the funds for Army and Marine Corps personnel that were requested as a cost of war but which reflect the cost of personnel that are intended to become part of the permanent force) structure back into the base budget where appropriate. The detailed funding tables contained in this report identify such transfers.

The summary table that follows summarizes the funding requested as emergency spending for these operations, together with the committee's action on these requests. Funding for Department of Defense operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, with the exception of funding for military construction projects to support these operations, is included in title XV of this Act. Funding for military construction projects in Iraq and Afghanistan is included in title XXIX of this Act.

Explanation of tables

The following tables provide the program-level detailed guidance for the funding authorized in title XV of this Act. The tables also display the funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2008 budget request for war-related programs, and indicate those programs for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the Department of Defense may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense), without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in this report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

**TITLE XV -- OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM
AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM**

In Thousands of Dollars

	Authorization <u>Request</u>	Senate <u>Change</u>	Senate <u>Authorization</u>
Title XV -- OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,900,306	-1,009,520	890,786
Missile Procurement, Army	492,734		492,734
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	4,780,172	-3,530,995	1,249,177
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	313,000	-10,000	303,000
Other Procurement, Army	13,630,977	-3,320,922	10,310,055
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	3,099,958	-836,940	2,263,018
Weapons Procurement, Navy	251,281		251,281
Other Procurement, Navy	793,311	21,000	814,311
Procurement, Marine Corps	2,462,140	1,774,000	4,236,140
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	590,090		590,090
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	3,336,809	-1,267,800	2,069,009
Missile Procurement, Air Force	1,800		1,800
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	74,005		74,005
Other Procurement, Air Force	3,760,206	403,244	4,163,450
Procurement, Defense-Wide	469,768	124,000	593,768
Subtotal Procurement	35,956,557	-7,653,933	28,302,624

**TITLE XV -- OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM
AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM**

In Thousands of Dollars

	Authorization <u>Request</u>	Senate <u>Change</u>	Senate <u>Authorization</u>
RDT&E, Army	141,653	-20,000	121,653
RDT&E, Navy	618,428	-247,630	370,798
RDT&E, Air Force	1,369,781	-446,990	922,791
RDT&E, Defense-Wide	727,498	-192,411	535,087
Subtotal RDT&E	2,857,360	-907,031	1,950,329
Operation and Maintenance, Army	46,230,964	-711,700	45,519,264
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	5,203,800	-13,800	5,190,000
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	4,013,093		4,013,093
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	10,536,330	-3,700	10,532,630
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	6,098,990	-122,774	5,976,216
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	158,410		158,410
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	69,598		69,598
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	68,000		68,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	466,150		466,150
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	31,168		31,168
Subtotal Operation & Maintenance	72,876,503	-851,974	72,024,529

**TITLE XV -- OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM
AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM**

	In Thousands of Dollars		
	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorization</u>
Military Personnel, Army	12,504,398	-3,363,882	9,140,516
Military Personnel, Navy	752,089		752,089
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	1,601,882	-784,407	817,475
Military Personnel, Air Force	1,411,890		1,411,890
Military Personnel, Army Reserve	235,000		235,000
Military Personnel, Navy Reserve	70,000		70,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps Reserve	15,420		15,420
Military Personnel, Air Force Reserve	3,000		3,000
Military Personnel, Army National Guard	476,584		476,584
Subtotal Military Personnel	17,070,263	-4,148,289	12,921,974
Defense Health Program	1,022,842		1,022,842
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	257,618		257,618
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	4,000,000	500,000	4,500,000
Iraq Security Forces Fund	2,000,000		2,000,000
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	2,700,000		2,700,000
Iraq Freedom Fund	107,500		107,500

**TITLE XV -- OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM
AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM**

In Thousands of Dollars

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorization
Defense Working Capital Funds	1,676,275		1,676,275
National Defense Sealift Fund	5,100		5,100
Office of the Inspector General	4,394		4,394
Subtotal Other Authorizations	11,773,729	500,000	12,273,729
TOTAL TITLE XV	140,534,412	-13,061,227	127,473,185

Army procurement (sec. 1501)

This section would authorize an additional \$17.7 billion for fiscal year 2008 procurement of war-related items for the Army.

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>		<u>Change</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Aircraft Procurement, Army				
	Aircraft				
	Fixed Wing				
1	UTILITY F/W CARGO AIRCRAFT		12,500		12,500
	Rotary Wing				
3	ARMED RECONNAISSANCE HELICOPTER	29	222,600	29	
	Reduction				-222,600
	Transfer to OMA for UH-60 Blackhawk Recapitalization				[-38,600]
	Transfer to APA to upgrade UH-60A helicopters to UH-60L				[-86,000]
	Transfer to APA for common missile warning systems for fixed-wing aircraft				[-38,000]
5	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	39	527,403	39	157,023
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)				-370,380
	Transfer to Title I				[-370,380]
	Modification of Aircraft				
9	GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)		33,000		33,000
10	ARL MODS (TIARA)		25,000		25,000
11	AH-64 MODS	12	417,800	12	417,800
13	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS	21	635,607	21	121,067
	Transfer to Title I				-514,540
18	UH-60 MODS				[-514,540]
	Transferred from ARH to upgrade UH-60A helicopters to UH-60L				38,000
					[38,000]

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
	Spares and Repair Parts						
	Support Equipment and Facilities						
	Ground Support Avionics						
23	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT			60,000			60,000
	Transferred from ARH for Common Missile Warning System for fixed-wing aircraft			[60,000]			
	Other Support						
27	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT			10,000			10,000
28	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS			10,200			10,200
29	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL			6,196			6,196
	Total - Aircraft Procurement, Army			1,900,306		-1,009,520	890,786
	Missile Procurement, Army						
	Other Missiles						
	Surface-to-air Missile System						
	Air-to-surface Missile System						
4	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	2585	2585	228,426			2,585
	Anti-tank/Assault Missile System						
8	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	570	570	67,200			570
12	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	177	177	197,108			177
	Modification of Missiles						
	Modifications						
	Spares and Repair Parts						
	Support Equipment and Facilities						

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Program Title	FY 2008 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
Total - Missile Procurement Army			492,734				492,734
Procurement of Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles							
2	Tracked Combat Vehicles						
	BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT	481	1,402,500	-481	-1,402,500		
	Transfer to Title I				[-1,402,500]		
5	STRYKER VEHICLE	100	402,775	-71	-285,775		
	Transfer to Title I				[-402,775]		
	Additional Stryker vehicles to replace battle losses				[117,000]		
Modification of Tracked Combat Vehicles							
8	CARRIER, MOD	317	132,220	-317	-132,220		
	Transfer to Title I				[-132,220]		
9	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	44	130,000	-44	-130,000		
	Transfer to Title I				[-130,000]		
10	BFVS SERIES (MOD)		48,000				48,000
13	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)	100	277,400	-100	-277,400		
	Transfer to Title I				[-277,400]		
18	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		337,565				337,565
19A	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM (M1A2 SEP) (GA0750)	235	1,303,100	-235	-1,303,100		
	Transfer to Title I				[-1,303,100]		
Support Equipment and Facilities							
Weapons and Other Combat Vehicles							
24	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62MM)	3,000	42,721			3,000	42,721

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate Change</u>		<u>Senate Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
25	MACHINE GUN, CAL .50 M2 ROLL	1,278	19,000			1,278	19,000
26	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN (5.56MM)		1,784				1,784
27	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN (40MM)	1,580	30,614			1,580	30,614
28	MORTAR SYSTEMS	345	29,880			345	29,880
30	M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE		402				402
31	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	1,042	3,500			1,042	3,500
33	M4 CARBINE	47,185	79,469			47,185	79,469
34	SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM (MASS)	3,109	4,000			3,109	4,000
35	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WPNS STATION (CRO)	768	220,000			768	220,000
	Modification of Weapons and Other Combat Vehicles						
39	M4 CARBINE MODS		125,115				125,115
40	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS		9,000				9,000
41	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS		11,883				11,883
42	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		2,648				2,648
43	PHALANX MODS	16	150,000			16	150,000
45	M16 RIFLE MODS		1,845				1,845
46	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		7,054				7,054
	Support Equipment and Facilities						
50	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		7,697				7,697
	Spares						
	Total - Procurement of WTCV, Army		4,780,172		-3,530,995		1,249,177

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
	Procurement of Ammunition, Army						
	Ammunition						
	Small/Medium Caliber Ammunition						
2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	8,894		10,000	8,894		10,000
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	3,111		13,500	3,111		13,500
6	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES	284		15,000	284		15,000
7	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	535		40,000	535		40,000
8	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	2,014		75,000	2,014		75,000
	Mortar Ammunition						
	Tank Ammunition						
	Artillery Ammunition						
15	CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES			10,000		-10,000	
	105 MM HERA					[-10,000]	
18	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T			20,000			20,000
	Artillery Fuzes						
	Mines						
	Rockets						
23	SHOULDER FIRED ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	1,927		20,000	1,927		20,000
24	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES			28,000			28,000

444

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Line	Program Title	Request		Change		Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
Other Ammunition							
25	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	689	8,000			689	8,000
26	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	119	10,000			119	10,000
28	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	115	8,000			115	8,000
Miscellaneous							
30	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES	499	54,000			499	54,000
32	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	538	1,500			538	1,500
Ammunition Production Base Support							
Production Base Support							
Re-Estimate of Guaranteed Loan							
Interest on Re-Estimate							
Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Army		18,725	313,000		-10,000	18,725	303,000
Other Procurement, Army							
Tactical and Support Vehicles							
Tactical Vehicles							
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS		210,188				210,188
2	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED	117	6,226			117	6,226
4	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)	6690	1,321,630			6,690	1,321,630
5	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	3181	185,110			3,181	185,110

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate Change</u>		<u>Senate Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
6	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMEN	10	9,000			10	9,000
7	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	2747	1,136,455			2,747	1,136,455
8	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	371	301,898	-371	-301,898		
	Transfer to Title I				[-301,898]		
9	MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY	155	174,440	1,552	1,552,000	1,707	1,726,440
	Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles				[1,552,000]		
10	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	1791	276,022			1,791	276,022
13	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM	9255	455,000			9,255	455,000
14	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		1,094,789				1,094,789
15	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (TAC VEH)	1559	7,970			1,559	7,970
	Non-tactical Vehicles						
	Communications and Electronics Equipment						
	Comm-Joint Communications						
	Comm-Satellite Communications						
23	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS		18,614				18,614
24	SHF TERM		22,822				22,822
25	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)		17,600				17,600
26	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	19034	50,745			19,034	50,745
27	SMART-T (SPACE)		2,041				2,041
	Comm-C3 System						
31	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	1	2,755			1	2,755
	Comm-Combat Communications						
32	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)	795	23,540			795	23,540

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Senate

Authorized

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Change</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>

34	SINCGARS FAMILY Transfer to Title I	98410	1,370,347	-98,410	-1,370,347		
38	BRIDGE TO FUTURE NETWORKS Transfer to Title I	653	2,560,571	-653	[-1,370,347] -2,560,571		
39	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING		2,000		[-2,560,571]		2,000
42	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)	3115	43,831			3,115	43,831
43	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY	26785	433,398			26,785	433,398
44	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)		12,934				12,934
	Comm-Intelligence Communications						
45	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		7,410				7,410
	Information Security						
46	TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)		51,600				51,600
47	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	24922	96,651			24,922	96,651
	Comm-Long Haul Communications						
	Comm-Base Communications						
56	Elect Equip-Nat For Int Prog (NFIP)		[]				[]
57	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)		[]				[]
	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)						
58	Elect Equip-Tact Int Rel Act (TIARA)	220	103,500			220	103,500
60	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (MIP)	24	23,000			24	23,000
61	PROPHET GROUND (MIP)	12	213,485			12	213,485
	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYS (TUAS)MIP						

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>
62	SMALL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM (SUAS)	10,400			10,400
64	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (MIP)	12,000	16		16
67	DCGS-A (MIP)	62,331	14		14
71	CI HUMINT INFO MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CHIMS)	1,200	42		42
72	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MIP)	15,300	28		28
	Elect Equip-Electronic Warfare (EW)				
73	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	10,470	25		25
74	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	23,880			23,880
	Elect Equip-Tactical Surv. (TAC SURV)				
77	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	340,394	109,124		109,124
78	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTI			33,000	340,394
	Night Vision Advanced Technology			[33,000]	33,000
79	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT	36,000	3493		3,493
84	PROFILER	64,800	42		42
85	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)	43,200			43,200
86	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)	374,860	6629		6,629
87	LIGHTWEIGHT LSR DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD)	57,000	206		206
88	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32	9,400	297		297
89	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	1,500	12		12
	Elect Equip-Tactical C2 Systems				
92	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	263,709	397		397
93	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	17,800			17,800
95	FAAD C2	21,500			21,500
96	AIR & MSL DEF PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (AMD)	45,200	12		12

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate Change</u>		<u>Senate Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
97	KNIGHT FAMILY	29	50,000			29	50,000
99	AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY		189,506				189,506
100	TC AIMS II		10,225				10,225
102	TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER		12,400				12,400
104	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)		57,905				57,905
105	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)		552,520		-552,520		
	Army SALE				[-552,520]		
	Elect Equip - Automation						
109	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		9,949				9,949
110	CSS COMMUNICATIONS		145,380				145,380
110A	Sequoyah Foreign Language Translation System (B88605)	1658	12,813			1,658	12,813
110B	Counter-Rocket Artillery & Mortar (CRAM)		245,000				245,000
	Elect Equip-Audio Visual Sys (AV)						
	Elect Equip-Mods Tactical Sys/Eq						
	Elect Equip-Support						
	Other Support Equipment						
	Chemical Defensive Equipment						
118	RADIAC SET AN/PDR 77()						
119	RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM NUCLEAR - BIOLOGICAL CH		72,000				72,000
120	CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION		44,564				44,564
	Bridging Equipment						
123	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON		39,000				39,000
	Engineer (Non-construction) Equipment						
128	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)		3,300				3,300
		449					

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate Change</u>		<u>Senate Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Combat Service Support Equipment						
131	HEATERS AND ECU'S	396	6,859			396	6,859
133	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT		8,757				8,757
139	CARGO AERIAL DELIVERY PROGRAM	270	22,400			270	22,400
	Petroleum Equipment						
143	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	8	12,680			8	12,680
144	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER		21,741				21,741
	Water Equipment						
145	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS	3	1,600			3	1,600
	Medical Equipment						
146	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL		3,617				3,617
	Maintenance Equipment						
147	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS		69,997				69,997
148	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MAINT EQ)		120,586		-120,586		
	Transfer to Title I				[-120,586]		
	Construction Equipment						
159	CONST EQUIP ESP	69	9,500			69	9,500
160	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (CONST EQUIP)						
	Rail Float Containerization Equipment						
	Generators						
166	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP		99,998				99,998
	Material Handling Equipment						
167	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)	37	29,219			37	29,219
168	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM		22,064				22,064

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Training Equipment				
170	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	136	342	136	342
	Test Measure and Dig Equipment (TMD)				
173	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT		36,856		36,856
174	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)		57,111		57,111
175	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	1305	10,840	1,305	10,840
	Other Support Equipment				
178	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		35		35
180	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)		4,620		4,620
	Spares and Repair Parts				
	OPA2				
	OPA3				
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		1,077		1,077
Total - Other Procurement, Army			13,630,977	-3,320,922	10,310,055
	Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund				
	Network Attack				
1	ATTACK THE NETWORK		926,000		926,000
	JIEDDO Device Defeat				
2	DEFEAT THE DEVICE		2,740,000		2,940,000
	Transfer from Title I			200,000	[200,000]

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
3	Force Training TRAIN THE FORCE		334,000				334,000
4	Staff and Infrastructure OPERATIONS			300,000			300,000
	Transfer from Title I			[300,000]			
	Total - Joint IED Defeat Fund		4,000,000	500,000		4,500,000	

Navy and Marine Corps procurement (sec. 1502)

This section would authorize an additional \$9.3 billion for fiscal year 2008 procurement of war related items for the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Aircraft Procurement, Navy						
	Combat Aircraft						
4	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	12	713,540	-12	-713,540		
4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
	Transfer to Title I						
8	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	2	140,500		[-713,540]	2	140,500
10	UH-1Y/AH-1Z	6	123,400	-6	-123,400		
	Delay production ramp-up						
11	MH-60S (MYP)	3	88,000		[-123,400]	3	88,000
13	MH-60R	6	205,000			6	205,000
	Airlift Aircraft						
	Trainer Aircraft						
	Other Aircraft						
20	KC-130J	7	495,400			7	495,400
	Modification of Aircraft						
25	EA-6 SERIES		200,710				200,710
26	AV-8 SERIES		22,600				22,600
28	F-18 SERIES		60,264				60,264
29	H-46 SERIES		35,140				35,140
30	AH-1W SERIES		66,974				66,974
31	H-53 SERIES		94,112				94,112

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Senate
Change

Senate
Authorized

Line Program Title

Qty Cost

Qty Cost

Qty Cost

32	SH-60 SERIES	6,696	6,696		6,696
33	H-1 SERIES	42,134	42,134		42,134
35	P-3 SERIES	700	700		700
40	C-130 SERIES	53,100	53,100		53,100
43	E-6 SERIES	1,000	1,000		1,000
44	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	3,360	3,360		3,360
45	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	2,710	2,710		2,710
47	POWER PLANT CHANGES	11,300	11,300		11,300
50	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	183,180	183,180		183,180
54	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY	107,792	107,792		107,792
55	Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts				
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	371,487	371,487		371,487
	Aircraft Support Equipment and Facilities				
56	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	54,000	54,000		54,000
57	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	787	787		787
58	WAR CONSUMABLES	16,072	16,072		16,072

Total - Aircraft Procurement, Navy **3,099,958** **-836,940** **2,263,018**

Weapons Procurement, Navy
Ballistic Missiles
Modification of Missiles
Support Equipment and Facilities

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Other Missiles						
	Strategic Missiles						
3	TOMAHAWK	103,460				103,460	
	Tactical Missiles						
4	AMRAAM	825				825	
7	SLAM-ER	13,500				13,500	
10	HELLFIRE	44,000				44,000	
	Modification of Missiles						
	Support Equipment and Facilities						
	Ordnance Support Equipment						
	Torpedoes and Related Equipment						
	Torpedoes and Related Equip.						
	Mod of Torpedoes and Related Equipment						
	Support Equipment						
	Destination Transportation						
	Other Weapons						
	Guns and Gun Mounts						
28	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	22,196				22,196	
	Modification of Guns and Gun Mounts						
	Other						
35	MARINE CORPS TACTIAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM	67,300				67,300	
	Spares and Repair Parts						

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Total - Weapons Procurement, Navy	251,281					251,281
	Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps						
	Proc Ammo, Navy						
	Navy Ammunition						
8	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	13,250				13,250	
12	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	85				85	
13	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	56,057				56,057	
14	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	127				127	
	Proc Ammo, MC						
	Marine Corps Ammunition						
16	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION	55,289				55,289	
20	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	7,749				7,749	
22	40 MM, ALL TYPES	46,192				46,192	
23	60MM, ALL TYPES	60,504				60,504	
24	81MM, ALL TYPES	70,002				70,002	
25	120MM, ALL TYPES	118,041				118,041	
26	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	1,341				1,341	
28	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	18,769				18,769	
29	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	16,546				16,546	
							457

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate Change</u>		<u>Senate Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
30	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		102,066				102,066
32	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		7,077				7,077
33	FUZE, ALL TYPES		1,761				1,761
34	NON LETHALS		11,231				11,231
35	AMMO MODERNIZATION		4,002				4,002
36	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		1				1
Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps			590,090				590,090
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy							
Other Warships							
Amphibious Ships							
Auxiliaries, Craft and Prior Yr Program Costs							
Total - Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy							
Other Procurement, Navy							
Ships Support Equipment							
Ship Propulsion Equipment							
Navigation Equipment							
Underway Replenishment Equipment							

458

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Periscopes						
	Other Shipboard Equipment						
	Reactor Plant Equipment						
	Ocean Engineering						
	Small Boats						
24	STANDARD BOATS	19,396				19,396	459
	Training Equipment						
	Production Facilities and Equipment						
	Other Ship Support						
	Drug Interdiction Support						
	Communications and Electronics Equipment						
	Ship Radars						
	Ship Sonars						
	ASW Electronic Equipment						
40	TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER	3,060					3,060

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Electronic Warfare Equipment						
	Reconnaissance Equipment						
43	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT		44,000				44,000
	Submarine Surveillance Equipment						
44	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG		17,100				17,100
	Other Ship Electronic Equipment						
47	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT		920				920
	Training Equipment						
	Aviation Electronic Equipment						
56	MATCALS		26,890				26,890
60	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		750				750
	Other Shore Electronic Equipment						
67	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS		38,000				38,000
	Shipboard Communications						
75	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		12,021				12,021
76	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER \$5M		2,200				2,200
	Satellite Communications						
	Shore Communications						
	Cryptographic Equipment						
	Cryptologic Equipment						
	Other Electronic Support						
	Drug Interdiction Support						

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>		<u>Change</u>		<u>Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Aviation Support Equipment						
	Sonobuoys						
90	Aircraft Support Equipment		29,750				29,750
93	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		10,120				10,120
	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT						
	Ordnance Support Equipment						
	Ship Gun System Equipment						
	Ship Missile System Equipment						
	FBM Support Equipment						
	ASW Support Equipment						
109	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS		3,600				3,600
	Other Ordnance Support Equipment						
	Other Expendable Ordnance						
	Civil Engineering Support Equipment						
118	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		4,530				4,530
120	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		101,400				101,400
122	TACTICAL VEHICLES		290,535		21,000		311,535
	Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles				[21,000]		
123	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		350				350
126	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION		116,531				116,531
	Supply Support Equipment						
128	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		832				832

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
131	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS Personnel and Command Support Equipment Training Devices	11,000		11,000			11,000
132	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT Command Support Equipment	8,445		8,445			8,445
133	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	15,950		15,950			15,950
137	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	16,900		16,900			16,900
140	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT Other	18,806		18,806			18,806
145	Spares and Repair Parts SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	225		225			225
Total - Other Procurement, Navy		793,311		793,311		21,000	814,311
Procurement, Marine Corps							
Weapons and Combat Vehicles							
2	Tracked Combat Vehicles						
	AAV7A1 PIP	14,467		14,467			14,467
5	LAV PIP	113,001		113,001			113,001
5A	Improved Recovery Vehicle (IRV)	8,247		8,247			8,247
6	M1A1 FIREPOWER ENHANCEMENTS	90		90			90

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Artillery and Other Weapons						
8	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	12	12	36,000		12	36,000
10	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER \$5 MILLION			16,695			16,695
	Weapons						
11	MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM			17,098			17,098
	Other Support						
12	MODIFICATION KITS			4,906			4,906
13	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM			34,223			34,223
	Guided Missiles and Equipment						
	Guided Missiles						
	Other Support						
18	MODIFICATION KITS			949			949
	Communications and Electronics Equipment						
	Command and Control Systems						
19	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER			92,400			92,400
	Repair and Test Equipment						
20	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT			7,638			7,638
	Other Support (Tel)						
22	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM			8,435			8,435
23	MODIFICATION KITS			15,984			15,984
	Command and Control System (Non-tel)						
24	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)			2,409			2,409

463

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate Change</u>		<u>Senate Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
25	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		107,593				107,593
	Repair and Equipment (Non-tel)						
27	RADAR SYSTEMS		22,900				22,900
	Intell/Comm Equipment (Non-tel)						
28	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		18,075				18,075
29	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		34,348				34,348
	Other Comm/Elec Equipment (Non-tel)						
30	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		142,731				142,731
	Other Support (Non-tel)						
31	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		87,410				87,410
32	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		13,416				13,416
33	RADIO SYSTEMS		464,565		-165,000		299,565
	Slow execution of radio procurement effort				[-165,000]		
34	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		22,913				22,913
	Support Vehicles						
	Administrative Vehicles						
	Tactical Vehicles						
38	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	251	46,683			251	46,683
39	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS		149,162				149,162
40	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT		13,676				13,676
43	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		4,402				4,402

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Other Support						
44	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	8,048					8,048
	Engineer and Other Equipment						
45	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	2,829					2,829
46	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	13,189					13,189
47	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	21,702					21,702
48	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	91,080					91,080
49	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,343					6,343
50	EOD SYSTEMS	50,563		1,939,000		1,989,563	
	Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles			[1,939,000]			
	Materials Handling Equipment						
51	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	640,000					640,000
53	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	17,242					17,242
	General Property						
55	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	6,750					6,750
56	TRAINING DEVICES	30,300					30,300
57	CONTAINER FAMILY	18,032					18,032
58	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	17,383					17,383
59	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)	18,000					18,000
60	BRIDGE BOATS	13,195					13,195

Title XV - Procurement
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
61	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN		68				68
	Other Support						
63	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		4,007				4,007
	Spares and Repair Parts						
64	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		2,993				2,993
	Total - Procurement, Marine Corps		2,462,140	1,774,000		4,236,140	

Air Force procurement (sec. 1503)

This section would authorize an additional \$6.3 billion for fiscal year 2008 procurement of war related items for the Air Force.

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Aircraft Procurement, Air Force						
	Combat Aircraft						
	Tactical Forces						
1	F-35	1	230,000	-1	-230,000		
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
	F-35 Joint Strike Fighter				[-230,000]		
	Airlift Aircraft						
	Tactical Airlift						
	Other Airlift						
8	C-130J	17	1,356,300	-4	-468,000	13	888,300
8	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
	More realistic production ramp-up				[-468,000]		
	Trainer Aircraft						
	Operational Trainers						
	Other Aircraft						
	Helicopters						
13	V22 OSPREY	5	492,500	-5	-492,500		
13	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
	Delay production ramp-up to complete operational testing				[-492,500]		
	Mission Support Aircraft						
	Other Aircraft						
22A	TG-10D	1	150			1	150

468

(Dollars in Thousands)

469

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
28	Tactical Aircraft		152,944				130,944
	F-15			-22,000			
	Tactical targeting network technology (TTNT) funding in advance of need			[-22,000]			
31	Airlift Aircraft		75,000				75,000
33	C-5		72,000				72,000
35	C-17A		43,000				43,000
36	C-32A		11,000				11,000
	C-37A						
	Trainer Aircraft						
	Other Aircraft						
46	C-40		39,000				39,000
47	C-130		86,340				86,340
50	COMPASS CALL MODS		19,000				19,000
52	DARP		158,800				158,800
53	E-3		65,000				65,000
55	E-8		41,300	-41,300			
	JSTARS			[-41,300]			
57	H-60		6,900				6,900
63	Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts						
	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		116,900				116,900

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>

Aircraft Support Equipment and Facilities

Common Support Equip

64 AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP 237,360 237,360

Post Production Support

Industrial Preparedness

War Consumables

Other Production Charges

78 OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES 25,000 25,000

Classified Pgms

Other Production Charges SOF

DARP

84 DARP 6,000 6,000

Total - Aircraft Procurement, Air Force

3,336,809

-1,267,800

2,069,009

Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force

Procurement of Ammo, Air Force

Rockets

Cartridges

2 CARTRIDGES 33,954 33,954

Bombs

4 GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS 7,887 7,887

6 JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION 13,094 13,094

582

471

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
							<u>Cost</u>
	Flare, IR MJU-7B						
12	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000			12,100			12,100
	Fuzes						
13	FLARES			6,495			6,495
14	FUZES			475			475
	Weapons						
	Small Arms						
	Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force			74,005			74,005
	Missile Procurement, Air Force						
	Ballistic Missiles						
	Missile Replacement Equipment-Ballistic						
	Other Missiles						
	Tactical						
	Industrial Facilities						
	Modification of In-service Missiles						
	Class IV						
8	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE			600			600
	Spares and Repair Parts						
	Missiles and Repair Parts						
12	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS			1,200			1,200
							472

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

Request

Qty

Cost

Qty

Cost

Senate
Change

Qty

Senate
Authorized

Cost

Line

Program Title

Other Support

Space Programs

Special Programs

Total - Missile Procurement, Air Force

Other Procurement, Air Force

Vehicular Equipment

Passenger Carrying Vehicles

PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES

Cargo and Utility Vehicles

MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE

Special Purpose Vehicles

SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES

Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles

Fire Fighting Equipment

FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES

Materials Handling Equipment

HALVERSEN LOADER

Base Maintenance Support

RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU

ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000(VEHICLES)

473

1,800

23,396

7,624

585,315

15,200

27,000

6,987

1,625

23,396

7,624

155,315

15,200

27,000

6,987

1,625

430,000
[430,000]

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Cancelled Account Adjustment						
	Electronics and Telecommunications						
	Comm Security Equipment (COMSEC)						
	Intelligence Programs						
	Electronics Programs						
18	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM		4,200				4,200
21	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL		4,200				4,200
	Special Comm-Electronics Projects						
24	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		15,776				15,776
27	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM		109,000				109,000
28	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES		10,000				10,000
31	GCSS-AF FOS		15,024				15,024
	Air Force Communications						
34	BASE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE		231,000				231,000
	DISA Programs						
40	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE		20,000				20,000
	Organization and Base						
	Modifications						
	Other Base Maintenance and Support Equip						
	Personal Safety and Rescue Equipment						
	Depot Plant and Material Handling Equip						
	Base Support Equipment						
60	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000 (BASE S)		156,000				156,000

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
61	PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES		[]				[]
	Special Support Projects						
63	DISTRIBUTED GROUND SYSTEMS		12,500				12,500
64	SELECTED ACTIVITIES		[]				[]
65	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		[]				[]
66	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.		[]				[]
	Spares and Repair Parts						
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,945,359	-26,756			2,918,603
	Total - Other Procurement, Air Force		3,760,206	403,244			4,163,450

475

Defense-wide activities procurement (sec. 1504)

This section would authorize an additional \$593.8 million for fiscal year 2008 procurement of war related items for the defense agencies and the United States Special Operations Command.

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

FY 2008

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Request</u>		<u>Senate Change</u>		<u>Senate Authorized</u>	
		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Procurement, Defense-Wide						
	Major Equipment						
	Major Equipment, OSD/WHHS						
	Major Equipment, NSA						
2	INTEL SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPS		[]				[]
3	CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM		[]				[]
5	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PGM		[]				[]
7	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM		[]				[]
	Major Equipment, WHS						
	Major Equipment, DISA						
	Major Equipment, DIA						
20	INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS		[]				[]
21	COMBATANT COMMAND INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS		[]				[]
22	DIA SUPPORT TO SOUTHCOM INTEL OPS		[]				[]
23	DIA SUPPORT TO PACOM MANAGEMENT HQ		[]				[]
24	INTEL SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPS		[]				[]
25	DEFENSE HUMINT INTELLIGENCE (HUMINT) PROGRAM		[]				[]
	Major Equipment, DLA						
	Major Equipment, DCAA						

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	Major Equipment, TJS						
	Major Equipment, DHRA						
	National Geospatial Intelligence Agency						
30	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA			[]		[]	
	Defense Threat Reduction Agency						
	Defense Security Cooperation Agency						
	Major Equipment, AFIS						
	Major Equipment, DODDE						
	Major Equipment, DCMA						
	Major Equipment, DTSA						
	Major Equipment, CIFA						
38	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			[]		[]	
	Major Equipment, BTA						
	Special Operations Command						
	Aviation Programs						
48	CV-22 SOF MOD	286,800					286,800
	Shipbuilding						
	Ammunition Programs						
54	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	30,379					30,379

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
55	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION	3,200		3,200			3,200
	Other Procurement Programs						
58	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	4,583		4,583			4,583
59	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[]		[]			[]
64	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	[]		[]			[]
65	TACTICAL VEHICLES					124,000	124,000
	Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles					[124,000]	
70	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM (GDIP)	[]		[]			[]
74	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	1,337		1,337			1,337
	Chemical/Biological Defense						
	CBDP						
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	143,469		143,469			143,469
Total - Procurement, Defense-Wide		469,768				124,000	593,768
National Guard & Reserve Equipment							
Reserve Equipment							
ARMY RESERVE							
NAVY RESERVE							
MARINE CORPS RESERVE							
AIR FORCE RESERVE							

Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
	National Guard Equipment						
	ARMY NATIONAL GUARD						
	AIR NATIONAL GUARD						
	Total - National Guard & Reserve Equipment						
	Rapid Acquisition Fund						
	Total - Rapid Acquisition Fund						
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	39,956,557				(7,153,933)	32,802,624

Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 1505)

This section would authorize an additional \$2.0 billion for fiscal year 2008 war-related research and development expenses.

Title XV-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY			
		Advanced Technology Development			
		Advanced Component Development & Prototypes			
0603747A	63	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	30,375		30,375
		System Development & Demonstration			
0604601A	83	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	8,158		8,158
0604642A	88	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	20,000	-20,000	
		Transfer to Title II		[-20,000]	
0604741A	102	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - SI	38,900		38,900
0604746A	104	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	6,500		6,500
		RDT&E Management Support			
0605801A	145	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	20		20
		Operational Systems Development			
0203764A	161	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	7,500		7,500
0303140A	170	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	23,300		23,300
0303150A	173	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,800		3,800
0303158A	174	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	3,100		3,100
		Total, RDT&E Army	141,653	-20,000	121,653

Title XV-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY			
		Advanced Technology Development			
0603640M	20	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	13,000		13,000
		Advanced Component Development & Prototypes			
0603635M	55	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	35,825	-20,000	15,825
		Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) - transfer to Title II		[-20,000]	
0603654N	56	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	14,000		14,000
0603764N	68	LINK EVERGREEN	9,300		9,300
0603851M	72	NONLETHAL WEAPONS	8,000		8,000
		System Development & Demonstration			
0604214N	84	AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	6,406		6,406
0604215N	85	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	6,000		6,000
0604262N	94	V-22A	82,360		82,360
0604270N	97	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	8,676		8,676
0604373N	105	AIRBORNE MCM	19,500		19,500
0604504N	109	AIR CONTROL	1,500		1,500
0604562N	115	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	4,900		4,900
0605013N	136	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,810		2,810
0304785N	140	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	13,000		13,000

Title XV-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		RDT&E Management Support			
0605152N	144	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	150		150
		Operational Systems Development			
0204136N	170	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	1,500		1,500
0204152N	171	E-2 SQUADRONS	1,024		1,024
0205601N	179	HARM IMPROVEMENT	4,330		4,330
0206313M	186	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	80,542		80,542
0206623M	187	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYS	20,600		20,600
0206624M	188	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	19,675		19,675
0305204N	203	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	23,500		23,500
0305207N	206	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	14,200		14,200
	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	227,630	-227,630	
		Classified program		[-227,630]	
		Total, RDT&E Navy	618,428	-247,630	370,798
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE			
		Advanced Technology Development			
0603112F	20	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	2,800		2,800

Title XV-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Advanced Component Development & Prototypes			
		System Development & Demonstration			
0604226F	67	B-1B	40,000		40,000
0604240F	70	B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	14,100		14,100
0604329F	75	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	27,900		27,900
0604617F	84	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	3,800		3,800
0604735F	87	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	10,000		10,000
0207450F	98	E-10 SQUADRONS	178,390	-178,390	
		E-10 program cancellation / transfer to PE 27581F (RDAF 157)		[-178,390]	
		RDT&E Management Support			
0605807F	110	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	21,815		21,815
0605976F	113	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION - TEST ANI	1,610		1,610
		Operational Systems Development			
0207131F	129	A-10 SQUADRONS	230,000		230,000
0207133F	130	F-16 SQUADRONS	55,300	-47,600	7,700
		F-16 beyond line-of-sight (BLOS) funding in advance of need		[-47,600]	
0207134F	131	F-15E SQUADRONS	97,500		97,500
0207253F	141	COMPASS CALL	5,600		5,600
0207268F	142	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	20,000		20,000
0207325F	144	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	23,000		23,000

485

Title XV-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0207417F	147	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	72,500		72,500
0207581F	157	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JS Vanishing vendors development funding ahead of need	291,600	-251,000 [-251,000]	40,600
0303601F	178	MILSATCOM TERMINALS Milsatcom Terminals	79,750	79,750 [79,750]	159,500
0304311F	181	SELECTED ACTIVITIES Classified program	[]	[-49,750] [-49,750]	[]
0305202F	201	DRAGON U-2	660		660
0305206F	202	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	1,520		1,520
0305220F	206	GLOBAL HAWK UAV	1,384		1,384
0305940F	214	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	8,900		8,900
0101314F	242	NIGHT FIST USSRATCOM	1,640		1,640
	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	180,012	-49,750	130,262
Total, RDT&E Air Force			1,369,781	-446,990	922,791
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE					
RDT&E Management Support					
0605200D8Z	144	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	34,000		34,000

Title XV-RDT and E (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operational Systems Development			
0301011G	177	CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	[]	[-191,511]	[]
		Classified program		[-191,511]	
0304345BQ	201	NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (NGP)	[]	[-900]	[]
		Classified program		[-900]	
0305125D8Z	203	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	9,000		9,000
0902298J	228	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS)	1,028		1,028
1160428BB	240	UNMANNED VEHICLES (UV)	74,968		74,968
	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	608,502	-192,411	416,091
		Total, RDT&E Defense-Wide	727,498	-192,411	535,087
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE			
		Total, Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense			
		TOTAL RDT&E	2,857,360	-907,031	1,950,329

Operation and maintenance (sec. 1506)

This section would authorize an additional \$72.9 billion for fiscal year 2008 war-related operation and maintenance expenses of the military services, the defense agencies, and the United States Special Operations Command.

Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operation and Maintenance, Army			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT</u>			
2020a	140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	34,348,922	-711,700	33,637,222
2020a		Grow the Force Transfer to title III		[-689,400]	
2020a		Classified program	977,441	[-22,300]	977,441
2020a		COMMANDERS' EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	7,840,027		7,840,027
2020a		RESET			
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	43,166,390	-711,700	42,454,690
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>SECURITY PROGRAMS</u>			
2020a	310	SECURITY PROGRAMS	1,111,465		1,111,465
		<u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS</u>			
2020a	320	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	1,953,109		1,953,109
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	3,064,574		3,064,574
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Army	46,230,964	-711,700	45,519,264

Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operation and Maintenance, Navy			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>AIR OPERATIONS</u>			
1804n	010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	993,170		993,170
1804n	020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	6,566		6,566
1804n	030	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	2,948		2,948
1804n	040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	64,217		64,217
1804n	050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	27,243		27,243
1804n	060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	147,709		147,709
		<u>SHIP OPERATIONS</u>			
1804n	080	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	560,850		560,850
1804n	090	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	9,938		9,938
1804n	100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	339,377		339,377
1804n	110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	28,062		28,062
		<u>COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT</u>			
1804n	120	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	9,015		9,015
1804n	130	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	10,294		10,294
1804n	150	WARFARE TACTICS	10,863		10,863
1804n	160	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	1,812		1,812
1804n	170	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,773,563		1,773,563
1804n		JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF-JOINT PUBLICATION	3,300		3,300
1804n	180	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	90,512		90,512

Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<u>WEAPONS SUPPORT</u>			
1804n	220	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	18,608		18,608
1804n	230	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	68,023		68,023
		<u>BASE SUPPORT</u>			
1804n	260	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	7,033		7,033
1804n	270	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	454,181		454,181
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	4,627,284		4,627,284
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION</u>			
		<u>READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES</u>			
1804n	280	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	164,486		164,486
1804n		TRANSCOM (Second Destination Transportation)	62,900		62,900
		TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	227,386		227,386
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u>			
		<u>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</u>			
1804n	370	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	36,593		36,593
		TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	36,593		36,593

491

Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>					
<u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u>					
1804n	450	ADMINISTRATION	3,435		3,435
1804n	460	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	337		337
1804n	480	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	1,262		1,262
1804n	490	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	6,145		6,145
1804n	500	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	25,809		25,809
<u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT</u>					
1804n	520	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	113,231		113,231
1804n	550	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	1,289		1,289
1804n	570	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	372		372
<u>INVESTIGATIONS AND SECURITY PROGRAMS</u>					
1804n		SECURITY PROGRAMS	155,987	-13,800	142,187
1804n		Classified program		[-13,800]	
1804n	590	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	4,670		4,670
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			312,537	-13,800	298,737
Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy			5,203,800	-13,800	5,190,000

Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>EXPEDITIONARY FORCES</u>			
1106n	010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	2,068,150		2,068,150
1106n	020	FIELD LOGISTICS	787,879		787,879
1106n	030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	490,638		490,638
		<u>USMC PREPOSITIONING</u>			
1106n	050	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	26,893		26,893
		<u>BASE SUPPORT</u>			
1106n	070	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	60,401		60,401
1106n	080	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	92,710		92,710
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	3,526,671		3,526,671
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u>			
		<u>ACCESSION TRAINING</u>			
1106n	090	RECRUIT TRAINING	1,710		1,710
		<u>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</u>			
1106n	110	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	150		150
1106n	140	TRAINING SUPPORT	141,110		141,110

493

Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<u>RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION</u>			
1106n	150	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	44,187		44,187
		<u>BASE SUPPORT</u>			
1106n	190	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	88		88
		TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	187,245		187,245
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u>			
1106n	200	SPECIAL SUPPORT	167		167
1106n	210	SERVICE-WIDE TRANSPORTATION	299,010		299,010
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	299,177		299,177
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	4,013,093		4,013,093
		Operation and Maintenance, Air Force			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>AIR OPERATIONS</u>			
3400f	010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,066,463		2,066,463
3400f	020	PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	25,362		25,362

Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
3400f	030	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	167,200		167,200
3400f	040	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	32,736		32,736
3400f	050	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	695,412		695,412
3400f	060	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	518,702		518,702
3400f	070	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	190,849		190,849
3400f	080	BASE SUPPORT	1,698,003		1,698,003
<u>COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS</u>					
3400f	090	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	21,351		21,351
3400f	100	NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	6,490		6,490
3400f	110	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	276,728		276,728
3400f	130	MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HQ	106,907		106,907
3400f	140	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	1,092		1,092
<u>SPACE OPERATIONS</u>					
3400f	150	LAUNCH FACILITIES	1,129		1,129
3400f	160	LAUNCH VEHICLES	21		21
3400f	170	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	585		585
3400f	180	SATELLITE SYSTEMS	75		75
3400f	190	OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	8,132		8,132
3400f	200	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	160		160
3400f	210	BASE SUPPORT	9,266		9,266
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES			5,826,663		5,826,663

Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION</u>			
		<u>MOBILITY OPERATIONS</u>			
3400f	220	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	3,629,379		3,629,379
3400f	230	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	12,567		12,567
3400f	240	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	20,447		20,447
3400f	260	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	115,670		115,670
3400f	270	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,497		1,497
3400f	280	BASE SUPPORT	97,494		97,494
		TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	3,877,054		3,877,054
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u>			
		<u>ACCESSION TRAINING</u>			
3400f	300	RECRUIT TRAINING	55		55
3400f	330	BASE SUPPORT	1,545		1,545
		<u>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</u>			
3400f	340	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	116,062		116,062
3400f	350	FLIGHT TRAINING	25		25
3400f	360	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	708		708
3400f	370	TRAINING SUPPORT	1,269		1,269
3400f	390	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	2,462		2,462
3400f	400	BASE SUPPORT	15,345		15,345

Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<u>RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION</u>			
3400f	410	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	74		74
		TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	137,545		137,545
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS</u>			
3400f	460	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	251,052		251,052
3400f	470	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	1,126		1,126
3400f	480	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	116,393		116,393
3400f	500	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	149		149
3400f	510	BASE SUPPORT	15,472		15,472
		<u>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
3400f	520	ADMINISTRATION	2,068		2,068
3400f	530	SERVICE-WIDE COMMUNICATIONS	41,702		41,702
3400f	540	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	227		227
3400f	560	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	48,578		48,578
3400f	570	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	2,663		2,663
3400f	600	BASE SUPPORT	2,927		2,927
		<u>SECURITY PROGRAMS</u>			
3400f	610	SECURITY PROGRAMS	188,537	-3,700	184,837
3400f		Classified program		[-3,700]	

Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<u>SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS</u>			
3400f	620	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	24,174		24,174
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	695,068	-3,700	691,368
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	10,536,330	-3,700	10,532,630
		Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
0100d	010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	90,548		90,548
0100d	020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	1,660,342		1,660,342
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	1,750,890		1,750,890
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
0100d	050	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	16,409		16,409
0100d	100	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	15,345		15,345
0100d	120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	175,021		175,021
0100d	140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES	18,242		18,242
0100d	150	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	154,015		154,015
0100d	180	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	12,401		12,401

Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0100d	190	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY	174,813		174,813
0100d	200	DOD HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	27,152		27,152
0100d	210	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	6,012		6,012
0100d	220	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	1,700,000		1,700,000
0100d	260	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	63,214		63,214
0100d	270	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE	14,410		14,410
		OTHER PROGRAMS			
0100d	999	OTHER PROGRAMS	1,971,066	-122,774	1,848,292
0100d		Classified program		[-122,774]	
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	4,348,100	-122,774	4,225,326
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	6,098,990	-122,774	5,976,216
		Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT</u>			
2080a	120	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	158,410		158,410
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	158,410		158,410

Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>AIR OPERATIONS</u>			
1806n	010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	44,105		44,105
1806n	020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	94		94
		<u>SHIP OPERATIONS</u>			
1806n	060	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	2,331		2,331
		<u>COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT</u>			
1806n	100	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	6,700		6,700
1806n	110	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	16,368		16,368
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	69,598		69,598
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	69,598		69,598
		Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>EXPEDITIONARY FORCES</u>			
1107n	010	OPERATING FORCES	65,519		65,519
1107n	030	TRAINING SUPPORT	2,346		2,346

Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1107n	050	<u>BASE SUPPORT</u>			
		BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	135		135
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	68,000		68,000
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	68,000		68,000
		Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
2065a	130	<u>LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT</u>			
		ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	466,150		466,150
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	466,150		466,150
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	466,150		466,150

Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>AIR OPERATIONS</u>			
3840f	010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	24,724		24,724
3840f	020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	6,444		6,444
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	31,168		31,168
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	31,168		31,168
		TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:	72,876,503	-851,974	72,024,529

Military personnel (sec. 1507)

This section would authorize an additional \$12.9 billion for fiscal year 2008 war-related military personnel expenses of the active and reserve components, including mobilization costs for reserve and National Guard forces.

Title XV - War-Related Military Personnel Authorizations (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Budget Sub Activity Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
MILITARY PERSONNEL ARMY (Direct)	12,504,398		12,504,398
Active Duty Overstrength Transfers to Title IV:			
BASIC PAY		-152,123	-152,123
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL		-44,116	-44,116
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING		-51,770	-51,770
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE		-5,665	-5,665
RECRUITING AND RETENTION (Total AC)		-62,000	-62,000
SPECIAL PAYS		-26,582	-26,582
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX		-11,637	-11,637
BASIC PAY		-1,047,717	-1,047,717
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL		-303,838	-303,838
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING		-386,219	-386,219
RECRUITING AND RETENTION (Total AC)		-958,120	-958,120
SPECIAL PAYS		-111,751	-111,751
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX		-80,150	-80,150
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE		-122,194	-122,194
TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL ARMY	12,504,398	-3,363,882	9,140,516
MILITARY PERSONNEL NAVY (Direct)	752,089		752,089

Title XV - War-Related Military Personnel Authorizations
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Budget Sub Activity Title</u>	<u>FY2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
MILITARY PERSONNEL MARINE CORPS (Direct)			
Active Duty Overstrength Transfers to Title IV:	1,601,882		1,601,882
BASIC PAY		-97,595	-97,595
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL		-28,303	-28,303
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING		-32,823	-32,823
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE		-3,075	-3,075
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX		-7,466	-7,466
BASIC PAY		-206,354	-206,354
RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL		-59,843	-59,843
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING		-87,381	-87,381
INCENTIVE PAYS		-219,881	-219,881
SOCIAL SECURITY TAX		-15,786	-15,786
BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE		-25,900	-25,900
TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL MARINE CORPS	1,601,882	-784,407	817,475
MILITARY PERSONNEL AIR FORCE (Direct)			
RESERVE PERSONNEL ARMY (Direct)	1,411,890		1,411,890
RESERVE PERSONNEL NAVY (Direct)	235,000		235,000
RESERVE PERSONNEL MARINE CORPS (Direct)	70,000		70,000
RESERVE PERSONNEL AIR FORCE (Direct)	15,420		15,420
NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL ARMY (Direct)	3,000		3,000
NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL AIR FORCE (Direct)	476,584		476,584
TOTAL WAR-RELATED PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS	17,070,263	-4,148,289	12,921,974

Defense Health Program (sec. 1508)

This section would authorize an additional \$1.0 billion for fiscal year 2008 war-related expenses of the Defense Health program.

Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide (sec. 1509)

This section would authorize an additional \$257.6 million for fiscal year 2008 war-related drug interdiction and counterdrug expenses.

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1510)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$4.5 billion for the fiscal year 2008 war-related expenses of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund. The provision would also specify the authorized use of these funds, authorize the transfer of funds from this account to other accounts of the Department of Defense, require a plan for the use of these funds, and require quarterly reports on the specific use of the funds.

Iraq Security Forces Fund (sec. 1511)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize an additional \$2.0 billion for the fiscal year 2008 war-related expenses of the Iraq Security Forces Fund. The provision would also specify the authorized use of these funds, authorize the transfer of funds from this account to other accounts of the Department of Defense, provide for prior notice to Congress before obligation of these funds, and require quarterly reports on the specific use of these funds.

Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (sec. 1512)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$2.7 billion in fiscal year 2008 for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund transfer account. These funds would be available to the Secretary of Defense for the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, construction, and for the Afghanistan Security Forces. The provision would require the concurrence of the Secretary of State for the provision of assistance under this section. The provision would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to receive contributions of funds from any person, foreign government, or international organization for the purposes of the fund. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees in writing 5 days prior to the use or transfer of funds from the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, and to provide quarterly reports summarizing the details of the use or transfer of funds.

Iraq Freedom Fund (sec. 1513)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize an additional \$107.5 million for the fiscal year 2008 war-related expenses of the Iraq Freedom Fund. The provision would also authorize the transfer of funds from this account to other accounts of the Department of Defense and require prior notice to Congress before obligation of these funds.

Defense Working Capital Funds (sec. 1514)

This section would authorize an additional \$1.7 billion for the fiscal year 2008 war-related working capital fund expenses of the Department of Defense.

National Defense Sealift Fund (sec. 1515)

This section would authorize an additional \$5.1 million for the fiscal year 2008 war-related expenses of the National Defense Sealift Fund.

Defense Inspector General (sec. 1516)

This section would authorize an additional \$4.4 million for the fiscal year 2008 war-related expenses of the Defense Inspector General.

Subtitle B—General Provisions Relating to Authorizations**Purpose (sec. 1521)**

This section states the purpose of this title which is to authorize additional appropriations for Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2008.

Additional war-related authorizations for military construction programs are contained in title XXIX of this Act.

Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1522)

This section would provide that the amounts authorized for war-related purposes in this title are in addition to the amounts otherwise authorized in this Act for the base budget.

Special transfer authority (sec. 1523)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the transfer of up to \$3.5 billion of war-related funding authorizations in this title among the accounts in this title. This special transfer authority is in addition to the general transfer authority contained in section 1001 of this Act, but the same reprogramming procedures applicable to transfers under section 1001 would also apply to transfers under this section.

Subtitle C—Other Matters**Limitation on availability of funds for certain purposes relating to Iraq (sec. 1531)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations in this Act to establish permanent bases in Iraq or to exercise United States control over the oil resources of Iraq. This provision would effectively extend the prohibition already in effect during fiscal year 2007.

Reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations (sec. 1532)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse any key cooperating nation for logistical and military support provided by that nation to, or in con-

nection with, U.S. military operations in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. The total amount of payments made under the authority of this section during fiscal year 2008 may not exceed \$1.2 billion. The provision would prohibit the Secretary from entering into any contractual obligation to make a reimbursement under the authority provided by this section. The provision would require the Secretary to prescribe standards for determining the kinds of logistical support that could be reimbursed under this section, and to submit those standards to the congressional defense committees no less than 15 days before those standards take effect. The provision would also require the Secretary to notify the congressional defense committees no less than 15 days before making any reimbursement under this section, and to report to those committees quarterly on reimbursements made during the reporting period under the authority provided by this section.

Logistical support for coalition forces supporting operations in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 1533)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the use of Operation and Maintenance funds for fiscal year 2008 to provide supplies, services, transportation, and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting U.S. military and stabilization operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Secretary of Defense may provide logistical support under the authority of this section only if he makes a determination that the coalition forces to be supported are essential to the success of the U.S. military or stabilization operation and that those forces would not be able to participate in the operation without the provision of that support. The provision would also require that logistical support provided under this section comply with the Arms Export Control Act and other U.S. export control laws. The total amount of logistical support provided under this section during fiscal year 2008 may not exceed \$400.0 million. The provision would require the Secretary to submit quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the recipients of logistical support provided under the authority of this section and the type and value of support provided.

Competition for procurement of small arms supplied to Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 1534)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a full and open competition for procurement of small arms (pistols and other weapons less than 0.50 caliber) supplied to Iraq and Afghanistan, ensuring that no responsible U.S. manufacturer is excluded and that products manufactured in the U.S. are not excluded from the competition.

The Multi-National Security Transition Command—Iraq (MNSTC-I) is the principal Department of Defense (DOD) activity which supports the training and equipping of Iraqi Security Forces (ISF). DOD awards contracts, using U.S. appropriated Iraq Security Forces Funds (ISSF) in support of the Iraqi Government, specifically, the Iraqi Ministry of Interior (police forces) and Ministry of Defense (military forces). According to DOD, the Iraqi Government, with MNSTC-I advice, has determined that the Glock Model 19 and Beretta 9m pistols are the weapons of choice for the ISF.

DOD has awarded five Indefinite Delivery-Indefinite Quantity contracts for these pistols. U.S. manufactured weapons are not available under these contracts.

The committee believes that U.S. manufacturers should not be excluded from competing for contracts funded by the American taxpayers for procurement of small arms supplied to Iraq and Afghanistan.

Budget Items

105MM high explosive rocket assisted artillery ammunition

The fiscal year 2008 budget requested \$10.0 million in war-related funding in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA) for 105MM High Explosive Rocket Assisted (HERA) artillery ammunition. The committee notes that this is a new, developmental program for artillery ammunition that the Army has not procured since fiscal year 1999. Army budget materials lack justification for a new start and fails to explain this ammunition's relationship to war costs or any plans for procurement of this ammunition in the future. The committee recommends a decrease of \$10.0 million in war-related PAA for the procurement of 105MM HERA artillery ammunition.

Mine resistant ambush protected vehicles

The fiscal year 2008 budget request included \$441.0 million in the war-related budget request and no funding in the base budget request for the procurement of Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles. Based on the most current information provided by the military services, the Department of Defense has an unfunded requirement of approximately \$4.1 billion to procure 7,700 MRAP vehicles.

A May 2007 memorandum from the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of the Army and Secretary of the Navy identifies the procurement of MRAP vehicles as the Department's highest priority. The Department's failure to include any funding in the fiscal year 2008 base budget request and a minor percentage of the requirement in the fiscal year 2008 war-related budget request for the procurement of MRAPs is very troubling in view of the criticality of rapidly fielding this force protection system.

Further, the committee is concerned with the separate and diverging paths the Army and Marine Corps have taken regarding the fielding of MRAP vehicles. At present, the Army projects a requirement of roughly one MRAP for every seven Up-armored High Mobility Multi-purpose Wheeled Vehicles (UAH) in theater, while the Marine Corps intends to replace UAHs with MRAPs. The Department has not provided an adequate explanation for these divergent fielding strategies.

The committee recognizes the challenges the Department faces with regard to this matter given the number of contractors manufacturing MRAP vehicle variants. However, the committee is concerned that the service has not formulated its long-term plan for logistic support to maintain the MRAPs. The committee expects the Army and Marine Corps to evaluate the effectiveness of continuing

contractor logistic support and develop a transition plan to assume the logistics and sustainment of these systems.

Improvised explosive devices (IEDs) remain the number one threat to troops in theater. For this reason, it is critical that the Department deploys the survivability enhancements to our warfighters afforded by MRAPs as quickly as possible.

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.1 billion in title XV, including: \$1.6 billion in Other Procurement, Army (OPA); \$2.0 billion in Procurement, Marine Corps (PMC); \$430.0 million in Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF); \$21.0 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN); and \$124.0 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW) for MRAP vehicles. Additional guidance is contained in the classified annex to this report.

Night vision advanced technology

The budget request included \$35.9 million in PE 63710A for night visions advanced technology. The committee recognizes the benefits of night vision devices, including the improved situational awareness it provides soldiers and soldiers' enhanced ability to operate at night. The committee funded the Army's \$33.0 million unfunded requirement for over 11,000 monocular night vision devices. In addition to procuring these critical devices, the Army must continue to develop more technologically capable and agile night vision devices. To accelerate these developments, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 63710A, including \$7.5 million for research and development of short-range electro-optic sensors, and \$2.5 million for the continued research and development of intelligence surveillance and detection sensors.

Night vision devices

The budget request included \$278.6 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for night vision devices. The committee recognizes the benefits of night vision devices, including the improved situational awareness it provides soldiers and their enhanced ability to operate at night. According to the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded requirement list submitted to the committee, the Army has an unfunded requirement for over 11,000 monocular night vision devices. These additional night vision goggles would permit the Army to fulfill the equipment shortages of military police and combat engineer units. The additional funding would also provide the Stryker force with a night vision capability, thereby increasing its mobility and situational awareness in times of low light and at night. The committee recommends an increase of \$33.0 million in OPA for night vision devices to fulfill the Army's remaining unfunded requirement.

Single Army Logistics Enterprise

The Army's fiscal year 2008 base budget request included \$53.6 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the Single Army Logistic Enterprise (SALE). The fiscal year 2008 war-related budget request included \$602.8 million in OPA for the SALE. Over the next several years, the Army plans to invest billions of dollars to develop and field the General Fund Enterprise Business System (GFEBS), the Global Combat Support System-Army, Field/Tactical

(GCSS-Army), and the Logistics Modernization Program (LMP). The Government Accountability Office (GAO) determined that these three systems will replace about 120 legacy logistics information management systems.

The committee is not satisfied by the Army's progress in implementing these three systems. Last year, based upon its concerns about the cost performance and schedule delays, Congress prohibited the expenditure of funds on LMP until the Secretary of Defense certified that the LMP had addressed its many shortcomings. While the Department of Defense did approve the LMP for further development, the GAO continues to raise concerns that the Army is investing in systems without the benefit of an overarching Army business enterprise architecture. The committee shares the GAO's concerns. The Army's attempt to implement major information technology modernization efforts absent a guiding enterprise architecture could result in systems that are duplicative, are not well integrated, and do not effectively optimize mission performance.

Additionally, the GAO has reported that GCSS-Army and LMP have already experienced significant delays and, as currently structured, there is no certainty that additional delays will not occur. The GAO has determined that GFEBS and LMP will not be fully fielded until fiscal year 2010, and GCSS-Army will not be fully deployed until fiscal year 2014. Further, budget justification materials provided in the fiscal year 2008 war-related budget request fail to relate the costs associated with these information technology modernizations to the current global war on terror. Similarly, the Army's Grow the Force budget request contains an additional \$159.0 million for these information technology upgrades, without sufficient justification. Attempts to have the Army provide further detailed justification materials have gone unheeded.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of \$552.5 million in title XV, OPA for SALE.

UH-1Y/AH-1Z helicopters

The budget request included \$518.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) to procure 20 UH-1Y/AH-1Z helicopters and \$123.4 million requested in fiscal year 2008 war-related APN to procure six more UH-1Y/AH-1Z helicopters. Total production orders in fiscal year 2007 consisted of 11 UH-1Y/AH-1Z helicopters.

The Marine Corps has been developing upgrades and replacements for its existing fleet of attack (AH-1) and utility (UH-1) helicopters. These programs, the AH-1Z and UH-1Y, are being conducted by the same manufacturer. Unfortunately, both programs have experienced delayed deliveries and increasing costs. These problems appear, at least in part, to have been caused by deficient cost control and cost accounting procedures by which the contractor manages the programs and through which Department of Defense acquisition officials can manage the Government's equities in the programs.

This raises concerns with the committee, since these same procedures have been used on other existing programs and could be used on future programs as well. The Marine Corps' MV-22, U.S. Special Operations Command's CV-22, and the Army's Armed Recon-

naissance Helicopter (ARH) programs will all be acquired in whole or in part from the same contractor.

The committee strongly supports modernizing the forces with the UH-1Y and AH-1Z, but doubts that the contractor team will be able to expand production rapidly enough to more than double production in 1 year given these recent problems. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease in war-related APN of six aircraft and \$123.4 million.

Radio systems

The budget request included \$644.4 million for procurement of radios for the Marine Corps in the base budget, the war-related budget, and the “Grow the Force” initiative. For fiscal year 2007, between the base budget and supplementals, the Marine Corps is slated to receive \$1,294.3 million for radio procurement. The Marine Corps, like the Army, faces a serious shortage of radios due in part to delays in developing the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS). The Marine Corps also urgently requires new versions of current radios that are resistant to self-jamming in operations against radio-controlled improvised explosive devices.

Obligations of funds have been delayed because the Marine Corps temporarily reprogrammed significant amounts from radio procurement to production of Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles, which the committee agrees was a wise decision. In addition, the Marine Corps will not receive the funds to repay these borrowed funds and for additional radio procurement until almost the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2007, which will further impact budget execution. The committee therefore recommends a reduction of \$165.0 million to the request for fiscal year 2008.

The committee believes that the roughly \$1.9 billion budgeted for legacy radio system procurement across fiscal years 2007 and 2008 is driven by continued delays in developing and fielding the JTRS. The committee is aware that this joint program was restructured in fiscal year 2006 to improve cost and schedule performance, which seems to have successfully stabilized the program. However, some concerns still persist regarding the JTRS program’s ability to achieve a series of critical milestones scheduled in 2008 and 2009, which will lead to operational testing and production. The committee is also concerned about the availability of resources for both the sustainment of legacy radio systems and development of JTRS, and intends to closely monitor the program’s progress in achieving upcoming critical milestones.

Therefore, the Secretary of Defense is directed to ensure that detailed quarterly updates are provided to the congressional defense committees, commencing in the first quarter of fiscal year 2008, that describe the JTRS program schedule and progress in completing the critical design, technical, integration, test, and production milestones leading to initial operational capability.

Joint Strike Fighter

The budget request included \$1,421.7 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) to purchase six Air Force Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) aircraft in fiscal year 2008 and a budget request of \$230.0 million in war-related APAF funding to purchase an addi-

tional JSF aircraft. In addition, the budget request included \$1,232.2 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) to purchase six Marine Corps JSF aircraft.

The committee believes that producing 12 aircraft in fiscal year 2008 would be adequate to support the planned production expansion and subsequent deliveries to the JSF testing and training activities, and that there are higher priorities for using these funds for other programs in the war-related budget. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$230.0 million in the fiscal year 2008 war-related APAF budget.

C-130J aircraft

The budget request included \$686.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) to procure nine C-130J tactical airlift aircraft and \$1,356.3 million requested in fiscal year 2008 war-related APAF to procure 17 C-130Js. The budget request also included \$256.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) to procure four KC-130J aerial refueling aircraft, and \$495.4 million in war-related APN to procure seven KC-130Js. This would result in procuring a total of 37 C-130J aircraft for all Department of Defense requirements.

The committee notes that production of the C-130 aircraft has not been at those levels in recent years. In fiscal year 2006, the Air Force and the Navy bought 18 C-130Js and, in fiscal year 2007, the total will be 15 aircraft at most.

The committee strongly supports modernizing the forces with the C-130J, but doubts that the contractor team will be able to expand production rapidly enough to more than double production in 1 year after several years of producing at current rates. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease in war-related APAF of four aircraft and \$468.0 million.

CV-22 Osprey aircraft

The budget request included \$495.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) to procure five CV-22 aircraft and \$492.5 million requested in fiscal year 2008 war-related APAF to procure five more CV-22 aircraft. The budget request also included \$1,959.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) to procure 21 MV-22 aircraft, and \$140.5 million in war-related APN to procure two more MV-22 aircraft. This would result in procuring a total of 33 V-22 aircraft in fiscal year 2008 for all Department of Defense requirements.

The committee notes that the budget request would cause production of the V-22 to increase dramatically. In fiscal year 2006, the Navy and the Air Force bought 14 V-22s and, in fiscal year 2007, the total will be 17 aircraft at most.

The committee strongly supports modernizing the forces with the V-22, but doubts that the contractor team will be able to expand production rapidly enough to more than double production in 1 year after several years of producing at current rates. The committee has expressed similar concerns elsewhere in this report about the production rate increase for the Marine Corps' UH-1Y and AH-1Z helicopters, which are built in the same facility.

Additionally, CV-22 initial operational test and evaluation is scheduled for the first quarter of fiscal year 2008. Ramping up production from two or three aircraft in fiscal year 2007 to a level of five aircraft in fiscal year 2008 would show a strong commitment to the program, while avoiding any risk of unpleasant surprises in testing. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease in war-related APAF of five aircraft and \$492.5 million.

F-15 modifications

The budget request included \$19.2 million for modifications to the F-15 aircraft in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF, line 28) and \$152.9 million in fiscal year 2008 war-related APAF for F-15 modifications, including \$22.0 million for tactical targeting network technology (TTNT) upgrades.

The Air Force request for \$22.0 million to buy and install TTNT is premature. According to the budget justification material, the Air Force would not place these procurement funds on contract until fiscal year 2010. The TTNT system development for the F-15 program is a 3-year effort, expected to begin in fiscal year 2008. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$22.0 million for the TTNT modification.

Joint surveillance target attack radar system modifications

The budget request included \$79.7 million for modifications to the E-8 joint surveillance target attack radar system (JSTARS) aircraft in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF, line 55) and \$41.3 million in fiscal year 2008 war-related APAF for JSTARS modifications. The war-related request would be used to replace components of the JSTARS system affected by vanishing vendors, sometimes known as a diminishing manufacturing sources (DMS) problem.

The Air Force budget justification material indicates that the Air Force could award a research and development contract for the JSTARS DMS program by the end of the third quarter of fiscal year 2008 or at the latest, the beginning of the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2008. Given that circumstance, awarding procurement contracts in fiscal year 2008 would be premature. The committee recommends a decrease of \$41.3 million for JSTARS DMS procurement.

Joint light tactical vehicle

The budget request included \$82.3 million in PE 64642A for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army (RDTEA) for Light Tactical Wheeled Vehicles. The war-related budget request for fiscal year 2008 also included \$20.0 million for the same program element. This \$20.0 million is requested for acceleration of the development of the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV). The JLTV development program has nothing to do with ongoing military operations and should be funded exclusively in the base budget. The committee recommends a reduction to the war-related JLTV request of \$20.0 million and an increase of \$20.0 million for JLTV development in the base budget.

F-16 research and development

The budget request included \$90.6 million in PE 27133F for research and development projects for the F-16 and \$55.3 million requested in fiscal year 2008 war-related research and development for the F-16 to develop secure, beyond-line-of-sight (BLOS) capability. The F-16 needs a BLOS capability to communicate over long distances with command and control nodes and ground forces in mountainous terrain.

In the near-term, to develop a capability to fill an urgent need, the Air Force plans to modify 72 aircraft with ARC-210 or equivalent radios and associated hardware to provide the secure line-of-sight (SLOS) capability using funds from the fiscal year 2006 budget. The F-16 BLOS program would build on that effort. The committee supports achieving this BLOS capability. However, only \$7.7 million of the war-related request is needed in fiscal year 2008 to support the BLOS effort. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$47.6 million for F-16 BLOS development.

Military satellite communication terminals

The fiscal year 2008 war-related budget request included \$79.8 million in PE 33601F for military satellite communications terminals. No justification was provided by the Air Force for this request. The committee recommends that no funds for military satellite communication terminals be included in the war-related request.

Operation and maintenance funding transfers

The budget request included \$689.4 million in operation and maintenance funding for the Army as emergency funding to support modular conversions and the so-called “overstrength” personnel levels above the levels contained in the Quadrennial Defense Review of 482,000 active-duty Army personnel.

The fiscal year 2008 budget now proposes a permanent increase in the Army’s personnel level. Under these circumstances the committee does not believe it is appropriate to continue to budget for the costs of personnel we know we will have and intend to retain as emergency war costs. Funding for these support costs has been transferred to the base budget and is included in title III of this Act.

The funding tables for this title and for title III reflect these transfers.

Military personnel funding transfers

The budget request included \$3.4 billion in military personnel funding for the Army and an additional \$784.4 million for the Marine Corps in emergency funding for the cost of so-called “overstrength” personnel levels above the levels contained in the Quadrennial Defense Review of 482,400 active-duty Army personnel and 175,000 active-duty Marine Corps personnel. Both services have maintained and funded personnel ceilings above these levels for the past several years, on a recurring year-to-year “temporary” basis, using emergency funding.

The fiscal year 2008 budget now proposes a permanent increase in these personnel levels. Under these circumstances the committee

does not believe it is appropriate to continue to budget for personnel we know we will have and intend to retain as an emergency war cost. Funding for these personnel, including funding for bonuses that apply to the entire force and not specifically to personnel serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, has been transferred to the base budget and is included in title IV of this Act.

The following table lists the specific amounts transferred.

Joint improvised explosive device defeat office

The budget request included \$500.0 million in the Joint Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Defeat Fund and the war-related budget request included \$4.0 billion in OPA for the Joint IED Defeat Fund.

The Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Office (JIEDDO) was created by the Department of Defense in February 2006 to defeat the IED threat, train the force in tactics and techniques to defend against the IED threat, and to attack the networks that enable IEDs to be used against American service members. In its first year, the organization undertook a number of counter-IED initiatives costing approximately \$2.8 billion, as well as hiring staff, establishing a financial management function, and developing performance metrics.

The committee is aware of the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) March 2007 assessment of the JIEDDO which stated that it has not developed a strategic plan to clearly articulate its mission and, as a result, JIEDDO cannot effectively assess whether it is making the right investment decisions or whether it has effectively organized itself to meet its mission. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense has expressed similar concerns.

The committee is also concerned that JIEDDO does not have full visibility over all of the services' counter-IED efforts, which has resulted in duplication of efforts. Moreover, according to the GAO, JIEDDO has not finalized guidance for how and when sustainment costs for all proven counter-IED initiatives will be transitioned to the services.

In addition to concerns about JIEDDO's investment strategy and organizational structure, the committee is concerned about the gaps that exist in training the force. According to the GAO, training efforts do not reach all deploying personnel who may be exposed to the IED threat. This training gap is a serious force protection issue that must be addressed by JIEDDO.

The committee awaits the Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force on IEDs' next quarterly report on the ongoing program and activities in the context of a strategic campaign to address the IED threat. The committee expects that the DSB will address the matter of duplication of effort among the services' respective research and development communities, relevant defense agencies, and JIEDDO. Further, the committee expects the DSB will examine JIEDDO's approach to short- and long-term investments in technology development.

The committee expects that JIEDDO will implement the recommendations already provided to it by the GAO and will implement quickly the recommendations of the DSB Task Force once the

report has been completed. Additional directive guidance to JIEDDO is contained in the classified annex.

The committee views JIEDDO as a war-related expense and, therefore, recommends transferring the funding provided in the base budget to title XV of the bill. To accomplish this, the committee recommends a reduction of \$500.0 million in the base budget for the Joint IED Defeat Fund, and an increase of \$500.0 million in the fiscal year 2008 war-related budget request for the Joint IED Defeat Fund.

Blast injury research

Blast injury from improvised explosive devices (IEDs) continues to be the most significant cause of American casualties in Iraq. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not appropriately allocated resources provided for the defeat of IEDs to the “full range of efforts necessary to defeat the IED threat,” including much needed research and training on the prevention, mitigation, and treatment of blast injuries. Section 256 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) established a Department of Defense-wide program to prevent, mitigate, and treat blast injuries. The committee expects that the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Office (JIEDDO), in accordance with the 2006 Act, will be a partner in the Department-wide efforts to coordinate, manage, and fund research efforts for medical blast research.

To support these efforts, the committee directs that JIEDDO fund blast-related medical research, training, and programmatic activities which have been identified as high priorities by the DOD executive agent at a level of not less than \$50.0 million in fiscal year 2008. These include: research and development of diagnostics, training, and treatment for traumatic brain injury; collection, storage, and integration of operational, medical, and protective equipment performance data associated with wounding and non-wounding events; body surface wound mapping for investigation of wounding patterns to be included in body armor design; research and training to prevent traumatic eye injury, cranial-facial injury, and burns; and enhanced research on hemorrhage control.

Further, the committee directs JIEDDO to report to the executive agent and to the congressional defense committees on actions, including funding, to fulfill these requirements, no later than March 1, 2008.

Counter radio-controlled improvised explosive device electronic warfare

The Chief of Staff of the Army’s unfunded requirements list included a request for \$152.9 million in Other Procurement, Army for the acquisition of counter radio-controlled improvised explosive device electronic warfare (CREW) systems. According to the budget request submitted to the committee by the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Office (JIEDDO), the JIEDDO’s budget includes over \$745.0 million to assist the military services with urgent requests from in theater. In light of these funds, the committee directs the JIEDDO to provide the Army with the funds necessary to procure 1,000 CREW–2 systems and 8,131 CREW trainers.

Counter-remote controlled improvised explosive device systems

The committee is concerned that the Joint Improvised Explosive Defeat (IED) Office has become too dependent on a single source of supply for counter-Remote Controlled IED (RCIED) jamming systems and system components, thereby limiting innovation and potentially preventing more effective systems from being fielded. The committee further believes the Joint IED Defeat Office (JIEDDO) should consider identifying and qualifying additional sources for counter-RCIED systems. The committee therefore directs the JIEDDO and the military departments to identify and, as appropriate, qualify additional sources for counter-RCIED systems and system components.

Directed energy for improvised explosive device defeat

The committee is heartened that the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) is starting to invest significant resources in research, development, and production of technologies to counter a broader spectrum of electronics used in improvised explosive devices (IEDs). The committee is concerned that JIEDDO has taken a short-term view of this technology area, looking for off-the-shelf solutions. Not finding fully mature technologies or properly engineered prototypes, JIEDDO has chosen not to invest, expecting the services or the private sector to make the necessary investments. For their part, service advocates have not persuaded their management to invest because the prevailing view is that JIEDDO has the responsibility.

The IED problem is obviously severe and our exposure in Iraq has endured. These devices are almost certainly here to stay as a threat to U.S. and allied military forces. It is incumbent on the Department of Defense to develop robust solutions even if that takes considerable time and resources. JIEDDO, the services, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, and the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics should be working together to develop a rational investment strategy.

More specifically, the committee is persuaded that technology advances in photonic switches and transformers provide potential pulse-power/directed energy capabilities far better than what is currently available. On behalf of JIEDDO, the Technical Support Working Group (TSWG) is rapidly maturing technology for compact, single-cycle, very high peak power, ultra-wideband, extremely short pulse, very fast discharge, and high pulse rate from low prime power sources. The possibility exists that a multiple cycle terawatt system could be built for fielding on an airborne platform. The committee directs that, of the amounts authorized and appropriated for JIEDDO, \$20.0 million be used for a competitive award through the TSWG to accelerate ongoing projects and to develop multiple cycle technology.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Summary and explanation of funding tables

Division B of this Act authorizes funding for military construction projects of the Department of Defense. It includes funding authorizations for the construction and operation of military family housing as well as military construction for the reserve components, the defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment program. It also provides authorization for the base closure accounts that fund military construction, environmental cleanup, and other activities required to implement the decisions in base closure rounds.

The following tables provide the project-level authorizations for the military construction funding authorized in division B of this Act and summarize that funding by account. Funding for base closure projects is explained in additional detail in the table included in title XXVII of this report.

The budget request for fiscal year 2008 included authorization of appropriations for military construction and housing programs totaling \$21.2 billion. Of this amount, \$9.8 billion was requested for military construction, \$2.9 billion for the construction and operation of family housing, and \$8.4 for base closure activities, including \$8.2 billion to implement the results of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.

The budget also proposed an additional \$907.9 million in emergency spending for Army military construction projects in Iraq and Afghanistan and Navy military construction projects in the United States related to the administration's proposal to grow the size of the Marine Corps. Additional funding for the Army projects is contained in title XXIX of this Act. The funding requested for Marine Corps projects has been included in title XXII of this Act.

Including all funding in division B of this Act, the committee recommends authorization of appropriations for military construction and housing programs totaling \$22.6 billion. The total amount authorized for appropriations reflects this committee's continuing commitment to invest in the recapitalization of Department of Defense facilities and infrastructure. The committee recommends an increase of \$600.0 million for additional construction projects, and a reduction of \$139.1 million in unjustified or lower priority projects, for a net increase of \$460.9 million to the amount requested for military construction and family housing.

SUMMARY OF FY 2008 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Army	4,039,197	16,550	4,055,747
Navy	2,104,276	257,015	2,361,291
Air Force	912,109	134,166	1,046,275
Defense Agencies	1,799,336	95,845	1,895,181
Chemical Demilitarization Construction	86,176	-86,176	0
NATO Security Investment Program	201,400	0	201,400
Army National Guard	404,291	54,224	458,515
Army Reserve	119,684	15,000	134,684
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	59,150	0	59,150
Air National Guard	85,517	130,900	216,417
Air Force Reserve	26,559	0	26,559
Subtotal Construction	9,837,695	617,524	10,455,219
Army Family Housing Construction	419,400	0	419,400
Army Family Housing Operations	742,920	0	742,920
Navy Family Housing Construction	298,329	1,766	300,095
Navy Family Housing Operations	371,404	0	371,404
Air Force Family Housing Construction	362,747	0	362,747
Air Force Family Housing Operations	688,335	0	688,335
Defense Agencies Family Housing Operations	48,848	0	48,848
Family Housing Improvement Fund	500	0	500
Subtotal Family Housing	2,932,483	1,766	2,934,249
Base Realignment and Closure IV	220,689	0	220,689
Base Realignment and Closure 2005	8,174,315	0	8,174,315
Subtotal BRAC	8,395,004	0	8,395,004
Subtotal Construction, Housing and BRAC FY2008 Authorizations (Non War-Related)	21,165,182	619,290	21,784,472
Prior Year Savings	0	-3,100	-3,100
Subtotal Excluding war-related construction	21,165,182	616,190	21,781,372
Title XXIX War-Related Construction			
Army Military Construction	738,850	13,800	752,650
Navy Military Construction	157,305	-157,305	0
Navy Housing Construction	11,766	-11,766	0
Subtotal War-Related Construction	907,921	-155,271	752,650
Grand Total Division B	22,073,103	460,919	22,534,022

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Army	Alabama	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	INDUSTRIAL WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT	26,000		26,000
Army	Alabama	REDSTONE ARSENAL	SYSTEM SOFTWARE ENGINEERING ANNEX, PH2		20,000	20,000
Navy	Alabama	EVERGREEN	NOLF EVERGREEN RUNWAY EXTENSION	9,560		9,560
Army Guard	Alabama	SPRINGVILLE	READINESS CENTER, ADD/ALT (ADRS)	3,300		3,300
Army	Alaska	FORT RICHARDSON	Military Police Operations Facilities (Grow the Force)		42,000	42,000
Army	Alaska	FORT RICHARDSON	Barracks (Grow the Force)		36,000	36,000
Army	Alaska	FORT RICHARDSON	Construction Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force)		14,800	14,800
Army	Alaska	FORT WAINWRIGHT	EOD/MP Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force)		11,600	11,600
Army	Alaska	FORT WAINWRIGHT	Barracks (Grow the Force)		20,000	20,000
Army	Alaska	FORT WAINWRIGHT	RAILHEAD OPERATIONS FACILITY PHASE 1		8,900	8,900
Army	Alaska	FORT WAINWRIGHT	REPLACE SUBSTATIONS/UPGRADE ELECTRIC	60,000		60,000
Air Force	Alaska	ELMENDORF AFB	COMPANY OPERATIONS FACILITY	14,000		14,000
Air Force	Alaska	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22 JET ENGINE INSPECTION & MAINT	13,800		13,800
Air Force	Alaska	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22 7 BAY A/C SHELTER	21,400		21,400
Air Force	Alaska	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22 FIGHTER TOWN EAST INFRASTRUCTURE PHASE 2	7,100		7,100
Air Force	Alaska	ELMENDORF AFB	F-22 TAXIWAY, TAXILANE & ARMDE-ARM PAD	27,880		27,880
Air Force Reserve	Alaska	ELMENDORF AFB	REPLACE JOINT PME CENTER, PHASE 1		13,000	13,000
Air Force Reserve	Alaska	ELMENDORF AFB	AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SQUADRON FACILITY			
Army	Arizona	FORT HUACHUCA	GROUP HEADQUARTERS	4,550		4,550
Army	Arizona	FORT HUACHUCA	EFFLUENT REUSE SYSTEM	10,400		10,400
Army	Arizona	FORT HUACHUCA	General Instructional Building (Grow the Force)	11,000		11,000
Army	Arizona	FORT HUACHUCA	AIT Trainee Complex (Grow the Force)		13,600	13,600
Navy	Arizona	YUMA	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	22,980	105,000	105,000
Navy	Arizona	YUMA	TOWWAY "G"	10,740		10,740
Air Force	Arizona	DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB	CSAR EC130 MAINT HANGAR/AMU	11,200		11,200
Army Guard	Arizona	FLORENCE	FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP		10,870	10,870
Air Force	Arkansas	LITTLE ROCK AFB	REPAIR RUNWAY		9,800	9,800
Army Guard	Arkansas	CAMP ROBINSON	AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT	5,500		5,500
Army Guard	Arkansas	CAMP ROBINSON	Professional Educ Ctr/Training Complex (Grow the Force)		18,423	18,423
Army	California	FORT IRWIN	MILITARY OPERATIONS IN URBAN TERRAIN, PHASE 2	18,500		18,500
Army	California	PRESIDIO MONTEREY	TRAINING LAND IMPROVEMENTS	5,500		5,500
Army	California	CAMP PENDLETON	GENERAL INSTRUCTION BUILDING	28,000		28,000
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	8,510		8,510
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	BEQ - CHAPPO AREA	29,050		29,050
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	ISR CAMP - INTEL BATTALION	17,980		17,980
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	MARSOC SUPPORTING FACILITIES	17,730		17,730
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	BEQ - HEADQUARTERS	31,980		31,980

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENTS	5,830		5,830
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	TACTICAL SUPPORT VAN PADS EXPANSION	6,050		6,050
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	HANGAR ADDITIONS	4,400		4,400
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	BEQ - MARGARITA	26,530		26,530
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	INFANTRY SQUAD BATTLE COURSE	18,090	-18,090	0
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Force Intel Ops Center - HQ Area (Grow the Force)		24,990	24,990
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Consolidated Comm/Electronics Shop (Grow the Force)		16,840	16,840
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	1st MLG Operations Center (Grow the Force)		18,160	18,160
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	1st MLG Armory (Grow the Force)		8,150	8,150
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	1st MLG Group and Battalion Ops Center (Grow the Force)		22,220	22,220
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	BEQ - Wounded Warrior Battalion (Grow the Force)		25,940	25,940
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Armory - Regimental and Battalion HQ (Transfer from Title XXIX)		5,160	5,160
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Armory - Intelligence Battalion (Transfer from Title XXIX)		4,180	4,180
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Armory - 5th Marine Regiment (Transfer from Title XXIX)		10,890	10,890
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Bachelor Quarters and Armory - Horns (Transfer from Title XXIX)		34,970	34,970
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Bachelor Quarters and Dining Facility (Transfer from Title XXIX)		24,390	24,390
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Company HQ - Military Police (Transfer from Title XXIX)		8,240	8,240
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Explosive Ordnance Detachment - Ops Facility (From Title XXIX)		13,090	13,090
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Intelligence Surveillance Reconnaissance Camp (From Title XXIX)		1,114	1,114
Navy	California	MIRAMAR MCAS	Hangar Modification (Grow the Force)		26,760	26,760
Navy	California	SAN DIEGO	PIER 5002 SUB FENDER INSTALLATION	9,040		9,040
Navy	California	SAN DIEGO	MAGNETIC SILENCING FACILITY MODIFICATION	14,590		14,590
Navy	California	TWENTYNINE PALMS	BEQ AND PARKING STRUCTURE	34,329		34,329
Navy	California	TWENTYNINE PALMS	Multi-Battalion Operations Center (Grow the Force)		33,770	33,770
Navy	California	TWENTYNINE PALMS	Multi-Battalion Operations Center (Grow the Force)		33,650	33,650
Navy	California	TWENTYNINE PALMS	Armory (Grow the Force)		5,920	5,920
Navy	California	TWENTYNINE PALMS	Landfill (Grow the Force)		13,560	13,560
Navy	California	TWENTYNINE PALMS	MOUT Facility (Phase 3) (Grow the Force)		21,390	21,390
Navy	California	TWENTYNINE PALMS	Regimental Headquarters Addition (Transfer from Title XXIX)		4,440	4,440
Air Force	California	EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE	MAIN BASE RUNWAY INCREMENT 3	35,000		35,000
Air Force	California	TRAVIS AFB	C-17 ROAD IMPROVEMENTS	4,600		4,600
Air Force	California	TRAVIS AFB	C-17 SOUTHWEST LANDING ZONE	22,000		22,000
Defense Agencies	California	CAMP PENDLETON	SOF SUPPLY FACILITY	8,310		8,310
Defense Agencies	California	CAMP PENDLETON	SOF PARALOT/BOAT/DIVE LOCKER	5,770		5,770
Defense Agencies	California	CAMP PENDLETON	SOF ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION FACILITY	5,950		5,950
Defense Agencies	California	CORONADO	SOF SPECIAL BOAT TEAM OPERATIONS FACILITY	12,000		12,000
Defense Agencies	California	POINT LOMA ANNEX	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE FACILITIES	140,000		140,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Amy Guard	California	CAMP ROBERTS	INFANTRY PLATOON BATTLE COURSE	2,850		2,850
Amy Guard	California	SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT	READINESS CENTER	21,000		21,000
Amy Reserve	California	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	CONVOY LIVE FIRE RANGE	2,534		2,534
Amy Reserve	California	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	RANGE CONTROL FACILITY	4,501		4,501
Amy Reserve	California	GARDEN GROVE	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	25,440		25,440
Naval Reserve	California	MIRAMAR MCAS	RESERVE CENTER ADDITIONS	5,580		5,580
Amy	Colorado	FORT CARSON	INDOOR RANGE	4,900		4,900
Amy	Colorado	FORT CARSON	DEFENSE ACCESS ROAD	9,300	-1,000	8,300
Amy	Colorado	FORT CARSON	Engineer Bn HQ/Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force)		59,000	59,000
Amy	Colorado	FORT CARSON	Barracks (Grow the Force)		53,000	53,000
Amy	Colorado	FORT CARSON	MP Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force)		13,000	13,000
Amy	Colorado	FORT CARSON	Hospital Addition & Dental Clinic (Grow the Force)		18,000	18,000
Air Force	Colorado	FORT CARSON	AIR SUPT OPS SQUADRON COMPLEX	13,500		13,500
Air Force	Colorado	SCHRIEVER AFB	AIR AND SPACE INTEGRATION FACILITY	24,500		24,500
Chem Demil Const	Colorado	U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY	UPGRADE ACADEMIC FACILITY PH IVB	15,000		15,000
Defense Agencies	Colorado	PUEBLO DEPOT	AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY PHASE IX	35,159	-35,159	0
Air National Guard	Colorado	PUEBLO DEPOT	AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY PHASE IX		35,159	35,159
Nav	Colorado	BUCKLEY ANGB	SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY		7,300	7,300
Amy Guard	Connecticut	NAVAL SUB BASE NEW LONDON	WATERFRONT OPERATIONS FACILITY		11,900	11,900
Amy	Connecticut	NIANTIC	READINESS CENTER (ADRS)	13,600		13,600
Air National Guard	Delaware	DOVER AFB	JOINT PERSONAL EFFECTS DEPOT	17,500		17,500
Air Force	Delaware	NEW CASTLE	REPLACE C-130 MAINTENANCE HANGAR		10,800	10,800
Defense Agencies	District of Columbia	BOLLING AFB	COMMUNICATION SWITCH FACILITY	2,500		2,500
Amy	District of Columbia	BOLLING AFB	INSTALL BACKUP WATER SYSTEM	1,012		1,012
Amy	Florida	EGLIN AFB	OPERATIONS COMPLEX, PHASE 2	66,000		66,000
Amy	Florida	MIAMI DORAL	SOUTHCOM HEADQUARTERS FACILITY	237,000	-3,467	233,533
Amy	Florida	MIAMI DORAL	SOUTHCOM HQ CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	0	3,467	3,467
Nav	Florida	BLOUNT ISLAND	MAIN GATE IMPROVEMENTS	7,570		7,570
Nav	Florida	CAPE CANAVERAL	ENGINEERING SERVICES FACILITY		9,900	9,900
Nav	Florida	PANAMA CITY	LITTORAL WARFARE SYSTEMS FACILITY	13,870		13,870
Air Force	Florida	EGLIN AFB	F-35 ADAL 53RD JOINT REPROGRAMMING FAC	8,300		8,300
Air Force	Florida	EGLIN AFB	CONSTRUCT SEAWALLS SANTA ROSA IS RANGE COMP	35,000		35,000
Air Force	Florida	EGLIN AFB	REPAIR ROADS SANTA ROSA IS RANGE COMPLEX	49,000		49,000
Air Force	Florida	EGLIN AFB	F-35 INTEGRATED TRAINING CENTER	39,000		39,000
Air Force	Florida	EGLIN AFB	F-35 SQUADRON OPS/AMU/HANGAR	27,000		27,000
Air Force	Florida	MACDILL AFB	CENTCOM JOINT INTELLIGENCE CENTER PHASE III	25,000		25,000
Air Force	Florida	MACDILL AFB	ALTER USCENTCOM HEADQUARTERS	57,000		57,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Air Force	Florida	PATRICK AFB	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	11,854		11,854
Air Force	Florida	TYNDALL AFB	FITNESS CENTER	19,014		19,014
Defense Agencies	Florida	TYNDALL AFB	REPAIR AIRFIELD	25,100		25,100
Defense Agencies	Florida	HURLBURT FIELD	SOF MAINTENANCE STORAGE FACILITY	4,711		4,711
Defense Agencies	Florida	HURLBURT FIELD	SOF OPERATIONS FACILITY	5,500		5,500
Defense Agencies	Florida	HURLBURT FIELD	SOF COMBAT WEATHER OPERATIONS FACILITY	14,900		14,900
Defense Agencies	Florida	HURLBURT FIELD	SOF SQUADRON OPERATIONS ADDITION	4,000		4,000
Defense Agencies	Florida	KEY WEST	REPLACE FUEL PUMP HOUSE	1,874		1,874
Defense Agencies	Florida	MACDILL AFB	SOF ACQUISITION CENTER	35,500		35,500
Defense Agencies	Florida	MACDILL AFB	SOF 501-D BUILDING ADDITION PHASE 2	12,200		12,200
Defense Agencies	Florida	MACDILL AFB	PHARMACARE ADDITIONAL ALTERATION	5,000		5,000
Defense Agencies	Florida	MACDILL AFB	CLINIC REPLACEMENT, INCREMENT II	41,400		41,400
Air Force	Florida	JACKSONVILLE	ARMY AVN SUPPORT FACILITY ADD/ALT	12,200		12,200
Air Force	Georgia	FORT BENNING	RECEPTION STATION, PH 1	51,000		51,000
Air Force	Georgia	FORT BENNING	TRAINEE BARRACKS COMPLEX	73,000		73,000
Air Force	Georgia	FORT BENNING	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	5,800		5,800
Air Force	Georgia	FORT STEWART	SIMULATIONS TRAINING FACILITY	56,000		56,000
Air Force	Georgia	FORT STEWART	BARRACKS COMPLEX	36,000		36,000
Air Force	Georgia	FORT STEWART	BRIGADE COMPLEX-HEADQUARTERS	26,000		26,000
Air Force	Georgia	FORT STEWART	Fire Station (Grow the Force)		5,500	5,500
Air Force	Georgia	FORT STEWART	Barracks (Grow the Force)		25,000	25,000
Air Force	Georgia	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	Human Resources Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force)		15,000	15,000
Air Force	Georgia	ROBINS AFB	Quartermaster Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force)		16,000	16,000
Defense Agencies	Georgia	AUGUSTA	AIRCRAFT COMPONENT REPAIR FAC	14,700		14,700
Defense Agencies	Georgia	FORT BENNING	REGIONAL SECURITY OPERATION CENTER INCREMENT III	100,000		100,000
Defense Agencies	Georgia	FORT BENNING	SOF BATTALION COMPLEX	21,000		21,000
Defense Agencies	Georgia	FORT BENNING	SOF HQ BUILDING ADDITION	5,000		5,000
Defense Agencies	Georgia	HUNTER ANG	SOF TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	9,000		9,000
Defense Agencies	Georgia	HUNTER ANG	SOF SUPPORT COMPANY FACILITY	13,800		13,800
Air National Guard	Georgia	SAVANNAH IAP	TROOP QUARTERS		9,000	9,000
Army	Hawaii	FORT SHAFTER	BARRACKS COMPLEX	31,000		31,000
Army	Hawaii	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	BARRACKS COMPLEX	43,000		43,000
Army	Hawaii	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	BARRACKS COMPLEX	45,000		45,000
Army	Hawaii	WHEELER AFB	BARRACKS COMPLEX	51,000		51,000
Navy	Hawaii	KANEOHE BAY	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	37,961		37,961
Navy	Hawaii	PEARL HARBOR	SUB DRIVE-IN MAGNETIC SILENCING FAC	99,860		99,860
Navy	Hawaii	PEARL HARBOR NAVAL SHIPYARD	DRYDOCK NUMBER 1 AND 2		30,200	30,200

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Navv	Hawaii	WAIHAWA	COMMUNICATION CENTER	65,410		65,410
Air Force	Hawaii	HICKAM AFB	DCGS INTELLIGENCE SQUADRON OPS FACILITY	16,500		16,500
Air Force	Hawaii	HICKAM AFB	C-17 PARKING RAMP	15,471		15,471
Defense Agencies	Hawaii	HICKAM AFB	REPLACE HYDRANT FUELS SYSTEM	11,900		11,900
Defense Agencies	Hawaii	KUNIA	REGIONAL SECURITY OPERATION CENTER INCREMENT III	136,318		136,318
Army Guard	Idaho	GOWEN FIELD	TRAINING AREA RAILHEAD, PH 2		7,615	7,615
Army Guard	Idaho	ORCHARD TRAINING AREA	URBAN ASSAULT COURSE	1,700		1,700
Army	Illinois	ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL	COMBINED FIREPOLICE FACILITY, PHASE 2		3,350	3,350
Army	Illinois	GREAT LAKES	RTC INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADE INCREMENT 3	16,650		16,650
Navv	Illinois	GREAT LAKES	SMALL ARMS MARKSMANSHIP TRAINER	10,221		10,221
Air Force	Illinois	SCOTT AFB	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		8,200	8,200
Air Force	Illinois	SCOTT AFB	SECURITY FORCES OPERATIONS FACILITY	16,700		16,700
Defense Agencies	Illinois	GREAT LAKES	FEDERAL HEALTHCARE FACILITY	99,000		99,000
Army Guard	Illinois	ST CLAIR COUNTY	READINESS CENTER (ADRS)	8,100		8,100
Navv	Indiana	NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY CRANE	SECURED ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYS FAC		12,000	12,000
Air National Guard	Indiana	HULMAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	DIGITAL GROUND STATION (DGS) BEDDOWN	7,700		7,700
Army Guard	Iowa	IOWA CITY	READINESS CENTER		13,186	13,186
Army	Kansas	FORT LEAVENWORTH	BARRACKS COMPLEX	55,000		55,000
Army	Kansas	FORT LEAVENWORTH	MP HQ & MP I/R Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force)		23,000	23,000
Army	Kansas	FORT LEAVENWORTH	Barracks (Grow the Force)		12,800	12,800
Army	Kansas	FORT RILEY	Engineer Bn HQ/Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force)		43,000	43,000
Army	Kansas	FORT RILEY	Barracks (Grow the Force)		50,000	50,000
Army	Kansas	FORT RILEY	Child Development Center (Grow the Force)		8,500	8,500
Army	Kansas	FORT RILEY	Health & Dental Clinic (Grow the Force)		8,800	8,800
Army	Kansas	FORT RILEY	DIGITAL MULTIPURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX			28,000
Air Force	Kansas	FORT RILEY	AIR SUPPORT OPS SQUADRON COMPLEX	28,000		28,000
Air National Guard	Kansas	SMOKY HILL RANGE	ASOS BEDDOWN	12,515		12,515
Army	Kentucky	FORT CAMPBELL	INDOOR RANGE	5,000	9,000	9,000
Army	Kentucky	FORT CAMPBELL	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	49,000		49,000
Army	Kentucky	FORT CAMPBELL	MP/CID/Medical Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force)		24,000	24,000
Army	Kentucky	FORT CAMPBELL	Barracks (Grow the Force)		27,000	27,000
Army	Kentucky	FORT KNOX	CANTONMENT AREA ROADS, PAVED	6,700		6,700
Chem Demil Const	Kentucky	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY PHASE VIII	51,017	-51,017	0
Defense Agencies	Kentucky	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY PHASE VIII		69,017	69,017
Defense Agencies	Kentucky	FORT CAMPBELL	SOF BATTALION OPERATIONS COMPLEX	35,000		35,000
Defense Agencies	Kentucky	FORT CAMPBELL	SOF GROUP SUPPORT BATTALION COMPLEX	18,500		18,500
Army	Louisiana	FORT POLK	4TH BDE, HEADQUARTERS		9,800	9,800

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Army	Louisiana	FORT POLK	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		6,100	6,100
Air National Guard	Louisiana	CAMP BEAUREGARD	UPGRADE ASOS FACILITY	1,800		1,800
Navy	Maine	PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD	CONSOLIDATED EMERGENCY CONTROL CTR		9,700	9,700
Army	Maryland	ABERDEEN PG	AUTOMOTIVE TECH EVALUATION FAC		12,200	12,200
Navy	Maryland	PATUXENT RIVER	AIRCRAFT PROTOTYPE FACILITY PHASE 1	17,990		17,990
Navy	Maryland	PATUXENT RIVER	E-2 ADVANCED HAWKEYE ROT&E FACILITY	13,650		13,650
Navy	Maryland	PATUXENT RIVER	JPALS ADDITION TO BUILDING 2110/2122	6,720		6,720
Navy	Maryland	SUJITLAND	NATIONAL MARITIME INTELLIGENCE CENTER INC II	52,069		52,069
Defense Agencies	Maryland	FORT DETRICK	USAMRIID STAGE I, INCREMENT II	150,000		150,000
Defense Agencies	Maryland	FORT MEADE	NSAW PSC UTILITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM PH II	7,901		7,901
Air Force	Maryland	FORT MEADE	NSAW OPS1 SOUTH STAIR TOWER	4,000		4,000
Air National Guard	Massachusetts	HANSCOM AFB	RENOVATE ACQUISITION MGT FACILITY		12,800	12,800
Army	Massachusetts	OTIS ANGB	DIGITAL GROUND STATION (DGS) IOC BEDDOWN	1,800		1,800
Army	Michigan	DETROIT ARSENAL	GROUND SYS POWER & ENERGY LAB		18,500	18,500
Army Guard	Michigan	CAMP GRAYLING	INFANTRY PL BATTLE COURSE/LIVE FIRE RANGE		2,450	2,450
Army Guard	Michigan	SELFRIEDGE ANGB	USPFO AND READINESS CENTER, PH 2		4,239	4,239
Navy	Minnesota	CAMP RIPLEY	RESERVE TRAINING CENTER	4,030		4,030
Defense Agencies	Mississippi	NAVAL AIR STATION MERIDIAN	COMBINED ARMS COLLECTIVE TRAINING FACILITY	4,850		4,850
Army Guard	Mississippi	STENNIS SPACE CENTER	FIRE STATION		6,770	6,770
Army	Missouri	CAMP SHELBY	SOF RIVERINE AND COMBATANT CRAFT OPS FAC		10,200	10,200
Army	Missouri	FORT LEONARD WOOD	LIVE FIRE SHOOT HOUSE/URBAN ASSAULT COURSE	3,800		3,800
Army	Missouri	FORT LEONARD WOOD	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	4,000		4,000
Army	Missouri	FORT LEONARD WOOD	Automated Multipurpose Machine Gun Range (Grow the Force)		4,150	4,150
Army	Missouri	FORT LEONARD WOOD	Automated Pistol Range (Grow the Force)		2,700	2,700
Army	Missouri	FORT LEONARD WOOD	Maneuver Enhance Bde Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force)		56,000	56,000
Army	Missouri	FORT LEONARD WOOD	Barracks (Grow the Force)		26,000	26,000
Army	Missouri	FORT LEONARD WOOD	Dining Facility-Basic Combat Training Complex (Grow the Force)		22,000	22,000
Army	Missouri	FORT LEONARD WOOD	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		7,000	7,000
Army Guard	Missouri	WHITEMAN AFB	ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY	30,000		30,000
Air Force	Montana	MALMSTRON AFB	CONSTRUCT COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTER		7,000	7,000
Army Reserve	Montana	BUTTE	ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND	7,629		7,629
Air Force	Nebraska	OFFUTT AFB	ADAL INTELL SQUADRON FAC	16,952		16,952
Air National Guard	Nebraska	LINCOLN	SECURITY FORCES & COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY		8,900	8,900
Army	Nevada	HAWTHORNE ARMY AMMO PLANT	GROUND WATER TREATMENT PLANT	11,800		11,800
Navy	Nevada	NAVAL AIR STATION FALLON	RANGE IMPROVEMENTS, B-20		11,460	11,460

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Air Force	Nevada	NELLIS AFB	JOINT TERMINAL AIR CONTROL VIRTUAL TNG FAC	4,950	4,950	4,950
Air National Guard	Nevada	RENO-TAHOE IAP	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	5,200	5,200	5,200
Air National Guard	New Hampshire	PEASE ANGB	WING HEADQUARTERS, OPS AND TRAINING FACILITY	8,900	8,900	8,900
Navy	New Jersey	NAVAL AIR STATION LAKEHURST	JOINT INSTALLATION ROAD IMPROVEMENTS	4,100	4,100	4,100
Air Force	New Mexico	FORT DIX	COMBINED MAINTENANCE FACILITY	17,000		17,000
Air Force	New Mexico	WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE	Engineer Bn HQ/Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force)	71,000	71,000	71,000
Air Force	New Mexico	CANNON AFB	ADAL HANGAR 09 FOR C-130	1,688		1,688
Defense Agencies	New Mexico	KIRTLAND AFB	PJ/CRO RESCUE/RECOVERY TRNG CENTER	11,400	11,400	11,400
Defense Agencies	New Mexico	CANNON AFB	SOF FLIGHT SIMULATOR FACILITY	7,500	7,500	7,500
Air Force	New Mexico	KIRTLAND AFB	REPLACE FUEL UNLOAD FACILITY	1,800		1,800
Air Force	New York	FORT DRUM	INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADES	12,000		12,000
Air Force	New York	FORT DRUM	BRIGADE COMPLEX-COMPANY OPERATIONS	55,000		55,000
Air Force	New York	FORT DRUM	BRIGADE COMPLEX-BARRACKS/OPERATIONS	40,000		40,000
Air Force	New York	FORT DRUM	BRIGADE COMPLEX MAINTENANCE FACILITY	44,000		44,000
Air Force	New York	FORT DRUM	DINING FACILITY	0	-7,839	36,161
Air Force	New York	FORT DRUM	BN/Forward Supl/Eng Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force)	7,839	7,839	7,839
Air Force	New York	FORT DRUM	MP BN HQ/MP Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force)	41,000	41,000	41,000
Air Force	New York	FORT DRUM	Barracks (Grow the Force)	38,000	38,000	38,000
Air Force	New York	FORT DRUM	MEDICAL CLINIC ADD/ALT	61,000	61,000	61,000
Air Force	New York	GABRESKI AIRPORT	PARARESCUE FACILITY, PHASE 1	41,000		41,000
Air National Guard	New York	FORT DRUM	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	8,400	8,400	8,400
Air National Guard	New York	FORT BRAGG	BARRACKS COMPLEX, INCREMENT 3	15,923	15,923	15,923
Air National Guard	North Carolina	FORT BRAGG	INDOOR RANGE	47,400	47,400	47,400
Air National Guard	North Carolina	FORT BRAGG	STUDENT BARRACKS	4,800	4,800	4,800
Air National Guard	North Carolina	FORT BRAGG	BLOOD DONOR FACILITY	51,000		51,000
Air National Guard	North Carolina	FORT BRAGG	Barracks (Grow the Force)	4,800	4,800	4,800
Air National Guard	North Carolina	FORT BRAGG	Ammunition Supply Point/Vehicle Maint (Grow the Force)	73,000	73,000	73,000
Air National Guard	North Carolina	FORT BRAGG	Surv/Signal/Qtr/Eng/POL Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force)	88,000	88,000	88,000
Air National Guard	North Carolina	FORT BRAGG	BEQ - FRENCH CREEK	54,000	54,000	54,000
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	FIELD MEDICAL SERVICE SCHOOL	27,800		27,800
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	MOUT ENHANCEMENTS	8,080	8,080	8,080
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	MARSOC SUPPORT FACILITY	14,120	14,120	14,120
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	MARSOC TRAINING FACILITIES	21,720	21,720	21,720
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	MARSOC FITNESS CENTER/TRAINING TANK	12,590		12,590
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	MARSOC COMMUNITY SUPPORT FACILITIES	14,480	14,480	14,480
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION FACILITY	9,170	9,170	9,170
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	BEQ - 4TH MEB	16,460	16,460	16,460
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE		29,970		29,970

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	Multi-Purpose Machine Gun Range - G10 (Grow the Force)	17,250	17,250	17,250
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	Landfill Cell (Grow the Force)	14,170	14,170	14,170
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	Wastewater System Modification (Grow the Force)	7,070	7,070	7,070
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	Main Gate Physical Security Upgrade (Grow the Force)	7,920	7,920	7,920
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	Physical Security Upgrades - Piney Green (Grow the Force)	6,660	6,660	6,660
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	BEQ - Wounded Warrior Battalion (Grow the Force)	27,270	27,270	27,270
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	Maintenance/Operations Complex-2/9 (Transfer from Title XXIX)	43,340	43,340	43,340
Navy	North Carolina	CHERRY POINT MCAS	UAV OPERATIONS/MAINTENANCE	12,110	12,110	12,110
Navy	North Carolina	CHERRY POINT MCAS	HANGAR RENOVATION & FAC UPGRADES F/A18E/F	16,500	16,500	16,500
Navy	North Carolina	NEW RIVER	BEQ	22,530	22,530	22,530
Navy	North Carolina	NEW RIVER	HANGAR ADDITION (PHASE 2)	17,330	17,330	17,330
Navy	North Carolina	NEW RIVER	JET ENGINE TEST CELL	14,570	14,570	14,570
Navy	North Carolina	NOLF WASHINGTON COUNTY	OUTLYING LANDING FIELD FACS & LAND ACQ (INCRS 5-7)	10,060	-10,060	0
Defense Agencies	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	DELALIO ES - CONSTRUCT GYMNASIUM	2,014	2,014	2,014
Defense Agencies	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	SOF SUPPLY & PRE-DEPLOYMENT FAC	10,500	10,500	10,500
Defense Agencies	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	SOF ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION FACILITY	6,910	6,910	6,910
Defense Agencies	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	SOF EQUIPMENT FACILITY	10,800	10,800	10,800
Defense Agencies	North Carolina	FORT BRAGG	SOF OPERATIONS/INTEL ADDITION	8,000	8,000	8,000
Air Force	North Carolina	FORT BRAGG	SOF HQ AND MOTOR POOL COMPLEX	39,250	39,250	39,250
Air Force	North Dakota	GRAND FORKS AFB	CONTROL TOWER/RAPCON	13,000	13,000	13,000
Air Force	North Dakota	MINOT AFB	DORMITORY (144 RM)	18,200	18,200	18,200
Army Guard	North Dakota	CAMP GRAFTON	Regional Training Institute Phase 1 (Grow the Force)	33,416	33,416	33,416
Defense Agencies	Ohio	COLUMBUS	DECENTRALIZE HEAT PLANT	4,000	4,000	4,000
Naval Reserve	Ohio	WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB	RESERVE TRAINING CENTER - DAYTON OH	10,277	10,277	10,277
Army	Oklahoma	FORT SILL	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	2,900	2,900	2,900
Army	Oklahoma	ALTUS AFB	MULTI-PURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE	3,300	3,300	3,300
Air Force	Oklahoma	TINKER AFB	C-17 SHEET METAL COMPOSITE SHOP	2,000	2,000	2,000
Air Force	Oklahoma	VANCE AFB	CONSOLIDATED FUEL O/H REPAIR & TEST FAC	34,600	34,600	34,600
Army Guard	Oregon	ONTARIO	FUELS SYSTEM MAINTENANCE HANGAR	7,700	7,700	7,700
Naval Reserve	Oregon	PORTLAND	READINESS CENTER	11,000	11,000	11,000
Defense Agencies	Pennsylvania	DIST DEPOT NEW CUMBERLAND	OPERATIONAL FACILITIES MIUW 110/IBU 13	1,900	1,900	1,900
Army Guard	Pennsylvania	CARLISLE	REPLACE CENTRAL HEAT PLANT	21,000	21,000	21,000
Army Guard	Pennsylvania	EAST FALLOWFIELD TOWNSHIP	READINESS CENTER (SBCT)	7,800	7,800	7,800
Army Guard	Pennsylvania	FORT INDIANTOWN GAP	READINESS CENTER (SBCT)	8,300	8,300	8,300
Army Guard	Pennsylvania	GETTYSBURG	AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT UPGRADE (SBCT)	9,500	9,500	9,500
Army Guard	Pennsylvania	GRATERFORD	READINESS CENTER (SBCT)	6,300	6,300	6,300
			FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP (SBCT)	7,300	7,300	7,300

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Army Guard	Pennsylvania	HANOVER	READINESS CENTER, ADD/ALT (SBCT)	5,500		5,500
Army Guard	Pennsylvania	HAZELTON	READINESS CENTER ADD/ALT (SBCT)	5,600		5,600
Army Guard	Pennsylvania	HOLIDAYSBURG	READINESS CENTER (SBCT)	9,400		9,400
Army Guard	Pennsylvania	HUNTINGDON	READINESS CENTER (SBCT)	7,500		7,500
Army Guard	Pennsylvania	KUTZTOWN	READINESS CENTER, ADD/ALT (SBCT)	6,800		6,800
Army Guard	Pennsylvania	LEBANON	READINESS CENTER, ADD/ALT (SBCT)	7,800		7,800
Army Guard	Pennsylvania	PHILADELPHIA	FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP, ADD/ALT (SBCT)	3,650		3,650
Army Guard	Pennsylvania	PHILADELPHIA	READINESS CENTER, ALTERATION (SBCT)	10,000		10,000
Air National Guard	Pennsylvania	FORT INDIANTOWN GAP	AIR SUPT OPS SQUADRON (ASOS) BEDDOWN	6,400		6,400
Air National Guard	Pennsylvania	FORT INDIANTOWN GAP	OPERATIONS AND TRAINING FACILITY		6,300	6,300
Air National Guard	Rhode Island	NAVAL STATION NEWPORT	RECONSTRUCT WHARF BETWEEN PIERS 1 AND 2		9,990	9,990
Navy	Rhode Island	EAST GREENWICH	READINESS CENTER	8,200		8,200
Army Guard	Rhode Island	N KINGSTOWN	ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY	33,000		33,000
Air National Guard	Rhode Island	QUONSET STATE AIRPORT	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TRAINING FAC		5,000	5,000
Army	South Carolina	FORT JACKSON	Basic Training Complex (Grow the Force)		85,000	85,000
Navy	South Carolina	BEAUFORT	FIRE STATION	6,800		6,800
Navy	South Carolina	PARRIS ISLAND	RECRUIT BARRACKS - 3RD BATTALION (PH 1)	25,322		25,322
Navy	South Carolina	PARRIS ISLAND	MOTOR TRANSPORTATION COMPLEX	5,530		5,530
Navy	South Carolina	PARRIS ISLAND MCRD	Consolidated Dining Facility (Grow the Force)		24,430	24,430
Navy	South Carolina	CHARLESTON AFB	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		11,000	11,000
Air Force	South Carolina	ELLSWORTH AFB	BASE CIVIL ENGINEERING ADMIN FACILITY		16,600	16,600
Air Force	South Dakota	JOE FOSS FIELD	BASE CIVIL ENGINEERING MAINT FACILITY	3,730	7,900	7,900
Air National Guard	South Dakota	SIoux FALLS	JOINT ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER	3,200		3,200
Naval Reserve	Tennessee	MCGHEE-TYSON AIRPORT	MILSTAR BEDDOWN-RELOCATE BASE ACCESS RD	3,200		3,200
Air National Guard	Tennessee	MEMPHIS IAP	C-5 GROUND RUN-UP ENCLOSURE	3,200		3,200
Air National Guard	Tennessee	MEMPHIS IAP	C-5 FINAL INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	6,676		6,676
Air National Guard	Tennessee	MEMPHIS IAP	C-5 MUNITIONS STORAGE COMPLEX	1,500		1,500
Army	Texas	CAMP BULLIS	URBAN ASSAULT COURSE	1,600		1,600
Army	Texas	FORT BLISS	Army Eval Task Force Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force)		84,000	84,000
Army	Texas	FORT BLISS	Barracks (Grow the Force)		11,400	11,400
Army	Texas	FORT BLISS	Health & Dental Clinic (Grow the Force)		16,500	16,500
Army	Texas	FORT HOOD	Air Defense Bde HQ/Patrol Bn Unit Ops Facil (Grow the Force)		46,000	46,000
Army	Texas	FORT HOOD	Barracks (Grow the Force)		45,000	45,000
Army	Texas	FORT HOOD	BARRACKS COMPLEX	47,000		47,000
Army	Texas	FORT HOOD	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		7,400	7,400
Army	Texas	FORT SAM HOUSTON	BATTLE COMMAND TRAINING CENTER, PH 1	1,950		1,950
Army	Texas	FORT SAM HOUSTON	Medical Companies Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force)		10,600	10,600

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Army	Texas	FORT SAM HOUSTON	Barracks (Grow the Force)		6,600	6,600
Army	Texas	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	MANEUVER SYSTEMS SUSTAINMENT CTR, PHASE 2	9,200		9,200
Navy	Texas	CORPUS CHRISTI	AVIATION TRAINER/SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY	14,290		14,290
Air Force	Texas	LACKLAND AFB	BASIC EXPEDITIONARY AIRMAN SKILL TRNG PHASE 2	14,000		14,000
Defense Agencies	Texas	CAMP BULLIS	HEALTH CLINIC REPLACEMENT	7,400		7,400
Army Guard	Texas	CAMP BOWIE	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	1,500		1,500
Army Guard	Texas	FORT WOLTERS	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	2,100		2,100
Army Reserve	Texas	ELLINGTON FIELD	AFRC/BATTLE PROJECTION CTR, PH 2		15,000	15,000
Army Reserve	Texas	FORT WORTH	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	15,076		15,076
Naval Reserve	Texas	AUSTIN	RESERVE TRAINING CENTER - AUSTIN, TX	6,490		6,490
Naval Reserve	Texas	FORT WORTH	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	4,920		4,920
Naval Reserve	Texas	FORT WORTH	AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT PARKING FAC	5,140		5,140
Naval Reserve	Texas	FORT WORTH	JOINT CONTROL TOWER	12,454		12,454
Air Force	Utah	HILL AFB	AIRCRAFT POWER SYSTEMS REPAIR FACILITY	8,399		8,399
Air Force	Utah	HILL AFB	HYDRAULIC FLIGHT CONTROL FACILITY	8,400		8,400
Air Force	Utah	HILL AFB	MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY		9,200	9,200
Army Guard	Utah	NORTH SALT LAKE	READINESS CENTER	12,200		12,200
Air Force Reserve	Utah	HILL AFB	WING SUPPORT FACILITY	3,200		3,200
Army Guard	Utah	ETHAN ALLEN RANGE	MULTI-PURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE		1,996	1,996
Air National Guard	Vermont	BURLINGTON	POOR FARM ROAD SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS		6,600	6,600
Army	Virginia	FORT BELVOIR	DEFENSE ACCESS ROAD PHASE 3	13,000		13,000
Army	Virginia	FORT EUSTIS	Barracks (Grow the Force)		32,000	32,000
Army	Virginia	FORT EUSTIS	Transportation Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force)		43,000	43,000
Army	Virginia	FORT LEE	POL Truck Company Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force)		9,800	9,800
Army	Virginia	FORT LEE	Barracks (Grow the Force)		6,900	6,900
Army	Virginia	FORT MYER	Infantry Company Operations Facilities (Grow the Force)		8,400	8,400
Army	Virginia	FORT MYER	Barracks (Grow the Force)		12,400	12,400
Navy	Virginia	CHESAPEAKE	MOBILE USER OBJECTIVE SYSTEM INSTALLATION	8,450		8,450
Navy	Virginia	NORFOLK	E2/C2 AIRCREW TRAINING FACILITY	11,510		11,510
Navy	Virginia	NORFOLK	MH-60S HANGER & AIRFIELD IMPROVEMENTS	53,850		53,850
Navy	Virginia	NORFOLK	JOINT FORCES COMMAND HQ FAC - BLDG 1		14,200	14,200
Navy	Virginia	QUANTICO	STUDENT QUARTERS - TBS (PHASE 2)	26,680		26,680
Navy	Virginia	QUANTICO	BEQ - MSGBN HEADQUARTERS	18,839		18,839
Navy	Virginia	QUANTICO	Warfare Programs Support Center (Grow the Force)		5,000	5,000
Defense Agencies	Virginia	DAM NECK	SOF OPERATIONAL TRAINING FACILITY	14,000		14,000
Defense Agencies	Virginia	DAM NECK	SOF OPERATIONS FACILITY	94,500		94,500
Defense Agencies	Virginia	FORT BELVOIR	ENTRANCE GATE SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS	5,000		5,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Defense Agencies	Virginia	LITTLE CREEK	SOF SPECIAL BOAT TEAM OPERATIONS FACILITY	14,000		14,000
Defense Agencies	Virginia	LITTLE CREEK	SOF SEAL TEAM OPS AND SUPPORT FACILITY	34,000		34,000
Defense Agencies	Virginia	LITTLE CREEK	SOF HEADQUARTERS FACILITY	51,000		51,000
Defense Agencies	Virginia	NORFOLK	ENVIRONMENTAL PREVENTIVE MEDICINE UNIT 2 REPL	6,450		6,450
Defense Agencies	Virginia	PENTAGON	PENTAGON RESERVATION ELECTRICAL UPGRADES	18,531	-18,531	0
Army Guard	Virginia	FORT PICKETT	COMBAT PISTOL QUALIFICATION COURSE	1,050		1,050
Army Guard	Virginia	FORT PICKETT	Regional Training Institute Phase 1 (Grow the Force)		25,161	25,161
Army Guard	Virginia	WINCHESTER	FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP		3,113	3,113
Naval Reserve	Virginia	QUANTICO	RESERVE CENTER ADDITIONS	2,410		2,410
Army	Washington	FORT LEWIS	INDOOR RANGE	5,000		5,000
Army	Washington	FORT LEWIS	BRIGADE COMPLEX, INCREMENT 2			102,000
Army	Washington	FORT LEWIS	Railroad Yard Upgrade (Grow the Force)	14,600	14,600	14,600
Army	Washington	FORT LEWIS	Barracks (Grow the Force)	32,000	32,000	32,000
Army	Washington	FORT LEWIS	EOD/Eng/Med/MP Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force)	62,000	62,000	62,000
Army	Washington	FORT LEWIS	Battlefield Surveil Bde Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force)	51,000	51,000	51,000
Army	Washington	YAKIMA	DIGITAL MULTIPURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX	29,000		29,000
Navy	Washington	BANGOR	LIMITED AREA PROD & STORAGE COMPLEX INCR IV	39,750		39,750
Navy	Washington	BREMERTON	BEQ HOMEPOR ASHORE INCREMENT II	47,240		47,240
Navy	Washington	BREMERTON	CYN MAINTENANCE PIER REPLACEMENT	91,070		91,070
Navy	Washington	BREMERTON	MISSILE ASSEMBLY BUILDING 3	28,690		28,690
Navy	Washington	NAVAL STATION EVERETT	FLEET REGION READINESS CENTER		10,940	10,940
Navy	Washington	WHIDBEY ISLAND	EA-18G FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS	23,910		23,910
Defense Agencies	Washington	FORT LEWIS	SOF SUPPORT BATTALION COMPLEX	30,000		30,000
Defense Agencies	Washington	FORT LEWIS	SOF BATTALION OPS COMPLEX	47,000		47,000
Defense Agencies	Washington	FORT LEWIS	MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC	21,000		21,000
Army Guard	West Virginia	CAMP DAWSON	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	4,500		4,500
Air National Guard	West Virginia	E WW REG APT - SHEPHERD FIELD	C-5 FUEL CELL MAINT HANGAR AND SHOPS	26,000		26,000
Air National Guard	West Virginia	E WW REG APT - SHEPHERD FIELD	C-5 FINAL INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADE	5,176		5,176
Air National Guard	West Virginia	E WW REG APT - SHEPHERD FIELD	C-5 SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY	7,600		7,600
Air National Guard	West Virginia	E WW REG APT - SHEPHERD FIELD	C-5 PARKING APRON ADD/UPGRADE RUNWAY		12,000	12,000
Air National Guard	West Virginia	YEAGER	AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR		17,300	17,300
Air National Guard	Wisconsin	TRUXAL FIELD	FIRE/CRASH RESCUE STATION		7,300	7,300
Army Reserve	Wisconsin	ELLSWORTH	ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND	9,100		9,100
Army Reserve	Wisconsin	FORT MCCOY	REGIONAL MEDICAL TRAINING FACILITY	8,523		8,523
Air Force	Wyoming	F. E. WARREN AFB	RENOVATE HISTORIC DORMITORIES	14,600		14,600
Army Guard	Wyoming	CAMP GUERNSEY	QUALIFICATION TRAINING RANGE	2,650		2,650

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Army	Afghanistan	BAGRAM AB	ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING (Transfer to Title XXIX)	13,800	-13,800	0
Navy	Bahrain	NAVAL SUPT ACTIVITY BAHRAIN	WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PHASE 1	35,500		35,500
Defense Agencies	Bahrain	NAVAL SUPT ACTIVITY BAHRAIN	SOF OPERATIONS FACILITY	19,000		19,000
Defense Agencies	Belgium	CASTEU	BRUSSELS AMERICAN SCHOOL ADDITION	5,992		5,992
Army	Bulgaria	NEVO SELO FOS	BASE CAMP	61,000		61,000
Navy	Diego Garcia	DIEGO GARCIA	SEWAGE LAGOON, AIR OPS	7,150		7,150
Navy	Dibouti	CAMP LEMONIER	FUEL FARM	4,000		4,000
Navy	Dibouti	CAMP LEMONIER	WESTERN TAXIWAY	2,900		2,900
Navy	Dibouti	CAMP LEMONIER	FULL LENGTH TAXIWAY	15,490		15,490
Army	Germany	GRAFENWOEHR	BRIGADE COMPLEX-MAINTENANCE/OPERATIONS	34,000		34,000
Army	Germany	GRAFENWOEHR	BRIGADE COMPLEX-MAINTENANCE/OPERATIONS	28,000		28,000
Air Force	Germany	RAMSTEIN AB	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB FACILITIES PH 2	6,260		6,260
Air Force	Germany	RAMSTEIN AB	JOINT MOBILITY PROCESSING CENTER	24,000		24,000
Air Force	Germany	RAMSTEIN AB	DORMITORY - 128 RM	14,949		14,949
Air Force	Germany	RAMSTEIN AB	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	3,000		3,000
Defense Agencies	Germany	RAMSTEIN AB	RAMSTEIN INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL ADDITION	5,393		5,393
Defense Agencies	Germany	SPANGDAHLEM AB	MEDICAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT	30,100		30,100
Defense Agencies	Germany	WEISBADEN	HAIMERBER ESW/WEIS MS ADDITION	5,093		5,093
Defense Agencies	Germany	WEISBADEN	H.H. ARNOLD HS ADDITION	15,379		15,379
Navy	Guam	NAVAL BASE GUAM	KILO WHARF EXTENSION	101,828		101,828
Navy	Guam	NAVAL BASE GUAM	HARDEN BASE ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS	59,420		59,420
Navy	Guam	NAVAL BASE GUAM	WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT REPAIRS & UPGRADE	40,870		40,870
Navy	Guam	NAVAL BASE GUAM	FITNESS CENTER GUAM	45,250	-5,300	39,950
Navy	Guam	NAVAL BASE GUAM	POTABLE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM PHASE 1	31,450		31,450
Air Force	Guam	ANDERSEN AFB	UPGRADE NW FIELD INFRASTRUCTURE	10,000		10,000
Army	Honduras	SOTO CANO AIR BASE	DINING FACILITY	2,550		2,550
Army	Italy	VICENZA	BRIGADE COMPLEX-OPERATIONS SPT FACILITY (INCR 1)	87,000	-37,000	50,000
Army	Italy	VICENZA	BRIGADE COMPLEX-BARRACKS/COMMUNITY FAC (INCR 1)	86,000	-36,000	50,000
Navy	Japan	YOKOSUKA	WHARF UPGRADES (INCREMENT 3)	8,750		8,750
Army	Korea	CAMP HUMPHREYS	BARRACKS COMPLEX	22,000		22,000
Army	Korea	CAMP HUMPHREYS	BARRACKS COMPLEX	35,000		35,000
Air Force	Qatar	AL UDEID AIR BASE	MULTI AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR	22,300		22,300
Defense Agencies	Qatar	AL UDEID AIR BASE	SOF OPERATIONS COMPLEX	18,908		18,908
Defense Agencies	Qatar	AL UDEID AIR BASE	SOF AIRCRAFT PARKING RAMP	18,515		18,515
Defense Agencies	Qatar	AL UDEID AIR BASE	SOF VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FAC	3,507		3,507
Defense Agencies	Qatar	AL UDEID AIR BASE	SOF STORAGE FACILITY	3,590		3,590
Defense Agencies	Qatar	AL UDEID AIR BASE	SOF AIR OPERATIONS CENTER	8,332		8,332

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Army	Romania	MIHAIL KOHALNICEANU FOS	BASE CAMP, PHASE 2	12,600		12,600
Air Force	Spain	MORON	TACT LEADERSHIP PROGRAM DORM (400 RM)	1,800		1,800
Air Force	United Kingdom	MENWITH HILL STATION	POWER AVAIL & INFRASTRUC IMPROVEMENTS	10,000		10,000
Air Force	United Kingdom	MENWITH HILL STATION	ADAL OPS AND TECHNICAL FAC	31,000		31,000
Air Force	United Kingdom	ROYAL AIR FORCE LAKENHEATH	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB - STORAGE IGLOO	1,800		1,800
Air Force	United Kingdom	ROYAL AIR FORCE LAKENHEATH	F-15C SQUAD OPS/AMU	15,500		15,500
Air Force	Worldwide Classified	CLASSIFIED LOCATION	CLASSIFIED MILCON PROJECT	1,500		1,500
Air Force	Worldwide Classified	CLASSIFIED LOCATION	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM	9,889		9,889
Air Force	Worldwide Classified	CLASSIFIED LOCATION	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM	4,051		4,051
NSIP	Worldwide Unspecified	NATO SECURITY INVEST PROGRAM	NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM	201,400		201,400
Army	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	GROWING THE FORCE	1,608,129	-1,608,129	0
Army	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MINOR CONSTRUCTION	23,000		23,000
Army	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	HOST NATION SUPPORT	23,000		23,000
Army	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING & DESIGN (Other)	75,468	3,000	78,468
Army	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING & DESIGN (GROW THE FORCE)	383,000	-150,521	232,479
Navy	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	GROWING THE FORCE FACILITIES	381,120	-361,120	0
Air Force	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MINOR CONSTRUCTION	10,000		10,000
Air Force	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MINOR CONSTRUCTION	15,000		15,000
Air Force	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,200		2,200
Air Force	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	49,387	9,516	58,903
Defense Agencies	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	CLASSIFIED	1,887		1,887
Defense Agencies	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	ENERGY CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	70,000		70,000
Defense Agencies	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION	10,000		10,000
Defense Agencies	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MINOR CONSTRUCTION	3,499		3,499
Defense Agencies	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	666		666
Defense Agencies	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	8,753		8,753
Defense Agencies	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	3,000		3,000
Defense Agencies	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	3,400		3,400
Defense Agencies	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	26,749		26,749
Defense Agencies	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	NSA PLANNING AND DESIGN	35,900		35,900
Defense Agencies	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	77,000	-77,000	0
Army Guard	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	GROWING THE FORCE	8,700		8,700
Army Guard	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	26,841	6,755	33,596
Army Guard	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN (Other)	17,000	0	17,000
Air National Guard	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN (Grow the Force)	6,500		6,500
Air National Guard	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	7,965	1,000	8,965

57
53
53

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Amy Reserve	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	3,000		3,000
Amy Reserve	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	10,958	0	10,958
Naval Reserve	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,219		2,219
Navy	Worldwide Unspecified	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	WHARF UTILITIES UPGRADE	8,900		8,900
Navy	Worldwide Unspecified	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	HOST NATION INFRASTRUCTURE	2,700		2,700
Navy	Worldwide Unspecified	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN (Other)	88,375	2,000	90,375
Navy	Worldwide Unspecified	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING & DESIGN (Grow the Force)	21,792	0	21,792
Navy	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	Planning and Design (Transfer from Title XXIX)	7,491		7,491
Defense Agencies	Worldwide Unspecified	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	3,693		3,693
Defense Agencies	Worldwide Unspecified	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (S)	4,100		4,100
Defense Agencies	Worldwide Unspecified	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	69,000		69,000
Defense Agencies	Worldwide Unspecified	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	19,679		19,679
Air Force Reserve	Worldwide Unspecified	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	4,909		4,909
Air Force Reserve	Worldwide Unspecified	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING AND DESIGN	3,500		3,500
Fam House Con, A	Germany	ANSBACH	FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION	52,000		52,000
Fam House Con, A	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	99,400		99,400
Fam House Con, A	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS (Grow the Force)	266,000	-266,000	0
Fam House Con, A	Colorado	FORT CARSON	Family Housing Privatization (Grow the Force)		98,300	98,300
Fam House Con, A	North Carolina	FORT BRAGG	Family Housing Privatization (Grow the Force)		59,400	59,400
Fam House Con, A	Texas	FORT BLISS	Family Housing Privatization (Grow the Force)		35,600	35,600
Fam House Con, A	Washington	FORT LEWIS	Family Housing Privatization (Grow the Force)		72,700	72,700
Fam House Con, A	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FAMILY HOUSING P&D	2,000		2,000
Fam House Ops, A	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	145,366		145,366
Fam House Ops, A	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	OPERATIONS	128,289		128,289
Fam House Ops, A	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	OPERATIONS (Grow the Force)	11,000	0	11,000
Fam House Ops, A	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING	206,129		206,129
Fam House Ops, A	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	215,585		215,585
Fam House Ops, A	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS	35,694		35,694
Fam House Ops, A	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS (Grow the Force)	857	0	857
Fam House Con, N	Guam	GUAM	REPL GUAM OLD APRA PH II, MARIANAS	57,167	-10,000	47,167
Fam House Con, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	USMC GROUND FORCES AUGMENTATION	75,000		75,000
Fam House Con, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	IMPROVEMENTS	162,990		162,990
Fam House Con, N	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Improvements (Transfer from Title XXIX)		10,692	10,692
Fam House Con, N	California	TWENTYNINE PALMS	Improvements (Transfer from Title XXIX)		1,074	1,074
Fam House Con, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	DESIGN	3,172		3,172

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	41,802		41,802
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	14,962		14,962
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	59,422		59,422
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	640		640
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	SERVICES ACCOUNT	13,155		13,155
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING	141,757		141,757
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	70,678		70,678
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS	28,988		28,988
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING (117 UNITS)	56,275		56,275
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	294,211		294,211
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	CLASSIFIED PROJECT	51		51
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	PLANNING AND DESIGN	12,210		12,210
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	100,176		100,176
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	1,534		1,534
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	55,202		55,202
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	SERVICES ACCOUNT	20,673		20,673
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	43,472		43,472
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	1,960		1,960
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING ACCOUNT	1,485		1,485
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE ACCOUNT	112,909		112,909
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE (RMPA & RMP)	2,097		2,097
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	DEBT ACCOUNT	296,368		296,368
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	HOUSING PRIVATIZATION	1		1
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	52,458		52,458
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	445		445
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	34		34
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	4,274		4,274
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	SERVICES ACCOUNT	104		104
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	49		49
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	LEASING	410		410
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	10,534		10,534
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	32,662		32,662
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND	70		70
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	266		266
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND	500		500
Fam House Ops, N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, ARMY	73,716		73,716
BRAC, A	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE				

57
55
51

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
BRAC. N	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, NAVY	0	0	0
BRAC. AF	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, AIR FORCE	143,260	143,260	143,260
BRAC. D	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, DEFENSE AGENCIES	3,713	3,713	3,713
BRAC - Army	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE V, ARMY	4,015,746	4,015,746	4,015,746
BRAC - Navy	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE V, NAVY	733,695	733,695	733,695
BRAC - Air Force	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE V, AIR FORCE	1,183,812	1,183,812	1,183,812
BRAC - Def Aq	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE V, DEFENSE AGENCIES	2,241,062	2,241,062	2,241,062
Air Force Reserve	Alaska	ELMENDORF AFB	FY2006 PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS (Section 2608)	0	-3,100	-3,100
TOTAL TITLES XXI-XXVII AND XXIX				21,165,182	616,190	21,781,372

Budget justification material for incrementally funded and phased military construction projects

The committee defines an incrementally funded military construction project as having received an authorization for the full amount of the requirement in the first year, but only a partial authorization of appropriation for the project to provide funds for expected outlays against the project for that specific year. In contrast, a phased project receives authorization for a complete and useable facility or facilities as part of a total requirement, which may need more than one military construction project to complete.

The committee notes that the military departments and defense agencies do not always use the same format to submit budget justification material to the Congress. With respect to each phased requirement, or each incrementally funded military construction project, the committee requests that the budget justification documents for military construction projects (known as the DD1391 form) include, with respect to a phased requirement or any increment of an incrementally funded project, the entire cost of the requirement as well as the cost, by fiscal year, of each past and future phase or increment, in addition to the amount requested for the phase or increment contained in the budget request.

In the fiscal year 2008 budget request, the DD1391 forms for incrementally funded Army and Air Force projects generally contained all this information, while those for the Navy and certain defense agencies, such as the National Security Agency, did not. The committee suggests the table included in the justification material provided by the Air Force for increment 3 of the Main Base Runway project at Edwards Air Force Base, California as a model for presenting this information.

Budget justification material for military construction

The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) prepares and transmits budget justification material to the Congress describing the budget request of the Department of Defense. Among these documents are line item level descriptions of the budget request for military personnel, operation and maintenance, procurement, research and development, and military construction accounts, known respectively as the M-1, O-1, P-1, R-1, and C-1. With the exception of the C-1 for military construction, all of these documents include a listing of the funding amounts by program for the prior year as well as the current year and the budget year. The C-1 includes information only for the current year and the budget year. However, prior to the fiscal year 2000 budget request, the C-1 also included information for the prior year. The committee believes a public record of the amounts actually obligated as of the end of the fiscal year serves a useful purpose and requests that beginning with the budget request for fiscal year 2009 the C-1 once again include information on the prior year amounts for each line item.

Short title (sec. 2001)

The committee recommends a provision that would designate division B of this Act as the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008.

TITLE XXI—ARMY

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of \$4.0 billion for military construction and \$1.2 billion for family housing for the Army for fiscal year 2008.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of \$4.1 billion for military construction and \$1.2 billion for family housing for fiscal year 2008.

The budget request included “placeholders” in the Army’s military construction and family housing budget accounts of \$2.4 billion related to facilities to support the administration’s “Grow the Force” proposal to increase the size of the Army. On March 30, 2007, the Army provided a detailed breakout and supporting budget justification materials to the committee requesting a specific allocation of these funds. While this was not an official administration budget amendment, the committee has reviewed this request and included these proposed changes in the committee recommendation. These projects are identified in the State list table included in this report.

The committee recommends the following reductions and modifications to projects requested by the Army. The committee has deleted \$1.0 million included in a defense access road project at Fort Carson, Colorado which was unrelated to the project for which funds were requested.

The committee has also reduced the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2008 for two projects requested to support the stationing of a full brigade complex at Vicenza, Italy. The budget requested \$86.0 million for a barracks and community facilities project and an additional \$87.0 million for an operations support complex. The committee values the strong relationship between the United States and Italy, but notes with concern that the proposal to expand into these facilities at Dal Molin has yet to receive the required approvals from the Government of Italy. Therefore, the committee recommends these projects be incrementally funded at \$50.0 million each in fiscal year 2008. Should host nation approval not be forthcoming in a timely manner, further reductions in this funding may be warranted.

The congressional defense committees and the Department of Defense have traditionally analyzed requirements and funding for mission projects and quality of life projects as important and distinct categories. Several projects requested by the Army blur these traditional distinctions. The funding requested for a headquarters facility for the U.S. Southern Command in Miami included funding for a child development center inside the overall project cost for the headquarters. Funding requested for a brigade complex maintenance facility at Fort Drum, New York combined funding for a dining facility with funding for mission-oriented projects such as vehi-

cle maintenance shops. The committee has separated these mission and quality of life requests into separate projects. The committee accepts the practice of combining dining facilities with other quality of life projects such as unaccompanied housing. However, the committee directs the Army, and the other elements of the Department of Defense, to refrain from combining mission facilities and quality of life facilities into single project requests in future budget submissions.

Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the active component of the Army for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Family housing (sec. 2102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2008. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices and housing maintenance and storage facilities.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2103)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funding for fiscal year 2008 to improve existing Army family housing units.

Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Army authorized for construction for fiscal year 2008 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty component of the Army. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Termination of authority to carry out fiscal year 2007 Army projects for which funds were not appropriated (sec. 2105)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the project authorizations and authorization of appropriations for military construction projects authorized in fiscal year 2007 for which no funds were appropriated. No appropriations were provided in fiscal year 2007 for projects that were authorized but were not included in the President's original budget request. The entire list of fiscal year 2007 active Army projects for which the authorizations would be repealed follows. The committee has provided new authorizations for some of these projects for fiscal year 2008. Details on the projects that received new fiscal year 2008 authorizations can be found in the State list of fiscal year 2008 projects contained in this report.

The committee urges the Department of Defense and the military departments to review any projects on this list that are not authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2008 and re-insert those projects, if the requirements are still valid, in the fiscal year 2009 future-years defense program.

TERMINATION OF FY2007 AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	Location	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	FY 2007 Conference Authorization	Authorization Amount Terminated
Army	Alabama	Redstone Arsenal	Software Engineering Annex, Phase 2	20,000	20,000	20,000
Army	Alabama	Redstone Arsenal	Explosive Cargo Handling Apron	2,300	2,300	2,300
Army	Alabama	Redstone Arsenal	Child Development Center	2,000	2,000	2,000
Army	Alaska	Fort Wainwright	Railhead Operations Facility	8,800	8,800	8,800
Army	California	Fort Irwin	Child Development Center	8,200	8,200	8,200
Army	Colorado	Fort Carson	Utility Upgrades, Phase 1	6,800	6,800	6,800
Army	Kansas	Fort Riley	Vehicle Inspection/Cargo Processing Facility	10,200	10,200	10,200
Army	Kansas	Fort Leavenworth	Child Development Center	8,200	8,200	8,200
Army	Kentucky	Fort Campbell	Warrior Rehabilitation/Fitness Center	11,800	11,800	11,800
Army	Kentucky	Fort Campbell	Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Facility	8,100	8,100	8,100
Army	Louisiana	Fort Polk	Construct Brigade Facility (4th BDE 10th HQ)	9,800	9,800	9,800
Army	Louisiana	Fort Polk	Child Development Center	6,100	6,100	6,100
Army	Maryland	Fort Detrick	Research Acquisition Building	12,400	12,400	12,400
Army	Maryland	Aberdeen PG	Automotive Technology Evaluation Facility, Ph 1	8,800	8,800	8,800
Army	Michigan	Detroit Arsenal	Ground System Power and Energy Lab	18,500	18,500	18,500
Army	Missouri	Fort Leonard Wood	Vehicle Maintenance Shop - 58th Trans Bn	10,600	10,600	10,600
Army	Missouri	Fort Leonard Wood	Child Development Center	6,900	6,900	6,900
Army	New Jersey	Picatinny Arsenal	Armament Integration Facility	9,900	9,900	9,900
Army	New York	Fort Drum	Automated Qualification Training Range	9,400	9,400	9,400
Army	North Carolina	Fort Bragg	Child Development Center	7,900	7,900	7,900
Army	Pennsylvania	Leiterkenny Depot	Construct Port Staging Facility	7,500	7,500	7,500
Army	Texas	Fort Hood	CH-47 Maintenance Hangar	18,000	18,000	18,000
Army	Texas	Corpus Christi Depot	Aircraft Component Maintenance Shop	12,200	12,200	12,200
Army	Texas	Fort Bliss	Physical Fitness Center	8,200	8,200	8,200
Army	Texas	Red River Depot	Construct Maneuver Sys Sustainment Ctr, Ph 1	6,000	6,000	6,000
Army	Virginia	Fort Lee	Deployment Staging Area	4,150	4,150	4,150
Army Authorization Terminations						242,750

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2006 project (sec. 2106)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (division B of Public Law 109–163) to increase the project authorizations for Fort Bragg, North Carolina by \$7.0 million. This increase was requested by the Department of Defense in its legislative proposal to the Congress.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2107)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain Army fiscal year 2005 military construction projects until October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Department of Defense in their legislative proposal to the Congress.

Technical amendments to the Military Construction Authorization Act for 2007 (sec. 2108)

The committee recommends a provision that would make two corrections to the table of project authorizations in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–364). One amendment would modify the name of a specific location of a project in Romania to reflect a modification of the original plan. This modification was proposed by the Army and understood by the conferees prior to the adoption of the fiscal year 2007 legislation. The second amendment would correct an enrolling error and align the text of the public law with the text of the conference report.

Ground lease, SOUTHCOM Headquarters Facility, Miami-Doral, Florida (sec. 2109)

The committee recommends a provision that would require amendments to the existing ground lease agreement between the United States Government and the State of Florida for the land proposed as the site of a new headquarters for the U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) before the Secretary of the Army could begin construction of the headquarters. The committee is concerned that the existing agreement does not allow sufficient flexibility for the use of this facility by other federal agencies in the event future requirements change, and that the lease term should be a more standard 50-year period, rather than 20 years with options for extensions as under the current agreement. The committee understands the State is willing to make these modifications to the lease agreement.

Item of Special Interest

Army budget justification material for military construction

The military departments and defense agencies prepare detailed justification documents for each military construction project and transmit these to the Congress as part of the annual budget justification materials. These documents are known as DD1391 forms.

The budget justification materials submitted by the Army in February in support of the fiscal year 2008 budget contained, in 44 different projects, an assertion that “Title to utility infrastructure constructed as a result of this MILCON project may be transferred to the utility privatization contractor notwithstanding any other provision of law.”

The committee appreciates any attempt to make the DD1391 forms as informative as possible. However, the committee notes that an executive branch assertion in a budget justification document of a right to take an action “notwithstanding any other provision of law” has no force and effect and does not create any such right. Committee approval in this Act of funding for any Army military construction project containing this phrase does not constitute an endorsement or acceptance of any right by the Army to take actions contrary to existing law. The committee directs the Army to refrain from inserting such an assertion into DD1391 forms in the future.

TITLE XXII—NAVY

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of \$2.1 billion for military construction and \$669.7 million for family housing for the Department of the Navy for fiscal year 2008 in the base budget request, plus an additional \$169.1 million in emergency funding for projects to support increasing the size of the Marine Corps.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of \$2.4 billion for military construction and \$671.5 million for family housing for fiscal year 2008. Included in this amount is the \$169.1 million which was requested as emergency funding. The committee has transferred funding for these projects from title XXIX of this Act and included these projects in the regular State list on a non-emergency basis. These transfers are identified in the State list.

The budget request also included “placeholders” in the Navy’s military construction and family housing budget accounts of \$382.9 million related to facilities to support the administration’s “Grow the Force” proposal to increase the size of the Marine Corps. On April 20, 2007, the Navy provided a detailed breakout and supporting budget justification materials to the committee requesting a specific allocation of these funds. While this was not an official administration budget amendment, the committee has reviewed this request and included these proposed changes in the committee recommendation. These projects are identified in the State list table included in this report.

The committee recommends the following reductions and modifications to projects requested by the Navy. The committee has deleted \$18.1 million requested for an infantry squad battle course at Camp Pendleton, California. The budget justification material for this project indicated that only about 9 percent of the cost of this project was for the primary facility, while the rest was for supporting facilities and extensive site work and mitigation. The committee urges the Navy to find a more efficient way to construct this project.

The committee has also deleted funding requested for the Outlying Landing Field (OLF) project in Washington County, North Carolina. The committee is aware that the Navy is in the process of reconsidering the siting for this project. The committee has added funding for an expanded environmental impact statement that would evaluate other potential sites in title III of this Act.

The committee is concerned by the cost of the \$45.3 million request for a fitness center in Guam. In particular, the committee considers the \$5.3 million requested for an outdoor running track to be excessive in light of the \$7.9 million already included in the project for a lighted synthetic field, which would appear to be a suitable alternative for jogging.

The committee is also concerned by the cost of proposed family housing construction in Guam. The budget requests \$57.2 million for just 73 units in Guam, which equates to a per unit cost of \$783,198 per building including site work and utilities. The average unit cost of the dwelling units alone is \$437,562. The committee understands that construction costs in Guam are very high, but finds these unit costs unacceptable and has accordingly reduced this request by \$10.0 million. The proposal to relocate 8,000 marines from Okinawa to Guam over the next several years will not be affordable, even with cost sharing between the United States and the Government of Japan, at these prices.

Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Navy and Marine Corps military construction projects for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Family housing (sec. 2202)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2008. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices and housing maintenance and storage facilities.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funding for fiscal year 2008 to improve existing Navy family housing units.

Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Department of the Navy authorized for construction for fiscal year 2008 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty components of the Navy and the Marine Corps. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Termination of authority to carry out fiscal year 2007 Navy projects for which funds were not appropriated (sec. 2205)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the project authorizations and authorization of appropriations for military construction projects authorized in fiscal year 2007 for which no funds were appropriated. No appropriations were provided in fiscal year 2007 for projects that were authorized but were not included in the President's original budget request.

The entire list of fiscal year 2007 active Navy projects for which the authorizations would be repealed follows. The committee has provided new authorizations for some of these projects for fiscal

year 2008. Details on the projects that received new fiscal year 2008 authorizations can be found in the State list of fiscal year 2008 projects contained in this report.

The committee urges the Department of Defense and the military departments to review any projects on this list that are not authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2008 and re-insert those projects, if the requirements are still valid, in the fiscal year 2009 future-years defense program.

TERMINATION OF FY2007 AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	Location	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	FY 2007 Conference Authorization	Authorization Amount Terminated
Navy	California	MCB 29 Palms	MOUT Facility, Phase 2		19,000	19,000
Navy	California	NSA Monterey	Global Weather Ops Center Expansion		7,380	7,380
Navy	Connecticut	NSB New London	Waterfront Operations Small Craft Facility		9,580	9,580
Navy	Florida	Cape Canaveral	Engineering Services Facility		9,900	9,900
Navy	Georgia	MCLB Albany	Combat Vehicle Warehouse		4,960	4,960
Navy	Georgia	Blount Island	Waterfront Operations Facility		3,580	3,580
Navy	Hawaii	NSY Pearl Harbor	Dry Dock Ship Support Services		22,000	22,000
Navy	Hawaii	NAVMAG Pearl Harbor	Fire Station		6,010	6,010
Navy	Indiana	NSA Crane	Special Weapons Assessment Facility		6,730	6,730
Navy	Maine	NSY Portsmouth	Drydock #3 Waterfront Support Facility		9,650	9,650
Navy	Mississippi	NAS Meridian	Construct Fire Station		5,870	5,870
Navy	Nevada	NAS Fallon	Improve Range B-20		7,730	7,730
Navy	North Carolina	MCAS Cherry Point	Commercial Power/Cargo Refueling Lane		2,790	2,790
Navy	Rhode Island	NS Newport	Replace Vehicle Bridge, Incr 2*		3,410	3,410
Navy	South Carolina	MCAS Beaufort	Nuclear/Bio/Chem Facility		3,350	3,350
Navy	Virginia	NSA Norfolk	JFCOM Headquarters Building		13,250	13,250
Navy	Virginia	NSWC Dahlgren	Construct Electromagnetic Launch RDT&E Fac		9,850	9,850
Navy	Washington	NAS Whidbey Island	Indoor Aircraft Washrack		9,650	9,650
Navy	Washington	NB Kitsap	Ocean Engineering Support Facility		4,110	4,110
Navy Housing	Worldwide	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements (29 Palms)	176,446	180,146	3,700
Navy Authorization Terminations						162,500

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of \$912.1 million for military construction and \$1.1 billion for family housing for the Air Force in fiscal year 2008.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of \$1.0 billion for military construction and \$1.1 billion for family housing for fiscal year 2008.

Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Air Force military construction projects for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Family housing (sec. 2302)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2008. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices and housing maintenance and storage facilities.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funding for fiscal year 2008 to improve existing Air Force family housing units.

Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Air Force authorized for construction for fiscal year 2008 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty component of the Air Force. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Termination of authority to carry out fiscal year 2007 Air Force projects for which funds were not appropriated (sec. 2305)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the project authorizations and authorization of appropriations for military construction projects authorized in fiscal year 2007 for which no funds were appropriated. No appropriations were provided in fiscal year 2007 for projects that were authorized but were not included in the President's original budget request. The entire list of fiscal year 2007 active Air Force projects for which the authoriza-

tions would be repealed follows. The committee has provided new authorizations for some of these projects for fiscal year 2008. Details on the projects that received new fiscal year 2008 authorizations can be found in the State list of fiscal year 2008 projects contained in this report. The committee urges the Department of Defense and the military departments to review any projects on this list that are not authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2008 and re-insert those projects, if the requirements are still valid, in the fiscal year 2009 future-years defense program.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2006 project (sec. 2306)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2301 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (division B of Public Law 109–163) to increase the project authorizations for MacDill Air Force Base, Florida by \$25.0 million. This increase was requested by the Department of Defense in its legislative proposal to the Congress.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2307)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain Air Force fiscal year 2005 military construction projects until October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Air Force.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2004 projects (sec. 2308)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain Air Force fiscal year 2004 military construction projects until October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Department of Defense in their legislative proposal to the Congress.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of \$1.8 billion for military construction for the defense agencies, \$49.3 million for family housing for the defense agencies and the Family Housing Improvement Fund, and \$86.2 million for chemical demilitarization construction in fiscal year 2008.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of \$1.9 billion for military construction and \$49.3 million for family housing for the defense agencies and the Family Housing Improvement Fund for fiscal year 2008. These amounts include the funding for chemical demilitarization construction.

The Department of Defense requested funding for chemical demilitarization as a new separate funding title. The committee bill funds this program in title XXIV, as in previous years. The funding tables reflect the elimination of the \$86.2 million request from the proposed new title, the transfer of these funds into title XXIV, the net increase of \$18.0 million to this program, and the total of \$104.2 million authorized in this title for chemical demilitarization construction.

The committee does not agree to authorize the \$18.5 million requested by the Washington Headquarters Service for electrical upgrades for the Pentagon Reservation. The committee invites the Department of Defense to resubmit a modified version of this project in future years once the Department has reached agreement with the relevant electric utility companies on a more comprehensive approach that fulfills all the objectives this project was intended to address.

Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Energy conservation projects (sec. 2402)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2403)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the military construction and family housing projects of the defense agencies authorized for construction for fiscal year 2008 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction

and family housing projects for the defense agencies. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Termination or modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2007 Defense Agencies projects (sec. 2404)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the project authorizations and authorization of appropriations for military construction projects authorized in fiscal year 2007 for which no funds were appropriated. The provision would also increase the authorized amount for prior year base realignment and closure (BRAC) funding for fiscal year 2007 to authorize the additional amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2007.

No appropriations were provided in fiscal year 2007 for projects that were authorized but were not included in the President's original budget request. The entire list of fiscal year 2007 projects of the defense agencies for which the authorizations would be repealed follows.

The committee has provided new authorizations for some of these projects for fiscal year 2008. Details on the projects that received new fiscal year 2008 authorizations can be found in the State list of fiscal year 2008 projects contained in this report. The committee urges the Department of Defense and the military departments to review any projects on this list that are not authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2008 and re-insert those projects, if the requirements are still valid, in the fiscal year 2009 future-years defense program.

TERMINATION OF FY2007 AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	Location	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	FY 2007 Conference Authorization	Authorization Amount Terminated
Defense Agency: Mississippi		Stennis Space Center	Riverine and Combat Craft Operations Facility		10,200	10,200
Defense Agency: North Carolina		Fort Bragg	SOF Communications Training Facility		6,900	6,900
Defense Agency: Kentucky		Blue Grass Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Phase 7	89,157	99,157	10,000
			Defense Agency Authorization Terminations			27,100

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2405)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain defense agency fiscal year 2005 military construction projects until October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Department of Defense in their legislative proposal to the Congress.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriation of \$201.4 million for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2008. The committee recommends an authorization of appropriation of \$201.4 million for this program. The committee notes that a significant portion of the NATO Security Investment Program is currently devoted to support of the NATO mission in Afghanistan, and expects that a significant portion of the funding for fiscal year 2008 would be used to continue those efforts.

Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this title and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations of \$201.4 million for the United States' contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2008.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of \$695.2 million for military construction in fiscal year 2008 for National Guard and reserve facilities. The committee recommends a total of \$895.3 million for military construction for the reserve components. The detailed funding recommendations are contained in the State list table included in this report.

Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Army National Guard for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2602)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Army Reserve for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2603)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2604)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Air National Guard for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2605)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Air Force Reserve for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorization of appropriations, Guard and Reserve (sec. 2606)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the reserve component military construction projects authorized for construction for fiscal year 2008 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction projects for each of the reserve components of the military departments. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Termination of authority to carry out fiscal year 2007 Guard and Reserve projects for which funds were not appropriated (sec. 2607)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the project authorizations and authorization of appropriations for military construction projects authorized in fiscal year 2007 for which no funds were appropriated. No appropriations were provided in fiscal year 2007 for projects that were authorized but were not included in the President's original budget request. The entire list of fiscal year 2007 reserve component projects for which the authorizations would be repealed follows. The committee has provided new authorizations for some of these projects for fiscal year 2008. Details on the projects that received new fiscal year 2008 authorizations can be found in the State list of fiscal year 2008 projects contained in this report. The committee urges the Department of Defense and the military departments to review any projects on this list that are not authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2008 and re-insert those projects, if the requirements are still valid, in the fiscal year 2009 future-years defense program.

TERMINATION OF FY2007 AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	Location	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	FY 2007 Conference Authorization	Authorization Amount Terminated
Amy Guard	Arizona	Florence	Field Maintenance Shop		10,870	10,870
Amy Guard	Florida	Camp Blanding	Regional Training Institute, Phase 3		14,800	14,800
Amy Guard	Idaho	Gowen Field	Construct Railroad, Phase 2		6,964	6,964
Amy Guard	Iowa	Iowa City	Construct Readiness Center		10,724	10,724
Amy Guard	Kentucky	London	Readiness Center		2,500	2,500
Amy Guard	Michigan	Lansing	USPFO/Readiness Center Phase 2		4,239	4,239
Amy Guard	Minnesota	Camp Ripley	Urban Assault Course		1,700	1,700
Amy Guard	Mississippi	Camp Shelby	Joint Use Simulation Center		14,839	14,839
Amy Guard	Pennsylvania	Waynesburg	Readiness Center		8,012	8,012
Amy Guard	Rhode Island	East Greenwich	Combined Support Maintenance Shop	27,472	29,547	2,075
Amy Guard	Virginia	Winchester	Organizational Maintenance Shop		3,113	3,113
Amy Guard	West Virginia	Camp Dawson	Multi-Purpose Building		4,842	4,842
Amy National Guard Authorization Terminations						84,678
Air Guard	Alabama	Birmingham IAP	Alert Quarters Mobility Complex		4,500	4,500
Air Guard	California	Fresno/Yosemite	Replace Squadron Operations Facility		9,800	9,800
Air Guard	Colorado	Buckley AFB	Replace Squadron Ops Facility		7,000	7,000
Air Guard	Colorado	Buckley AFB	Air Sovereignty Alert Crew Quarters		3,100	3,100
Air Guard	Georgia	Savannah CRTC	Troop Training Quarters		8,700	8,700
Air Guard	Iowa	Fort Dodge	Vehicle Maint Communications Training Center		5,600	5,600
Air Guard	Maryland	Martin State Airport	Fire/Rescue Station		8,800	8,800
Air Guard	Massachusetts	Barnes ANGB	Add/Alt Fire Crash Rescue Station		7,000	7,000
Air Guard	Montana	Great Falls	Replace Operation and Training Facility		9,600	9,600
Air Guard	Nevada	Reno-Tahoe IAP	Vehicle Maintenance Complex		5,000	5,000
Air Guard	New Jersey	Atlantic City IAP	Arm/Disarm Apron		1,800	1,800
Air Guard	New York	Hancock Field	Upgrade Base Facilities		8,000	8,000

TERMINATION OF FY2007 AUTHORIZATIONS

Account	Location	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	FY 2007 Conference Authorization	Authorization Amount Terminated
Air Guard	New York	Griffiss	Construct NEADS Support Facility, Phase 2	6,600	6,600	6,600
Air Guard	Ohio	Rickenbacker ANG Base	Security Forces Complex/Communications Building		7,200	7,200
Air Guard	Pennsylvania	Fort Indiantown Gap	Operations and Training Facility		6,000	6,000
Air Guard	South Dakota	Joe Foss Field	Replace Civil Engineer Maintenance Complex		7,500	7,500
Air Guard	Tennessee	McChase Tyson	Replace Squadron Operations Facility		11,200	11,200
Air Guard	Vermont	Burlington	Improve Base Security, Phase 1		6,000	6,000
Air Guard	West Virginia	Yeager	Replace Aircraft Maintenance Hangar		17,300	17,300
Air Guard	West Virginia	Martinsburg ANGS	Construct C-5 Avionics Shop, ASE, Aerial Port		5,000	5,000
Air Guard	Wisconsin	Truax Field	Add/Alt Fire Crash Rescue Station		7,000	7,000
Air Guard	Wyoming	Cheyenne Airport	Replace Squadron Operations Facility		7,600	7,600
Air National Guard Authorization Terminations						160,300
Army Reserve	Nebraska	North Platte	Reserve Center/OMS/AMSA/Storage		7,630	7,630
Army Reserve	Texas	Ellington Field	Construct Armed Forces Reserve Ctr, Ph 2		15,000	15,000
Army Reserve Authorization Terminations						22,630
Naval Reserve	Texas	NAS/JRB Fort Worth	Joint Multi-Level Parking Facility		6,500	6,500
Navy Reserve Authorization Terminations						6,500
Air Force Reservist Florida		Patrick AFB	ISO/Phase Dock Extension, Hangar 630		3,000	3,000
Air Force Reservist Minnesota		Minneapolis-St. Paul IAP	Aerial Port Facility		6,400	6,400
Air Force Reserve Authorization Terminations						9,400

Modification of authority to carry out fiscal year 2006 Air Force Reserve construction and acquisition projects (sec. 2608)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the authorization for a fiscal year 2006 Air Force Reserve project to convert a hanger into a headquarters for a C-17 unit at Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska. Earlier this year, the Air Force submitted a reprogramming request to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives seeking to use this \$3.1 million in funding for a project supporting the F-22 program rather than the C-17 program. The committee does not believe that construction of facilities not authorized by law is an appropriate use of existing authorities. The reprogramming was not approved, and the Air Force later turned to an existing statutory authority to construct the F-22 project. Therefore, the funding proposed by the Air Force as a source of funds is no longer required. The committee has included a separate legislative provision to address the reprogramming process more generally.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2609)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain guard and reserve fiscal year 2005 military construction projects until October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Department of Defense in their legislative proposal to the Congress.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2004 projects (sec. 2610)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain guard and reserve fiscal year 2004 military construction projects until October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Department of Defense in their legislative proposal to the Congress.

Items of Special Interest

Planning and design, Army National Guard

The committee directs that the amount of \$3.5 million, added to the authorization of appropriations for planning and design for the Army National Guard, be used to complete the design of the Joint Forces Headquarters for the Minnesota National Guard at the Arden Hills Army Training Site, and that \$960,000 added to this account be used to complete the design of a readiness center in The Dalles, Oregon.

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

Summary and explanation of tables

The budget request included \$220.7 million for the ongoing cost of environmental remediation and other activities necessary to continue implementation of the 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) rounds. The committee has authorized the amount requested for these activities in section 2701 of this Act.

In addition, the budget requested an authorization of appropriations of \$8.2 billion for implementation of the 2005 BRAC round. Section 2703 of this Act authorizes the full \$8.2 billion requested for BRAC activities in fiscal year 2008. Included in the \$8.2 billion requested for BRAC is an authorization of appropriations for \$6.4 billion in military construction projects that would be initiated in fiscal year 2008. The full project authorization amount of these projects is \$8.7 billion. Section 2702 of this Act provides the authorization for these projects.

The following table provides the specific amount authorized for each BRAC military construction project as well as the amount authorized for appropriations for all BRAC activities, including military construction, environmental costs, relocation and other operation and maintenance costs, permanent change of station costs for military personnel, and other BRAC costs.

TITLE XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Commission Number</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Project Authorization</u>	<u>Authorization of Appropriation</u>
Air Force	80 110	Elmendorf AFB, AK	AK	Aircraft Maintenance Complex	11,400	11,400
Air Force	80 110	Elmendorf AFB, AK	AK	Ops and Med Training	12,200	12,200
Air Force	80 110	Elmendorf AFB, AK	AK	Composite Support Complex	9,600	9,600
Army	11	JFHQ Montgomery	AL	Headquarters Building, Joint Forces	36,100	36,100
Army	148	Redstone Arsenal	AL	AMC & USASAC Headquarters Increment 1	127,000	30,000
MDA	134	Redstone Arsenal, AL	AL	Construct Von Braun Complex	221,800	73,600
Army	13	Arkadelphia	AR	Armed Forces Reserve Center	12,200	12,200
Army	13	Fort Chaffee	AR	Vehicle Maintenance Facility, Joint Forces	31,300	31,300
Air Force	92 93 103	Little Rock AFB, AR	AR	AGE / Engine Facility	2,800	2,800
Army	73	AFRC Bell	CA	Armed Forces Reserve Center, Increment 2	22,100	22,100
Navy	184	China Lake	CA	Fuse Test Facility	9,476	9,476
Navy	184	China Lake	CA	Hardware In the Loop Facility	13,890	13,890
Navy	188	China Lake	CA	Fixed Wing Transfer Facility/AF	8,600	8,600
Navy	71	NS San Diego	CA	Renovate COMINELWARCOM HQ	19,558	19,558
Navy	71	NS San Diego	CA	Child Development Center	7,079	7,079
Navy	71	NWS Seal Beach	CA	MOMAU 15 Collocation to Building 78	5,150	5,150
Navy	71	NS San Diego	CA	Upgrade Magnetic Silencing Facility for MCMs	6,000	6,000
Army	6	Fort Carson	CO	Hospital Addition	27,000	27,000
Army	6	Fort Carson	CO	Troop Health Clinic	54,000	54,000
Army	6	Fort Carson	CO	Brigade Combat Team Complex, Increment 3	-	90,000
Army	6	Fort Carson	CO	Division Headquarters Complex, Increment 2	-	20,000
Army	6	Fort Carson	CO	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	13,200	13,200
Air Force	91 143B	Buckley AFB, CO	CO	Utility Infrastructure Construction	10,080	10,080
CIFA	131	Peterson AFB, CO	CO	CIFA West Office Building	2,363	2,363
Army	4	Eglin Air Force Base	FL	Indoor Firing Range	4,850	4,850
Army	4	Eglin Air Force Base	FL	Live Fire Exercise Shoothouse	3,300	3,300
Army	4	Eglin Air Force Base	FL	Live Fire Exercise Breach Facility	3,750	3,750
Army	4	Eglin Air Force Base	FL	Shotgun Assault Course	3,000	3,000
Army	4	Eglin Air Force Base	FL	Grenade Launcher Range	1,050	1,050
Army	4	Eglin Air Force Base	FL	Hand Grenade Qualification Course	1,000	1,000
Army	4	Eglin Air Force Base	FL	Urban Assault Course	1,500	1,500
Navy	65	Jacksonville	FL	Hangar/Parking Apron	-	19,761

TITLE XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Commission Number</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Project Authorization</u>	<u>Authorization of Appropriation</u>
Air Force	104	MacDill AFB, FL	FL	AFR CE and Disaster Prep Training	3,500	3,500
Air Force	104	MacDill AFB, FL	FL	AFR FF Admin/Training	1,150	1,150
Air Force	104	MacDill AFB, FL	FL	AFR Aeromedical Stag Sqd Training	3,150	3,150
Air Force	104	MacDill AFB, FL	FL	AFR Comm Squadron Training	940	940
Air Force	104	MacDill AFB, FL	FL	AFR Add Services Flight Training	840	840
Air Force	104	MacDill AFB, FL	FL	AFR SF Squadron Training	2,200	2,200
Air Force	113 115	Homestead ARB, FL	FL	AFRC Add Avionics and ECM Shop	2,150	2,150
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB, FL	FL	JSF Academic Simulator Facility	26,000	26,000
Air Force	125	Eglin AFB, FL	FL	USMC Hangar	16,800	16,800
Air Force	128	NAS Pensacola, FL	FL	AF CSO Training Hangar	36,500	36,500
Air Force	128	NAS Pensacola, FL	FL	CSO Training Facility	13,000	13,000
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Troop Health Clinic - Winder, Sand Hill	5,100	5,100
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Troop Health Clinic - Harmony Church	16,000	16,000
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Troop Dental Clinic - Solomon, Sand Hill	3,550	3,550
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Modified Record Fire Range 2	4,500	4,500
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Modified Record Fire Range 1	4,500	4,500
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	23,000	23,000
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	General Instruction Complex 1	24,000	24,000
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Training Aid Support Center Conversion	3,800	3,800
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Infrastructure Support Increment 1	148,000	74,000
Army	9	Fort Benning	GA	Training Support Brigade Complex Increment 2	73,000	73,000
Army	62	Fort Gillem	GA	RIA-14 Facility	3,764	3,764
Navy	79 103	Moody AFB, GA	GA	Dormitory, 120-PN	14,000	14,000
Air Force	87	Robins AFB, GA	GA	Relocate 202 EIS Ops	1,700	1,700
Army	18	Keauhaha	HI	Armed Forces Reserve Center	49,200	49,200
Army	162	Iowa AAP	IA	Industrial Waste Treatment Plant	3,000	3,000
Air Force	106	Cheyenne MAP AGS, ID	WY	Squadron Operations Addition	3,200	3,200
Army	19	Lake County	IL	Armed Forces Reserve Center	25,000	25,000
Army	19	Mt Vernon Armory	IL	Armed Forces Reserve Center	26,400	26,400
Army	151	Rock Island Arsenal	IL	Metal Parts Production Add/Alt	10,600	10,600
Air Force	142	Scott AFB, IL	IL	HQ USTRANSCOM Facilities	83,800	83,800
Army	20	Lafayette	IN	Armed Forces Reserve Center	28,605	28,605

TITLE XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

Agency	Commission Number	Location	State	Project	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Army	10	Fort Riley	KS	Combat Aviation Brigade Complex Increment 2	-	109,000
Army	9	Fort Knox	KY	Armed Forces Reserve Center Phase 1	12,000	12,000
Army	143	Fort Knox	KY	Human Resources Command Cplx, Ph 2 Incr 1	-	55,000
Army	23	Baton Rouge	LA	Armed Forces Reserve Center	40,666	40,666
Army	73	Baton Rouge	LA	Armed Forces Reserve Center	8,000	8,000
Navy	64	NAS/JRB New Orleans	LA	Flag Housing	1,527	1,527
Navy	64	NAS/JRB New Orleans	LA	Library	3,377	3,377
Navy	64	NAS/JRB New Orleans	LA	Recreation Center	2,186	2,186
Navy	64	NAS/JRB New Orleans	LA	General Administrative Building	9,158	9,158
Navy	64	NAS/JRB New Orleans	LA	Veterinary Facility	806	806
Air Force	108	New Orleans ARS, NAS New Or JRB	LA	Relocate 214 EIS Ops	1,200	1,200
Air Force	94	Barnes MPT AGS, MA	MA	Add To Munitions Site	5,000	5,000
Air Force	94	Barnes MPT AGS, MA	MA	ASA Alert Complex	16,500	16,500
Army	5	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	C4ISR Facilities Phase 3, Increment 1	245,000	141,000
Army	5	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	C4ISR (2WD) Facilities Phase 2	104,000	104,000
Army	169	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	Medical Research Lab, Chem Bio Defense	27,000	27,000
Army	187	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	Research Lab, Army	2,900	2,900
Navy	184	Indian Head	MD	Explosives Development Facility	28,789	28,789
Air Force	129	Andrews AFB, MD	MD	HQ & Readiness Center (Increment 1)	51,000	28,000
DISA	140	Fort Meade, MD	MD	Construct DISA Building	151,994	151,994
NSA	130	Fort Meade, MD	MD	Construct Adjudication Facility	94	94
TMA	169	WRNMMC Bethesda	MD	MEDCEN Add/Alt Increment 1	497,000	214,800
Navy	65	Kittery	ME	SERE School and Addition to Building B315	12,740	12,740
Navy	65	Brunswick	ME	NMNCB 27 Facilities	9,295	9,295
Air Force	95	Selfridge ANG, MI	MI	Add to Fuel/Corrosion Control	1,050	1,050
Army	27	Fort Belvoir, MO	MO	Armed Forces Reserve Center	16,000	16,000
Army	28	AFRC Jefferson Brk	MO	Armed Forces Reserve Center	27,100	27,100
Army	29	Missoula Army	MT	Armed Forces Reserve Center	19,200	19,200
Air Force	94	Great Falls IAP AGS, MT	MT	Upgrade Munitions Storage	3,300	3,300
Army	4	Fort Bragg	NC	Troop Medical Clinic	16,500	16,500
Air Force	103	Pope AFB, NC	NC	Reconfigure Base Supply Building 560	796	796
Air Force	103	Pope AFB, NC	NC	Reconfigure Wing HQ Bldg 753	778	778

TITLE XXVII – BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Commission Number</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Project Authorization</u>	<u>Authorization of Appropriation</u>
Air Force	104 119	Seymour Johnson AFB, NC	NC	Fitness Center Addition B4210	1,600	1,600
Air Force	104 119	Seymour Johnson AFB, NC	NC	Recreation Center Addition Bldg 3728	820	820
Air Force	104 119	Seymour Johnson AFB, NC	NC	Construct Flightline Kitchen Facility	960	960
Air Force	104	Grand Forks AFB, ND	ND	Convert Hangar for UAV Corrosion Control	1,280	1,280
Navy	68	McGuire AFB	NJ	Construct Helicopters Hangars & MAG HQ	37,809	37,809
Navy	68	McGuire AFB	NJ	Joint Use Reserve Training Center	20,580	20,580
Navy	68	McGuire AFB	NJ	NAVY VR Fleet Logistics Operations Facility	65,824	27,558
Air Force	187	Kirtland AFB, NM	NM	Space Vehicle Facility	42,700	42,700
Army	34	AFRC Farmingdale	NY	Armed Forces Reserve Center, Increment 1	86,000	65,000
Army	34	AFRC Niagara Falls	NY	Armed Forces Reserve Center	27,000	27,000
Army	53	Fort Hamilton	NY	Armed Forces Reserve Center	64,000	64,000
Army	37	Columbus	OH	Armed Forces Reserve Center	29,000	29,000
Army	37	Springfield	OH	Armed Forces Reserve Center	25,400	25,500
Navy	174	Wright-Patterson AFB, OH	OH	Naval Aero-Medical Research Lab	13,600	13,600
Air Force	170-188A	Wright-Patterson AFB, OH	OH	Alter Acquisition Mgt Fac (HSGGYA & Fixed Wing)	15,000	15,000
Air Force	170	Wright-Patterson AFB, OH	OH	Alter Materials Laboratory (HSGGYA Labs)	6,200	6,200
Air Force	170	Wright-Patterson AFB, OH	OH	Radiation Calibration Facility	4,600	4,600
Air Force	170	Wright-Patterson AFB, OH	OH	AFIOH Facility	54,000	54,000
Air Force	170	Wright-Patterson AFB, OH	OH	AFRLUHE (Brooks)	32,000	32,000
Air Force	170	Wright-Patterson AFB, OH	OH	USAFSAM Consult Service	18,500	18,500
Air Force	170	Wright-Patterson AFB, OH	OH	USAFSAM (Increment 1)	81,000	51,000
Air Force	170 187 188A	Wright-Patterson AFB, OH	OH	Dining Facility	980	980
Air Force	187	Wright-Patterson AFB, OH	OH	AFRLUHE (MESA)	34,000	34,000
Army	x	Fort Sill	OK	ADA Brigade Complex, Increment 1	156,000	89,000
Army	38	Fort Sill	OK	Armed Forces Reserve Center	34,000	34,000
Army	38	McAlester	OK	Armed Forces Reserve Center	16,000	16,000
Army	38	Norman	OK	Armed Forces Reserve Center	43,200	43,200
Army	38	Vance AFB	OK	Armed Forces Reserve Center	15,000	15,000
Army	38	West Oklahoma City	OK	Armed Forces Reserve Center	41,000	41,000
Army	126	Fort Sill	OK	Training Aids Support Center	6,000	6,000
Army	126	Fort Sill	OK	ADA School Complex Incr 2		87,000
Air Force	108	Tinker AFB, OK	OK	AFR Squad Ops/Life Support	6,900	6,900

TITLE XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

Agency	Commission Number	Location	State	Project	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
DLA	177	Def Distrib Depot Ok City (DDOO)	OK	Construct General Purpose Warehouse	22,000	22,000
Army	7	Letterkenny Army Depot	PA	Guided Missile Launcher Eqmt Shop, Depot	11,600	11,600
Army	40	AFRC Bristol	PA	Armed Forces Reserve Center	25,000	25,000
Army	40	AFRC Scranton	PA	Armed Forces Reserve Center	32,000	32,000
Army	57	Tobyhanna Army Depot	PA	Radar Test Range	2,450	2,450
Navy	73	NMCRRC Lehigh Valley	PA	NMCRRC Reading to NMCRRC Lehigh Valley, PA	8,600	8,600
DLA	177	Def Dist Depot Susquehanna	PA	Construct General Purpose Warehouse	38,350	38,350
Army	50	Fort Jackson	SC	Drill Sergeant School	24,000	24,000
Army	124	Fort Jackson	SC	Joint Religious Education & Training Center	11,600	11,600
Navy	71	Goose Creek	SC	EODMU-6 Detachment Boat Shops	1,580	1,580
Air Force	3A	Shaw AFB, SC	SC	BOS Project for HQ 3rd Army	25,000	25,000
Army	x	Fort Bliss	TX	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	18,500	18,500
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Brigade Combat Team Complex #3 Increment 1	286,000	103,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Digital Multipurpose Training Range	15,000	15,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Urban Assault Course	2,300	2,300
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Convoy Live Fire Training Range	3,200	3,200
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Infantry Squad Battle Course	2,400	2,400
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Troop Health Clinic	42,000	42,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Physical Fitness Facility	22,000	22,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Youth Center Expansion	2,000	2,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Information System Processing Center	6,100	6,100
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Infrastructure Support Phase 2	55,000	55,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Combat Aviation Brigade Complex Increment 2	-	90,000
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Close Combat Tactical Trainer Facility	6,100	6,100
Army	10	Fort Bliss	TX	Brigade Combat Team Complex #2 Increment 2	-	70,000
Army	44	AFRC East Houston	TX	Armed Forces Reserve Center	36,000	36,000
Army	44	AFRC Fort Bliss	TX	Armed Forces Reserve Center	49,900	49,900
Army	44	Northwest Houston	TX	Armed Forces Reserve Center	31,900	31,900
Army	174	Fort Sam Houston	TX	Battlefield Health & Trauma, Incr 2	-	53,000
Air Force	137C	Randolph AFB, TX	TX	Randolph - CPOs Admin Center Facility Construction	10,900	10,900
Air Force	147 170	Lackland AFB, TX	TX	HQ Admin Center (AFCEE & AFRPA & AFWSE)	37,000	37,000
Navy	174	Fort Sam Houston, TX	TX	Battlefield Health & Trauma Bio-Med Lab	7,473	7,473

TITLE XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Commission Number</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Project Authorization</u>	<u>Authorization of Appropriation</u>
Air Force	113	Carswell ARS, NAS Fort Worth JRB	TX	AFR Munitions Igloos	1,250	1,250
Air Force	172	Fort Sam Houston, TX	TX	Medical Training Facilities (Increment 1)	225,000	96,400
Air Force	172	Fort Sam Houston, TX	TX	Medical E&T - Dining Facilities	38,000	38,000
Air Force	172	Fort Sam Houston, TX	TX	METC Student Dorm #1 (Increment 1)	87,700	46,500
Air Force	172	Fort Sam Houston, TX	TX	METC Student Dorm #2 (Increment 1)	80,700	47,000
TMA	172	Fort Sam Houston	TX	ADA+E51L San Antonio Military MEDCEN North Incr 1	467,300	156,035
TMA	172	Fort Sam Houston	TX	Health Clinic	43,100	43,100
Army	121	Fort Lee	VA	Combat Service Support School Phase 2 Increment 2	-	212,000
Army	121	Fort Lee	VA	Combat Service Support School Phase 1 Increment 1	427,000	173,000
Army	122	Fort Lee	VA	Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation	13,400	13,400
Army	169	Fort Belvoir	VA	Infrastructure Support Increment 1	152,000	20,000
Navy	131	Quantico	VA	Investigative Agency Facilities	143,132	143,132
Navy	164	NSY Norfolk	VA	Ship Maintenance Engineering Facility Modification	19,362	19,362
Navy	166	NSY Norfolk	VA	Engineering Management Facility Conversion	9,506	9,506
Navy	184	Dahlgren	VA	RDA-T&E Consolidated Facility	28,930	28,930
DECA	139	Fort Lee, VA	VA	Facility for Consolidation	23,389	23,389
DIA	167	Rivanna Station, Charlottesville	VA	Joint Use Intelligence Facility - Phase 1	25,100	25,100
MDA	134	Fort Belvoir, VA	VA	Construct Headquarters Command Center	62,000	41,000
NGA	168	Fort Belvoir, VA	VA	Construct NGA Building	1,114,800	428,879
TMA	169	Fort Belvoir	VA	Hospital 1st Increment	498,000	219,400
WHS	133	Fort Belvoir, VA	VA	Office Complex, Increment 1	702,199	321,546
Army	45	AFRC Ruitland	VT	Armed Forces Reserve Center	23,000	23,000
Army	46	AFRC Yakima	WA	Armed Forces Reserve Center	20,000	20,000
Navy	166	Bremerton	WA	Ship Maint Engineering Consolidation	130	130
Navy	76	Fort Lewis	WA	Relocate Navy Cargo Handling Fac, Battalion 5	7,333	7,333
Army	49	JFHQ Cheyenne	WY	Armed Forces Reserve Center	32,500	32,500
Army		Various Locations		Planning and Design	-	183,900
Navy		Washington	DC	Planning and Design	-	20,127
Air Force		Various Locations		MILCON Planning and Design	0	25,487
Total Military Construction and P&D					8,718,988	6,419,758

TITLE XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

Agency	Commission Number	Location	State	Project	Project Authorization	Authorization of Appropriation
Army Navy Air Force Defense Wide		Various	Various	Environmental	0	86,756
		Various	Various	Environmental	0	16,953
		Various	Various	Environmental	0	8,696
		Various	Various	Environmental	0	0
				Total Environmental	0	112,405
Army Navy Air Force Defense Wide		Various	Various	Operations and Maintenance	0	442,967
		Various	Various	Operations and Maintenance	0	205,656
		Various	Various	Operations and Maintenance	0	222,601
		Various	Various	Operations and Maintenance	0	317,492
				Total Operation and Maintenance	0	1,188,716
Army Navy Air Force Defense Wide		Various	Various	Military Personnel PCS	0	0
		Various	Various	Military Personnel PCS	0	2,499
		Various	Various	Military Personnel PCS	0	12,256
		Various	Various	Military Personnel PCS	0	0
				Total Military Personnel PCS	0	14,755
Army Navy Air Force Defense Wide		Various	Various	Other	0	244,502
		Various	Various	Other	0	1,711
		Various	Various	Other	0	30,548
		Various	Various	Other	0	161,920
				Total Other	0	438,681
TOTAL FY2008 FUNDING FOR BRAC 2005					8,718,988	8,174,315

Authorization of appropriations for base closure and realignment activities funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 (sec. 2701)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decisions of the 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995 base realignment and closure (BRAC) rounds.

Authorized base closure and realignment activities funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 (sec. 2702)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for fiscal year 2008 that are required to implement the decisions of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round. The table included in this title of the report lists the specific amounts authorized at each location.

Authorization of appropriations for base closure and realignment activities funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 (sec. 2703)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for military construction projects for fiscal year 2008 that are required to implement the decisions of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for BRAC military construction projects. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Authorized cost and scope of work variations (sec. 2704)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that each Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) military construction project carried out with amounts authorized for appropriations by sections 2701 and 2703 of this title be subject to the limits on cost and scope variations contained in section 2853 of title 10, United States Code. Furthermore, this provision would establish, as a baseline for the determination of variations, the cost and scope contained in the military construction project data for each project provided to the congressional defense committees annually in justification material accompanying each President's budget request.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Effective Date and Expiration of Authorizations

Effective Date (sec. 2801)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, and XXIX of this Act take effect on October 1, 2007 or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2802)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the expiration date for authorizations in this Act for military construction projects, repair of real property, land acquisition, family housing projects, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program, as October 1, 2010, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2011, whichever is later.

Subtitle B—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

General military construction transfer authority (sec. 2811)

The committee recommends a provision that would create a transfer authority for military construction authorizations similar to that already in use by the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The provision would provide that up to \$200.0 million could be transferred among the military construction authorizations available to a particular military department or defense agency for fiscal year 2008. Funds could be transferred only to cover cost or scope changes on previously authorized and appropriated projects, not to create “new start” construction projects.

This provision is more limited than the general transfer authority provided in section 1001 for funds in division A of this Act, which allows funds to be transferred between military departments. The committee is willing to consider such additional flexibility, in consultation with the other congressional defense committees, in the future.

At present, military construction reprogrammings are presented only to the Committees on Appropriations, while notifications of cost and scope changes are provided to the Committees on Armed Services. The committee believes that it should have the same information on the proposed reprogramming of funds used as sources to cover cost and scope increases as the Committees on Appropriations.

The committee is concerned by the proposal made by the Air Force to the Committees on Appropriations in January 2007 to use the existing reprogramming process to carry out a “new start” military construction project that had not been authorized by law. The committee does not see a need at this time for a military construction transfer authority that would allow the Department of Defense to construct “new start” construction projects through the reprogramming process. At a minimum, all four congressional defense committees would have to agree on a common reprogramming procedure before the committee would entertain such an expansion of the reprogramming process.

Modifications of authority to lease military family housing (sec. 2812)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the existing authorities in section 2828 of title 10, United States Code, regarding the leasing of family housing by the Department of Defense. The provision would grant the Secretary of the Army additional authority to enter into high cost leases for up to 600 units in the United States. The provision would also set an annual per-unit cap on high cost leases overseas. The provision would combine and consolidate the existing authorities for high cost leases in Italy for the Army and the Navy into a single limit applicable to the entire Department of Defense. The provision would also raise the threshold for which congressional notification of overseas leases is required to \$1.0 million in annual rental payments.

The provision would also modify one of the limits on high cost housing leases in Korea. The committee values the strong alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea, and supports the implementation of the Land Partnership Plan and the Yongsan Relocation Plan.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to proceed with an economic analysis comparing the life cycle cost of military construction to build-to-lease construction of family housing units in Korea as soon as possible, in order to assess the likely size and quality of units that could be constructed in a competitive bidding situation. The committee also strongly urges the Secretary of the Army to issue a request for information to help inform this analysis. Taking these steps expeditiously would better inform the conferees of the need for any specific changes in the cost ceilings. The committee does not believe that the full increase in the leasing unit cost ceilings proposed by the Department is affordable, and urges the Secretary of the Army to review all the alternatives identified in the economic analysis, and then proceed with a request for proposals for a full and open competition for leasing or military construction in order to find the most economical means to provide suitable family housing units.

Increase in thresholds for unspecified minor military construction projects (sec. 2813)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2805(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, by raising the threshold of the cost of a construction project authorized by this section from \$1.5 million to \$2.5 million. This provision would also

raise the threshold of the cost of a construction project intended solely to correct a deficiency that is life-threatening, health-threatening, or safety-threatening from \$3.0 million to \$4.0 million.

The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office, in a report released in February 2004 entitled “Long-term Challenges in Managing the Military Construction Program,” estimated that construction costs for the military have increased by an average of 41 percent since the thresholds amended by this provision were last adjusted.

An identical provision was included in the last three defense authorization bills reported by the committee and passed by the Senate. The committee continues to believe that this change is necessary and appropriate.

Modification and extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects outside the United States (sec. 2814)

The committee recommends a provision that would further amend section 2808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), as amended, to extend for 1 year, through the end of fiscal year 2008, the temporary authority provided to the Secretary of Defense to use funds appropriated for operation and maintenance to carry out construction projects intended to satisfy certain operational requirements in support of a declaration of war, national emergency, or other contingency. The provision would also remove the authority in current law to waive the annual dollar limitation on this authority.

Temporary authority to support revitalization of Department of Defense laboratories through unspecified minor military construction projects (sec. 2815)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Department of Defense (DOD) with additional authority to improve DOD laboratories using minor construction authorities similar to those already contained in section 2805 of title 10, United States Code. The temporary authority would expire on September 30, 2012. The Department of Defense requested similar language in their fiscal year 2008 legislative proposal to the Congress. DOD laboratories are generally funded with research and development funds and do not have the same access to military construction funds as other types of DOD facilities.

Two-year extension of temporary program to use minor military construction authority for construction of child development centers (sec. 2816)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2810 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (division B of Public Law 109–163) to extend by 2 years the temporary authority provided to the Secretary of Defense to use higher thresholds contained in section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, for the construction of child development centers. This provision would also require the Secretary to report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2009, on the use of this temporary program.

Extension of authority to accept equalization payments for facility exchanges (sec. 2817)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority provided in section 2809 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) by an additional 3 years, until September 30, 2010. This provision was requested by the Department of Defense.

Subtitle C—Real Property and Facilities Administration

Requirement to report transactions resulting in annual costs of more than \$750,000 (sec. 2831)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense, the secretaries of the military departments, or their designees, to notify Congress prior to entering into a transaction or contract action that results in or includes the acquisition, lease or license, or any other use by entities of the Department of Defense of real property if the estimated annual rental or cost is more than \$750,000.

In hearings before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support earlier this year, the committee received testimony that elements of the Department of Defense may have violated existing law through the use of service contracts to acquire office space without providing the required notifications to Congress regarding what was a lease under another name. The provision recommended by the committee is in no way intended to imply that such actions were or are legal or appropriate under existing law. Rather, this provision is intended to clarify that elements of the Department of Defense are required to notify Congress before entering into any type of contract, including service contracts, for the use of real property or facility space.

Modification of authority to lease non-excess property (sec. 2832)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, to require the secretary of a military department to use competitive procedures to select lessees for transactions authorized by paragraph (a) of section 2667. The provision would also eliminate the authority for the secretary concerned to receive in-kind consideration or to use rental and other proceeds for facility operation support.

The committee is concerned that the authority granted to the secretary of a military department by section 2667 to provide an opportunity to gain benefit for underutilized real or personal property may be used to acquire services beyond that intended by Congress. The committee urges the military departments to use the proceeds gained in transactions carried out under this authority prudently to address military facility requirements directly related to maintenance, repair, improvements, and construction.

Enhanced flexibility to create or expand buffer zones (sec. 2833)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Department of Defense (DOD) with additional flexibility in entering into partnerships with non-federal entities to protect or enhance the capability of DOD installations. The provision would allow such agreements to provide for the ongoing upkeep and management of buffer zones bordering defense installations, in addition to the authority to acquire the property provided under current law. The committee also recognizes that the military value of such buffer zones may exceed the appraised value of the real property. The provision would provide additional authority in such cases for DOD entities to acquire an interest in property where the cost of acquiring the interest exceeds the fair market value of the property, if the Secretary of Defense or the secretary of a military department provides a certification to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the military value of the acquisition provides benefits that justify a payment in excess of the fair market value.

Reports on Army and Marine Corps operational ranges (sec. 2834)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify a reporting requirement on changing requirements for Army training ranges that was contained in section 2827 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (division B of Public Law 109-364). This report, which was due on February 1, 2007, has not been submitted. The provision would expand this reporting requirement to include the impact of the proposal contained in the fiscal year 2008 budget to permanently increase the size of the active-duty component of the Army by 65,000 personnel. The report by the Secretary of the Army would also include an assessment of the potential expansion of the Joint Readiness Training Center at Fort Polk, Louisiana, and an assessment of the available training capacity in Germany.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense might propose to base these additional 65,000 personnel in a way that would not effectively utilize the existing training capacity the Army already has in Germany. The committee expects a full assessment of this issue, including the cost of constructing any facilities that would duplicate any existing underutilized capacity in Germany, as part of this report. The report should also incorporate the analysis done for, and if possible the results of, the programmatic environmental impact statement the Army plans to conduct on the growth of the Army.

The provision would also add a similar reporting requirement with respect to the proposal in the fiscal year 2008 budget request to expand the size of the Marine Corps by 27,000 personnel. This report would include an analysis of a proposal under consideration by the Marine Corps to expand the training range at Marine Corps Base Twentynine Palms, California.

Consolidation of real property provisions without substantive change (sec. 2835)

The committee recommends a provision that would consolidate the real property authorities provided under sections 2663 and 2677 of title 10, United States Code. This provision was requested by the Department of Defense.

Subtitle D—Base Closure and Realignment

Niagara Air Reserve Base, New York, basing report (sec. 2841)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of the Air Force to report to the congressional defense committees on the current and future missions planned for Niagara Air Reserve Base in Niagara, New York.

Subtitle E—Land Conveyances

Land conveyance, Lynn Haven Fuel Depot, Lynn Haven, Florida (sec. 2851)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, for consideration, a parcel of approximately 40 acres, including real property, at the Lynn Haven Fuel Depot in Lynn Haven, Florida. The committee expects the consideration received by the Air Force to approximate the fair market value of the property to be conveyed.

Modification to land conveyance authority, Fort Bragg, North Carolina (sec. 2852)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Section 2836 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey without consideration to Harnett County, North Carolina, a parcel of real property totaling 137 acres at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, for educational purposes and the construction of public school structures. The provision would also authorize the Secretary to require the County to cover administrative and other costs for the conveyance.

Transfer of administrative jurisdiction, GSA property, Springfield, Virginia (sec. 2853)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration (GSA) to transfer control of a parcel of property adjacent to the Springfield metro station in Springfield, Virginia to the Secretary of the Army in return for fair market value compensation from the Army. The compensation provided by the Army could be provided through a combination of property or services. The property transferred to the Army would become part of Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

The committee believes the use of this GSA site to accommodate a portion of the workforce relocating to Fort Belvoir under the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process would greatly benefit the Army and the workforce by allowing a much greater use of public transportation. The committee believes that the relocation of Wash-

ington Headquarters Service employees to this site should be given priority consideration. The committee is aware that the parties may be able to reach an agreement on such a transfer under current law, but that the provision recommended by the committee would provide additional benefits and authorities. The committee urges the Army and the GSA to assess the terms and conditions available under current law and those available under this legislation and conclude an agreement that is fair to both parties as quickly as possible.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Report on condition of schools under jurisdiction of Department of Defense Education Activity (sec. 2861)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report by March 1, 2008 on the condition of schools under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense Education Activity (DODEA).

The committee is concerned that the recent and proposed amounts of investment for the maintenance, repair, and recapitalization of DODEA school facilities are not adequate to sustain acceptable conditions for the education of the dependents of military personnel. In addition, the committee is concerned that the proposed amounts for the construction of new schools and the elimination of temporary trailers are inadequate to address the requirements resulting from the 2005 Defense Base Realignment and Closure process, the Global Defense Realignment Plan, and initiatives by the Army and Marine Corps to increase their respective end strengths.

This provision would require the Secretary of Defense to establish standards for acceptable sizes and conditions of DODEA school facilities, to assess the existing inventory of facilities, and to develop a master plan and investment strategy to quickly correct identified deficiencies. Finally, this provision would require the Secretary to submit this plan to the congressional defense committees to facilitate further oversight and diligence to ensure the timely investment of resources to bring the entire DODEA school system up to acceptable standards.

Repeal of requirement for study and report on impact to military readiness of proposed land management changes on public lands in Utah (sec. 2862)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal a reporting requirement and associated restriction contained in section 2815 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). This provision of law restricted the actions of the Department of the Interior until the Secretary of Defense submitted a report. The Department of Defense has failed, for over 6 years, to submit this report, and has not given the committee any indication the report will ever be submitted. The committee does not believe it is fair for one government agency to restrict the actions of another agency indefinitely simply through inaction. Furthermore, circumstances have changed in the inter-

vening years, and the committee sees no further need for this restriction.

Additional project in Rhode Island (sec. 2863)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the terms and conditions applicable to an Army Corps of Engineers project in Rhode Island contained in section 2866 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) to an additional project in Woonsocket, Rhode Island.

Items of Special Interest

Host nation burdensharing

The committee notes that the United States Government has entered into separate agreements with the Governments of the Republic of Korea and Japan to share the costs of relocating United States military forces away from urban areas onto new bases to be constructed over the next 5 years. In Korea, two initiatives to consolidate over 14,000 U.S. military personnel, 11,000 family members, and 9,000 other civilians at Camp Humphreys from 59 smaller locations and the U.S. Army post in Seoul will cost approximately \$9.0 billion through fiscal year 2012. In Japan, over 8,000 U.S. marines and their families are planned to be relocated from Okinawa to Guam by 2015 at a current estimated cost of over \$10.0 billion.

For both countries, the United States Government currently maintains cost sharing arrangements for the sustainment and support of U.S. forces contributing to the common defense of each country. In Korea, for non-personnel stationing costs of U.S. forces, the U.S. goal is a 50–50 cost sharing arrangement for the total estimated amount of \$1.8 billion annually. Unfortunately, the Korean Government's contribution fell short in 2006, funding only 38 percent of the total costs, and the contribution for 2007 is expected to be 41 percent for a total of \$770.0 million. The Government of Japan contributes approximately \$4.0 billion annually for the support and operations of U.S. forces stationed throughout Japan and on Okinawa.

The committee is concerned that host nation plans to share costs specifically for the initiatives to relocate U.S. forces in each country will be funded from amounts already agreed to in existing burdensharing arrangements. Since these amounts are required to sustain the entirety of U.S. forces in each country, the net effect of this arrangement would be to defer or cancel other U.S. forces mission critical requirements in each country while host nation funding is diverted to pay for the relocations. The committee is concerned that this deferment would result in either a decrease in the readiness and mission effectiveness of forces in each country, or an increase of requirements to be funded through U.S. Department of Defense appropriations.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than December 31, 2007 that details the sources of funds to be used to fund the relocation of U.S. forces in the Republic of Korea and

Japan, by year, through completion of each initiative as well as the anticipated costs each year to sustain remaining forces and the expected contribution from the host nation to share in these costs. The committee further directs the Secretary to assess the impact on the readiness, training, and operations of U.S. forces stationed in each country of any deferment of facility and support requirements as a result of the funding proposed to be provided by the host nation in each agreement for the relocation of U.S. forces to be from amounts provided in existing burden-sharing arrangements.

Military investment strategy in facilities that support training for military operations in urban terrain

The committee continues to be concerned that the current range and facilities and infrastructure supporting U.S. military forces around the world for military operations in urban terrain (MOUT) does not comprehensively simulate the type of environment encountered by military units in the battlefield. This concern remains despite a proliferation of military construction projects over the past 5 years to construct new MOUT facilities and shoot houses. In addition, the committee believes that the current practice for the development and construction by each military service of MOUT complexes to serve their specific training requirements does not adequately account for the battlefield integration of joint operations and combined arms.

The committee is aware that, in response to consistent congressional oversight, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness established on April 13, 2007 a formal process to synchronize individual Department of Defense (DOD) Component efforts and to establish policies and responsibilities for evaluating and certifying military construction projects to upgrade existing or to construct new urban training facilities. The committee commends the Secretary of Defense's initiative to establish the Urban Training Facilities Review Group (URFRG) responsible for the implementation of the DOD policy to evaluate all proposals for new construction or modifications to MOUT complexes. Another positive step is the formal distinction of MOUT's that acknowledges the difference between regional urban training facilities to serve as national assets for complex large unit maneuvers and operations involving integrated components, and local urban training facilities to support individual and small unit basic skills training. But despite this progress, the committee notes that the Department still lacks a joint, future- year plan to combine resources from all components to construct and sustain a national infrastructure consisting of a varied range of MOUT complexes offering military units of all sizes, and from all components, a series of options to accomplish critical combined arms training in realistic settings truly simulating the atmosphere and conditions of a challenging urban battlefield.

Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to use the framework recently adopted to develop a comprehensive joint investment strategy, including an integrated priority list, to address the combined arms training needs and challenges of the warfighter for 21st century urban operations. The Secretary would

then be able to certify that military construction projects to construct MOUT complexes are in compliance with the adopted investment strategy to ensure the most efficient use of resources to establish and maintain this critical asset. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the MOUT facility investment strategy by March 1, 2008.

Naval master jet basing

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) continues to be inundated with requests to reconsider decisions made by the 2005 Defense Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission, which were approved by the President of the United States and reviewed by Congress without further action in November 2005. These requests are made without regard to the resources and manpower required within the military services to faithfully and fully respond with the required information. Furthermore, the requests serve to undermine the intent and integrity of the 2005 BRAC process by requiring the military services to justify decisions made by an independent commission, which was established by Congress to reduce the political influence on DOD's efforts to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of its domestic basing.

As an example, the Secretary of the Navy was recently encouraged to assess the viability and costs of relocating the east coast master jet base from Naval Air Station (NAS) Oceana, Virginia to numerous other locations around the country. This request came after the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations stated in testimony to the Committee on Armed Services in the House of Representatives on March 1, 2007 that "[t]he service is committed to staying at Oceana as long as these things continue to go well."

The committee notes that DOD previously conducted an assessment of naval master jet bases in 2004 in preparation of recommendations submitted to the BRAC Commission in May 2005. At that point, the Department recommended no realignment or closure actions for the master jet base at NAS Oceana. The BRAC Commission further studied alternate locations for the master jet base and also concluded that no viable alternative existed within the current inventory of Navy and Marine Corps installations. Finally, the Chief of Naval Operations received a report on December 9, 2005, entitled "Master Jet Base Assessment," which assessed NAS Oceana to have the highest score for operational training support due to its "proximity to the offshore training areas and ranges a Master Jet Base requires."

The 2005 Defense BRAC Commission did recommend a series of actions to be undertaken by the local community around NAS Oceana to control encroachment upon the airfield. As the Navy leadership indicated to the Committee on Armed Services in the House of Representatives, these actions have been successful to date in establishing a cooperative relationship between the community and the Navy for the preservation of safe flying operations at NAS Oceana, and, if continued, will allow for compatible airfield operations into the future. Therefore, a request to the Secretary of

the Navy to readdress a decision of the 2005 Defense BRAC round in order to satisfy parochial interests is not in the best interests of the United States Navy or the Department of Defense.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, if deciding to conduct the study, to expend the absolute minimal amount of manpower and resources necessary to satisfy the request to assess, once again, basing alternatives for naval air jet basing on the east coast of the United States. The committee also directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide to the congressional defense committees, prior to the commencement of the study, an estimate of the cost to satisfy the request, and a list of the activities deferred or cancelled in order to direct manpower and resources to the request. Furthermore, this committee strongly encourages the Secretary of the Navy to include in the Navy's assessment, as required, a review of the actions taken to date by the Commonwealth of Virginia and the community of Virginia Beach to work collaboratively with the Navy to proactively address encroachment concerns at NAS Oceana, with the intent that this review will serve as a positive example to the local communities around the country supporting naval and Marine Corps aviation operations.

Temporary facilities

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) continues to allow the proliferation on military installations worldwide of the use of non-permanent or temporary facilities, defined as having a useful design life of less than 25 years. The military services are using temporary structures to respond to the increased operational pace of our military and the realignment of U.S. forces, including the modular conversion of the U.S. Army. The committee also notes that the DOD is not adhering to internal policy requiring the approval of the use of temporary facilities only as an interim solution and accompanied by a plan for replacement with permanent facilities as quickly as possible. Temporary facilities do not offer the same level of durability, security, and safety from severe climatic events. The potential that non-permanent facilities would eventually be considered an acceptable working or living standard increases the risk over time of possible harm to military and DOD civilian personnel due to less sturdy construction.

The committee is also concerned about the use of procurement or operation and maintenance funding to lease or acquire temporary facilities. The practice of using a service contract to lease space in temporary buildings provided by a contractor on a military installation can be viewed as a deliberate attempt to circumvent federal statutes pertaining to the authorization of military construction. In addition, entering into a lease of non-permanent, temporary space with an option to purchase the building is equally problematic when it leads to overpayment for an inadequate facility over its life cycle. The committee is also concerned that the initial costs of acquiring and installing non-permanent facilities are eclipsed by increased sustainment requirements over the life cycle of the facility. These costs may not be readily apparent as they are included in a service contract or lease of a temporary building. In addition,

when temporary facilities are replaced by permanent facilities, the taxpayer ends up paying twice.

Therefore, in order for this committee to provide diligent oversight on the use of temporary facilities, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD-ATL) is directed to report to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the use of non-permanent, temporary facilities within the Department of Defense. Specifically, the Under Secretary shall report on: (1) a list of the acquisition or leasing actions of temporary facilities in each service over the past 5 years; (2) amounts spent on temporary facilities in the following categories: (a) operation and maintenance funding obligated in service contracts; (b) operation and maintenance funding obligated solely for non-permanent, temporary facility construction or procurement; (c) operation and maintenance funding obligated for leases of non-permanent, temporary facilities; and (d) procurement funding spent to procure non-permanent, temporary facilities; (3) the plan for the construction of permanent facilities to replace each temporary facility acquired or leased in the DOD inventory to include project title, planned budget year, and estimated cost; and (4) the number of non-permanent, temporary facilities previously leased by the Department or the military services that were later purchased, and the costs associated with these arrangements. The Under Secretary shall include within the report recommendations for improvements, as appropriate, in each area reported on. Non-permanent or temporary facilities used overseas at forward operating sites or cooperative security locations are exempted from this reporting requirement.

The committee directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to analyze and report on the findings of the Under Secretary 90 days after the receipt of the Under Secretary's report. The GAO may conduct independent research, make independent findings, and make independent recommendations as required.

TITLE XXIX—WAR-RELATED MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Summary

The committee bill would fund the \$752.7 million requested by the Department of Defense for military construction projects for the Army in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The President's budget also requested, as emergency funding, \$169.1 million in military construction funds for projects for the Department of the Navy. However, because those projects were inside the United States and related to the proposal to increase the size of the Marine Corps rather than to operations in Iraq or Afghanistan, the committee has authorized funding for those projects in title XXII of this Act.

TITLE XXIX - WAR-RELATED MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Armory - Regimental and Battalion HQ (Transfer to Title XXII)	5,160	-5,160	0
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Armory - Intelligence Battalion (Transfer to Title XXII)	4,180	-4,180	0
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Armory - 5th Marine Regiment (Transfer to Title XXII)	10,890	-10,890	0
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Bachelor Quarters and Armory - Horns (Transfer to Title XXII)	34,970	-34,970	0
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Bachelor Quarters and Dining Facility (Transfer to Title XXII)	24,390	-24,390	0
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Company HQ - Military Police (Transfer to Title XXII)	8,240	-8,240	0
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Explosive Ordnance Detachment - Ops Facility (To Title XXII)	13,090	-13,090	0
Navy	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Intelligence Surveillance Reconnaissance Camp (To Title XXII)	1,114	-1,114	0
Navy	California	TWENTYNINE PALMS	Regimental Headquarters Addition (Transfer to Title XXII)	4,440	-4,440	0
Navy	North Carolina	CAMP LEJEUNE	Maintenance/Operations Complex-2/9 (Transfer to Title XXII)	43,340	-43,340	0
Army	Afghanistan	BAGRAM AB	ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING (Transfer from Title XXI)	13,800		13,800
Army	Afghanistan	BAGRAM AB	Ammunition Supply Point	62,000		62,000
Army	Afghanistan	BAGRAM AB	Power Plant	41,000		41,000
Army	Iraq	CAMP ADDER	Power Plant	39,000		39,000
Army	Iraq	CAMP ADDER	Petroleum Oil & Lubricant Storage Area	10,000		10,000
Army	Iraq	CAMP ADDER	Waste Water Treatment and Collection System	9,800		9,800
Army	Iraq	CAMP ADDER	Multi Class Storage Warehouse	17,000		17,000
Army	Iraq	CAMP ADDER	Entry Control Point	4,850		4,850
Army	Iraq	AL ASAD	Power Plant	40,000		40,000
Army	Iraq	AL ASAD	Landfill Construction	3,100		3,100
Army	Iraq	AL ASAD	Urban By Pass Road	43,000		43,000
Army	Iraq	CAMP ANACONDA	Landfill Construction	6,200		6,200
Army	Iraq	CAMP ANACONDA	Power Plant	39,000		39,000
Army	Iraq	CAMP ANACONDA	Urban By Pass Road	43,000		43,000
Army	Iraq	FALLUJAH	Landfill Construction	880		880
Army	Iraq	CAMP MAREZ	Landfill Construction	880		880
Army	Iraq	MOSUL	Urban By Pass Road	43,000		43,000
Army	Iraq	Q-WEST	Power Plant	26,000		26,000
Army	Iraq	CAMP RAMADI	Landfill Construction	880		880
Army	Iraq	SCANIA	Entry Control Point	5,000		5,000
Army	Iraq	CAMP SPEICHER	Power Plant	39,000		39,000
Army	Iraq	CAMP SPEICHER	Landfill Construction	5,900		5,900
Army	Iraq	CAMP SPEICHER	Waste Water Treatment and Collection System	9,800		9,800
Army	Iraq	CAMP SPEICHER	Rotary Wing Parking Apron	49,000		49,000

57
00
00

TITLE XXIX - WAR-RELATED MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY2008 Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Army	Iraq	CAMP TAQQADUM	Landfill Construction	880		880
Army	Iraq	TIKRIT	Urban By Pass Road	43,000		43,000
Army	Iraq	CAMP VICTORY	Landfill Construction	6,200		6,200
Army	Iraq	CAMP VICTORY	Entry Control Point	5,000		5,000
Army	Iraq	CAMP VICTORY	Level 3 Hospital	13,400		13,400
Army	Iraq	CAMP VICTORY	Waste Water Treatment and Collection System	9,800		9,800
Army	Iraq	CAMP WARRIOR	Landfill Construction	880		880
Army	Iraq	IRAQ VARIOUS	Facilities Replacement, Phase I	36,000		36,000
Army	Iraq	IRAQ VARIOUS	Facilities Replacement, Phase II	36,000		36,000
Army	Iraq	IRAQ VARIOUS	Overhead Cover- eGlass	30,000		30,000
Army	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	Planning and Design	19,400		19,400
Navy	Worldwide Unspecified	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE	Planning and Design (Transfer to Title XXII)	7,491	-7,491	0
Fam House Con. N	California	CAMP PENDLETON	Improvements (Transfer to Title XXII)	10,692	-10,692	0
Fam House Con. N	California	TWENTYNINE PALMS	Improvements (Transfer to Title XXII)	1,074	-1,074	0
TOTAL TITLE XXIX				907,921	-155,271	752,650

57
08
09

Authorized war-related Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2901)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize war-related military construction projects in Iraq and Afghanistan for the Army for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Authorizations of war-related military construction appropriations, Army (sec. 2902)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for war-related military construction projects of the Army authorized for construction for fiscal year 2008 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction projects for the Army. The project list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

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

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations

Overview

Title XXXI authorizes appropriations for atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2008, including: the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment; research and development; nuclear weapons; naval nuclear propulsion; environmental restoration and waste management; operating expenses; and other expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91). This title authorizes appropriations in four categories: (1) National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA); (2) defense environmental cleanup; (3) other defense activities; and (4) defense nuclear waste disposal.

The budget request for atomic energy defense activities at the Department totaled \$15.9 billion, a less than 1 percent increase above the fiscal year 2007 appropriated level. Of the total amount requested:

- (1) \$9.4 billion is for NNSA, of which
 - (a) \$6.5 billion is for weapons activities;
 - (b) \$1.7 billion is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities;
 - (c) \$808.2 million is for naval reactors; and
 - (d) \$394.7 is for the Office of the Administrator;
- (2) \$5.4 billion is for defense environmental cleanup;
- (3) \$764.0 million is for other defense activities; and
- (4) \$292.0 million is for defense nuclear waste disposal.

The budget request also included \$5.9 million within energy supply.

The fiscal year 2008 budget requested \$50.0 million in war-related funding for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities.

The committee recommends \$15.9 billion for atomic energy defense activities at the Department, a decrease of \$5.0 million below the budget request.

Of the amounts authorized, the committee recommends:

- (1) \$9.5 billion for NNSA, of which
 - (a) \$6.5 billion is for weapons activities, a decrease of \$39.1 million below the budget request;
 - (b) \$1.8 billion is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, including the fiscal year 2008 funds requested for war-re-

lated funding, an increase of \$87.0 above the combined budget request;

(c) \$808.2 million is for naval reactors, the amount of the budget request; and

(d) \$399.7 million is for the Office of the Administrator, an increase of \$5.0 million above the budget request;

(2) \$5.4 billion for defense environmental cleanup activities, an increase of \$47.0 million above the budget request;

(3) \$663.1 million for other defense activities, a decrease of \$100.9 million below the budget request; and

(4) \$242.0 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, a decrease of \$50.0 million below the budget request.

The committee recommends no funds for energy supply, a reduction of \$5.9 million.

The following table summarizes the budget request and the authorizations:

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Discretionary Summary By Appropriation

Appropriation Summary:

	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Energy supply and conservation	5,860	-5,860	
Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
National nuclear security administration:			
Weapons activities	6,511,312	-39,140	6,472,172
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,722,646	87,000	1,809,646
Naval reactors	808,219		808,219
Office of the administrator	394,656	5,000	399,656
IAEA Fuel Bank		50,000	50,000
Total, National nuclear security administration	9,436,833	102,860	9,539,693

593

Environmental and other defense activities:

Defense environmental cleanup	5,363,905	47,000	5,410,905
Other defense activities	763,974	-100,900	663,074
Defense nuclear waste disposal	292,046	-50,000	242,046
Total, Environmental & other defense activities	6,419,925	-103,900	6,316,025
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	15,856,758	-1,040	15,855,718
Total, Discretionary Funding	15,862,618	-6,900	15,855,718

Department of Energy National Security Programs (Dollars in Thousands)

Energy Supply And Conservation
Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability
Operations and analysis
Infrastructure security & energy restoration

Weapons Activities

Directed stockpile work
Life extension programs
B61 Life extension program
W76 Life extension program
W80 Life extension program
Total, Life extension programs

Stockpile systems

B61 Stockpile systems
W62 Stockpile systems
W76 Stockpile systems
W78 Stockpile systems
W80 Stockpile systems
B83 Stockpile systems
W84 Stockpile systems
W87 Stockpile systems
W88 Stockpile systems
Total, Stockpile systems
Reliable replacement warhead
Weapons dismantlement and disposition

	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
	5,860	-5,860	
	63,115		63,115
	175,571	-60,000	115,571
	238,686	-60,000	178,686
	75,091		75,091
	2,153		2,153
	69,238		69,238
	38,991		38,991
	32,372		32,372
	25,012		25,012
	57,147		57,147
	46,713		46,713
	346,717		346,717
	88,769	106,300	195,069
	52,250	20,000	72,250

Department of Energy National Security Programs (Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Stockpile services			
Production support	284,979		284,979
Research and development support	33,329		33,329
R&D certification and safety	181,984		181,984
Management, technology, and production	205,576		205,576
Responsive infrastructure	14,946		14,946
Total, Stockpile services	720,814		720,814
Total, Directed stockpile work	1,447,236	66,300	1,513,536
Campaigns:			
Science campaign			
Primary assessment technologies	63,527		63,527
Dynamic materials properties	98,014		98,014
Advanced radiography	30,995		30,995
Secondary assessment technologies	80,539		80,539
Test readiness			
Total, Science campaign	273,075		273,075
Engineering campaign			
Enhanced surety	24,803	-19,300	5,503
Weapon systems engineering assessment			
technology	19,691	-13,200	6,491
Nuclear survivability	8,813	-5,600	3,213
Enhanced surveillance	80,614	-48,300	32,314

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Engineering campaign construction activities			
MESA, other project costs	7,630		7,630
Construction:			
01-D-108 Microsystem & engineering science applications (MESA), Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM	11,198		11,198
Total, Engineering campaign construction activities	18,828		18,828
Total, Engineering campaign	152,749	-86,400	66,349
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign			
Ignition	97,537	2,000	99,537
Support of stockpile programs			
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support.....	67,935	1,674	69,609
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	10,440		10,440
University grants/other ICF support			
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	3,213		3,213
Facility operations and target production	86,083	6,000	92,083
Inertial fusion technology			
NIF assembly and installation	136,912		136,912
High-energy petawatt laser development			
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	402,120	9,674	411,794

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Construction:			
96-D-111 National Ignition Facility (NIF), Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA	10,139		10,139
Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	412,259	9,674	421,933
Advanced simulation and computing campaign			
Operations and maintenance	585,738		585,738
Pit manufacturing and certification			
Pit manufacturing	155,838		155,838
Pit certification	45,999	-8,000	37,999
Pit manufacturing capability	54,479	-5,000	49,479
Modern pit facility			
Pit campaign support activities at NTS			
Consolidated plutonium center			
other project cost (OPC)	24,914	-24,914	
Total, Pit manufacturing and certification	281,230	-37,914	243,316
Readiness Campaign			
Stockpile readiness	18,924		18,924
High explosives and weapon operations	9,835		9,835
Non-nuclear readiness	25,592		25,592

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2008 <u>Request</u>	Senate <u>Change</u>	Senate <u>Authorized</u>
Tritium readiness			
Operations and maintenance	73,231		73,231
Construction:			
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC			
Total, Tritium readiness	73,231		73,231
Advanced design and production technologies			
Total, Readiness campaign	33,587		33,587
Total, Campaigns	161,169		161,169
	1,866,220	-114,640	1,751,580
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)			
Operations of facilities			
Operations of facilities	1,159,305		1,159,305
Operations of facilities			
Kansas City Plant			
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory			
Los Alamos National Laboratory			
Nevada Test Site			
Pantex			
Sandia National Laboratory		36,800	36,800
Savannah River Site			
Y-12 Production Plant			
Institutional site support			
Total, Operations of facilities	36,800		36,800
Total, Operations of facilities	1,159,305	36,800	1,196,105

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Program readiness	71,466		71,466
Material recycle and recovery	69,962		69,962
Containers	19,184		19,184
Storage	35,133		35,133
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,355,050	36,800	1,391,850
Construction:			
08-D-801 High pressure fire loop (HPFL) Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	7,000		7,000
08-D-802 High explosive pressing facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	25,300		25,300
08-D-804 TA-55 Reinvestment project Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	6,000		6,000
07-D-140 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations	2,500		2,500
07-D-220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos,	26,672		26,672
06-D-140 Project engineering design (PED) various locations	23,862		23,862
06-D-402 NTS replace fire stations 1 & 2 Nevada Test Site, NV	6,719		6,719
			599

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
06-D-403 Tritium facility modernization Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA			
06-D-404 Building remediation, restoration, and upgrade, Nevada Test Site, NV			
05-D-140 Project engineering design various locations	7,000		7,000
05-D-401 Building 12-64 production bays upgrades Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX			600
05-D-402 Beryllium capability(BEC) project, Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN			
04-D-103 Project engineering and design, (PED) various locations			
04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	95,586	-50,000	45,586
04-D-126 Building 12-44 production cells upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX			

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
04-D-128 TA-18 Criticality experiments facility (CEF), Los Alamos National Laboratory, NM and Nevada Test Site, NV	29,455		29,455
03-D-102 National security sciences building Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM			
03-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations			
01-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations			
01-D-124 HEU materials facility, Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN	77,000		77,000
Total, Construction	307,094	-50,000	257,094
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,662,144	-13,200	1,648,944
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	130,845		130,845
Program direction	84,801		84,801
Total, Secure transportation asset	215,646		215,646
Nuclear weapons incident response	161,748	10,000	171,748

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program			
Operation and maintenance			
Construction	231,023		231,023
08-D-601 Mercury highway			
Nevada Test Site, NV	7,800		7,800
08-D-602 Potable water system upgrades			
Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN	22,500		22,500
07-D-253 TA 1 heating systems modernization (HSM) Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM	13,000		13,000
06-D-160 Project engineering and design various locations			
06-D-601 Electrical distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	2,500		2,500
06-D-602 Gas main and distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	1,900		1,900
06-D-603 Steam plant life extension project (SLEP), Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN	15,020		15,020
			602

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
05-D-160 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program project engineering and design (PED), various locations			
05-D-601 Compressed air upgrades project (CAUP), Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN			
05-D-602 Power grid infrastructure upgrade (PGIU), Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM			
Total, Construction	62,720		62,720
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	293,743		293,743
Environmental projects and operations Long term response actions Long term stewardship	17,518		17,518
Total, Environmental projects and operations	17,518		17,518
Safeguards and security Defense nuclear security Operations and maintenance	721,318	62,400	783,718

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2008 <u>Request</u>	Senate <u>Change</u>	Senate <u>Authorized</u>
Construction:			
08-D-701 Nuclear materials S&S upgrade project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	49,496		49,496
05-D-170 Project engineering and design, various locations	8,000		8,000
Total, Construction	57,496		57,496
Total, Defense nuclear security	778,814	62,400	841,214
Cybersecurity	102,243		102,243
Total, Safeguards and security	881,057	62,400	943,457
Subtotal, Weapons Activities	6,545,312	10,860	6,556,172
Adjustments			
Use of prior year unobligated balances		-50,000	-50,000
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-34,000		-34,000
Transfer to Office of the Administrator			
Total, Adjustments	-34,000	-50,000	-84,000
Total, Weapons Activities	6,511,312	-39,140	6,472,172
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			
Nonproliferation and verification R&D			
Operations and maintenance		50,000	315,252
Construction:	265,252		
07-SC-05 Physical Science Facility			
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory			
Richland, WA			

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
06-D-180 06-01 Project engineering and design (PED), Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA			
Total, Construction	265,252	50,000	315,252
Total, Nonproliferation & verification R&D			
Nonproliferation and international security	124,870	13,000	137,870
Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention		{8,000}	
International Regimes and Agreements		{5,000}	
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation			
Second Line of Defense core program	371,771	10,000	381,771
		{10,000}	
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program.....	181,593	14,000	195,593
Zheleznogorsk		{14,000}	
Fissile materials disposition			
U.S. surplus materials disposition	215,685	{-14,000}	215,685
Russian surplus materials disposition		{14,000}	
Construction:			
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC	60,000		60,000
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	333,849		333,849
Total, Construction	393,849		393,849

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2008 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Total, Fissile materials disposition	609,534		609,534
Global threat reduction initiative	119,626		119,626
Megaports from FY08 cost of war	30,000		30,000
International Radiological threats from FY08 cost of war	20,000		20,000
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,672,646	87,000	1,759,646
Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances			
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,722,646	87,000	1,809,646

Naval Reactors			
Naval reactors development			
Operation and maintenance	765,519		765,519
Transfer to nuclear energy			
Total, Operation and maintenance	765,519		765,519
Construction:			
08-D-901 Shipping and receiving and warehouse complex (SRWC), Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory (BAPL), Pittsburgh, PA	9,000		9,000
08-D-190 Project engineering and design			
Expended Core Facility M-290 recovering discharge station, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	550		550

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

07-D-190 Materials research technology complex (MRTC), Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory (BAPL), Pittsburgh, PA	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
	450		450
05-D-900 Materials development facility building, Schenectady, NY			
Total, Construction	10,000		10,000
Total, Naval reactors development	775,519		775,519
Program direction	32,700		32,700
Total, Naval Reactors	808,219		808,219
Office Of The Administrator			
Office of the administrator	394,656	5,000	399,656
Use of prior year balances			
Total, Office Of The Administrator	394,656	5,000	399,656
IAEA Nuclear Fuel Bank			
Nuclear Fuel Bank	50,000		50,000
Total, Nuclear Fuel Bank	50,000		50,000
Defense Environmental Cleanup			
Closure sites:			
Ashtabula	295		295
Columbus			

Department of Energy National Security Programs (Dollars in Thousands)

Closure sites administration			
Fernald			
Miamisburg			
Rocky Flats			
Total, Closure sites			
	FY 2008 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	11,834		11,834
	30,308		30,308
	42,437		42,437
Hanford site:			
2012 completion projects			
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition			
plutonium finishing plant (PFP)	98,002		98,002
SNF stabilization and disposition	99,815		99,815
Nuclear facility D&D river corridor closure project	215,221		215,221
Solid waste stabilization and disposition			
HAMMER facility			
B-reactor museum			
Total, 2012 completion projects	413,038		413,038
2035 completion projects			
Solid waste stabilization and disposition			
Solid waste stabilization and disposition 2035	236,788		236,788
Soil and water remediation - groundwater			
vadose zone	105,552		105,552
Nuclear facility D&D - remainder of Hanford	98,753		98,753
Operate waste disposal facility	3,329		3,329
SNF stabilization and disposition/storage			

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

Richland community and regulatory support
Total, 2035 completion projects
Total, Hanford site

FY 2008 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
19,620		19,620
464,042		464,042
877,080		877,080

Office of River Protection:
Waste treatment and immobilization plant
Construction:

01-D-416 Waste treatment and
immobilization plant
01-D-16A Low activity waste facility
01-D-16B Analytical laboratory
01-D-16C Balance of facilities
01-D-16D High level waste facility
01-D-16E Pretreatment facility

Total, Construction

Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant

143,000		143,000
45,000		45,000
72,000		72,000
177,000		177,000
253,000		253,000
690,000		690,000
690,000		690,000

Tank farm activities

Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization
and disposition

River protection community and regulatory support
Total, Tank farm activities

Total, Office of River protection

272,972		272,972
471		471
273,443		273,443
963,443		963,443

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Idaho National Laboratory:			
SNF stabilization and disposition/storage			
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	2,250		2,250
SNF stabilization and disposition - 2012	29,188		29,188
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	168,623		168,623
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	61,616		61,616
Construction			
06-D-401 Sodium bearing waste treatment project, Idaho	112,800		112,800
04-D-414 Sodium bearing waste treatment facility, PED, Idaho			
Total, Construction	112,800		112,800
Soil and water remediation - 2012	112,389		112,389
Nuclear facility D & D	13,373		13,373
Non-nuclear facility D & D			
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,787		3,787
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	504,026		504,026
NNSA sites			
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	8,680		8,680
NNSA Service Center	29,096		29,096
Nevada	81,106		81,106

Department of Energy National Security Programs (Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Kansas City Plant			
California site support	370		370
Pantex	12,411		12,411
Sandia National Laboratories			
Nevada off-sites			
Los Alamos National Laboratory	139,467		139,467
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	271,130		271,130
Oak Ridge Reservation:			
Solid waste stabilization and completion - 2006			
Soil and water remediation - Melton Valley			
Solid waste stabilization and disposition - 2012	72,285		72,285
Soil and water remediation - offsites	6,379		6,379
Nuclear facility D & D, East Tennessee			
technology park	3,353		3,353
Nuclear facility D & D, Y-12 National Security Complex	19,855		19,855
Nuclear facility D & D, Oak Ridge National Laboratory	51,446		51,446
Solid waste stabilization and disposition			
Science current generation			
Solid waste stabilization and disposition			
OR reservation community and regulatory support	5,966		5,966
Building 3019	20,000		20,000
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	179,284		179,284

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Savannah River sites:			
2012 completion projects			
Nuclear facility D&D			
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition			
Construction:			
04-D-423 Container surveillance capability in 105K	31,000		31,000
04-D-414 Container surveillance capability			
in 235F, Project engineering and design			
Total, Construction	31,000		31,000
Total, 2012 completion projects	31,000		31,000
2035 completion projects			
SNF stabilization, disposition/storage	12,500		12,500
SR community and regulatory support	311,811		311,811
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	31,133		31,133
Spent nuclear fuel stabilization and disposition	61,528	16,000	77,528
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	75,191		75,191
Soil and water remediation			
Nuclear facility D&D	2,908	21,000	23,908
Construction:			
08-D-414 Project engineering and design	15,000		15,000
Plutonium Vitrification Facility, VL	15,000		15,000
Total, Construction	30,000		30,000
Total, 2035 completion projects	510,071	37,000	547,071

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Tank farm activities			
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	524,018		524,018
Construction:			
05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	131,000		131,000
04-D-408 Glass waste storage building #2, Savannah River			
03-D-414 Salt waste processing facility PED, Savannah River	10,001		10,001
Total, Construction	141,001		141,001
Total, Tank farm activities	665,019		665,019
Total, Savannah River site	1,206,090	37,000	1,243,090
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant			
Waste isolation pilot plant	133,018		133,018
Central characterization project	32,898		32,898
Transportation	27,134		27,134
Community and regulatory support	26,689		26,689
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	219,739		219,739
Program direction	309,760		309,760
Program support	33,146		33,146

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2008 <u>Request</u>	Senate <u>Change</u>	Senate <u>Authorized</u>
Safeguards and Security:			
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,927		4,927
Oak Ridge Reservation	18,490		18,490
Fernald			
West Valley	1,600		1,600
Paducah			
Portsmouth	11,667		11,667
Richland/Hanford Site	87,297		87,297
Savannah River Site	149,400		149,400
Total, Safeguards and Security	273,381		273,381
Technology development	21,389	10,000	31,389
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	463,000		463,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup	5,363,905	47,000	5,410,905
Use of prior year balances			
Salt waste processing facility FY 2005			
uncosted balance			
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,363,905	47,000	5,410,905
Other Defense Activities			
Health, safety and security			
Health, safety and security	329,305	-1,900	327,405
Program direction	100,043		100,043
Total, Health, safety and security	429,348	-1,900	427,448

Department of Energy National Security Programs (Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY 2008 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Office of security and safety performance assurance			
Nuclear safeguards and security			
Security investigations			
Program direction			
Total, Security and safety performance assurance			
Environment, safety & health			
Environment, safety and health (defense)			
Program direction			
Total, Environment, safety and health			
Office of Legacy Management			
Legacy management	148,063		148,063
Program direction	11,000		11,000
Total, Office of Legacy Management	159,063		159,063
Nuclear energy			
Infrastructure			
Idaho facilities management			
INL infrastructure O&M			
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	75,949		75,949
Total, Infrastructure	75,949		75,949
Program direction			
Total, Nuclear energy	75,949		75,949

Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

Defense related administrative support			
Office of hearings and appeals			
Subtotal, Other defense activities			
	FY 2008	Senate	Senate
	Request	Change	Authorized
	99,000	-99,000	
	4,607		4,607
	767,967	-100,900	667,067
Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances	-990		-990
Less security charge for reimbursable work (NE)	-3,003		-3,003
Total, Adjustments	-3,993		-3,993
Total, Other Defense Activities	763,974	-100,900	663,074
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	292,046	-50,000	242,046

National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of \$9.5 billion for the Department of Energy (DOE) in fiscal year 2008 for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to carry out programs necessary to national security.

Weapons activities

The committee recommends \$6.5 billion for weapons activities, a decrease of \$39.1 million below the budget request. The committee authorizes the following activities: \$1.5 billion for directed stockpile work; \$1.8 billion for campaigns; \$1.6 billion for readiness in the technical base; \$215.6 million for the secure transportation asset; \$171.7 million for nuclear weapons incidence response; \$943.5 million for safeguards and security; \$293.7 million for facilities and infrastructure recapitalization; and, \$17.5 million for environmental projects and operations.

Directed stockpile work

The committee recommends \$1.5 billion for directed stockpile work, an increase of \$66.3 million above the amount of the budget request. The directed stockpile account supports work directly related to weapons in the stockpile, including day-to-day maintenance as well as research, development, engineering, and certification activities to support planned life extension programs and the reliable replacement warhead. This account also includes fabrication and assembly of weapons components, feasibility studies, weapons dismantlement and disposal, training, and support equipment.

The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million for weapons dismantlements to sustain the pace of dismantlements. The committee congratulates the NNSA on its Pantex throughput initiative, which has maintained nuclear operating safety and resulted in more efficient operations. Funding for the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) is reduced by \$43.0 million and is discussed later in this report. The committee recommends a reduction of \$60.0 million for the W-76 life extension program. The reduction brings the funding for the W-76 life extension program to the fiscal year 2008 funding level that was planned in fiscal year 2007. The additional funds were included in the budget request to accelerate the W-76 life extension. The committee supports the W-76 life extension program, but sees no justification for an accelerated program.

Campaigns

The committee recommends \$1.8 billion for campaigns, a decrease of \$114.6 million below the amount of the budget request. The campaigns focus on science and engineering efforts involving the three nuclear weapons laboratories, the Nevada Test Site, and the weapons production plants. Each campaign is focused on a specific activity to support and maintain the nuclear stockpile without full-scale underground nuclear weapons testing. These efforts form the scientific underpinning of the Department's certification that the stockpile remains safe, secure, and reliable without nuclear weapons testing.

The reductions in the engineering campaigns reflect a shift in funds that were requested for the RRW but were included in the engineering campaigns, from the engineering campaigns to the RRW account. The committee also recommends an increase of \$9.7 million in the Inertial Confinement Fusion and High Yield campaign for the National Ignition Facility (NIF) to fully fund the national ignition campaign, consistent with the approved baseline plan. The committee supports the goal of ignition in 2010 and urges the NNSA to utilize the NIF as soon as possible to conduct stockpile stewardship experiments.

Readiness in the technical base

The committee recommends \$1.6 billion for readiness in the technical base and facilities (RTBF), a decrease of \$13.2 million below the budget request. This account funds facilities and infrastructure in the nuclear weapons complex to ensure the operational readiness of the complex and includes construction funding for new facilities.

The committee recommends an increase of \$36.8 million for deferred maintenance and infrastructure needs at Pantex, including operations of facilities and critical infrastructure and nuclear safety upgrades, including replacement of nuclear facility hoists and high pressure fire loop lead-ins. The committee further recommends a \$50.0 million decrease in the Chemistry and Metallurgy Facility Replacement project (CMRR), Project 04-D-125, at the Los Alamos National Laboratory as a result of changing project requirements of the nuclear facility component of the CMRR. The NNSA has taken a pause in the design activities for the nuclear facility component of the CMRR while continuing with the design of the radiological laboratory.

Secure transportation asset

The committee recommends \$215.6 million for the secure transportation asset, the amount of the budget request. The secure transportation asset is responsible for the transportation of nuclear weapons, weapons materials and components, and other materials requiring safe and secure transport. The committee commends the secure transportation asset and its federal agents for increasing the number of secure convoys in recent years, under constrained funding. The committee is aware that workload requirements for the secure transportation asset will escalate significantly as the Department proceeds with the consolidation of its nuclear materials and deals with increased weapons dismantlements. The committee urges the DOE and the NNSA to budget adequate funding to undertake this important activity. The committee is concerned that as the workload increases the NNSA maintains a robust training program, which is essential to the long-term effectiveness of the federal agents.

Nuclear weapons incident response

The committee recommends \$171.7 million for nuclear weapons incident response, an increase of \$10.0 million above the budget request, to address shortfalls in the ability to attribute an incident to a state or non-state actor.

Safeguards and security

The committee recommends \$943.5 million for weapons safeguards and security, an increase of \$62.4 million above the budget request. The committee recommends the additional funds to address training and equipment shortages at many of the NNSA sites.

Sites that store and use weapons grade fissile materials must meet the defined, rigorous Design Basis Threat (DBT) standards for security. The committee urges the NNSA to work with the DOE to consolidate these nuclear materials at a minimum number of sites. The consolidation effort should go forward independent of any plans to restructure the nuclear weapons complex. The committee questions the wisdom of moving nuclear materials numerous times, which appears to be the current plan. The committee continues to be concerned with the lack of results coming from the Department's nuclear materials consolidation coordinating committee and the length of time needed to decide on and implement a comprehensive consolidation. The extended delay can only serve to reduce the security posture in the long-term. As a result, the NNSA and the DOE must either invest significant resources to maintain the required level of security, or defer the necessary upgrades to meet the DBT at sites that are to be de-inventoried, thus calling into question the security posture at those sites. Neither of these outcomes is acceptable or responsible.

The NNSA has initiated the Complex 2030 study to review the nuclear weapons complex and decide on the design for the complex of the future. The committee is troubled by the scope and timing of the study and the options under consideration. The study does not include any options that would significantly reduce the size of the complex or that would consolidate operations and NNSA sites. The committee urges the NNSA to expand the scope of the Complex 2030 study to look at site consolidation, including the possibility of closing NNSA sites that are surplus to mission needs.

Facilities and infrastructure

The committee recommends \$293.7 million for the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization program (FIRP), the amount of the budget request. FIRP is a capital renewal program which was established to reduce the approximately \$2.4 billion backlog of NNSA deferred maintenance which developed during the 1980s and 1990s. While the FIRP program has been successful, the committee is concerned that at some sites, particularly the Pantex site, the ongoing routine maintenance activities are once again lagging and a new backlog of deferred maintenance is being created.

Environmental projects and operations

The committee recommends \$17.5 million for environmental projects and operations, the amount of the budget request.

The committee was cautious in its support of the creation of the environmental projects and operations account and office, and was concerned that activities that are appropriately within the scope of the Defense Environmental Management (EM) program would be transferred to the NNSA. The DOE fiscal year 2008 budget request made clear that the EM program will continue to assume responsi-

bility for dismantlement of excess contaminated facilities. As a result, the committee believes that this new organization is a valuable addition to support long-term NNSA environmental stewardship responsibilities.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program

The committee recommends \$1.8 billion for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program, an increase of \$87.0 million above the total amount of the fiscal year base budget request and the amount requested in fiscal year 2008 war-related funding. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has management and oversight responsibilities for the nonproliferation programs of the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program. The committee recommends funding for these programs as follows: \$315.3 million for nonproliferation and verification research and development—an increase of \$50.0 million for next generation nuclear detection technologies, the nuclear explosion monitoring program, and technologies to support improved nuclear material forensic capabilities, including a nuclear forensic library, research on improvised nuclear explosive devices, and new nuclear energy production concepts; \$137.9 million for nonproliferation and international security—an increase of \$8.0 million for global initiatives for proliferation prevention, and an increase of \$5.0 million for international regimes and agreements, including technical assistance to the International Atomic Energy Agency for enhanced safeguards activities; \$381.8 million for international nuclear materials protection and cooperation—an increase of \$10.0 million for the second line of defense core program; \$195.6 million for elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production—an increase of \$14.0 million to accelerate shutdown of the plutonium producing reactor at Zheleznogorsk, Russia; \$609.5 million for fissile materials disposition—the amount of the request, including a \$14.0 million reduction in U.S. surplus materials disposition and a \$14.0 million increase in Russian surplus materials disposition for the U.S./Russia partnership in Gas Turbine-Modular Helium reactor technology; and \$169.6 million for the global threat reduction initiative—the amount of the budget request, including funds in the fiscal year 2008 war-related funding budget request.

Nuclear Forensics

In the event that a non-state actor would ever detonate a nuclear device or explode a dirty bomb in the United States, correctly ascertaining the responsible party would be a difficult task, complicated by the fact that the nuclear material or weapon used would most likely be stolen. The committee supports the efforts in the NNSA, in conjunction with the Air Force and the intelligence community, to develop the tools to determine the source of the materials or weapons. There are two key aspects to successful forensics and attribution: technical capabilities to assess and collect samples, and the ability to compare them with material of known origin. The committee includes additional funding for research and development to develop the necessary collection and analytic capabilities, both pre-detonation and post-detonation, and to support

the development of the Department of Energy (DOE) forensic library of nuclear materials.

An additional element of the nuclear forensics capability is the nuclear explosion monitoring program. Attention to these technologies has lagged in recent years. New capabilities for ground and space monitoring technologies, as well as analytic capabilities are needed to detect low level, uncoupled, clandestine underground nuclear explosions. Such technologies would include hydroacoustic and signature element detection capabilities as well as other technologies.

Radiation Detection

The committee also recommends additional funding for work on basic nuclear detection technologies. The NNSA is responsible for all of the U.S. Government's basic nuclear and radiation detection research and development. Today the ability to detect the most dangerous nuclear materials, weapons-grade plutonium and highly enriched uranium, is limited. The consequences of a terrorist using these materials in a nuclear explosive device would be catastrophic. The committee believes that additional effort should be focused on research that could detect these largely undetectable materials.

Fissile Materials Disposition program

The committee notes its continuing and serious concerns regarding the Russian and U.S. Fissile Materials Disposition programs. The program consists of three separate functional areas, the Mixed Oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication facility, the plutonium pit disassembly facility, and the waste solidification facility. The MOX facility total project cost is estimated by the NNSA to be \$4.7 billion, and the pit disassembly and waste solidification facilities total project cost (TPC) is estimated to be \$2.7 billion. All of these projects have focused on the effort to disposition 34 metric tons of plutonium over a 13-year period without respect to the need to disposition all the many additional tons of excess plutonium that will be excess as the nuclear weapons stockpile draws down significantly in the future. Even with the \$7.4 billion TPC for the disposition facilities there are still tons of plutonium that are not sufficiently pure to be used in the MOX process. The fate of this plutonium is unknown and not included in the \$7.4 billion TPC. Given all of the other demands on the defense budget, the committee is becoming more concerned about the entire approach to disposition. The committee also recognizes that long-term storage is not a good long-term option, given cost, security and environmental concerns.

The committee notes that the NNSA has failed to conduct an independent cost estimate of the MOX facility and directs the NNSA to conduct an independent cost estimate of the pit disassembly and waste solidification facilities.

The committee further notes that the United States and Russia have still not finalized an agreement whereby each country agrees to complete disposition of the original 34 metric tons of excess plutonium by a date certain.

The committee directs the Department of Energy to look at all of the plutonium that is currently excess or that could be declared excess in the next 15 years and develop a complete plan that in-

cludes a comprehensive, coordinated disposition path for all of the excess plutonium. The plan should be provided to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2008.

International Atomic Energy Agency nuclear fuel bank

The committee recommends a provision that would recommend \$50.0 million for the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) nuclear fuel bank. As described by Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei, Director General of the IAEA, the fuel bank would have four key aspects:

- (1) provide assurance of supply of reactor technology and nuclear fuel;
- (2) accept a time-limited moratorium (of perhaps 5 to 10 years) on new uranium enrichment and plutonium separation facilities—at the very least for countries that do not currently have such technologies;
- (3) establish a framework for multilateral management and control of the “back end” of the fuel cycle (i.e. spent fuel reprocessing and waste disposal); and
- (4) create a similar framework for multilateral management and control of the “front end” of the fuel cycle (i.e. enrichment and fuel production).

The committee notes that the Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI) has contributed \$50.0 million to the IAEA to jump-start the nuclear fuel bank and to help create a low enriched uranium stockpile to support nations that make the sovereign choice not to build indigenous nuclear fuel cycle capabilities. This grant to the IAEA was contingent on two conditions: that the IAEA takes the necessary actions to approve establishment of this reserve, and that one or more member states contribute an additional \$100.0 million in funding or an equivalent value of low enriched uranium to jump-start the reserve. The committee believes that the U.S. should lead the way and match the NTI funding.

Naval reactors

The committee recommends \$808.2 million for Naval reactors, the amount of the budget request.

Office of the Administrator

The committee recommends \$399.7 million for program direction for the NNSA, an increase of \$5.0 million above the the budget request, to support increased nonproliferation program activities. This account provides program direction funding for all elements of NNSA, except for the Naval reactors program and the secure transportation asset.

Defense environmental cleanup (sec. 3102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of \$5.4 billion for the Department of Energy in fiscal year 2008 for environmental cleanup activities, an increase of \$47.0 million above the budget request.

The committee recommends an increase of \$37.0 million above the budget request for 2035 completion projects at the Savannah River Site that would reduce long-term costs, avoid the possible as-

assessment of fines and penalties for failing to meet enforceable milestones, and would allow the site to package and ship additional transuranic waste. The committee also recommends an increase of \$10.0 million above the budget request for technology development to address new technologies for treating liquid wastes and increasing the ability to remove additional sludge from high level radioactive waste tanks cost effectively.

Other defense activities (sec. 3103)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$663.1 million for the Department of Energy for other defense activities, \$100.9 million below the budget request.

Health, safety, and security

The committee recommends \$427.4 million for health, safety, and security, \$1.9 million below the budget request. The committee notes that in late 2006 the Department of Energy established a new Office of Health, Safety, and Security, combining elements of the Office of Environment, Safety, and Health and the Office of Security and Safety Performance Assessment. The committee remains concerned that this important office, which is responsible for a broad range of oversight, was not established under the direction of an assistant secretary. This new account supports the operation of this new office.

Office of Legacy Management

The committee recommends \$159.1 million for the Office of Legacy Management, the amount of the budget request. The Office of Legacy Management is responsible for ensuring pension and benefit continuity to the Department's former contractor work force. This work force was formerly employed at seven of the Department's sites at which cleanup has now been completed. As additional sites are cleaned up and closed down, and their benefit programs transferred to the Office of Legacy Management, the budget for the Office of Legacy Management is expected to increase sharply. The committee encourages the Department to avail itself of the ready expertise existing in the private sector specializing in administering health and pension benefit programs instead of "reinventing the wheel" inside the Department.

Nuclear energy

The committee recommends \$75.9 million for nuclear energy, the amount of the budget request.

Defense-related administrative support

The budget request included \$99.0 million for defense-related administrative support. The committee recommends no funds for these activities. The committee views these administrative support activities as inherently part of the nondefense activities of the Department and resists their categorization as defense-related. The committee does not support the use of atomic energy defense funds for nondefense activities.

Office of Hearings and Appeals

The committee recommends \$4.6 million for the Office of Hearings and Appeals, the amount of the budget request.

Defense nuclear waste disposal (sec. 3104)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$242.0 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, a decrease of \$50.0 million below the budget request. The committee notes that the Department of Energy is currently unable to provide a predicted timetable for either when a Nuclear Regulatory Commission license for the geologic repository would be granted, or a prediction of when a repository might begin operating. In addition, there is uncertainty about the disposition of the administration's legislative proposal that would permanently withdraw the land for the repository and would eliminate the administrative cap on the total amount of waste placed in the repository. The committee remains supportive of the effort to establish a geologic repository as delays in the repository delay the ability of the Defense Environmental Management program to complete its work with respect to high level waste and spent nuclear fuel, and increase the overall cost of cleanup.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

Reliable Replacement Warhead program (sec. 3111)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$195.1 million for the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) program, a decrease of \$43.0 million from the budget request. In addition, the provision would restrict the RRW program to activities in phase 2A and below and limit the funds that could be used in fiscal year 2008 for the RRW program to \$195.1 million.

The Department of Energy (DOE) budget request for fiscal year 2008 for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) included a specific line item for the RRW that included \$88.8 million. Additional funds for the RRW program were included in: the NNSA budget in the engineering campaigns, \$86.4 million; the pit manufacturing and certification campaign, \$37.9 million; and the readiness campaign, \$25.0 million; for a total of \$238.1 million. The budget request included funds that could be used for activities up to and including early phase 3 activities, although there was no specific request for phase 3 funding.

The committee does not support RRW activities beyond the phase 2A level at this time. Moreover, authorizing funds for the RRW phase 2A study does not signal support to manufacture or deploy an RRW. Phase 2A is at the beginning of the nuclear weapons acquisition process and the committee believes that many years of research are necessary before any such decision can be made or even meaningfully discussed.

Section 3111 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) directed the Secretary of Energy to carry out an RRW program and established eight enumerated objectives. In November 2006, the NNSA completed a feasibility study for an RRW and in February 2007, the Nuclear Weapons

Council (NWC) approved a candidate design and authorized the NNSA and the Navy to begin phase 2A of the nuclear weapons acquisition process to see if the objectives in section 3111 were achievable.

The nuclear weapons acquisition is comprised of eight well-understood, numbered steps, referred to as phases (1, 2, 2A, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7), that cover the life cycle of a nuclear weapon. This process starts at phase 1, which is a concept development study, and ends with phase 7, which is retirement, storage, and dismantlement. Phase 2A, the phase that the provision recommended by the committee would authorize, is the design definition and cost study. Phase 3 is the full scale engineering development phase. This phase, like phase 2A and all subsequent phases, must be approved by the NWC, and the activities and funding must be specifically authorized and appropriated by Congress.

The RRW as envisioned by the NNSA and the NWC would be a new warhead, designed to fit within a current weapon and delivery system, the Trident D-5 ballistic missile carried on the Trident ballistic missile submarines. The RRW design approved by the NWC is planned to replace the current W-76 warhead and meet the same military requirements as the W-76. As a new warhead, there are many policy questions, concerns, and issues that must be raised, discussed, and resolved before any decision can be made to move to phase 3 or beyond. The committee urges the administration to begin to address these policy issues while concurrently addressing the technical and cost issues for the RRW.

The current nuclear weapons stockpile is safe, secure, and reliable and the Stockpile Stewardship program (SSP), established 15 years ago, has been extremely successful. With the new computational and analytic tools developed under the SSP, nuclear weapons scientists and engineers are able to understand nuclear weapons performance and behavior with more fidelity than was possible prior to the cessation of nuclear weapons testing. With the experience gained through the SSP, these weapons scientists and engineers have high confidence that the nuclear weapons could be maintained through stockpile life extension programs well into the next decade.

The life extension programs are designed to anticipate, identify, and fix or replace the non-nuclear components and fix, if necessary, the nuclear components. Most of the non-nuclear components have a relatively limited lifetime and will eventually have to be replaced as part of a life extension program.

Currently the life extension programs are not designed to replace the nuclear components, the plutonium, primary and the uranium secondary, and have somewhat limited latitude with respect to the manner in which non-nuclear components can be replaced with more modern components.

Recent studies have determined that one of the most troublesome nuclear components of a nuclear weapon, the plutonium primary, or pit, will have minimum lifetimes of at least 85 years. Given that most of the weapons in the stockpile were put into the inventory between 1960 and 1989, this determination is particularly important in making future stockpile decisions.

The NNSA is, however, on the verge of regaining the ability to make an identical pit that could be used to replace a pit in an existing weapon. Even if this effort is successful, a life extension program would be limited to replacing a pit with an identical pit.

An RRW would not be so constrained, as the design approved by the NWC would incorporate new nuclear and non-nuclear components. As such it could be designed to be more safe and secure, to avoid many hazardous materials during manufacture, to be periodically dismantled, and to eliminate any need to resume testing. Equally, if not more important, an RRW would enable substantial reductions in the total number of nuclear weapons in the stockpile by restoring confidence in the nuclear complex. Maintaining multiple levels of redundancy would no longer be necessary to ensure reliability, as is currently the case. Today the stockpile ensures reliability through redundant types of nuclear weapons and through redundant numbers of nuclear warheads. The result of these levels of redundancy is that there are between three and four nuclear warheads in some form of reserve for every deployed weapon. The RRW could have the potential to shrink these ratios to 1 to 1 or lower.

In spite of these potential advantages, however, there are several potential draw backs to the RRW. A new warhead has not been placed in the inventory without testing since the earliest days of the nuclear weapons program. There is significant concern that placing a new, untested weapon in the inventory could reduce reliability or increase the possibility of a return to nuclear weapons testing. Some have suggested it is an option that should not even be considered. As a January 15, 2007, editorial in the New York Times questioned, “while experts debate whether the lab can really build a weapon without testing it, the more important question is whether any president would stake America’s security on an untested arsenal.”

Historically, the United States has sought to prevent the development of nuclear weapons by non-nuclear weapons states by being the world leader for nonproliferation. Many critics and skeptics of the RRW, including former Senator Sam Nunn, are deeply concerned that if Congress gives a green light to this program, such an action will be “misunderstood by our allies, exploited by our adversaries, complicate our work to prevent the spread and use of nuclear weapons . . . and make resolution of the Iran and North Korea challenges all the more difficult.”

The idea of a new nuclear warhead and leadership in non-proliferation are distinctly at odds in the absence of additional steps and policies to reduce the reliance on nuclear weapons, accelerate reductions in the size of the stockpile, formalize the moratorium on nuclear weapons testing, strengthen the nonproliferation regime, and renew commitments to all aspects of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

As Dr. Sidney Drell, a preeminent expert in nuclear weapons and policy, testified before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, “a clear decision on our long-term nuclear policy goals is needed in order to decide on the appropriate size and scope” of the new complex as well as the size of the stockpile and the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. defense planning.

The committee believes that the technical work must go forward apace with the policy discussion and before any decision on RRW development, manufacturing, or deployment. This dual track process must be undertaken cautiously, openly, and with the goals of the RRW clearly stated and well understood. Technical evaluations and conclusions must be reviewed by experts in the DOE laboratories, in the military services, and by outside experts. A consensus in the technical community is necessary to inform the policy discussion. There is no rush on either front.

The committee believes that whether the future decision is to support or not to support an RRW, there may be opportunities presented through the technical work on the RRW to address and improve the safety and security of the existing stockpile as well as for an RRW.

Before this country can collectively come to a thoughtful decision on the RRW, many questions must be answered. Today there are goals and objectives for the RRW, but no answers. Determining whether the goals can be met will be a daunting technical and policy challenge but the committee believes it is worth the effort to try, for now.

The committee notes that section 1061 would direct the next administration to undertake a new nuclear posture review, one of the steps necessary to evaluate the RRW in a policy context.

Limitation on availability of funds for Fissile Materials Disposition program (sec. 3112)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Energy to certify to the congressional defense committees what portions of the fiscal year 2008 and prior fiscal years' funding for the fissile materials disposition program will be obligated and expended in fiscal years 2008 and 2009, before any of the fiscal year 2008 funds are obligated or expended. In the event that any of the fiscal year 2008 funds will not be obligated in fiscal years 2008 or 2009, the provision would authorize the Secretary to use the fiscal year 2008 funds that would not be obligated in fiscal years 2008 and 2009 for fissile materials disposition to be obligated for any other nonproliferation program in which the funds could be obligated and expended in the 2 fiscal years.

Modification of limitations on availability of funds for Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (sec. 3113)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3120 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) to strike the requirement for the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) to review the earned value management system (EVMS) to be used by the construction contractor at the Department of Energy (DOE) Waste Treatment and Immobilization plant (WTP) under construction at the DOE Hanford Site in Richland, Washington. The provision would direct the Secretary of Energy to have the EVMS reviewed by an independent entity chosen by the Secretary.

The committee has learned that subsequent to the passage of section 3120, the DCMA changed its approach to reviewing EVM systems. Furthermore, the committee believes that the change in

approach is not practical for large, technically complex construction projects. The committee notes that the WTP is the largest construction project in the United States. A change in the EVMS at this late stage would delay the construction of the WTP and place the people and the environment in Washington State at prolonged risk of contamination from high level radioactive waste.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

Nuclear test readiness (sec. 3121)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 3152 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–06), as amended, and section 3113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). The recommended provision would reconcile several competing provisions of legislation and report language and is consistent with current test readiness posture. The provision would retain the requirement for a test readiness report, which is due in every odd-numbered year, and allow the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to establish the appropriate level of test readiness. In the most recent test readiness report, dated March 2007, the Secretary of Energy reported that at the end of 2006, the Department of Energy had achieved a 24-month level of test readiness.

Sense of Congress on the nuclear nonproliferation policy of the United States and the Reliable Replacement Warhead program (sec. 3122)

The committee recommends a provision that would set forth the sense of the Congress that the United States should take a number of actions to restore its leadership in nonproliferation matters. These actions outlined in the provision should be taken or initiated before any decision is made to manufacture or deploy a reliable replacement warhead.

Report on status of environmental management initiatives to accelerate the reduction of environmental risks and challenges posed by the legacy of the Cold War (sec. 3123)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a report on the status of environmental management initiatives, and would expand the scope of the report to include the status of enforceable milestones and plans for the future. When the report is completed the Government Accountability Office would be allotted 180 days to review and assess the required report and then submit a report setting forth the results of the review.

The Department of Energy (DOE) Environmental Management program has taken significant steps to streamline and accelerate the rate of cleanup at DOE sites. In February 2002, the DOE completed a top-to-bottom review of the Environmental Management program that set out new approaches for cleanup. Congress received the first environmental status report in 2003.

Some notable progress, such as the closure of the Rocky Flats, Fernald, and Columbus Plants has occurred in the last several

years. Fiscal year 2008 marks the first year in which the DOE Environmental Management budget request does not include funds for any of these three sites. The committee notes that without the need to fund these sites, and with progress at other sites, the fiscal year 2008 budget request is approximately \$1.0 billion less than fiscal year 2006 funding. The committee believes that it is appropriate to get a wrap-up of the accomplishments in the 5 years since the last report and an estimate of what remains to be done. As the Department completes the report the committee would like the DOE to address the method and status of efforts to establish final cleanup and end-state standards.

Comptroller General report on Department of Energy protective force management (sec. 3124)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the security protection forces at Department of Energy (DOE) sites on which category I nuclear materials are maintained.

The Department of Energy is in the process of changing the nature of its security protective forces from defense focused forces to offensive forces functioning in small, military-like, tactical units. These small tactical response units are necessary to meet the most recent Design Basis Threat issued by the DOE.

Protective forces at DOE sites are civilians provided by contractors through individual contracts administered at each site. Both the contractors and the contracting mechanisms differ from site to site, with varying subcontractor and prime contractor arrangements. At a time when threats to nuclear materials and weapons are escalating, the committee wants to make sure that the protective forces are managed, trained, equipped, organized, and compensated in the most appropriate and cost-effective manner to ensure a continued high level of security at DOE sites.

The committee notes that in April the guard force at the Pantex site went on strike on a variety of issues including issues associated with the change in approach to security.

Technical amendments (sec. 3125)

The committee recommends a provision that would make technical amendments to the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2521 et seq.).

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Authorization (sec. 3201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$27.5 million—an increase of \$5.0 million—to the budget request for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB). The DNFSB has the responsibility to ensure that the health and safety of the public and workers at Department of Energy (DOE) defense nuclear facilities is adequately protected.

Currently, the DNFSB is evaluating 25 defense nuclear facility design activities with a total project cost of about \$20.0 billion. Many of these new facilities have significant safety and technical challenges, and are often first of a kind or one of a kind projects. Staffing for the DNFSB is authorized by statute at 150 full-time staff, but the DNFSB fiscal year 2008 budget request supports just 98 full-time staff to ensure adequate protection of public health and safety of nuclear operations at all DOE defense nuclear facilities as well as the construction projects. The committee is concerned that the DNFSB is not sufficiently staffed to meet the challenges presented by the growth in DOE nuclear facility construction and nuclear operations. As a result, the committee believes that additional technical staff are needed.

The committee notes that the statement of managers accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) directed the DOE and the DNFSB to submit a joint report to the congressional defense committees on efforts to “improve the timeliness of issues resolution, including recommendations, if any, for legislation that would strengthen and improve technical oversight of the Department’s nuclear design and operational activities” (H. Rept. 109–702).

Eight months have elapsed since the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) was enacted and the DOE and DNFSB have yet to submit the required report. The committee directs the DOE and the DNFSB to submit the report no later than July 1, 2007.

The committee finds the DNFSB quarterly reports, which were also required in the statement of managers, to be very useful and directs the DNFSB to continue those reports until October 1, 2008.

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* indicates Committee initiative	
	APA		7	CH-47 Helicopters	6,000	*
	APA		13	CH-47 Cargo Helicopter Modifications	16,000	*
	APA		18	Electronic Digital Engine Control Unit	3,000	Lieberman
	APA		18	Electronic Digital Engine Control Unit	3,000	Dodd
	APA		19	Transfer to Kiowa Warrior	31,000	*
	APA		28	Aircraft Wireless Intercom System	5,000	Clinton
	APA		28	Aircraft Wireless Intercom System	5,000	Schumer
	APA		28	Air Warrior	2,000	Warner
	APA		28	Air Warrior	2,000	Webb
	MPA		2	PAC-3 Procurement	75,000	*
	WTCV		24	M240 Medium Machine Gun (7.62 mm)	19,400	Graham
	WTCV		49	Arsenal Support Program Initiative (ASPI)	12,000	Clinton
	WTCV		49	Arsenal Support Program Initiative (ASPI)	12,000	Schumer
	PAA		26	Smoke Grenades	13,000	Pryor
	PAA		26	Smoke Grenades	13,000	Lincoln
	PAA		34	Ammunition Outloading Test Bed	5,000	Inhofe
	PAA		34	Ammunition Outloading Test Bed	5,000	Lugar
	PAA		34	Ammunition Outloading Test Bed	5,000	Bayh
	OPA		54	DISN Hardware Enhancements	1,700	Levin
	OPA		135	Land Warrior	49,500	*
	OPA		142	Recon-Navigation System (RNAV)	4,500	Clinton
	OPA		142	Recon-Navigation System (RNAV)	4,500	Schumer
	OPA		170	Urban Training Center	24,800	Lugar
	OPA		170	Urban Training Center	24,800	Bayh
	OPA		170	Laser Collective Combat Training System (LCCATS) Fielding Program	10,000	Reed
	OPA		170	Call for Fire Trainer II/JFETS	5,000	Inhofe
	APN		29	H-46 Series Modifications	2,000	Webb
	APN		29	H-46 Series Modifications	2,000	Warner
	APN		31	H-53 Series Modifications	2,900	Thune

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* Indicates Committee Initiative	
	APN		35	P-3C Modifications	8,900	Graham
	WPN		17	Allegany Ballistics Laboratory	30,000	Byrd
	SCN		4	Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement	470,000	Lieberman
	SCN		4	Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement	470,000	Reed
	SCN		4	Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement	470,000	Dole
	SCN		4	Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement	470,000	Dodd
	SCN		4	Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement	470,000	Fengold
	SCN		4	Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement	470,000	Voinovich
	OPN		31	AN / SPQ-9B	6,000	Clinton
	OPN		31	AN / SPQ-9B	6,000	Schumer
	OPN		88	Sonobuoys	15,000	Levin
	OPN		88	Sonobuoys	15,000	Lugar
	OPN		88	Sonobuoys	15,000	Stabenow
	OPN		88	Sonobuoys	15,000	Bayh
	OPN		88	Sonobuoys	15,000	Bill Nelson
	OPN		89	Multi-Spectral Threat Emitters (MTES)	8,000	Clinton
	OPN		89	Multi-Spectral Threat Emitters (MTES)	8,000	Schumer
	OPN		89	Multi-Spectral Threat Emitters (MTES)	8,000	Graham
	OPN		115	NULKA Decoy Procurement	6,000	Kennedy
	OPN		117	SSN Training Device Mods	5,000	Reed
	APAF		25	B-52	19,000	*
	APAF		47	LAIRCM for AFSOC AC-130 & MC-130 Aircraft	14,000	Bill Nelson
	APAF		47	LAIRCM for AFSOC AC-130 & MC-130 Aircraft	14,000	Martinez
	APAF		47	LAIRCM for AFSOC AC-130 & MC-130 Aircraft	14,000	Reid
	APAF		49	KC-135 Global Air Traffic Management (GATM)	9,000	Sessions
	APAF		49	KC-135 Global Air Traffic Management (GATM)	9,000	Inhofe
	APAF		49	KC-135 Global Air Traffic Management (GATM)	9,000	Cornyn
	APAF		49	KC-135 Global Air Traffic Management (GATM)	9,000	Bill Nelson
	APAF		78	Litening Advanced Targeting Pods	49,500	Stabenow
	APAF		78	Litening Advanced Targeting Pods	49,500	Sessions

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					*	* indicates Committee initiative
I	APAF		78	Litening Advanced Targeting Pods	49,500	Thune
I	APAF		78	Litening Advanced Targeting Pods	49,500	Crapo
I	APAF		78	Litening Advanced Targeting Pods	49,500	Craig
I	APAF		78	Litening Advanced Targeting Pods	49,500	Salazar
I	MPAF		13	AEHF 4	125,000	*
I	OPAF		28	Joint Threat Emitters	8,000	Levin
I	OPAF		28	Joint Threat Emitters	8,000	Isakson
I	OPAF		36	SBIRS Backup Ground Station	27,600	*
I	OPAF		53	Self Deploying Infrared Streamers	2,500	Akaka
I	PDW		18	Defense Information System Network Enhancement	14,000	Levin
I	PDW		78	M291 Skin Decontamination Kit	14,000	Clinton
I	PDW		78	M291 Skin Decontamination Kit	14,000	Schumer
I	PDW		78	M291 Skin Decontamination Kit	14,000	Pryor
I	PDW		78	M291 Skin Decontamination Kit	14,000	Lincoln
I	PDW		80	CP DEPMEDS	1,500	Pryor
I	PDW		80	CP DEPMEDS	1,500	Lincoln
I	PDW		81	M22 ACADA	20,000	Thune
I	PDW		81	M22 ACADA	20,000	Reid
I	PDW		81	Improved Chemical Agent Monitor	10,000	Thune
I	PDW		81	Improved Chemical Agent Monitor	10,000	Reid
I	PDW		81	Joint Biological Point Detection System	4,000	Dole
II	RDA	0601102A	2	Respiratory Infections Research	2,000	Ben Nelson
II	RDA	0601102A	2	Document Exploitation Systems	3,000	Warner
II	RDA	0601102A	2	Organic Semiconductor Modeling and Simulation Research	1,000	Cornyn
II	RDA	0601102A	2	Nanostructure De-Icing Research	1,500	Pryor
II	RDA	0601102A	2	Nanostructure De-Icing Research	1,500	Lincoln
II	RDA	0601103A	3	URI Program Increase	9,000	Kennedy
II	RDA	0601103A	3	URI Program Increase	9,000	Collins
II	RDA	0601103A	3	URI Program Increase	9,000	Levin
II	RDA	0601103A	3	URI Program Increase	9,000	Stabenow

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* Indicates Committee initiative	
II	RDA	0601103A	3	URI Program Increase	9,000	Bingaman
II	RDA	0601103A	3	URI Program Increase	9,000	Roberts
II	RDA	0601103A	3	URI Program Increase	9,000	Domenici
II	RDA	0601103A	3	URI Program Increase	9,000	Clinton
II	RDA	0601103A	3	URI Program Increase	9,000	Dodd
II	RDA	0601103A	3	URI Program Increase	9,000	Kerry
II	RDA	0601103A	3	URI Program Increase	9,000	Lautenberg
II	RDA	0601104A	4	Automotive Research	3,000	Levin
II	RDA	0601104A	4	Automotive Research	3,000	Stabenow
II	RDA	0601104A	4	Information Assurance Research	1,500	Warner
II	RDA	0601104A	4	Information Assurance Research	1,500	Webb
II	RDA	0601104A	4	Nanoscale Biosensor Research	2,500	Pryor
II	RDA	0601104A	4	Nanoscale Biosensor Research	2,500	Lincoln
II	RDA	0601104A	4	Integrated Sensing and Communications Systems	2,000	Levin
II	RDA	0601104A	4	Integrated Sensing and Communications Systems	2,000	Stabenow
II	RDA	0601104A	4	Urban Simulation and Training Research	1,400	McConnell
II	RDA	0601104A	4	Network Security Research	2,000	McConnell
II	RDA	0601104A	4	Low Temperature Vehicle Performance Research	2,000	Levin
II	RDA	0601104A	4	Machine Interface Research	1,500	McConnell
II	RDA	0601104A	4	Transparent Nanocomposite Armor Research	300	Thune
II	RDA	0601104A	4	Nanocomposite Materials Research	2,000	Bill Nelson
II	RDA	0601104A	4	Nanocomposite Materials Research	2,000	Martinez
II	RDA	0602105A	5	Nanosensor Manufacturing Research	2,000	Kerry
II	RDA	0602105A	5	Nanosensor Manufacturing Research	2,000	Kennedy
II	RDA	0602105A	5	Ballistic Materials for Future Combat Systems	2,000	Reed
II	RDA	0602105A	5	IED Protection Materials Research	4,000	Ben Nelson
II	RDA	0602105A	5	IED Protection Materials Research	4,000	Hagel
II	RDA	0602105A	5	Advanced Composite Materials Research	3,000	Stabenow
II	RDA	0602105A	5	Advanced Composite Materials Research	3,000	Levin
II	RDA	0602105A	5	Soldier Torso Armor Systems	2,000	Chambliss
II	RDA	0602120A	6	Advanced Microelectronics Manufacturing	2,000	Clinton

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* Indicates Committee initiative	
II	RDA	0602120A	6	Advanced Microelectronics Manufacturing	2,000	Schumer
II	RDA	0602120A	6	Operationally Responsive Space Research	5,000	Sessions
II	RDA	0602120A	6	Integrated Remote Sensing Technologies	2,000	Bill Nelson
II	RDA	0602303A	10	Materials for Munitions Protection Research	2,000	Reid
II	RDA	0602308A	12	Photonics Research for Sniper Detection	4,000	Kennedy
II	RDA	0602601A	13	Medium/Heavy Duty Fuel Cell Vehicle Demonstration	3,000	Lieberman
II	RDA	0602601A	13	Medium/Heavy Duty Fuel Cell Vehicle Demonstration	3,000	Dodd
II	RDA	0602601A	13	Transparent Armor Research	2,000	Levin
II	RDA	0602601A	13	Military Fuels Research	2,000	McConnell
II	RDA	0602623A	16	Recoil Mitigation Technologies	2,000	Reed
II	RDA	0602624A	17	UGV Weaponization Technologies	3,000	Snowe
II	RDA	0602624A	17	UGV Weaponization Technologies	3,000	Collins
II	RDA	0602705A	18	High-Frequency, High-Power Electronic and Optoelectronic Devices	3,000	Dole
II	RDA	0602705A	18	Advanced Rechargeable Batteries	3,000	Dole
II	RDA	0602712A	20	Standoff IED Detection Technologies	5,000	Akaka
II	RDA	0602712A	20	Standoff IED Detection Technologies	5,000	Bill Nelson
II	RDA	0602712A	20	Standoff IED Detection Technologies	5,000	Pryor
II	RDA	0602712A	20	Standoff IED Detection Technologies	5,000	Lincoln
II	RDA	0602786A	27	Ballistic Materials for Force Protection	5,000	Snowe
II	RDA	0602786A	27	Ballistic Materials for Force Protection	5,000	Collins
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Advanced Fibrin Dressings	2,000	Clinton
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Advanced Fibrin Dressings	2,000	Schumer
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Advanced Fibrin Dressings	2,000	Dole
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Battlefield Head Injury Diagnostic Tools	1,000	Graham
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Biomechanics Research	2,000	Warner
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Biomechanics Research	2,000	Webb
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Bioengineering Research	1,500	Isakson
II	RDA	0602787A	28	Bioengineering Research	1,500	Chambliss
II	RDA	0603001A	29	AGAS Technology Development	2,000	Lieberman
II	RDA	0603001A	29	AGAS Technology Development	2,000	Dodd
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Lower Limb Prosthetics Research	3,000	Kerry

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* Indicates Committee initiative	
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Lower Limb Prosthetics Research	3,000	Kennedy
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Combat Wound Initiative	2,000	Reed
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Electronic Vital Signs Monitoring Systems	2,000	Reed
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Robotic Telesurgery Research	2,000	Ben Nelson
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Robotic Telesurgery Research	2,000	Hagel
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Blast Trauma Detection Research	2,000	Clinton
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Blast Trauma Detection Research	2,000	Schumer
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Dengue Infections Research	5,000	Graham
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Dengue Infections Research	5,000	Lieberman
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Dengue Infections Research	5,000	Dodd
II	RDA	0603002A	30	Tissue Regeneration Research	3,000	Dole
II	RDA	0603003A	31	UAV Payload Delivery Systems	2,000	Sessions
II	RDA	0603003A	31	UAV Munitions Technologies	3,000	Reed
II	RDA	0603003A	31	UAV Munitions Technologies	3,000	Kennedy
II	RDA	0603003A	31	UAV Munitions Technologies	3,000	Kerry
II	RDA	0603004A	32	Cannon Recoil Reduction System	1,000	Ensign
II	RDA	0603004A	32	Cannon Recoil Reduction System	1,000	Reid
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Unmanned Ground Vehicle Initiative	12,000	Levin
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Hostile Fire Detection Systems	3,000	Cornyn
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Military Hybrid Engine Development Program	10,000	Levin
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Composite Ceramic Vehicle Armor Program	1,000	Reed
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Solid Hydrogen Storage Vehicle Research	4,000	Levin
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Fuel Cell Cost Reduction Research	3,000	Stabenow
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Fuel Cell Cost Reduction Research	3,000	Levin
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Tactical Vehicle APS Research	7,500	*
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Solid Oxide Fuel Cell Manufacturing Research	1,500	Stabenow
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Solid Oxide Fuel Cell Manufacturing Research	1,500	Levin
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Antibalistic Windshield Armor	4,000	Bayh
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Antibalistic Windshield Armor	4,000	Lugar
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Vehicle Design Optimization Tools	1,500	Levin

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* indicates Committee initiative	
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Composite Armor Cab Development	3,000	Reed
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Composite Armor Cab Development	3,000	Carper
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Dynamometer Facility Upgrade	3,000	Levin
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Dynamometer Facility Upgrade	3,000	Stabenow
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Fastening and Joining Research	1,500	Stabenow
II	RDA	0603005A	33	Fastening and Joining Research	1,500	Levin
II	RDA	0603015A	38	Joint Leadership Training Systems	4,000	Inhofe
II	RDA	0603710A	50	Intelligence Surveillance and Detection Sensor Suite	2,500	Chambliss
II	RDA	0603710A	50	Intelligence Surveillance and Detection Sensor Suite	2,500	Isakson
II	RDA	0603710A	50	FCS Short Range Electro Optic (SREO) Sensor for Stryker	7,500	Bill Nelson
II	RDA	0603710A	50	Night Vision Advanced Technology	33,000	Martinez
II	RDA	0603734A	52	Direct Methanol Fuel Cell Development	3,000	Martinez
II	RDA	0603734A	52	Fuel Cells for Continuity of Operations	3,000	Clinton
II	RDA	0603734A	52	Fuel Cells for Continuity of Operations	3,000	Schumer
II	RDA	0603734A	52	Fuel Cells for Continuity of Operations	3,000	Levin
II	RDA	0603772A	53	Advanced Radar Technologies	3,000	Reed
II	RDA	0603772A	53	Phaselator Improvement Program	3,000	Reed
II	RDA	0603653A	62	Stryker Active Protection System Integration	40,000	*
II	RDA	0603779A	66	Undersea Chemical Weapons Assessment	8,000	Akaka
II	RDA	0603782A	67	Warfighter Information Network - Tactical	100,000	*
II	RDA	0603807A	72	Future Medical Shelter Systems	7,500	Dodd
II	RDA	0603807A	72	Future Medical Shelter Systems	7,500	Lieberman
II	RDA	0603807A	72	Future Medical Shelter Systems	7,500	Pryor
II	RDA	0603807A	72	Future Medical Shelter Systems	7,500	Lincoln
II	RDA	0603827A	73	Nickel Boron Metal Coating Technology for Crew Served Weapons	5,300	Bill Nelson
II	RDA	0603305A	76	Rad Hard	2,000	Sessions
II	RDA	0604622A	86	Advanced Thermal and Oil Management Controls	5,000	Levin
II	RDA	0604642A	88	Army Fuel Cell Non-Tactical Vehicle Propulsion	3,000	Levin
II	RDA	0604642A	88	Army Fuel Cell Non-Tactical Vehicle Propulsion	3,000	Schumer
II	RDA	0604642A	88	Army Fuel Cell Non-Tactical Vehicle Propulsion	3,000	Stabenow

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* indicates Committee initiative	
II	RDA	0604642A	88	Army Fuel Cell Non-Tactical Vehicle Propulsion	3,000	Clinton
II	RDA	0604660A	92	FCS Active Protection System Acceleration	25,000	*
II	RDA	0604663A	95	FCS Armed Robotic Vehicles	90,000	*
II	RDA	0604817A	115	SINCGARS Based Combat Identification Research	2,000	Bayh
II	RDA	0604817A	115	SINCGARS Based Combat Identification Research	2,000	Lugar
II	RDA	0604827A	120	Land Warrior	30,400	*
II	RDA	0605605A	137	HELSTF	7,500	Domenici
II	RDA	0603778A	151	HIMARS Modular Launcher Communications System (MLCS)	2,500	Inhofe
II	RDA	0203735A	155	Vehicle Health Management Systems Development	6,000	Sessions
II	RDA	0203735A	155	Combat Vehicle Transmission Improvement	4,900	Bayh
II	RDA	0203735A	155	Combat Vehicle Transmission Improvement	4,900	Lugar
II	RDA	0203744A	157	Helicopter Autonomous Landing System (HALS)	5,000	Reid
II	RDA	0305206A	175	Constant Hawk	30,000	*
II	RDN	0601103N	1	URI Program Increase	9,000	Kennedy
II	RDN	0601103N	1	URI Program Increase	9,000	Collins
II	RDN	0601103N	1	URI Program Increase	9,000	Stabenow
II	RDN	0601103N	1	URI Program Increase	9,000	Bingaman
II	RDN	0601103N	1	URI Program Increase	9,000	Roberts
II	RDN	0601103N	1	URI Program Increase	9,000	Levin
II	RDN	0601103N	1	URI Program Increase	9,000	Domenici
II	RDN	0601103N	1	URI Program Increase	9,000	Clinton
II	RDN	0601103N	1	URI Program Increase	9,000	Dodd
II	RDN	0601103N	1	URI Program Increase	9,000	Kerry
II	RDN	0601103N	1	URI Program Increase	9,000	Lautenberg
II	RDN	0601153N	3	Science and Technology Educational Outreach Programs	1,000	Warner
II	RDN	0601153N	3	Science and Technology Educational Outreach Programs	1,000	Webb
II	RDN	0602114N	4	Infrared Materials Research	3,000	Inhofe
II	RDN	0602123N	5	Undersea Perimeter Security Systems	3,500	Reed
II	RDN	0602123N	5	Port Security Technologies	2,000	Reed
II	RDN	0602123N	5	Unmanned Sea Surface Vessel Propulsion and Power Research	3,000	Collins

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* Indicates Committee initiative	
II	RDN	0602123N	5	Energy Systems Integration Research	2,000	Bill Nelson
II	RDN	0602123N	5	Energy Systems Integration Research	2,000	Martinez
II	RDN	0602123N	5	UAV Fuel Cell Technologies	2,000	Clinton
II	RDN	0602123N	5	UAV Fuel Cell Technologies	2,000	Schumer
II	RDN	0602123N	5	Critical Composite Technologies for SOF Medium Range Endurance Craft	1,000	Collins
II	RDN	0602123N	5	Critical Composite Technologies for SOF Medium Range Endurance Craft	1,000	Snowe
II	RDN	0602131M	6	Rapid Awareness Systems	4,500	Akaka
II	RDN	0602271N	10	RF Power Technologies	3,000	Dole
II	RDN	0602747N	13	Vector Sensor Technology Development	3,000	Reed
II	RDN	0603114N	15	Excalibur UAV	1,000	Warner
II	RDN	0603114N	15	Excalibur UAV	1,000	Webb
II	RDN	0603114N	15	Free Electron Laser Research	4,000	Warner
II	RDN	0603114N	15	Free Electron Laser Research	4,000	Webb
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Navy Manufacturing and Repair Cell	5,000	Levin
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Navy Manufacturing and Repair Cell	5,000	Stabenow
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Electrochemical Field-Deployable System for Potable Water Generation	3,000	Ensign
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Electrochemical Field-Deployable System for Potable Water Generation	3,000	Reid
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Development of Wide-Band Gap Semiconductor Materials	5,000	Stabenow
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Development of Wide-Band Gap Semiconductor Materials	5,000	Levin
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Single Generator Operations Lithium Ion Battery	5,000	Reid
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Navy/USMC Fuel Cell Non-Tactical Vehicle Initiative	4,900	Schumer
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Navy/USMC Fuel Cell Non-Tactical Vehicle Initiative	4,900	Levin
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Navy/USMC Fuel Cell Non-Tactical Vehicle Initiative	4,900	Clinton
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Autonomous Superconducting Fault Current Limiting Systems	3,000	Stabenow
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Autonomous Superconducting Fault Current Limiting Systems	3,000	Levin
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Fuel Cell Manufacturability Research	3,400	Clinton
II	RDN	0603123N	16	Fuel Cell Manufacturability Research	3,400	Schumer
II	RDN	0603640M	20	Acoustic Combat Sensors	5,000	Inhofe
II	RDN	0603506N	34	Sensor Arrays for Multiple Applications (SAMA)	1,500	Bill Nelson
II	RDN	0603513N	36	Smart Valve	3,000	Collins

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* indicates Committee initiative	
II	RDN	0603513N	36	Smart Valve	3,000	Snowe
II	RDN	0603513N	36	Power Conversion Equipment	2,500	Inhofe
II	RDN	0603513N	36	High Temperature Superconducting AC Synchronous Propulsion Motor	14,400	Kennedy
II	RDN	0603513N	36	Shipboard Flywheel Energy Storage System	9,500	Kennedy
II	RDN	0603553N	41	Improved Surface Vessel Torpedo Tube Launcher	4,000	Reed
II	RDN	0603561N	43	Undersea Missile Launch Study (ULMS)	25,000	Lieberman
II	RDN	0603561N	43	Undersea Missile Launch Study (ULMS)	25,000	Reed
II	RDN	0603561N	43	Undersea Missile Launch Study (ULMS)	25,000	Dodd
II	RDN	0603561N	43	Twinline Thin Line Towed Array	4,500	Dodd
II	RDN	0603561N	43	Twinline Thin Line Towed Array	4,500	Lieberman
II	RDN	0603563N	45	Next Generation Shipboard Monitoring	4,000	Warner
II	RDN	0603563N	45	Next Generation Shipboard Monitoring	4,000	Webb
II	RDN	0603739N	63	Highly Integrated Optical Interconnects for Advanced Air Vehicles	4,000	Levin
II	RDN	0604272N	78	High Power Fiber Laser- Base Pod	4,000	Lugar
II	RDN	0604272N	78	High Power Fiber Laser- Base Pod	4,000	Bayh
II	RDN	0604300N	100	Permanent Magnet Motor System	9,000	Dodd
II	RDN	0604300N	100	Permanent Magnet Motor System	9,000	Kennedy
II	RDN	0604300N	100	Permanent Magnet Motor System	9,000	Lieberman
II	RDN	0604300N	100	Advanced Wireless Encryption Module	6,000	Ben Nelson
II	RDN	0604503N	108	Improved Submarine Towed Thin Line Array Handler and Array Reliability	4,400	Reed
II	RDN	0604518N	112	Combat Information Center Conversion	4,000	Graham
II	RDN	0604558N	113	Submarine Electronic Chart Updates	6,000	Bill Nelson
II	RDN	0604567N	116	LHA[R]	4,900	*
II	RDN	0604756N	127	Phalanx Next Generation	9,800	Hatch
II	RDN	0604756N	127	Phalanx Next Generation	9,800	Sessions
II	RDN	0604756N	127	Phalanx Next Generation	9,800	McConnell
II	RDN	0604757N	128	NULKA Decoy R&D	9,000	Kennedy
II	RDN	0604771N	130	Hemostatic Agent Research	4,000	Dole
II	RDN	0604800N	133	JSF Alternate Engine	240,000	Warner
II	RDN	0604800N	133	JSF Alternate Engine	240,000	Bayh

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* indicates Committee initiative	
II	RDN	0604800N	133	JSF Alternate Engine	240,000	Kennedy
II	RDN	0604800N	133	JSF Alternate Engine	240,000	McConnell
II	RDN	0604800N	133	JSF Alternate Engine	240,000	Voinovich
II	RDN	0604800N	133	JSF Alternate Engine	240,000	Brown
II	RDN	0101221N	165	LINAC	9,000	Bayh
II	RDN	0101221N	165	LINAC	9,000	Lugar
II	RDN	0205633N	183	Structural Life Tracking of Navy and Marine Corps Helicopter Aircraft	4,000	Webb
II	RDN	0205633N	183	Structural Life Tracking of Navy and Marine Corps Helicopter Aircraft	4,000	Warner
II	RDN	0206623M	187	Ultrasonic Consolidation of Embedded Sensors	3,900	Levin
II	RDN	0206623M	187	Ultrasonic Consolidation of Embedded Sensors	3,900	Stabenow
II	RDN	0303109N	195	UHF Gap Risk Reduction	10,000	*
II	RDN	0303109N	195	IPV6	3,000	Akaka
II	RDN	0708011N	212	Materials Stress Measurement Technologies	2,500	Levin
II	RDN	0708011N	212	Materials Stress Measurement Technologies	2,500	Stabenow
II	RDN	0708730N	213	National Shipbuilding Research Program	15,000	Sessions
II	RDN	0708730N	213	National Shipbuilding Research Program	15,000	Lott
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	High-Energy Laser Systems Research	3,000	Ben Nelson
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	High-Energy Laser Systems Research	3,000	Hagel
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	Military Decision Cycle Time Research	3,000	Hagel
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	Military Decision Cycle Time Research	3,000	Ben Nelson
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	Secure Grid Research	3,000	Cornyn
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	URI Program Increase	10,000	Kennedy
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	URI Program Increase	10,000	Collins
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	URI Program Increase	10,000	Stabenow
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	URI Program Increase	10,000	Levin
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	URI Program Increase	10,000	Bingaman
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	URI Program Increase	10,000	Roberts
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	URI Program Increase	10,000	Domenici
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	URI Program Increase	10,000	Clinton
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	URI Program Increase	10,000	Dodd

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* indicates Committee Initiative	
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	URI Program Increase	10,000	Kerry
II	RDAF	0601103F	2	URI Program Increase	10,000	Lautenberg
II	RDAF	0602102F	5	Advanced Carbon Fiber Research and Testing Initiative	3,000	Graham
II	RDAF	0602201F	6	Optical Connector Research	1,500	Stabenow
II	RDAF	0602201F	6	Optical Connector Research	1,500	Levin
II	RDAF	0602203F	8	X-51B Scramjet Research	3,500	Clinton
II	RDAF	0602203F	8	X-51B Scramjet Research	3,500	Schumer
II	RDAF	0602204F	9	Net Centric Sensor Grid Research	1,000	Bayh
II	RDAF	0602204F	9	Net Centric Sensor Grid Research	1,000	Voynovich
II	RDAF	0602601F	11	Nuclear Test Seismic Research	11,800	Kerry
II	RDAF	0602601F	11	Rocket Payload Shielding Technologies	400	Thune
II	RDAF	0602702F	14	Cyber Situational Awareness Research	2,000	Clinton
II	RDAF	0602702F	14	Cyber Situational Awareness Research	2,000	Schumer
II	RDAF	0603112F	20	Metals Affordability Initiative	5,000	Bingaman
II	RDAF	0603112F	20	Metals Affordability Initiative	5,000	Feingold
II	RDAF	0603112F	20	Metals Affordability Initiative	5,000	Lieberman
II	RDAF	0603112F	20	Metals Affordability Initiative	5,000	Reid
II	RDAF	0603112F	20	Metals Affordability Initiative	5,000	Salazar
II	RDAF	0603112F	20	Metals Affordability Initiative	5,000	Dodd
II	RDAF	0603112F	20	Metals Affordability Initiative	5,000	Kohl
II	RDAF	0603112F	20	Metals Affordability Initiative	5,000	Rockefeller
II	RDAF	0603112F	20	Metals Affordability Initiative	5,000	Wyden
II	RDAF	0603112F	20	Metals Affordability Initiative	5,000	Levin
II	RDAF	0603112F	20	Metals Affordability Initiative	5,000	Reed
II	RDAF	0603211F	22	Deployable Fuel Cell Processors	2,000	Chambliss
II	RDAF	0603211F	22	Titanium Structures Initiative	2,500	Levin
II	RDAF	0603211F	22	Titanium Structures Initiative	2,500	Warner
II	RDAF	0603401F	28	Thin Film Amorphous Solar Cells	5,600	Levin
II	RDAF	0603789F	34	Optical Interconnects Research	2,000	Ensign
II	RDAF	0603789F	34	Optical Interconnects Research	2,000	Reid

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* indicates Committee initiative	
II	RDAF	0603858F	53	SR Tech Study	80,000	*
II	RDAF	0604857F	61	ORS	15,000	*
II	RDAF	0604421F	76	Space Control Test	5,200	Sessions
II	RDAF	0604421F	76	RAIDRS Block 20	5,000	*
II	RDAF	0604425F	77	JSIDS	7,500	Ben Nelson
II	RDAF	0604441F	79	SBIRS GEO-4	100,000	*
II	RDAF	0604800F	91	JSF Alternate Engine	240,000	Warner
II	RDAF	0604800F	91	JSF Alternate Engine	240,000	Bayh
II	RDAF	0604800F	91	JSF Alternate Engine	240,000	Kennedy
II	RDAF	0604800F	91	JSF Alternate Engine	240,000	McConnell
II	RDAF	0604800F	91	JSF Alternate Engine	240,000	Voinovich
II	RDAF	0604800F	91	JSF Alternate Engine	240,000	Brown
II	RDAF	0605860F	111	BMRST	13,700	Bill Nelson
II	RDAF	0205219F	128	Upgrade MQ-9 SIGINT Payload	10,000	*
II	RDAF	0205219F	128	Predator Trainer Upgrade	4,000	Clinton
II	RDAF	0205219F	128	Predator Trainer Upgrade	4,000	Schumer
II	RDAF	0207581F	157	JSTARS RTIP	275,400	Lieberman
II	RDAF	0207581F	157	JSTARS RTIP	275,400	Dodd
II	RDAF	0207581F	157	JSTARS RTIP	275,400	Martinez
II	RDAF	0208161F	165	Special Evaluation Systems	150,000	*
II	RDAF	0304111F	179	Classified Program	20,000	*
II	RDAF	0305111F	185	Operations Risk Management Visualization & Integration (ORM-VIZ)	6,000	Ben Nelson
II	RDAF	0305219F	205	Upgrade MQ-1 SIGINT Payload	10,000	*
II	RDAF	0305221F	207	NCCT	25,000	*
II	RDAF	0305924F	213	NSSO	7,000	*
II	RDAF	0305940F	213	SAA Operations	16,800	*
II	RDAF	0401115F	217	C-130 De-icing System	3,000	Webb
II	RDAF	0401115F	217	C-130 De-icing System	3,000	Warner
II	RDAF	0408011F	228	Combat Casualty Management System for AFSOC	3,600	Reid

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* Indicates Committee initiative	
II	RDAF	0708011F	231	Laser Materials Processing	2,000	Ben Nelson
II	RDDW	0601111D8Z	3	Semiconductor Focus Research Center Program	5,000	Clinton
II	RDDW	0601111D8Z	3	Semiconductor Focus Research Center Program	5,000	Isakson
II	RDDW	0601111D8Z	3	Semiconductor Focus Research Center Program	5,000	Schumer
II	RDDW	0601111D8Z	3	Semiconductor Focus Research Center Program	5,000	Martinez
II	RDDW	0601111D8Z	3	Semiconductor Focus Research Center Program	5,000	Kerry
II	RDDW	0601111D8Z	3	Semiconductor Focus Research Center Program	5,000	Hatch
II	RDDW	0601111D8Z	3	Semiconductor Focus Research Center Program	5,000	Cornyn
II	RDDW	0601111D8Z	3	Semiconductor Focus Research Center Program	5,000	Dole
II	RDDW	0601384BP	6	Supersubstructural Particle Evaluation	3,000	Kennedy
II	RDDW	0602227D8Z	8	MFEL Program Increase	8,000	Kerry
II	RDDW	0602227D8Z	8	MFEL Program Increase	8,000	Dole
II	RDDW	0602227D8Z	8	MFEL Program Increase	8,000	Stabenow
II	RDDW	0602384BP	14	Chem-Bio Protective Textile Fabric	1,500	Levin
II	RDDW	0602384BP	14	Chem-Bio Protective Textile Fabric	1,500	Collins
II	RDDW	0602384BP	14	Chem-Bio IR Detector	2,000	Levin
II	RDDW	0602718BR	14	Chemical Agent Fate Model Verification	1,000	Warner
II	RDDW	0602718BR	21	Blast Mitigation and Protection Analysis	1,000	Webb
II	RDDW	0602718BR	21	Blast Mitigation and Protection Analysis	1,000	Warner
II	RDDW	0602718BR	21	Comprehensive National Incident Management System	4,000	Webb
II	RDDW	0602718BR	21	Comprehensive National Incident Management System	4,000	Webb
II	RDDW	0602718BR	21	Classified Program	26,500	*
II	RDDW	1160401BB	23	FOPEN Radar Technologies	2,500	Akaka
II	RDDW	0603122D8Z	28	Arabic Language Analysis Systems	2,000	Warner
II	RDDW	0603122D8Z	28	Arabic Language Analysis Systems	2,000	Webb
II	RDDW	0603175C	30	Directly Printed Electronic Components	4,000	Inhofe
II	RDDW	0603384BP	34	Semiconducting Metal Oxide Sensors	2,000	Collins
II	RDDW	0603384BP	34	Improved CBR Filters	2,000	Warner
II	RDDW	0603384BP	34	Improved CBR Filters	2,000	Webb
II	RDDW	0603384BP	34	Raman Chemical ID System	4,000	Kennedy
II	RDDW	0603665D8Z	38	Standoff Biometrics Technology	4,000	Kennedy

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* Indicates Committee initiative	
II	RDDW	0603680D8Z	40	High Performance Defense Manufacturing Technology Research	10,000	*
II	RDDW	0603680D8Z	40	Disruptive Manufacturing Technologies Research	10,000	*
II	RDDW	0603712S	42	Vehicle Fuel Cell and Hydrogen Logistics Program	10,000	Levin
II	RDDW	0603712S	42	Solid Hydrogen Storage Initiative	6,000	Levin
II	RDDW	0603712S	42	UAV Battery Technologies	2,000	Bayh
II	RDDW	0603712S	42	UAV Battery Technologies	2,000	Lugar
II	RDDW	0603712S	42	Biofuels Program	3,000	Levin
II	RDDW	0603712S	42	Emerging Critical Interconnect Technology Program	4,000	Bayh
II	RDDW	0603712S	42	Emerging Critical Interconnect Technology Program	4,000	Lugar
II	RDDW	0603712S	42	Mobile Microgrid Research	3,000	Levin
II	RDDW	0603712S	42	Mobile Microgrid Research	3,000	Stabenow
II	RDDW	0603716D8Z	44	Enhanced Water Remediation Research	2,500	Levin
II	RDDW	0603755D8Z	50	High Performance Computing Modeling and Simulation	2,000	Bill Nelson
II	RDDW	0603826D8Z	60	Small Craft Integrated Common Operating Picture	1,500	Snowe
II	RDDW	0603826D8Z	60	Small Craft Integrated Common Operating Picture	1,500	Collins
II	RDDW	0603826D8Z	60	APS Comparative Testing	15,000	*
II	RDDW	0603826D8Z	60	APS Technical Assessment	1,000	*
II	RDDW	0603828D8Z	61	Asymmetric Warfare Initiative	1,500	Collins
II	RDDW	0603828D8Z	61	Asymmetric Warfare Initiative	1,500	Warner
II	RDDW	0603828D8Z	61	Asymmetric Warfare Initiative	1,500	Webb
II	RDDW	0603828D8Z	61	Asymmetric Warfare Initiative	1,500	Snowe
II	RDDW	0603828D8Z	61	Cultural and Societal Modeling and Simulation	3,200	*
II	RDDW	0603828D8Z	61	Joint Urban Fires Prototype	1,500	*
II	RDDW	0603941D8Z	63	Test Range and Resource Analysis	1,000	Ensign
II	RDDW	0603941D8Z	63	Test Range and Resource Analysis	1,000	Reid
II	RDDW	1160402BB	65	Advanced Generator Technologies	2,000	Kennedy
II	RDDW	1160402BB	65	Portable Power Sources Development	3,000	Stabenow
II	RDDW	1160402BB	65	Portable Power Sources Development	3,000	Levin
II	RDDW	1160402BB	65	Standoff Precision Guided Munitions	6,000	Sessions
II	RDDW	1160402BB	65	Advanced Tactical Airborne C4ISR Systems	3,000	Bill Nelson

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* indicates Committee initiative	
II	RDDW	0603714D8Z	70	Advanced Sensor Applications Program (ASAP)	20,000	*
II	RDDW	0603881C	72	Short-Range Ballistic Missile Defense (SRBMD)	25,000	Kyl
II	RDDW	0603881C	72	Short-Range Ballistic Missile Defense (SRBMD)	25,000	Lott
II	RDDW	0603881C	72	Short-Range Ballistic Missile Defense (SRBMD)	25,000	Sessions
II	RDDW	0603881C	72	Arrow	25,000	Lott
II	RDDW	0603881C	72	Arrow	10,000	Lott
II	RDDW	0603881C	72	Arrow	10,000	Sessions
II	RDDW	0603881C	72	Arrow	25,000	Sessions
II	RDDW	0603881C	72	THAAD	105,000	Sessions
II	RDDW	0603884BP	75	Real-Time Viral Agent Detectors	4,000	Dole
II	RDDW	0603892C	82	Aegis BMD	75,000	Pryor
II	RDDW	0603892C	82	Aegis BMD	75,000	Lincoln
II	RDDW	0604940D8Z	131	SAM Hardware Simulators	4,000	Chambliss
II	RDDW	0604940D8Z	131	SAM Hardware Simulators	4,000	Isakson
II	RDDW	0303140G	191	Software Assurance Education and Research	1,000	Levin
II	RDDW	0303140G	191	ISSP Tech Base	30,000	*
II	RDDW	0304345BQ	201	Commercial Imagery	200,000	*
II	RDDW	0708011S	226	Manufacturing Supply Chain Research	3,000	Reed
II	RDDW	0708011S	226	Manufacturing Supply Chain Research	3,000	Snowe
II	RDDW	0708011S	226	Manufacturing Supply Chain Research	3,000	Collins
II	RDDW	0708011S	226	Castings Research	2,000	Reed
II	RDDW	0708011S	226	Military High Pressure Packaging Program	4,000	Bayh
II	RDDW	0708011S	226	Military High Pressure Packaging Program	4,000	Lugar
II	RDDW	0708011S	226	Defense Fuel Cell Manufacturing	3,000	Graham
II	RDDW	0708011S	226	Industrial Base Innovation Fund	30,000	*
III	OMA-1		10	Extended Cold Weather Clothing System	4,000	Kennedy
III	OMA-1		10	Extended Cold Weather Clothing System	4,000	Kerry
III	OMA-1		10	Extended Cold Weather Clothing System	4,000	Graham
III	OMA-1		70	Manufacturing Engineering Training Outreach Program	5,000	Levin
III	OMA-1		110	Training Range Improvement	15,000	Chambliss

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* indicates Committee initiative	
III	OMN-1		230	Mk45 Mod 5" Gun Overhaul	29,500	McConnell
III	OMN-1		270	Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement	5,000	*
III	OMMC-1		10	Extended Cold Weather Clothing System	6,000	Stabenow
III	OMMC-1		10	Rapid Deployable Shelter	6,000	Clinton
III	OMMC-1		10	Rapid Deployable Shelter	6,000	Schumer
III	OMMC-1		10	Mobile Corrosion Protection	15,100	Akaka
III	OMMC-1		10	Mobile Corrosion Protection	15,100	Clinton
III	OMMC-1		10	Mobile Corrosion Protection	15,100	Schumer
III	OMAF-1		90	National Security Space Institute	3,300	Allard
III	OMAF-4		560	Mobile Shear	525	Reid
III	OMDW-1		20	Language Training	8,700	*
III	OMDW-4		260	Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative	20,000	*
III	OMDW-4		260	Defense Readiness Reporting System	12,000	Warner
III	OMDW-4		260	Defense Readiness Reporting System	12,000	Webb
III	OMDW			Impact Aid	35,000	Ben Nelson
III	OMDW			Impact Aid	35,000	Chambliss
III	OMDW			Impact Aid	35,000	Isakson
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Reed
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Inhofe
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Kennedy
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Murray
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Dorgan
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Mikulski
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Menendez
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Roberts
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Salazar
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Clinton
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Akaka
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Conrad
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Feingold

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* indicates Committee Initiative	
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Durbin
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Obama
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Boxer
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Bayh
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Bingaman
III	OMDW			Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities	5,000	Cantwell
III	OMDW			Special Assistance to Local Education Agencies	10,000	Chambliss
III	OMDW			Special Assistance to Local Education Agencies	10,000	Isakson
III	OMAR-1		80	Mobile Corrosion Protection	4,000	Akaka
III	OMAR-1		80	Mobile Corrosion Protection	4,000	Schumer
III	OMANG-1		10	Extended Cold Weather Clothing System	4,000	Clinton
III	OMANG-1		10	Extended Cold Weather Clothing System	4,000	Reed
III	OMANG-1		40	National Guard Interoperability Upgrades	4,000	Carper
III	OMANG-1		40	National Guard Interoperability Upgrades	1,300	Webb
III	OMANG-1		80	Mobile Corrosion Protection	1,300	Warner
III	OMANG-1		80	Mobile Corrosion Protection	4,000	Akaka
III	OMANG-1		80	Mobile Corrosion Protection	4,000	Schumer
III	OMANG-1		80	Mobile Corrosion Protection	4,000	Clinton
III	OMANG-1		130	Operator Driving Simulator	5,000	Warner
III	OMANG-1		130	Operator Driving Simulator	5,000	Webb
III	OMANG-1		130	Operator Driving Simulator	5,000	Levin
III	OMAirNG-1		10	Controlled Humidity Protection	6,000	Graham
III	OMAirNG-1		10	Controlled Humidity Protection	6,000	Warner
III	OMAirNG-1		10	Controlled Humidity Protection	6,000	Webb
III	OMAirNG-1		20	Weapons Skills Trainer	7,500	Bill Nelson
III	OM Transfer		50	Environmental Restoration Formerly Used Sites - Increased Funds	20,000	*
XIII	OM	Misc Appr	190	CTR Increased Funds	100,000	*
XIV	DHP RDTE	0603115HP	5	Motor Vehicle Crash Study	2,000	Webb
XIV	DHP RDTE	0603115HP	5	Motor Vehicle Crash Study	2,000	Warner
XIV	Counter-Drug			Project Athena	7,500	Reed

TITLE	ACCT	PE	LINE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	MEMBER
					* indicates Committee initiative	
XIV	Counter-Drug			Surveillance Technology ACTD	15,000	*
XIV	OIG O&M		10	OIG O&M Increased Funds	10,000	*
XIV	CAMD O&M			Chemical Demilitarization Program Increase	24,000	*
XIV	CAMD Proc			Chemical Demilitarization Program Increase	12,000	*
XV	OPN		122	Navy MRAP	21,000	*
XV	OPAF		7	Air Force MRAP	430,000	*
XV	PDW		65	SOCOM MRAP	124,000	*
XXXI	NNSA			Nonproliferation	101,000	*
XXXI	NNSA			IAEA Fuel Bank	50,000	*
XXXI	NNSA			Weapons Dismantlement	20,000	*
XXXI	NNSA			NIF	9,700	*
XXXI	NNSA			Pantex Plant RTBF	36,800	*
XXXI	NNSA			Nuclear Weapons Incident Response	10,000	*
XXXI	NNSA			Safeguards and Security	62,400	*
XXXI	NNSA			Office of the Administrator	5,000	*
XXXI	DOE-EM			Savannah River Cleanup	37,000	*
XXXI	DOE-EM			Technology Development	10,000	*
XXXII	DNFSB			DNFSB	5,000	*

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Departmental Recommendations

By letter dated February 6, 2007, the General Counsel of the Department of Defense forwarded to the President of the Senate proposed legislation “To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes.” The transmittal letter and proposed legislation were officially referred as Executive Communication 743 to the Committee on Armed Services on February 12, 2007.

Executive Communication 743 is available for review at the committee.

Committee Action

The committee ordered reported a comprehensive original bill and a series of original bills for the Department of Defense, military construction and Department of Energy authorizations by voice vote. The committee vote to report the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 was by unanimous rollcall vote, 25–0.

The rollcall votes on motions and amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of the markup have been made public and are available at the committee.

Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate

It was not possible to include the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate on this legislation because it was not available at the time the report was filed. It will be included in material presented during floor debate on the legislation.

Regulatory Impact

Paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report on the regulatory impact of the bill be included in the report on the bill. The committee finds that there is no regulatory impact in the case of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2008.

Changes in Existing Law

Pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law made by certain portions of the bill have not been shown in this section of the report because, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with showing such changes in order to expedite the business of the Senate and reduce the expenditure of funds.