

109TH CONGRESS }  
*1st Session*

SENATE

{ REPORT  
109-69

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION  
ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006**

---

**R E P O R T**

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1042]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
UNITED STATES SENATE**



MAY 17, 2005.—Ordered to be printed

★ (Star Print)

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006**

**Calendar No. 102**

109TH CONGRESS }  
*1st Session*

SENATE

{ REPORT  
109-69

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION  
ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006**

---

**R E P O R T**

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1042]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
UNITED STATES SENATE**



MAY 17, 2005.—Ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

21-326 ★ (Star Print)

WASHINGTON : 2005

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(109th Congress, 1st Session)

JOHN WARNER, Virginia, *Chairman*

JOHN MCCAIN, Arizona	CARL LEVIN, Michigan
JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma	EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
PAT ROBERTS, Kansas	ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia
JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama	JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut
SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine	JACK REED, Rhode Island
JOHN ENSIGN, Nevada	DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
JAMES M. TALENT, Missouri	BILL NELSON, Florida
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia	E. BENJAMIN NELSON, Nebraska
LINDSEY O. GRAHAM, South Carolina	MARK DAYTON, Minnesota
ELIZABETH DOLE, North Carolina	EVAN BAYH, Indiana
JOHN CORNYN, Texas	HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, New York
JOHN THUNE, South Dakota	

JUDITH A. ANSLEY, *Staff Director*

RICHARD D. DEBOBES, *Democratic Staff Director*

# CONTENTS

Purpose of the Bill .....	Page 1
Committee overview and recommendations .....	2
Explanation of funding summary .....	8
Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations .....	17
Title I—Procurement .....	17
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations .....	17
Explanation of tables .....	17
Subtitle B—Army Programs .....	19
Multiyear procurement authority for AH–64D Apache attack heli- copter block II conversions (sec. 111) .....	38
Multiyear procurement authority for modernized target acquisition designation/pilot night vision sensors for AH–64D Apache attack helicopters (sec. 112) .....	38
Multiyear procurement authority for utility helicopters (sec. 113) .....	38
Missile Procurement, Army .....	39
Advanced precision kill weapon system .....	39
Weapons and Tracked Vehicles .....	39
Lightweight 155 millimeter Howitzer .....	39
Army Ammunition .....	39
M1028 120mm tank cartridge .....	39
Modern demolition initiator .....	39
Rapid wall breaching kit .....	40
Ammunition peculiar equipment outloading modules .....	40
Provision of industrial facilities .....	40
Conventional ammunition demilitarization .....	40
Other Procurement, Army .....	41
Movement tracking system .....	41
Night vision devices .....	42
Modular causeway system .....	42
Subtitle C—Navy Programs .....	42
Prohibition on acquisition of next generation destroyer (DD(X)) through a single naval shipyard (sec. 121) .....	66
Split funding authorization for CVN–78 aircraft carrier (sec. 122) .....	66
LHA replacement (LHA(R)) ship (sec. 123) .....	67
Refueling and complex overhaul of the USS “Carl Vinson” (sec. 124) ..	67
Navy Aircraft .....	68
C–40A procurement .....	68
Advanced targeting pods .....	68
Night targeting system upgrade .....	68
H–53 modifications .....	68
SH–60 armed helicopter .....	69
EP–3 aircraft electronic attack .....	69
P–3 aircraft modifications .....	69
Navy Weapons .....	70
AIM–9X captive air training missile .....	70
Weapons industrial facilities .....	70
Gun mount modifications .....	70
Navy and Marine Corps Ammunition .....	70
M795 155mm high explosive cartridge .....	70
Time fuze blasting igniter .....	70
Shipbuilding .....	71
DD(X) destroyer program .....	71
DDG–51 Arleigh Burke-class destroyer modernization program .....	71
Other Procurement, Navy .....	72

Title I—Procurement—Continued	
Other Procurement, Navy—Continued	
High performance metal fiber brushes for shipboard motors and generators	72
Items less than 5.0 million	72
Littoral combat ship mission modules	72
Submarine acoustic modernization installation	73
Surface sonar dome window	73
Surface electronic warfare improvement program	73
Weapons range support equipment	73
Maritime domain awareness	73
Rolling airframe missile launcher system	74
NULKA anti-ship missile decoy	74
Submarine training device modifications	74
Command support equipment	74
Navy medical automated information technology insertion	75
Marine Corps Procurement	75
Modification kits	75
Rapid deploying interoperable shelter systems	75
United States Marine Corps continuity of operations	76
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs	76
Multiyear procurement authority for C-17 aircraft (sec. 131)	91
Prohibition on retirement of KC-135E aircraft (sec. 132)	91
Use of Tanker Replacement Transfer Fund for modernization of aerial refueling tankers (sec. 133)	91
Prohibition on retirement of F-117 aircraft (sec. 134)	92
Prohibition on retirement of C-130E/H tactical airlift aircraft (sec. 135)	92
Procurement of C-130J/KC-130J aircraft after fiscal year 2005 (sec. 136)	92
Aircraft for performance of aeromedical evacuations (sec. 137)	93
Air Force Aircraft	93
F-15E procurement	93
C-130J/KC-130 multiyear procurement restoration	94
B-1 digital communication improvements	94
C-5 aircraft avionics modernization program	95
C-130E/H aircraft modifications	95
KC-135 global air traffic management	95
E-8C joint surveillance and target attack radar system reengining	95
Advanced targeting pods	96
Air Force Missiles	96
Minuteman III mods for propulsion replacement program	96
Other Air Force Procurement	96
Halvorsen loader	96
Distributed common ground system components	97
Joint threat emitters	97
Subtitle E—Other Matters	97
Advanced SEAL Delivery System (sec. 151)	104
Defense-wide Programs	105
MH-47 infrared engine exhaust suppressor	105
Time delayed firing device/sympathetic detonators	106
Multi-band inter/intra team radio	106
Multi-band multi-mission radio	106
Joint threat warning system	107
Rucksack portable unmanned aerial vehicle	107
Military mail screening equipment	107
Automatic Chemical Agent Detector and Alarm	108
Items of Special Interest	108
Army multi-band inter/intra team radio system	108
Cooperative engagement capability	108
F/A-22 aircraft	109
Intra-theater airlift	109
Littoral combat ship	110
Maritime prepositioning force, future	110
Transmission enterprise program	111
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	113
Explanation of tables	113

	Page
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued	
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations .....	115
Science and Technology .....	115
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations .....	116
Contract for the procurement of Future Combat System (sec. 211) .....	116
Joint field experiment on stability and support operations (sec. 212) ..	116
Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense .....	117
One-year extension of Comptroller General assessments of ballistic missile defense programs (sec. 221) .....	117
Fielding of Ballistic Missile Defense Capabilities (sec. 222) .....	117
Plans for test and evaluation of operational capability of the ballistic missile defense system (sec. 223) .....	118
Subtitle D—High-Performance Defense Manufacturing Technology Research and Development .....	118
High performance defense manufacturing technology research and development (sec. 230) .....	118
Subtitle E—Other Matters .....	119
Expansion of eligibility for leadership of Department of Defense Test Resource Management Center (sec. 241) .....	119
Technology transition (sec. 242) .....	119
Prevention, mitigation, and treatment of blast injuries (sec. 243) .....	120
Additional Matters of Interest .....	121
Army .....	121
Army basic research .....	135
Document exploitation .....	135
Army university research .....	135
Advanced mine detection and blast mitigation .....	136
Army small airship .....	136
Detection and neutralization of improved explosive devices .....	136
Real-time laser threat warning development .....	137
Army unmanned systems initiative .....	137
Technology enhancement for area protection .....	137
Multifunctional robot platform .....	137
Combat vehicle and automotive technology .....	137
Gun barrel coatings .....	138
Active coatings technology .....	138
Sonic rarefaction wave gun technology .....	138
Ultra wide band sensors .....	138
Army man-portable power .....	139
Flexible Display Initiative .....	139
Ultra wideband chipset .....	139
Biosecurity research for food safety .....	140
Army medicine for mitigation and treatment of blast injuries .....	140
Bio-defense detection and treatment .....	141
Posttraumatic stress disorder diagnostic tools .....	141
Surgical safety system .....	142
Human operator performance research .....	142
Wireless and digital medical improvements .....	142
Reconfigurable tooling systems .....	142
Rotorcraft system monitoring .....	142
Unmanned tactical combat vehicles .....	143
Midrange Munition .....	143
Nanotechnology manufacturing .....	143
Abrams track improvement .....	143
Combat vehicle advanced development .....	144
Coordinated training .....	144
Advanced simulated training .....	144
Explosive demilitarization .....	144
Alternative fuel supplies .....	145
Stryker vehicle active protection system demonstration .....	145
Advanced structures and composites .....	145
Army command and control visualization system .....	146
Interactive modeling and simulation management .....	146
Next generation interceptor materials .....	146
Long loiter sensor and communications platform .....	146
Architecture Analysis Program .....	147
Single Integrated Space Picture .....	147

# VI

	Page
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued	
Additional Matters of Interest—Continued	
Army—Continued	
Casting Emission Reduction Program .....	147
Advanced Army medical systems .....	148
Joint tactical radio system .....	148
Tactical vehicle modifications .....	149
Future tactical truck system .....	149
Protected simulation and test link .....	150
Unmanned aerial vehicle ice protection .....	150
High performance computing research .....	150
Retinal/iris multimodal biometrics technology for secure identification .....	150
Army manufacturing technologies .....	151
Navy .....	151
Navy university research .....	163
Navy science and technology outreach .....	163
Free electron laser .....	163
Littoral and undersea security .....	164
Nanomagnetic materials .....	164
Polymeric aircraft components .....	164
Small watercraft propulsion demonstrator .....	164
Advanced combat headborne system .....	164
Critical area protection systems .....	165
SensorNet .....	165
Space research .....	165
Automated video threat recognition .....	165
Multifunctional composite structures .....	165
Portable water bio-defense .....	166
Seabasing research .....	166
Gallium nitride radio frequency power .....	166
Integrated littoral sensor network .....	166
Coordination and integration of unmanned system teams .....	166
Information sharing for intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance .....	167
Force protection advanced technology .....	167
Improved shipboard combat information center .....	168
Warfighter sustainment advanced technology .....	168
Navy persistent surveillance .....	169
Armored patrol vehicle .....	169
Laser integrated target engagement system .....	169
Water purification system .....	169
Modeling and simulation for urban operations .....	170
Surface Navy integrated undersea tactical technology .....	170
Shipboard system component development .....	170
Improved surface vessel torpedo launcher .....	171
Guided missile submarine conversion .....	171
Advanced submarine system development .....	171
Regenerative filtration technology .....	172
Marine Corps ground and supporting arms systems .....	172
Marine mammal detection and mitigation .....	174
Navy logistics common operating picture .....	174
Automatic radar periscope detection and discrimination .....	174
DD(X) destroyer integrated propulsion system .....	174
Affordable towed array construction .....	175
New Design SSN .....	175
Submarine tactical warfare system .....	175
Autonomous unmanned surface vessel .....	176
NULKA anti-ship missile decoy development .....	176
Navy medical research .....	176
Shared Reconnaissance Pod logistics support .....	177
Marine Corps communications systems .....	177
Marine Corps ground combat and supporting arms systems .....	178
Battlefield management system .....	178
RQ-8B Firescout vertical takeoff and landing unmanned aerial vehicle .....	179
Distributed common ground system—Navy .....	179
National shipbuilding research program—advanced shipbuilding enterprise .....	179



# VII

## Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued Additional Matters of Interest—Continued

	Page
Air Force .....	180
Air Force basic science .....	194
Secure, assured information sharing .....	194
Blast resistant barriers .....	194
Air Force materials research .....	194
Nano-technologies for chemical and biological defense .....	195
Hypersonics engine research and integration .....	195
Space technology .....	195
Adaptive optics research .....	196
Integrated spacecraft engineering tool .....	196
Laser eye protection .....	196
Metals affordability initiative .....	197
Aerospace propulsion and power technologies .....	197
Versatile affordable advanced turbine engines .....	197
Ballistic missile technology .....	197
AC coupled interconnect .....	198
Energy cells for defense and intelligence applications .....	198
Radically Segmented launch vehicle .....	198
Thin film amorphous solar arrays .....	198
High Accuracy Network Determination System .....	199
Laser threat warning attack reporting .....	199
Enable network centric warfare .....	199
Military satellite communications .....	200
Space Radar .....	200
Tactical satellite demonstrations .....	201
Robust nuclear earth penetrator .....	202
Space control test capabilities .....	202
FPS-16 radar mobilization and upgrade .....	203
Ballistic missile range safety technology .....	203
A-10 aircraft propulsion improvements .....	203
Information systems security research .....	203
Viper Strike munition for Predator .....	204
S-band radar .....	204
Space-Based Space Surveillance .....	204
Nano-materials manufacturing .....	204
Air Force support systems .....	205
Personnel and pay information technology systems .....	205
Defense-wide .....	206
Focus center research program .....	220
Superstructural particle evaluation .....	220
Chemical and biological defense applied research .....	220
Mustard gas antidote .....	221
Tactical technology .....	221
Human performance in hazardous environments .....	221
Technology Support Working Group .....	221
Radiation detection technology .....	222
Ballistic missile defense reductions .....	222
Massively parallel optical interconnects .....	223
Missile technology .....	223
Anthrax and plague oral vaccine research and development .....	223
Miniaturized RAMAN chemical identification system .....	223
Diminishing manufacturing sources .....	224
Vehicle fuel cell program .....	224
Advanced electronics .....	224
Small scale systems packaging .....	224
Advanced ferrite antenna .....	225
Communications and control alert framework .....	225
Flexible JP-8 military fuel certification .....	225
Prevention and detection of cyber threats .....	225
Simulation center upgrade .....	226
Land warfare technology .....	226
Network centric warfare technology .....	226
Sensor technology .....	226
Advanced tactical laser .....	227
Mark V patrol boat replacement craft prototype .....	227
Special operations portable power source program .....	227

# VIII

	Page
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued	
Additional Matters of Interest—Continued	
Defense-wide—Continued	
Voice activated handheld translator .....	228
Aegis ballistic missile defense .....	228
Ground-based midcourse ballistic missile defense .....	229
Miniaturized carbon monoxide oxidation technology .....	229
Airborne Infrared System .....	230
Kinetic Energy Interceptor .....	230
Military mail screening system development and demonstration ..	231
UAV systems and operations validation program .....	231
Foreign supplier assessment center .....	231
Operationally responsive space payloads .....	231
Industrial preparedness .....	232
Special operations wireless management and control project .....	232
Maritime unmanned aerial vehicle sensor .....	233
Lightweight portable solar panels .....	233
Items of Special Interest .....	233
Canopy hard-coats .....	233
CH-53X helicopter development .....	234
Construction of Navy Research Vessels .....	234
Department of Defense computer science research .....	235
Unmanned aerial vehicles for resupply missions .....	235
Title III—Operation and Maintenance .....	237
Explanation of tables .....	237
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations .....	275
Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions .....	275
Elimination and simplification of certain items required in the annual report on environmental quality programs and other environmental activities (sec. 311) .....	275
Payment of certain private cleanup costs in connection with the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (sec. 312) .....	275
Subtitle C—Other Matters .....	276
Aircraft carriers (sec. 321) .....	276
Limitation on transition of funding for east coast shipyards from funding through Navy working capital fund to direct funding (sec. 322) .....	277
Use of funds from National Defense Sealift Fund to exercise purchase options on maritime prepositioning ship vessels (sec. 323) .....	277
Purchase and destruction of weapons overseas (sec. 324) .....	278
Increase in maximum contract amount for procurement of supplies and services from exchange stores outside the United States (sec. 325) .....	278
Extension of authority to provide logistics support and services for weapon systems contractors (sec. 326) .....	278
Army training strategy (sec. 327) .....	279
Limitations on financial management improvement and audit initiatives within the Department of Defense (sec. 328) .....	279
Study on use of ethanol fuel (sec. 329) .....	280
Budget Items .....	281
Other Defense Programs .....	281
Enhanced vision .....	281
Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives Program .....	281
Army .....	282
Advanced combat helmet with modular integrated communications headset .....	282
Army training .....	283
Corrosion prevention and control .....	284
Facility sustainment, restoration, and modernization for the Army .....	285
Quadruple specialty containers .....	285
Department of Defense foreign language training .....	285
Army civilian intern program .....	286
Unattended ground sensors .....	286
Information assurance vulnerability alert cell .....	286
Aviation and missile life cycle management pilot program .....	286
Army excess carryover .....	287
Audits of Department of Defense financial statements .....	287

## IX

	Page
Title III—Operation and Maintenance—Continued	
Budget Items—Continued	
Army—Continued	
Civilian personnel pay in excess of requirements .....	288
Defense Information System Network .....	288
Working capital funds .....	288
Navy .....	289
NULKA decoy cartridge .....	289
Stainless steel sanitary spaces .....	289
Manufacturing Technical Assistance and Production Program .....	289
Electric start system .....	290
Marine gas turbine photonic sensors .....	290
Mark-45 gun system overhauls .....	290
Facility sustainment, restoration, and modernization for the Navy .....	290
Marine Corps .....	291
Acclimate high performance undergarments .....	291
Combat casualty care equipment upgrades .....	291
Family of mountain cold weather clothing and equipment .....	291
Portable tent lighting .....	291
Ultra-light Camouflage Net System .....	291
Supplemental communications and electrical utility support to U.S. Marine Corps Network Operations Center .....	292
Air Force .....	292
Bomber deployable phase maintenance kits .....	292
Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator .....	292
Joint protection enterprise network .....	292
Joint task force north .....	293
Mobile consolidated command center .....	293
Mobility Air Force depot maintenance .....	293
Homeland Security/Homeland Defense Education Consortium .....	294
Defense-Wide .....	295
Counseling and assistance to military families .....	295
Increased support for child care for military families .....	295
Funding for Office of Economic Adjustment .....	296
Capital Security Cost Sharing .....	296
Information assurance scholarship program .....	296
Increased funding for conservation buffer zones .....	297
Citizen-Soldier Support Program .....	297
Parents as Teachers .....	298
Military to civilian conversions .....	298
Army Reserve .....	299
Army Reserve components cold weather clothing .....	299
Air Force Reserve .....	299
Air Force Reserve mobility Air Force depot maintenance .....	299
Army National Guard .....	299
Communicator Automated Emergency Notification System .....	299
Virtual battlefield system one .....	299
Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear and High Yield Ex- plosive Enhanced Response Force Package Teams .....	300
Air National Guard .....	301
Air National Guard mobility Air Force depot maintenance .....	301
Transfer Accounts .....	301
Funding for Formerly Used Defense Sites .....	301
Item of Special Interest .....	301
Defense Information System Network Access Transport Services .....	301
Test to improve the quality of agricultural produce available in com- missary stores .....	302
Title IV—Military Personnel Authorizations .....	303
Subtitle A—Active Forces .....	303
End strengths for active forces (sec. 401) .....	303
Revision of permanent active duty end strength minimum levels (sec. 402) .....	304
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces .....	304
End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411) .....	304
End strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the Reserves (sec. 412) .....	305
End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413) .....	305

	Page
Title IV—Military Personnel Authorizations—Continued	
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces—Continued	
Fiscal year 2006 limitations on non-dual status technicians (sec. 414)	305
Subtitle C—Authorizations of Appropriations	306
Authorization of appropriations for military personnel (sec. 421)	306
Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 422)	306
Title V—Military Personnel Policy	309
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy	309
Exclusion of general and flag officers on leave pending separation or retirement from computation of active duty officers for general and flag officer distribution and strength limitations (sec. 501)	309
Expansion of joint duty assignments for Reserve component general and flag officers (sec. 502)	309
Deadline for receipt by promotion selection boards of correspondence from eligible officers (sec. 503)	309
Furnishing to promotion selection boards of adverse information on officers eligible for promotion to certain senior grades (sec. 504)	310
Grades of the Judge Advocates General (sec. 505)	310
Temporary extension of authority to reduce minimum length of commissioned service for voluntary retirement as an officer (sec. 506)	310
Modification of strength in grade limitations applicable to Reserve flag officers in active status (sec. 507)	311
Uniform authority for deferment of separation of Reserve general and flag officers for age (sec. 508)	311
Subtitle B—Enlisted Personnel Policy	311
Uniform citizenship or residency requirements for enlistment in the Armed Forces (sec. 521)	311
Subtitle C—Reserve Component Personnel Matters	312
Requirements for physical examinations and medical and dental readiness for members of the Selected Reserve not on active duty (sec. 531)	312
Repeal of limitation on amount of financial assistance under Reserve Officers' Training Corps scholarship program (sec. 532)	312
Procedures for suspending financial assistance and subsistence allowance for senior ROTC cadets and midshipmen on the basis of health-related conditions (sec. 533)	312
Increase in maximum number of Army Reserve and Army National Guard cadets under Reserve Officers' Training Corps (sec. 534)	313
Modification of educational assistance for Reserves supporting contingency and other operations (sec. 535)	313
Repeal of limitation on authority to redesignate the Naval Reserve as the Navy Reserve (sec. 536)	313
Performance by reserve component personnel of operational test and evaluation and training relating to new equipment (sec. 537)	314
Subtitle D—Military Justice and Related Matters	314
Modification of periods of prosecution by courts-martial for murder, rape, and child abuse (sec. 551)	314
Establishment of offense of stalking (sec. 552)	315
Clarification of authority of military legal assistance counsel (sec. 553)	315
Administrative censures of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 554)	316
Reports by officers and senior enlisted personnel of matters relating to violations or alleged violations of criminal law (sec. 555)	316
Subtitle E—Military Service Academies	317
Authority to retain permanent military professors at the Naval Academy after more than 30 years of service (sec. 561)	317
Subtitle F—Administrative Matters	317
Clarification of leave accrual for members assigned to a deployable ship or mobile unit or other duty (sec. 571)	317
Limitation on conversion of military medical and dental billets to civilian positions (sec. 572)	318
Subtitle G—Defense Dependents Education Matters	318
Expansion of authorized enrollment in Department of Defense dependents schools overseas (sec. 581)	318
Assistance to local educational agencies with significant enrollment increases in military dependent students due to troop relocations, creation of new units, and realignments under BRAC (sec. 582)	318

# XI

	Page
Title V—Military Personnel Policy—Continued	
Subtitle G—Defense Dependents Education Matters—Continued	
Assistance to local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 583)	319
Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 584)	319
Subtitle H—Other Matters	319
Policy and procedures on casualty assistance to survivors of military decedents (sec. 591)	319
Modification and enhancement of mission and authorities of the Naval Postgraduate School (sec. 592)	320
Expansion and enhancement of authority to present recognition items for recruitment and retention purposes (sec. 593)	320
Requirement for regulations on policies and procedures on personal commercial solicitations on Department of Defense installations (sec. 594)	321
Federal assistance for State programs under the National Guard Youth Challenge program (sec. 595)	322
Items of Special Interest	322
Air Force Future Total Force Planning	322
Opportunity for general or flag officer review of involuntary administrative separation of victims of sexual assault and protection against reprisals for victim advocates	323
Premium conversion/flexible spending account options for service members	323
Western Governors University	324
Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits	325
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances	325
Eligibility for additional pay of permanent military professors at United States Naval Academy with over 36 years of service (sec. 601)	325
Enhanced authority for agency contributions for members of the Armed Forces participating in the Thrift Savings Plan (sec. 602)	325
Permanent authority for supplemental subsistence allowance for low-income members with dependents (sec. 603)	325
Modification of pay considered as saved pay upon appointment of an enlisted member as an officer (sec. 604)	326
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays	326
One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for Reserve forces (sec. 611)	326
One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for certain health care professionals (sec. 612)	326
One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613)	326
One-year extension of other bonus and special pay authorities (sec. 614)	326
Payment and repayment of assignment incentive pay (sec. 615)	327
Increase in amount of selective reenlistment bonus for certain senior supervisory nuclear qualified enlisted personnel (sec. 616)	327
Consolidation and modification of bonuses for affiliation or enlistment in the Selected Reserve (sec. 617)	327
Expansion and enhancement of special pay for enlisted members of the Selected Reserve assigned to certain high priority units (sec. 618)	328
Retention incentive bonus for members of the Selected Reserve qualified in a critical military skill or specialty (sec. 619)	328
Termination of limitation on duration of payment of imminent danger special pay during hospitalization (sec. 620)	328
Authority for retroactive payment of imminent danger special pay (sec. 621)	328
Authority to pay foreign language proficiency pay to members on active duty as a bonus (sec. 622)	329
Incentive bonus for transfer between the Armed Forces (sec. 623)	329
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances	329
Transportation of family members in connection with the repatriation of service members or civilian employees held captive (sec. 631)	329
Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits	330

## XII

	Page
Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits—Continued	
Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits—Continued	
Enhancement of death gratuity and life insurance benefits for deaths from combat-related causes or causes incurred in combat operations or areas (sec. 641)	330
Subtitle E—Other Matters	330
Payment of expenses of members of the Armed Forces to obtain professional credentials (sec. 651)	330
Pilot program on contributions to Thrift Savings Plan for initial enlistees in the Armed Forces (sec. 652)	331
Title VII—Health Care	333
Subtitle A—Benefits Matters	333
Clarification of eligibility of Reserve officers for health care pending active duty following issuance of orders to active duty (sec. 701)	333
Limitation on deductible and copayment requirements for nursing home residents under the pharmacy benefits program (sec. 702)	333
Eligibility of surviving active duty spouses of deceased members for enrollment as dependents in a TRICARE dental plan (sec. 703)	333
Increased period of continued TRICARE Prime coverage of children of members of the uniformed services who die while serving on active duty for a period of more than 30 days (sec. 704)	333
Subtitle B—Planning, Programming, and Management	334
TRICARE Standard coordinators in TRICARE regional offices (sec. 711)	334
Report on delivery of health care benefits through military health care system (sec. 712)	334
Comptroller General report on differential payments to children's hospitals for health care for children dependents under TRICARE (sec. 713)	335
Repeal of requirement for Comptroller General reviews of certain Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs projects on sharing of health care resources (sec. 714)	335
Surveys on TRICARE standard (sec. 715)	335
Modification of health care quality information and technology enhancement report requirements (sec. 716)	336
Modification of authorities relating to patient care reporting and management system (sec. 717)	336
Subtitle C—Other Matters	336
Report on adverse health events associated with use of anti-malarial drugs (sec. 731)	336
Pilot projects on early diagnosis and treatment of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and other mental health conditions (sec. 732)	336
Items of Special Interest	337
Active-duty medical extension	337
Comptroller General study of adequacy of TRICARE reimbursement for obstetrical, gynecological, and pediatric services	338
Increased awareness for families of TRICARE mental health benefits and the need for appropriate mental health services for families overseas	338
Specialty health care services referrals and authorizations	339
Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters	341
Overview	341
Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management	349
Internal controls for procurements on behalf of the Department of Defense (sec. 801)	349
Contract Support Acquisition Centers (sec. 802)	349
Authority to enter into acquisition and cross-servicing agreements with regional organizations of which the United States is not a member (sec. 803)	350
Requirement for authorization for procurement of major weapon systems as commercial items (sec. 804)	351
Report on service surcharges for purchases made for military departments through other Department of Defense agencies (sec. 805)	351
Review of defense acquisition structures (sec. 806)	351
Subtitle B—Defense Industrial Base Matters	352
Clarification of exception from Buy American requirements for procurement of perishable food for establishments outside the United States (sec. 811)	352

# XIII

	Page
Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Mat- ters—Continued	
Subtitle B—Defense Industrial Base Matters—Continued	
Conditional waiver of domestic source or content requirements for certain countries with reciprocal procurement agreements with the United States (sec. 812)	352
Consistency with United States obligations under trade agreements (sec. 813)	353
Identification of areas of research and development effort for pur- poses of the Small Business Innovative Research program (sec. 814)	353
Subtitle C—Defense Contractor Matters	353
Requirements for defense contractors relating to certain former De- partment of Defense officials (sec. 821)	353
Review of certain contractor ethics matters (sec. 822)	354
Contract fraud risk assessment (sec. 823)	355
Subtitle D—Defense Acquisition Workforce Matters	356
Availability of funds in Acquisition Workforce Training Fund for defense acquisition workforce improvements (sec. 831)	356
Limitation and reinvestment authority relating to reduction of the defense acquisition and support workforce (sec. 832)	356
Technical amendments relating to defense acquisition workforce im- provements (sec. 833)	356
Subtitle E—Other Matters	357
Extension of contract goal for small disadvantaged business and cer- tain institutions of higher education (sec. 841)	357
Codification and modification of limitation on modification of military equipment within five years of retirement or disposal (sec. 842)	357
Clarification of rapid acquisition authority to respond to combat emergencies (sec. 843)	357
Modification of authority to carry out certain prototype projects (sec. 844)	357
Extension of certain authorities on contracting with employers of persons with disabilities (sec. 845)	358
Items of Special Interest	358
Commercial satellite bandwidth	358
Defense trade data	359
Department of Defense anti-tamper program	359
Industrial base issues	360
Implementation of authority to enter energy savings performance contracts	360
National technology and industrial base considerations	361
Title IX—Department of Defense Organization and Management	363
Subtitle A—Duties and Functions of Department of Defense Officers and Organizations	363
Directors of small business programs (sec. 901)	363
Executive agent for acquisition of capabilities to defend the homeland against missiles and other low-altitude aircraft (sec. 902)	363
Subtitle B—Space Activities	364
Advisory committee on Department of Defense requirements for space control (Sec. 911)	364
Subtitle C—Other Matters	365
Acceptance of gifts and donations for Department of Defense regional centers for security studies (sec. 921)	365
Operational files of the Defense Intelligence Agency (sec. 922)	365
Prohibition on implementation of certain orders and guidance on functions and duties of the General Council and the Judge Advo- cate General of the Air Force (sec. 923)	365
Title X—General Provisions	367
Subtitle A—Financial Matters	367
Transfer authority (sec. 1001)	367
Incorporation of classified annex (sec. 1002)	367
United States contribution to NATO common-funded budgets in fiscal year 2006 (sec. 1003)	367
Reduction in certain authorizations due to savings relating to lower inflation (sec. 1004)	367
Authorization of supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2005 (sec. 1005)	367

# XIV

	Page
Title X—General Provisions—Continued	
Subtitle A—Financial Matters—Continued	
Increase in fiscal year 2005 transfer authority (sec. 1006) .....	368
Monthly disbursement to States of state income tax voluntarily withheld from retired or retained pay (sec. 1007) .....	368
Reestablishment of limitation on payment of facilities charges assessed by Department of State (sec. 1008) .....	368
Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards .....	368
Transfer of battleship (sec. 1021) .....	368
Conveyance of Navy Drydock, Jacksonville, Florida (sec. 1022) .....	369
Subtitle C—Counterdrug Matters .....	369
Use of unmanned aerial vehicles for United States border reconnaissance (sec. 1031) .....	369
Use of counterdrug funds for certain counterterrorism operations (sec. 1032) .....	370
Support for counterdrug activities through bases of operation and training facilities in Afghanistan (sec. 1033) .....	370
Subtitle D—Reports and Studies .....	371
Modification of frequency of submittal of Joint Warfighting Science and Technology Plan (sec. 1041) .....	371
Review and assessment of Defense Base Act insurance (sec. 1042) .....	371
Comptroller General report on corrosion prevention and mitigation programs of the Department of Defense (sec. 1043) .....	371
Subtitle E—Technical Amendments .....	372
Technical amendments relating to certain provisions of environmental defense laws (sec. 1051) .....	372
Subtitle F—Military Mail Matters .....	372
Safe delivery of mail in the military mail system (sec. 1061) .....	372
Delivery of mail addressed to any service member (sec. 1062) .....	374
Subtitle G—Other Matters .....	374
Policy on role of military medical and behavioral science personnel in interrogation of detainees (sec. 1071) .....	374
Clarification of authority to issue security regulations and orders under Internal Security Act of 1950 (sec. 1072) .....	375
Items of Special Interest .....	375
Strategic Seaports .....	375
Title XI—Department of Defense Civilian Personnel Policy .....	377
Extension of authority for voluntary separations in reductions in force (sec. 1101) .....	377
Compensatory time off for certain nonappropriated fund employees (sec. 1102) .....	377
Extension of authority to pay severance payments in lump sums (sec. 1103) .....	377
Continuation of Federal Employee Health Benefits program eligibility (sec. 1104) .....	377
Permanent and enhanced authority for Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation (SMART) defense education program (sec. 1105) .....	378
Item of Special Interest .....	378
Comptroller General Report on policy concerning Department of Defense civilians deployed in support of contingency operations .....	378
Title XII—Matters Relating to Other Nations .....	381
Commanders' Emergency Response Program (sec. 1201) .....	381
Enhancement and expansion of authority to provide humanitarian and civic assistance (sec. 1202) .....	381
Modification of geographic limitation on payment of personnel expenses under bilateral or regional cooperation programs (sec. 1203) .....	382
Payment of travel expenses of coalition liaison officers (sec. 1204) .....	382
Title XIII—Cooperative Threat Reduction with States of the Former Soviet Union .....	383
Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds (sec. 1301) .....	383
Funding allocations (sec. 1302) .....	383
Permanent waiver of restrictions on use of funds for threat reduction in states of the former Soviet Union (sec. 1303) .....	383
Modification of authority to use Cooperative Threat Reduction funds outside the former Soviet Union (sec. 1304) .....	383



	Page
Title XIII—Cooperative Threat Reduction with States of the Former Soviet Union—Continued	
Repeal of requirement for annual Comptroller General assessment of annual Department of Defense report on activities and assistance under Cooperative Threat Reduction programs (sec. 1305) .....	384
Title XIV—Authorization for Supplemental Appropriations for Iraq, Afghanistan, and the Global War on Terrorism .....	385
Overview .....	385
Summary table of authorization .....	385
Purpose (sec. 1401) .....	392
Designation as emergency amounts (sec. 1402) .....	392
Army procurement (sec. 1403) .....	392
Navy and Marine Corps procurement (sec. 1404) .....	393
Air Force procurement (sec. 1405) .....	393
Operation and Maintenance (sec. 1406) .....	393
Defense Health Program (sec. 1407) .....	393
Military personnel (sec. 1408) .....	393
Iraq Freedom Fund (sec. 1409) .....	393
Transfer authority (sec. 1410) .....	394
Budget Items .....	394
UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters .....	394
UH-60 Black Hawk helicopter modifications .....	395
M107 sniper rifle .....	395
Rapid fielding initiative .....	395
Night vision enhancements .....	395
Lightweight laser designation rangefinder .....	396
Mounted battle command on the move .....	396
UH-1Y helicopters .....	397
EA-6B ICAP III .....	397
Low band transmitters for EA-6B aircraft .....	397
CH-53E Helicopter Night Vision Systems .....	398
Hellfire missiles .....	398
Small arms .....	398
Pioneer tactical unmanned aerial vehicle .....	398
Dual mode laser guided training bombs .....	399
Small arms and landing party ammunition .....	399
M80/M62 7.62mm cartridge .....	399
.50 caliber link armor piercing cartridge with tracer .....	399
M430 40mm high explosive dual purpose .....	400
M830A1 120mm high explosive with tracer cartridge .....	400
XM1028 120mm tank cartridge .....	400
M72A7 66mm high explosive rocket .....	400
MK154 non-electric detonator .....	400
M762A1 electronic time fuze .....	401
M782 multi-option fuze for artillery .....	401
Explosive ordnance disposal equipment allowance for naval coastal warfare units .....	401
Amphibious equipment allowance for naval coastal warfare units .....	401
Equipment and trainer for maritime interdiction operations .....	402
High mobility artillery rocket system .....	402
AN/TPS-59(V3) radar system array rebuild .....	402
Enhanced position location reporting system .....	403
Explosive ordnance disposal equipment .....	403
C-5 aircraft missile warning system upgrade .....	403
C-17 aircraft infrared countermeasures .....	404
Mobile approach control system .....	404
Body armor .....	404
Expanded maritime interdiction operations training and outfitting .....	405
Small caliber weapons and mounts repair and replacement .....	405
Field medical equipment .....	405
M1A1 tank depot maintenance .....	406
Division B—Military Construction Authorizations .....	407
Explanation of funding tables .....	407
Short title (sec. 2001) .....	429
Title XXI—Army .....	431
Summary .....	431
Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101) .....	431

	Page
Title XXI—Army—Continued	
Family housing (sec. 2102) .....	431
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2103) .....	431
Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104) .....	431
Items of Special Interest .....	432
Report on permanent facilities for new Army units .....	432
Title XXII—Navy .....	435
Summary .....	435
Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201) .....	435
Family housing (sec. 2202) .....	435
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203) .....	436
Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204) .....	436
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2004 project (sec. 2205) .....	436
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2206) .....	436
Hockmuth Hall, Marine Corps Base Quantico, Virginia .....	436
Title XXIII—Air Force .....	437
Summary .....	437
Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301) .....	437
Family housing (sec. 2302) .....	438
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303) .....	438
Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304) .....	438
Items of Special Interest .....	438
Planning and design, Air Force .....	438
Title XXIV—Defense Agencies .....	439
Summary .....	439
Authorized defense agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401) .....	439
Energy conservation projects (sec. 2402) .....	439
Authorization of appropriations, defense agencies (sec. 2403) .....	440
Title XXV—North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program .....	441
Summary .....	441
Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501) .....	441
Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502) .....	441
Title XXVI—Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities .....	443
Summary .....	443
Authorized Guard and Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601) .....	443
Items of Special Interest .....	443
Unspecified minor construction, Army National Guard .....	443
Unspecified minor construction, Air National Guard .....	443
Planning and design, Army National Guard .....	443
Title XXVII—Expiration and Extension of Authorizations .....	445
Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2701) .....	445
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2003 projects (sec. 2702) .....	445
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2002 projects (sec. 2703) .....	445
Effective date (sec. 2704) .....	445
Title XXVIII—General Provisions .....	447
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family .....	447
Housing Changes .....	447
Increase in thresholds for unspecified minor military construction projects (sec. 2801) .....	447
Modification of cost variation authority (sec. 2802) .....	447
Department of Defense housing funds (sec. 2803) .....	447
Temporary authority to use minor military construction authority for construction of child development centers (sec. 2804) .....	448
Inapplicability to child development centers of restriction on authority to acquire or construct ancillary supporting facilities (sec. 2805) .....	448
Authority to carry out exchanges of facilities including associated utilities, equipment, and furnishings (sec. 2806) .....	449

XVII

	Page
Title XXVIII—General Provisions—Continued	
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family—Continued	
Increase in number of family housing units in Korea authorized for lease by the Army at maximum amount (sec. 2807)	449
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration	449
Authority to lease non-excess property of Department of Defense field activities (sec. 2821)	449
Modified criteria for agreements to limit encroachments and other constraints on military training, testing and operations (sec. 2822)	449
Subtitle C—Land Conveyances	450
Part I—Army Conveyances	450
Land conveyance, Helena, Montana (sec. 2841)	450
Land conveyance, Army Reserve center, Bothell, Washington (sec. 2842)	450
Part II—Air Force Conveyances	451
Acquisition of build-to-lease family housing at Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska (sec. 2861)	451
Subtitle D—Other Matters	451
Reorganization and technical improvement of codified laws applicable to real property of the Department of Defense (sec. 2881)	451
Report on application of force protection and anti-terrorism standards to leased facilities (sec. 2882)	451
Construction at Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico, for Reserve components (sec. 2883)	452
Authority to use Papago Park Military Reservation, Arizona, for general military purposes (sec. 2884)	452
One-year extension of Department of Defense laboratory revitalization program (sec. 2885)	452
Sense of Congress on establishment of Bakers Creek memorial (sec. 2886)	453
Items of Special Interest	453
Report on host nation agreements for overseas installations	453
Training facilities for military operations in urban terrain	454
Relocation of Reserve component military units at Lambert International Airport, St. Louis, Missouri	454
Division C—Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations	457
Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs	457
Overview	457
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations	478
National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101)	478
Weapons activities	478
Directed stockpile work	478
Campaigns	478
Readiness in the technical base	478
Secure transportation asset	479
Safeguards and security	479
Facilities and infrastructure	479
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program	480
Naval Reactors	481
Office of Administrator	481
Environmental Projects and Operations	481
Reliable replacement warhead	482
Robust nuclear earth penetrator	482
Defense environmental management (sec. 3102)	483
Defense site acceleration completion	483
Defense environmental services	483
Other defense activities (sec. 3103)	484
Security and Safety Performance Assurance	484
Environment, Safety and Health	484
Office of Legacy Management	484
Nuclear Energy	484
Defense Related Administrative Support	485
Office of Hearings and Appeals	485
Energy security and assurance	485
Defense nuclear waste disposal (sec. 3104)	485
Subtitle B—Other Matters	485

# XVIII

	Page
Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs—Continued	
Subtitle B—Other Matters—Continued	
Report on compliance with design basis threat (sec. 3105) .....	485
Cost estimate for Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant project, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (sec. 3106) .....	486
Report on international border security programs (sec. 3107) .....	486
Items of Special Interest .....	487
National security implications of the Rare Isotope Accelerator .....	487
Role of the Kansas City Plant .....	488
Title XXXII—Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board .....	489
Authorization (sec. 3201) .....	489
Title XXXIII—National Defense Stockpile .....	491
Revisions to required receipt objectives for previously authorized dis- posals from the National Defense Stockpile (sec. 3301) .....	491
Legislative Requirements .....	491
Departmental Recommendations .....	491
Committee Action .....	491
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate .....	491
Regulatory Impact .....	491
Changes in Existing Law .....	491

## Calendar No. 102

109TH CONGRESS }  
*1st Session* }

SENATE

{ REPORT  
109-69

---

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

---

MAY 17, 2005.—Ordered to be printed

---

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

### R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 1042]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and recommends that the bill do pass.

### PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would:

- (1) authorize appropriations for (a) procurement, (b) research, development, test and evaluation, (c) operation and maintenance and the revolving and management funds of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2006;
- (2) authorize the personnel end strengths for each military active duty component of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2005;
- (3) authorize the personnel end strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2006;
- (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 2006; and
- (7) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2006.

### **Committee overview and recommendations**

The past three and one-half years have been a time of great successes and enormous challenges for the U.S. Armed Forces. The mission of the men and women in uniform to defend the nation has never been executed with better skill or dedication on the battlefield. The rapid successes of Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and Operation Iraqi Freedom have evolved into the hard work of counter-insurgency, reconstruction, and stability operations necessary to achieve peace and security in these troubled regions. Such important work brings new challenges associated with the extraordinarily high operational tempo on people and equipment, the technological challenges of countering asymmetric threats such as improvised explosive devices, the demands of transforming the Armed Forces for future threats, and the responsibility of the nation to properly care for those who volunteer to serve—Active, Reserve, National Guard, and retired—and their families.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 addresses these challenges. This bill is being considered by the committee at a time when the United States continues to lead a coalition of nations to defeat terrorism globally and to defend freedom and democracy. Hundreds of thousands of soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, and Coast Guardsmen—Active, Reserve, and National Guard—countless civilians who support military, diplomatic, and humanitarian operations have served, and more are serving valiantly in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other locations to secure hard-won military successes and to preserve peace and freedom. Successful elections in Iraq and Afghanistan in the past year are testament to the yearning of the people of those nations for a voice in their own destiny, the willingness of the United States to assist, and the professionalism of the brave Americans who volunteer to serve in uniform. The U.S. Armed Forces, serving around the world, are truly the first line of defense in the security of the U.S. homeland.

The committee is ever mindful of the risks members of the U.S. Armed Forces face every day, and of the many sacrifices made by the families and communities that support them. Our men and women in uniform have been asked to do much in the past year, and they have responded in the finest traditions of the generations of Americans that preceded them. Tragically, many members of the U.S. Armed Forces, as well as a number of civilian employees and contractors of the Department of Defense have been killed in service to their country, and many more have been wounded. On behalf of a grateful nation, the committee is committed to ensuring that those who have sacrificed so much will not be forgotten and will receive the care and support that they deserve. The American people are proud of their Armed Forces for what they have accomplished, for their selfless sacrifices, and for the manner in which they represent American values and the generosity of America.

While recent successes have proven the value of past investment in the people and the equipment of the U.S. Armed Forces, there is no room for complacency. A recurring lesson of history is that na-

tional security threats are ever-changing and persistent. Victory and success must be accompanied by vigilance. Such vigilance takes the form of readiness of today's forces and preparation for future threats to the security of the United States, its interests, and its allies.

Since the beginning of the 109th Congress, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate has conducted 35 hearings and received numerous policy and operational briefings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 2006 and related defense issues. As a result of these deliberations, the committee identified seven priorities to guide its work on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006:

- (1) Provide our men and women in uniform with the resources, training, technology, equipment, and authorities they need to win the global war on terrorism, with particular focus on supporting the conduct of military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

- (2) Enhance the ability of the Department of Defense to fulfill its homeland defense responsibilities by providing the resources and authorities necessary for the Department to assist in protecting our nation against all current and anticipated forms of attack.

- (3) Provide the resources and authorities needed to rapidly acquire the full range of force protection capabilities for deployed forces.

- (4) Continue the committee's commitment to improve the quality of life for those who serve—Active, Reserve, National Guard, and retired—and their families; enhance incentives to recruit and retain those who volunteer to serve in the Armed Forces; provide the best possible care and rehabilitation services for those who bear the wounds of combat; and ensure generous support for the survivors of those military personnel killed in defense of our Nation.

- (5) Sustain the readiness of our Armed Forces to conduct military operations against all current and anticipated threats.

- (6) Support the Department's efforts to develop the innovative, forward-looking capabilities necessary to modernize and transform the Armed Forces to successfully counter current and future threats, particularly by enhancing our technology in areas such as unmanned systems, personal protection systems, and measures to counter improvised explosive devices.

- (7) Continue active committee oversight of Department programs and operations, particularly in the areas of acquisition reform and contract management, to ensure proper stewardship of taxpayers' dollars.

In order to fund these priorities, the committee recommends \$441.6 billion in budget authority for defense programs for fiscal year 2006, an increase of \$21.0 billion—or 3.1 percent in real terms—above the amount authorized by the Congress for fiscal year 2005. The committee's recommendations include: \$78.2 billion in procurement funding, a \$1.5 billion increase above the President's budget request; \$69.8 billion in funding for research, development, test, and evaluation, a \$0.4 billion increase over the requested level; and \$109.2 billion for military personnel, a \$237 million increase over the requested level. The committee's rec-

ommendation also includes budget authority for \$50.0 billion in emergency supplemental funding in fiscal year 2006 to cover costs of military operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the global war on terrorism.

The committee's first priority was to provide the Department of Defense with the resources and authorities it needs to win the global war on terrorism. In these areas, the committee authorizes an increase of almost \$600.0 million over the budget request. Funding highlights for ground forces include: \$2.9 billion for new helicopters and helicopter modifications, in order to get needed lift and attack helicopters to troops in the field and \$878.4 million to continue procuring the Stryker armored vehicles that are proving so valuable in military operations in Iraq. To improve the ability of special operations forces, a major component of the war on terror, the committee authorized an increase of \$84.5 million above the President's budget request to accelerate the availability of important new capabilities. For naval forces, the committee authorized an increase of \$336.7 million to the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, account for a total of \$9.1 billion to accelerate development of the CVN-78 aircraft carrier, the LHA(R) amphibious ship, and the second DD(X) destroyer of the class, as well as authorizing the four ships in the President's budget request. For air forces, the committee supported the President's budget request funding levels for major aircraft acquisition programs. The committee provided for the continued funding of the C-130J aircraft multiyear contract and added \$37.7 million for the procurement of center wing box assemblies for C-130E/H aircraft to improve the availability of these important intra-theater lift assets.

To enhance the Department's homeland defense capabilities, the committee added \$48.8 million above the President's budget request including: an additional \$19.8 million to provide expanded capabilities for the Weapons of Mass Destruction-Civil Support teams that provide the Department support to local and regional first responders in every State and territory of the United States and an additional \$20.0 million for cybersecurity research. The committee also authorized an additional \$60.0 million for development and fielding of chemical and biological agent detection and protection technologies, that have application for both homeland defense and for protection of deployed forces. To protect America from missile threats, the committee authorized \$8.8 billion for ballistic missile defense, and reemphasized the need to develop defenses against cruise missiles, unmanned aerial vehicles, and other low-altitude air threats.

To address the force protection needs of deployed U.S. forces, the committee authorized over \$1.4 billion for various programs to protect personnel, vehicles, and installations, including: \$344.2 million for up-armored HMMWV's and armor kits for other wheeled vehicles, an increase of \$120.0 million above the requested amount; and an additional \$500.0 million for research, development, and fielding of technologies to counter improvised explosive devices; and added \$117.8 million for individual body armor. The committee is fully supportive of the Department of Defense efforts to improve the force protection capabilities available to deployed forces and will work closely with the Department of Defense and the military serv-



ices to ensure that all requirements to improve force protection are fully funded.

The committee is committed to continuing to improve the quality of life of the men and women in uniform—Active, Reserve, National Guard, and retired—and their families. The proposed bill would authorize a 3.1 percent across-the-board pay raise for all uniformed service personnel. The committee has increased the death gratuity payable to survivors of military decedents to \$100,000 when the death occurs under combat-related conditions or in designated combat zones. Additionally, the committee authorized an increase in the maximum Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance benefit from \$250,000 to \$400,000.

The committee has authorized full funding for the defense health program, and is committed to ensuring that there is no erosion in quality health care for all beneficiaries. To this end, the committee authorizes an additional \$82.2 million to ensure the medical readiness of the Reserve components. The committee is pleased that the Department has taken steps to implement the full range of health care benefits for members of Reserve components and their families—both before and after deployment—that was authorized in the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for 2005 (Public Law 108–375).

An important aspect of quality of life for service members are the benefits and services available to family members. The committee recognizes the tremendous dedication and sacrifices of military family members who share in every way in the successes, accomplishments, and hardships of the members of the Armed Forces. The committee supports all of the benefits for family members contained in the President's budget request and authorizes an increase of \$70.0 million to further enhance support for military families, particularly with regard to additional child care services.

The quality of combat medicine has improved dramatically since World War II, the Korean Conflict, and Vietnam. More service members now survive the initial wounds of war, and it is important that the best possible care and rehabilitative services are available for those wounded in combat. The bill would authorize various provisions that recognize the evolving nature of battlefield medicine, the long-term needs of seriously wounded survivors and combat veterans, and the social and fiscal support responsibilities of the nation to the survivors of those who make the ultimate sacrifice.

The committee is concerned about the challenges of recruiting and retaining volunteers for the Active and Reserve component force in a wartime environment. In addition to the quality of life improvements already discussed, the committee has authorized a variety of incentives and bonuses for Active Duty and Reserve component personnel, and will continue to work closely with the Department of Defense and the military services to ensure that they have the resources and authorities they need to recruit and retain a high quality volunteer force.

The committee recognizes that U.S. ground forces in general, and the U.S. Army in particular, have experienced a high operational tempo for an extended period. The bill recommended by the committee authorizes an increase in active-duty end strength for the Army of 20,000 personnel in fiscal year 2006, for an end strength level of 522,400. The active-duty end strength for the U.S. Marine

Corps is maintained at 178,000, equal to the end strength authorized for fiscal year 2005, and 3,000 above the President's budget request. The bill supports the end strength levels of the other military services for both Active and Reserve components recommended by the President, and includes an increase of 85 National Guard personnel to man augmentation elements to the Weapons of Mass Destruction—Civil Support Teams. The committee supports the initiatives by the Army to reorganize their combat formations into modular brigade sized units to provide more combat formations and a more deployable, flexible force.

The administration requested \$12.1 billion for military construction and family housing, including \$1.9 billion to initiate activities required to carry out the results of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commission recommendations. The committee recommendations include certain adjustments to provide prudent investment in overseas locations and increased investment in installations in the United States. Among the funding adjustments made by the committee are increases of over \$120.0 million in critical unfunded projects identified by the military services, and an additional \$187.0 million to fund improvements to facilities supporting National Guard and reserve forces needs.

Over the past several years, the committee has worked with the Department to ensure that necessary modernization, transformation, and long-range research were maintained, even in times of high operational tempo. The committee continues its support for these transformational activities, authorizing \$3.4 billion for the Army's Future Combat System development; \$115.4 million for tactical UAV's that have proven so valuable in recent military operations; and \$10.9 billion for defense science and technology programs, an increase of over \$400.0 million above the President's budget request, that are the foundation for future capabilities. The committee remains committed to the goals it set for the Department five years ago to have one-third of deep strike aircraft unmanned combat systems by the year 2010, and one-third of the ground combat vehicles unmanned by the year 2015.

The committee takes its oversight responsibilities over the Department of Defense and defense related activities of the Department of Energy very seriously. The bill contains several provisions designed to improve management and oversight of Department of Defense acquisition programs. These provisions would increase the size and quality of the acquisition workforce, strengthen defense ethics programs, and reduce the risk of contract fraud. In addition, the bill would expand the authority of the Secretary of Defense to rapidly acquire capabilities to ensure that our deployed troops can quickly get needed equipment.

The committee is particularly concerned about the state of the current shipbuilding program. The committee does not believe that the current or projected level of funding for shipbuilding is adequate to build the numbers of ships that will allow the Navy to perform its global missions or to sustain an increasingly fragile industrial base. The founding fathers were specific in the United States Constitution that it is the duty of Congress to "maintain" a Navy. They had the foresight to realize that a Navy cannot be quickly constituted, or reconstituted. That is as true today as it was over two centuries ago. If the United States is to remain a

global power, it must have a global presence. As a maritime nation, that presence is often displayed in the form of naval ships, not only through ensuring open sea lines of communication and trade in international waters, but also through the inherently diplomatic mission of visiting foreign ports and “showing the flag”.

The Navy currently has only 288 ships in the fleet. This is the smallest number of ships in the Navy since before the start of the Second World War. It is true that these ships possess capabilities far greater than those of the past, but global presence demands sufficient numbers of ships as well as the capabilities possessed by those ships.

Numerous officials have testified before this committee that shipbuilding must become a subject of national debate. They have testified that the Department of Defense, the Congress, and the shipbuilders need to engage in this debate. Low shipbuilding rates have resulted in increased costs for ships, as recently documented by the Government Accountability Office. These increased costs have translated into even lower shipbuilding rates. The committee believes this downward spiral needs to be reversed. To accomplish this, the committee believes that significantly higher funding is required in the shipbuilding budget. That funding must be stable, and some degree of flexibility is required in the funding mechanisms for shipbuilding to allow for efficient management while visibility remains to allow for sufficient oversight.

The committee believes that the shipbuilding budget must be reviewed by the administration as a matter of the utmost urgency in the coming year. The committee recommends that the President consider establishing a special shipbuilding fund, which would be funded apart from the normal give and take within the Department of Defense budget process, to dedicate a sustained amount of funding for the construction of naval ships. The Congressional Budget Office estimates, based on testimony before the committee, that the amount of funding necessary to maintain a Navy of appropriate size and capability to deter any potential adversaries and meet U.S. global commitments is at least \$15.0 billion a year, and that it needs to be sustained at that level for a period of 10 to 15 years.

America has much to be thankful for in terms of the patriotic young Americans who volunteer to serve and who have individually and collectively performed with such professionalism and distinction in defense of the United States. The efforts of the U.S. Armed Forces have been remarkable, but they are not without cost—the loss of priceless lives that must be honored and remembered; the responsibility to care for the survivors and their families; the cost of ongoing operations and related refurbishment or replacement of heavily used equipment; and the responsibility to ensure that those who serve, and their families, receive the quality of life and benefits they have earned and deserve. As a nation at war against enemies who have attacked our homeland and who seek to impose the tyranny of their beliefs on others, Americans understand their responsibility to defeat the scourge of terrorism at any cost to ensure the security of America.

The U.S. Armed Forces are the best trained, best equipped, and most experienced military force in the world today. To ensure the security of America, the excellence of this force must be sustained,

modernized, and transformed. The committee believes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 prudently addresses the defense needs of the United States, recognizes the service and sacrifice of our men and women in uniform and their families, provides the resources needed to win the global war on terrorism, and makes the necessary investments to provide for the security of the nation in the future.

#### **Explanation of funding summary**

The administration's budget request for the national defense function of the federal budget for fiscal year 2006 was \$435.9 billion. According to the estimating procedures used by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the budget implication of the amount requested was \$441.6 billion. The funding summary table that follows uses the budget authority as calculated by CBO.

The following table summarizes both the direct authorizations and equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 2006 defense programs. The columns relating to the authorization request do not include funding for the following items: Concurrent Receipt Accrual Payments to the Military Retirement Fund; military construction authorizations provided in prior years; and other portions of the defense budget that are not within the jurisdiction of this committee, or that do not require an annual authorization.

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 report.

The committee recommends funding for national defense programs totaling \$441.6 billion in budget authority. This funding level is consistent with the budget authority level of \$441.6 billion for the national defense function recommended in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006 (H. Con. Res. 95), which was adopted on April 28, 2005.

# SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2006

(Dollars in Thousands)

## DIVISION A

### Title I -- PROCUREMENT

	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change to Request</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>	<u>Budget Authority Request</u>	<u>Implication Senate</u>
Aircraft Procurement, Army	2,800,880		2,800,880	2,800,880	2,800,880
Missile Procurement, Army	1,270,850	-5,000	1,265,850	1,270,850	1,265,850
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,660,149	32,400	1,692,549	1,660,149	1,692,549
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,720,872	110,800	1,831,672	1,720,872	1,831,672
Other Procurement, Army	4,302,634	36,800	4,339,434	4,302,634	4,339,434
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	10,517,126	-570,200	9,946,926	10,517,126	9,946,926
Weapons Procurement, Navy	2,707,841	41,600	2,749,441	2,707,841	2,749,441
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	872,849	20,000	892,849	872,849	892,849
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	8,721,165	336,700	9,057,865	8,721,165	9,075,865
Other Procurement, Navy	5,487,818	108,400	5,596,218	5,487,818	5,596,218
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,377,705	9,000	1,386,705	1,377,705	1,386,705
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	11,973,933	1,238,700	13,212,633	11,973,933	13,212,633
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	1,031,207		1,031,207	1,031,207	1,031,207
Missile Procurement, Air Force	5,490,287	10,000	5,500,287	5,490,287	5,500,287
Other Procurement, Air Force	14,002,689	25,200	14,027,889	14,002,689	14,027,889
Procurement, Defense-wide	2,677,832	107,000	2,784,832	2,677,832	2,784,832
National Guard and Reserve Equipment					
Defense Production Act Purchases				19,573	19,573
<b>Total Procurement</b>	<b>76,615,837</b>	<b>1,501,400</b>	<b>78,117,237</b>	<b>76,635,410</b>	<b>78,154,810</b>

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

Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	9,733,824	-17,000	9,716,824	9,733,824	9,716,824
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	18,037,991	360,100	18,398,091	18,037,991	18,398,091
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	22,612,351	24,217	22,636,568	22,612,351	22,636,568

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2006

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization <u>Request</u>	Senate Change <u>to Request</u>	Senate <u>Authorized</u>	Budget Authority <u>Request</u>	Implication <u>Senate</u>
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	18,803,416	39,880	18,843,296	18,803,416	18,843,296
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	168,458		168,458	168,458	168,458
<b>Total Research, Development, Test &amp; Evaluation</b>	<b>69,356,040</b>	<b>407,197</b>	<b>69,763,237</b>	<b>69,356,040</b>	<b>69,763,237</b>
<b>Title III -- OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE &amp; OTHER PROGRAMS</b>					
<b>Operation and Maintenance</b>					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	25,316,595	-365,135	24,951,460	25,316,595	24,951,460
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	30,759,889	-212,400	30,547,489	30,759,889	30,547,489
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	3,804,926	37,100	3,842,026	3,804,926	3,842,026
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	31,521,136	-95,217	31,425,919	31,521,136	31,425,919
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	18,453,469	131,000	18,584,469	18,453,469	18,584,469
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,987,382		1,987,382	1,987,382	1,987,382
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,245,695	2,000	1,245,695	1,245,695	1,245,695
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	199,934		199,934	199,934	199,934
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	2,501,686	58,000	2,559,686	2,501,686	2,559,686
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	4,509,719	18,300	4,528,019	4,509,719	4,528,019
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	4,724,091	48,900	4,772,991	4,724,091	4,772,991
Transfer Accounts	1,369,689	40,000	1,409,689	1,369,689	1,409,689
Miscellaneous Appropriations	508,331		508,331	508,331	508,331
<b>Subtotal Operation and Maintenance</b>	<b>126,902,542</b>	<b>-337,452</b>	<b>126,565,090</b>	<b>126,902,542</b>	<b>126,565,090</b>
<b>Other Programs</b>					
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	895,741		895,741	895,741	895,741
Defense Health Program	19,791,612	109,200	19,900,812	19,791,612	19,900,812
Office of the Inspector General	209,687		209,687	209,687	209,687
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense	1,405,827	20,000	1,425,827	1,405,827	1,425,827
<b>Subtotal Other Programs</b>	<b>22,302,867</b>	<b>129,200</b>	<b>22,432,067</b>	<b>22,302,867</b>	<b>22,432,067</b>

# SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2006

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change to Request</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>	<u>Budget Authority Request</u>	<u>Implication Senate</u>
<b>Revolving and Management Funds</b>					
Defense Working Capital Funds (Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense-w	316,340		316,340	316,340	316,340
Defense Working Capital Funds - DeCA	1,155,000		1,155,000	1,155,000	1,155,000
National Defense Sealift Fund	1,648,504	-637,200	1,011,304	1,648,504	1,011,304
<b>Subtotal Revolving and Management Funds</b>	<b>3,119,844</b>	<b>-637,200</b>	<b>2,482,644</b>	<b>3,119,844</b>	<b>2,482,644</b>
<b>Total Operation and Maintenance &amp; Other Programs</b>	<b>152,325,253</b>	<b>-845,452</b>	<b>151,479,801</b>	<b>152,325,253</b>	<b>151,479,801</b>
<b>MILITARY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>108,942,746</b>	<b>236,855</b>	<b>109,179,601</b>	<b>108,942,746</b>	<b>109,179,601</b>
<b>Title X – GENERAL PROVISIONS</b>					
General Transfer Authority (non-additive)	[4,000,000]	[-500,000]	[3,500,000]		
Inflation Savings		-1,300,000	-1,300,000		-1,300,000
<b>Subtotal General Provisions</b>		<b>-1,300,000</b>	<b>-1,300,000</b>		<b>-1,300,000</b>
<b>DIVISION B</b>					
<b>MILITARY CONSTRUCTION</b>					
Military Construction, Army	1,479,841	124,172	1,604,013	1,479,841	1,604,013
Military Construction, Navy	1,029,249	73,417	1,102,666	1,029,249	1,102,666
Military Construction, Air Force	1,069,640	137,781	1,207,421	1,069,640	1,207,421
Military Construction, Defense-wide	1,042,730		1,042,730	1,042,730	1,042,730
Military Construction, Army National Guard	327,012	137,668	464,680	327,012	464,680
Military Construction, Air National Guard	165,256	80,605	245,861	165,256	245,861
Military Construction, Army Reserve	106,077	15,000	121,077	106,077	121,077
Military Construction, Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	45,226	5,000	50,226	45,226	50,226
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	79,260		79,260	79,260	79,260
Military Construction, Foreign Currency Fluctuations					65,000
Base Realignment and Closure Account IV	377,827		377,827	377,827	377,827
Base Realignment and Closure Account 2005	1,880,466	-376,000	1,504,466	1,880,466	1,504,466

# SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2006

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change to Request</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>	<u>Budget Authority Request</u>	<u>Budget Authority Implication Senate</u>
NATO Security Investment Program	206,858		206,858	206,858	206,858
Chem Agents and Munitions Destruction					
<b>Subtotal Military Construction</b>	<b>7,809,442</b>	<b>197,643</b>	<b>8,007,085</b>	<b>7,809,442</b>	<b>8,072,085</b>
<b>FAMILY HOUSING</b>					
Family Housing Construction, Army	549,636		549,636	549,636	549,636
Family Housing Support, Army	812,993		812,993	812,993	812,993
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	218,942	3,197	222,139	218,942	222,139
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps	593,660		593,660	593,660	593,660
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	1,251,108		1,251,108	1,251,108	1,251,108
Family Housing Support, Air Force	766,939	-108,486	658,453	766,939	658,453
Family Housing Construction, Defense-wide					
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide	46,391		46,391	46,391	46,391
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund	2,500		2,500	2,500	2,500
<b>Subtotal Family Housing</b>	<b>4,242,169</b>	<b>-105,289</b>	<b>4,136,880</b>	<b>4,242,169</b>	<b>4,136,880</b>
Prior Year Rescissions		-92,354	-92,354		-92,354
<b>Total Military Construction and Family Housing</b>	<b>12,051,611</b>		<b>12,051,611</b>	<b>12,051,611</b>	<b>12,116,611</b>
<b>OTHER DoD MILITARY (Discretionary)</b>					
Receipts from Travel and Purchase Card Refunds					45,000
Armed Forces Retirement Home Fund	58,281		58,281		
Disposal of DoD Real Property				15,000	15,000
Lease of DoD Real Property				12,000	12,000



# SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2006

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change to Request</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>	<u>Budget Authority Request</u>	<u>Implication Senate</u>
Overseas Facility Investment Recovery				1,000	
<b>Total Other DoD Military Discretionary</b>	<b>58,281</b>		<b>58,281</b>	<b>28,000</b>	<b>72,000</b>
<b>Subfunction (051) Department of Defense Discretionary</b>	<b>419,349,768</b>		<b>419,349,768</b>	<b>419,339,060</b>	<b>419,466,060</b>
<b>OTHER DoD MILITARY (Mandatory)</b>					
Concurrent Receipt Accrual Payments to the Military Retirement Fund				2,343,000	2,343,000
Offsetting Receipts and Other				-1,358,000	-1,165,000
Revolving, Trust, and Other DoD Mandatory				792,000	748,000
Sale of Certain Materials in the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund					-100,000
Pilot program on post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)				1,000	1,000
<b>Total Other DoD Military Mandatory</b>				<b>1,777,000</b>	<b>1,827,000</b>
<b>Subfunction (051) Department of Defense Mandatory</b>				<b>1,777,000</b>	<b>1,827,000</b>
<b>SUBFUNCTION (051) TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE</b>	<b>419,349,768</b>		<b>419,349,768</b>	<b>421,116,060</b>	<b>421,293,060</b>
<b>DIVISION C</b>					
<b>ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)</b>					
Energy Supply	12,000	-12,000		12,000	
Weapons Activities	6,630,133	-39,814	6,590,319	6,630,133	6,590,319
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,637,239		1,637,239	1,637,239	1,637,239
Naval Reactors	786,000		786,000	786,000	786,000
Office of the Administrator	343,869		343,869	343,869	343,869
<b>Subtotal National Nuclear Security Administration</b>	<b>9,397,241</b>	<b>-39,814</b>	<b>9,357,427</b>	<b>9,397,241</b>	<b>9,357,427</b>

# SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2006

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change to Request</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>	<u>Budget Authority Request</u>	<u>Implication Senate</u>
Defense Site Acceleration Completion	5,183,713	152,136	5,335,849	5,183,713	5,335,849
Defense Environmental Services	831,331	22,253	853,584	831,331	853,584
Other Defense Activities	635,998	-72,575	563,423	635,998	563,423
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	351,447	-50,000	301,447	351,447	301,447
Subtotal Environmental & Other Defense Activities	7,002,489	51,814	7,054,303	7,002,489	7,054,303
Subtotal Department of Energy	16,411,730		16,411,730	16,411,730	16,411,730
OTHER ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (Discretionary)					
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	22,032		22,032	22,032	22,032
Corps of Engineers - Civil Works					140,000
Total Other Atomic Energy Defense Activities Discretionary	22,032		22,032	22,032	162,032
Subfunction (053) Atomic Energy Defense Activities Discretion	16,433,762		16,433,762	16,433,762	16,573,762
OTHER ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (Mandatory)					
Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program (EEOICPA)				916,000	453,000
Subfunction (053) Other Atomic Energy Defense Activities Ma				916,000	453,000
SUBFUNCTION (053) TOTAL ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENS	16,433,762		16,433,762	17,349,762	17,026,762

# SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2006

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change to Request</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>	<u>Budget Authority Request</u>	<u>Senate Implication</u>
<b>DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)</b>					
Department of Homeland Security				727,000	727,000
Department of Justice Salaries and Expenses				1,600,000	1,600,000
General Administration Salaries and Expenses				17,000	17,000
Department of Transportation - MARAD Maritime Security Program				156,000	156,000
Intelligence Community Management Account				337,844	337,844
National Science Foundation - Antarctic Research Activities				68,000	68,000
Selective Service System - Salaries and Expenses				26,000	26,000
<b>Subfunction (054) Defense Related Activities Discretionary</b>				<b>2,931,844</b>	<b>2,931,844</b>
<b>OTHER DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES (Mandatory)</b>					
CIA Retirement & Disability				244,600	244,600
Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund				43,000	65,000
Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund				29,000	
FBI Offsetting Receipts				316,600	309,600
<b>Subfunction (054) Defense Related Activities Mandatory</b>				<b>316,600</b>	<b>309,600</b>
<b>SUBFUNCTION (054) TOTAL DEFENSE-RELATED ACTIV</b>				<b>3,248,444</b>	<b>3,241,444</b>
<b>Total National Defense Function (050) Discretionary</b>	<b>435,783,530</b>		<b>435,783,530</b>	<b>438,704,666</b>	<b>438,971,666</b>
<b>Total National Defense Function (050) Mandatory</b>				<b>3,009,600</b>	<b>2,589,600</b>
<b>TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)</b>	<b>435,783,530</b>		<b>435,783,530</b>	<b>441,714,266</b>	<b>441,561,266</b>



**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 2006 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 administration 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 2006  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Title I – PROCUREMENT</u>	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorization</u>
Aircraft Procurement, Army	2,800,880		2,800,880
Missile Procurement, Army	1,270,850	-5,000	1,265,850
Procurement of W&TCV, Army	1,660,149	32,400	1,692,549
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,720,872	110,800	1,831,672
Other Procurement, Army	4,302,634	36,800	4,339,434
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	10,517,126	-570,200	9,946,926
Weapons Procurement, Navy	2,707,841	41,600	2,749,441
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	872,849	20,000	892,849
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	8,721,165	336,700	9,057,865
Other Procurement, Navy	5,487,818	108,400	5,596,218
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,377,705	9,000	1,386,705
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	11,973,933	1,238,700	13,212,633
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	1,031,207		1,031,207
Missile Procurement, Air Force	5,490,287	10,000	5,500,287
Other Procurement, Air Force	14,002,689	25,200	14,027,889
Procurement, Defense-Wide	2,677,832	107,000	2,784,832
National Guard and Reserve Equipment			
Defense Production Act Purchases			
<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT</b>	<b>76,615,837</b>	<b>1,501,400</b>	<b>78,117,237</b>

**Subtitle B—Army Programs**

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>		<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Cost</u>
		<b>Aircraft Procurement, Army</b>					
		<b>Aircraft</b>					
		<b>Fixed Wing</b>					
2031	1	UTILITY F/W CARGO AIRCRAFT		4,926			4,926
2031	2	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT					
		<b>Rotary Wing</b>					
2031	3	ARMED RECONNAISSANCE HELICOPTER		70,000			70,000
2031	4	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)		108,000			108,000
2031	5	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	41	562,160	41		562,160
2031	5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-56,510			-56,510
2031	6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		79,052			79,052
2031	7	HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING					
		<b>Modification of Aircraft</b>					
2031	8	GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)					
2031	9	ARL MODS (TIARA)		580,392			580,392
2031	10	AH-64 MODS		19,000			19,000
2031	11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		675,065			675,065
2031	12	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS		-23,722			-23,722
2031	12	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		24,689			24,689
2031	13	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		13,575			13,575
2031	14	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS					
2031	15	OH-58 MODS					
2031	16	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS		779			779
2031	17	LONGBOW		84,513			84,513
2031	17	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)					
2031	18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)					



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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
2031	19	UH-60 MODS		33,294				<u>Cost</u>
2031	19	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						33,294
2031	20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
2031	21	KIOWA WARRIOR		24,478				24,478
2031	22	AIRBORNE AVIONICS		106,124				106,124
2031	23	GATM ROLLUP		31,542				31,542
2031	24	AIRBORNE DIGITIZATION						
		<b>Spares and Repair Parts</b>						
2031	25	SPARE PARTS (AIR)		3,948				3,948
		<b>Support Equipment and Facilities</b>						
		<b>Ground Support Avionics</b>						
2031	26	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT		11,200				11,200
2031	27	ASE INFRARED CM		211,151				211,151
		<b>Other Support</b>						
2031	28	AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL		28,055				28,055
2031	29	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,418				3,418
2031	30	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		70,436				70,436
2031	31	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS		29,352				29,352
2031	32	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		62,399				62,399
2031	33	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		41,222				41,222
2031	34	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET		2,342				2,342
2031	35	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS						
<b>Total - Aircraft Procurement, Army</b>				<b>2,800,880</b>				<b>2,800,880</b>

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
		<b>Missile Procurement, Army</b>						
		<b>Other Missiles</b>						
		<b>Surface-to-air Missile System</b>						
2032	1	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY	108	489,700			108	489,700
2032	2	STINGER SYSTEM SUMMARY						
2032	3	SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYSTEM SUMMARY		19,315				19,315
		<b>Air-to-surface Missile System</b>						
2032	4	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY		80,073				80,073
2032	5	APKWS (ADVANCED PRECISION KILL WEAPON SYS)	600	34,055	-135	-5,000	465	29,055
		Program reduction			[-135]	[-5,000]		
2032	5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-6,124				-6,124
2032	6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
		<b>Anti-tank/Assault Missile System</b>						
2032	7	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	300	57,636			300	57,636
2032	7	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
2032	8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
2032	9	LINE OF SIGHT ANTI-TANK (LOSAT) SYSTEM SUM						
2032	10	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	800	44,002			800	44,002
2032	10	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-16,795				-16,795
2032	11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		18,900				18,900
2032	12	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	1,026	124,814			1,026	124,814
2032	13	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	900	7,726			900	7,726
2032	14	MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS		20,787				20,787
2032	15	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (HIMAR	35	174,929			35	174,929
2032	16	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	45	58,458			45	58,458

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<b>Modification of Missiles</b>						
		<b>Modifications</b>						
2032	17	PATRIOT MODS		77,411				77,411
2032	18	STINGER MODS						
2032	19	JAVELIN MISSILE MODS		14,007				14,007
2032	20	ITAS/TOW MODS		9,587				9,587
2032	21	MLRS MODS		14,579				14,579
2032	22	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS: (NON AAO)		8,001				8,001
2032	23	HELLFIRE MODIFICATIONS						
		<b>Spares and Repair Parts</b>						
2032	24	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		30,142				30,142
		<b>Support Equipment and Facilities</b>						
2032	25	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		6,156				6,156
2032	26	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MISSILES)		10				10
2032	27	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		3,481				3,481
2032	28	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
		<b>Total - Missile Procurement Army</b>		<b>1,270,850</b>	<b>-5,000</b>			<b>1,265,850</b>
		<b>Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Air</b>						
		<b>Tracked Combat Vehicles</b>						
2033	1	ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD		3,754				3,754
2033	2	BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT		37,908				37,908
2033	2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
2033	3	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)		5,679				5,679
2033	4	ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES		3,709				3,709

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
2033	5	STRYKER	240	878,449				
		Modification of Tracked Combat Vehicles						
2033	6	CARRIER, MOD						
2033	7	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)						
2033	8	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, FIST VEHICLE						
2033	9	BFVS SERIES (MOD)		45,265				45,265
2033	10	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		14,801				14,801
2033	11	FAASV PIP TO FLEET		6,439				6,439
2033	12	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		443,475				443,475
2033	13	SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2						
2033	14	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM						
		Support Equipment and Facilities						
2033	15	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (TCV-WTCV)		407				407
2033	16	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		10,258				10,258
		Weapons and Other Combat Vehicles						
2033	17	INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY		32,484				32,484
2033	18	ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240 SERIES	1,197	14,148		1,197		14,148
2033	19	MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)		80				80
2033	20	GRENADA LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	352	8,715		352		8,715
2033	21	MORTAR SYSTEMS		200				200
2033	22	M16 RIFLE	14,500	8,000		14,500		8,000
2033	23	M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE	600	9,656		600		9,656
2033	24	5.56 CARBINE M4	2,106	3,215		2,106		3,215
2033	25	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION						
2033	26	HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T) Additional M777 LW-155	23	46,786		32,400	23	79,186
								[32,400]

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<b>Modification of Weapons and Other Combat Vehicles</b>						
2033	27	MARK-19 MODIFICATIONS		5,444				5,444
2033	28	M4 CARBINE MODS		44,817				44,817
2033	29	SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD)		3,095				3,095
2033	30	MEDIUM MACHINE GUNS (MODS)		7,089				7,089
2033	31	HOWITZER, TOWED, 155MM, M198 (MODS)						
2033	32	M119 MODIFICATIONS		1,000				1,000
2033	33	M16 RIFLE MODS		1,970				1,970
2033	34	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		5,146				5,146
		<b>Support Equipment and Facilities</b>						
2033	35	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		488				488
2033	36	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		6,494				6,494
2033	37	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		2,655				2,655
2033	38	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		5,181				5,181
2033	39	REF SMALL ARMS						
		<b>Spares</b>						
2033	40	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)		3,342				3,342
<b>Total - Procurement of WTCV, Army</b>				<b>1,660,149</b>		<b>32,400</b>		<b>1,692,549</b>
<b>Procurement of Ammunition, Army</b>								
		<b>Ammunition</b>						
		<b>Small/Medium Caliber Ammunition</b>						
2034	1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		142,363				142,363
2034	2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		75,290				75,290
2034	3	CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES		4,018				4,018

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
2034	4	CTG, 50 CAL, ALL TYPES		110,043				110,043
2034	5	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		30,965				30,965
2034	6	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		17,618				17,618
2034	7	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		142,594				142,594
		<b>Mortar Ammunition</b>						
2034	8	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		14,355				14,355
2034	9	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		85,250				85,250
2034	10	CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ALL TYPES		62,918				62,918
		<b>Tank Ammunition</b>						
2034	11	CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES		29,421				29,421
2034	12	120MM TANK TRAINING, ALL TYPES		145,094				145,094
2034	13	CTG, TANK, 120MM TACTICAL, ALL TYPES		52,724		5,500		58,224
		M1028 120mm tank cartridge				[5,500]		
		<b>Artillery Ammunition</b>						
2034	14	CTG, ARTY, 75MM: ALL TYPES		2,246				2,246
2034	15	CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES		41,873				41,873
2034	16	CTG, ARTY, 155MM: ALL TYPES		124,565				124,565
2034	17	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982		25,098				25,098
2034	18	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T		67,966				67,966
		<b>Artillery Fuzes</b>						
2034	19	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES		22,926				22,926
		<b>Mines</b>						
2034	20	MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES		230				230
2034	21	MINES (CONVENTIONAL), ALL TYPES		4,009				4,009
2034	22	MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES		4,646				4,646
2034	23	ANTI PERSONNEL LANDMINE ALTERNATIVES		27,876				27,876

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<b>Rockets</b>						
2034	24	SHOULDER FIRED ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		7,810				7,810
2034	25	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		156,879				156,879
		<b>Other Ammunition</b>						
2034	26	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		29,719		4,900		34,619
		Rapid wall breaching kit				[3,000]		
		Modern demolition initiator				[1,900]		
2034	27	GRENADAES, ALL TYPES		53,107				53,107
2034	28	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		26,648				26,648
2034	29	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		10,415				10,415
		<b>Miscellaneous</b>						
2034	30	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES		8,796				8,796
2034	31	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES		18,784				18,784
2034	32	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES		2,598				2,598
2034	33	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		5,503				5,503
2034	34	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		12,765		8,000		20,765
		Ammunition peculiar equipment outloading modules				[8,000]		
2034	35	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)		9,101				9,101
2034	36	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES		100				100
		<b>Ammunition Production Base Support</b>						
		<b>Production Base Support</b>						
2034	37	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		33,532		82,400		115,932
		HMX/RDX nitrate explosive formulation capabilities				[10,000]		
		Insensitive munitions load assembly and pack				[10,000]		
		Small-caliber production facility modernization				[22,400]		
		Acid concentration and nitrocellulose production				[40,000]		

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
2034	38	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		348				348
2034	39	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES		5,001				5,001
2034	40	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALI		102,933				112,933
		Missile recycling center energetics processing module						
2034	41	ARMS INITIATIVE		2,745				2,745
<b>Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Army</b>				<b>1,720,872</b>		<b>110,800</b>		<b>1,831,672</b>
<b>Other Procurement, Army</b>								
<b>Tactical and Support Vehicles</b>								
<b>Tactical Vehicles</b>								
2035	1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS		15,867				15,867
2035	2	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED		6,049				6,049
2035	3	SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS		6,287				6,287
2035	4	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)		224,222				224,222
2035	5	TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)						
2035	6	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)		449,601				449,601
2035	7	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMEI		7,523				7,523
2035	8	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)		207,096				208,696
		Movement Tracking System						
2035	9	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)						
2035	10	MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY						
2035	11	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916		17,063				17,063
2035	12	TRUCK, TRACTOR, YARD TYPE, M878 (C/S)						
2035	13	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV		40,710				40,710
2035	14	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM		32,800				32,800



# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
2035	15	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		11,659				11,659
2035	16	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (TAC VEH)		378				378
2035	17	TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL		1,950				1,950
		<b>Non-tactical Vehicles</b>						
2035	18	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN		2,900				2,900
2035	19	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		270				270
2035	20	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		430				430
		<b>Communications and Electronics Equipment</b>						
		<b>Comm-Joint Communications</b>						
2035	21	WIN - TACTICAL PROGRAM		122,433				122,433
2035	22	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		4,240				4,240
		<b>Comm-Satellite Communications</b>						
2035	23	SECURED ENROUTE COM PACKAGE		7,582				7,582
2035	24	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SP)		55,023				55,023
2035	25	SHF TERM		23,359				23,359
2035	26	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)		1,439				1,439
2035	27	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)		44,730				44,730
2035	28	SMART-T (SPACE)		14,607				14,607
2035	29	SCAMP (SPACE)		600				600
2035	30	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS		12,478				12,478
2035	31	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)		7,699				7,699
		<b>Comm-C3 System</b>						
2035	32	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)		17,358				17,358
		<b>Comm-Combat Communications</b>						
2035	33	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)		34,837				34,837
2035	34	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM						

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
2035	35	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		3,240				3,240
2035	36	SINGGARS FAMILY		55,511				55,511
2035	37	MULTI-PURPOSE INFORMATION OPERATIONS SYSTEM		8,602				8,602
2035	38	JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS						
2035	39	BRIDGE TO FUTURE NETWORKS		41,288				41,288
2035	40	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING		6,837				6,837
2035	41	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRO		8,153				8,153
2035	42	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)		15,729				15,729
2035	43	RADIO, IMPROVED HIGH FREQUENCY FAMILY		28,041				28,041
2035	44	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)		8,262				8,262
2035		<b>Comm-Intelligence Communications</b>						
2035	45	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,320				1,320
2035		<b>Information Security</b>						
2035	46	TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)		2,994				2,994
2035	47	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP		69,734				69,734
2035		<b>Comum-Long Haul Communications</b>						
2035	48	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION		15,661				15,661
2035	49	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		33,583				33,583
2035	50	ARMY DISN ROUTER						
2035	51	ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)		479				479
2035	52	VW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)		2,704				2,704
2035		<b>Comm-Base Communications</b>						
2035	53	INFORMATION SYSTEMS		12,883				12,883
2035	54	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)		6,433				6,433
2035	55	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRA		294,384				294,384
2035	56	LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)						

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
2035	57	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM		28,618				28,618
2035	58	Elect Equip-Nat For Int Prog (NFIP)						
2035	59	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]
2035	59	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]
2035	60	Elect Equip-Tact Int Rel Act (TIARA)						
2035	61	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)		21,204				21,204
2035	61	JTT/CIBS-M (TIARA)		9,862				9,862
2035	62	PROPHET GROUND (TIARA)		13,006				13,006
2035	63	TUAV		26,000				26,000
2035	64	SMALL UAV: (SUAV)		20,000				20,000
2035	65	ARMY COMMON GROUND STATION (CGS) (TIARA)						
2035	66	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA)		2,888				2,888
2035	67	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)						
2035	68	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION SYSTEM (TIARA)						
2035	69	DCGS-A (JMIP)		43,543				43,543
2035	70	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTGS)		12,648				12,648
2035	71	TROJAN (TIARA)		6,067				6,067
2035	72	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)		1,668				1,668
2035	73	CI HUMINT INFO MANAGE SYS (CHIMS) (TIARA)		730				730
2035	74	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (TIARA)		16,563				16,563
2035	75	Elect Equip-Electronic Warfare (EW)						
2035	75	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR						
2035	76	WARLOCK						
2035	77	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASU						
2035	78	Elect Equip-Tactical Surv. (TAC SURV)						
2035	78	SENTINEL MODS		8,393				8,393

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
2035	79	NIGHT VISION DEVICES		164,674				184,874
		Enhanced NVG procurement and fielding						
2035	80	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYS		42,293				42,293
2035	81	LTWT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS)						
2035	82	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT		83,692				83,692
2035	83	JLENS FAMILY						
2035	84	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP						
2035	85	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MMS)		334				334
2035	86	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MVS)						
2035	87	ENHANCED PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE						
2035	88	PROFILER						
2035	89	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		6,763				6,763
2035	90	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)		4,869				4,869
2035	91	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER		18,027				18,027
2035	92	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMCB XM32		146,085				146,085
2035	93	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		12,720				12,720
2035	94	INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS)-(TIARA)		1,415				1,415
2035	95	ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM		18,877				18,877
		<b>Elect Equip-Tactical C2 Systems</b>		3,699				3,699
				2,000				2,000
2035	96	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS		58,339				58,339
2035	97	AFATDS		29,537				29,537
2035	98	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, AFATDS		5,104				5,104
2035	99	LIGHT WEIGHT TECHNICAL FIRE DIRECTION SYS		2,978				2,978
2035	100	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM		10,139				10,139
2035	101	FAAD C2		26,108				26,108
2035	102	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS		3,668				3,668

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
2035	103	FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE / LIGHTWEIGHT FED		3,159				3,159
2035	104	KNIGHT FAMILY						1,914
2035	105	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		1,914				62,256
2035	106	LOGTECH		62,256				31,356
2035	107	TC AIMS II		31,356				
2035	108	ISYSCON EQUIPMENT						11,885
2035	109	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JNMS)		11,885				16,962
2035	110	TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER		16,962				49,562
2035	111	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)		49,562				89,017
2035	112	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)		89,017				
2035	113	STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM						870
2035	114	MOUNTED BATTLE COMMAND ON THE MOVE (MBCO)		870				
		<b>Elect Equip - Automation</b>						
2035	115	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION		23,722				23,722
2035	116	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		152,268				152,268
2035	117	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)		30,819				30,819
		<b>Elect Equip-Audio Visual Sys (A/V)</b>						
2035	118	AFRTS		2,732				2,732
2035	119	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (A/V)		6,381				6,381
2035	120	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)		2,895				2,895
		<b>Elect Equip-Support</b>						
2035	121	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)		438				438
		<b>Other Support Equipment</b>						
		<b>Chemical Defensive Equipment</b>						
2035	122	RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM,FOX NBC (NBCRS) XM93						2,904
2036	123	SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM)		2,904				

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
								<u>Cost</u>
		<b>Bridging Equipment</b>						
2035	124	TACTICAL BRIDGING		26,611				26,611
2035	125	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON		5,913				5,913
		<b>Engineer (Non-construction) Equipment</b>						
2035	126	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS		7,084				7,084
2035	127	KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING						
2035	128	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (GSTAMI		2,962				2,962
2035	129	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)		1,617				1,617
2035	130	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPM		29,786				29,786
2035	131	< \$5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT		580				580
		<b>Combat Service Support Equipment</b>						
2035	132	HEATERS AND ECUS		3,420				3,420
2035	133	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES		1,998				1,998
2035	134	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT		4,810				4,810
2035	135	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)						
2035	136	LAND WARRIOR		35,700				35,700
2035	137	MOUNTED WARRIOR		1,600				1,600
2035	138	FORCE PROVIDER						
2035	139	AUTHORIZED STOCKAGE LIST MOBILITY SYSTEM (AS						
2035	140	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT		26,553				26,553
2035	141	CARGO AERIAL DELIVERY PROGRAM		39,644				39,644
2035	142	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (ENG SPT)		3,282				3,282
2035	143	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (CSS EQ)						
		<b>Petroleum Equipment</b>						
2035	144	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		730				730
2035	145	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER		66,055				66,055

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
								<u>Cost</u>
2035	146	INLAND PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM						
		Water Equipment						
2035	147	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS		8,888				8,888
		Medical Equipment						
2035	148	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL		10,686				10,686
		Maintenance Equipment						
2035	149	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP)		8,244				8,244
2035	150	WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD		252				252
2035	151	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MAINT EQ)		1,300				1,300
		Construction Equipment						
2035	152	MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING		3,785				3,785
2035	153	LOADERS		1,217				1,217
2035	154	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED		966				966
2035	155	CRANES						
2035	156	CRUSHING/SCREENING PLANT, 150 TPH						
2035	157	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEET) TYPE		13,472				13,472
2035	158	CONST EQUIP ESP		3,646				3,646
2035	159	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (CONST EQUIP)		4,285				4,285
		Rail Float Containerization Equipment						
2035	160	LOGISTIC SUPPORT VESSEL (LSV)		15,000				15,000
2035	161	JOINT HIGH SPEED VEHICLE (JHSV)		600				600
2035	162	HARBORMASTER COMMAND & CONTROL CENTER (HCC)		2,000				17,000
2035	163	CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS					15,000	
		Modular Causeway System					[15,000]	
2035	164	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)		4,988				4,988

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<b>Generators</b>						
2035	165	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP		43,067				43,067
		<b>Material Handling Equipment</b>						
2035	166	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)						
2035	167	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM		361				361
2035	168	MHE EXTENDED SERVICE PROGRAM (ESP)						
2035	169	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MHE)						
		<b>Training Equipment</b>						
2035	170	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS (CTC) SUPPORT		60,811				60,811
2035	171	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM		184,528				184,528
2035	172	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER		63,746				63,746
2035	173	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (AVC)		71,301				71,301
		<b>Test Measure and Dig Equipment (TMD)</b>						
2035	174	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT						
2035	175	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)		21,605				21,605
2035	176	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)		471				471
		<b>Other Support Equipment</b>						
2035	177	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQ (REF)		50,000				50,000
2035	178	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		66,614				66,614
2035	179	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT		6,224				6,224
2035	180	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)		9,379				9,379
2035	181	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		2,638				2,638
2035	182	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING		9,316				9,316
2035	183	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM (MA8975)		2,434				2,434



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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		Spares and Repair Parts						
		OPA2						
2035	184	INITIAL SPARES - C&E		33,076				33,076
		OPA3						
2035	185	INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP		732				732
2035	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		9,978				9,978
<b>Total - Other Procurement, Army</b>				<b>4,302,634</b>		<b>36,800</b>		<b>4,339,434</b>

**Multiyear procurement authority for AH-64D Apache attack helicopter block II conversions (sec. 111)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide authority to the Secretary of the Army to enter into a multiyear contract for AH-64 Apache attack helicopter Block II Conversions. The committee commends the Army for its commitment to Army aviation modernization by reinvesting the resources made available by the Comanche termination.

This provision provides authorization for the third multiyear procurement for the conversion of AH-64A Apache helicopters to the "D" model Apache. Multiyear one delivered 232 AH-64D helicopters from fiscal years 1996 through 2002 and a second multiyear will complete delivery of an additional 269 AH-64D helicopters in fiscal year 2006. The committee understands that the Army will convert an additional 96 AH-64A helicopters with the multiyear procurement authority granted by this provision. Previous multiyear procurement contracts have yielded significant savings and the committee anticipates that a third multiyear will yield savings as well.

**Multiyear procurement authority for modernized target acquisition designation/pilot night vision sensors for AH-64D Apache attack helicopters (sec. 112)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide authority to the Secretary of the Army to enter into a multiyear procurement contract for the Modernized Target Acquisition Designation Sight/Pilot Night Vision Sensor (MTADS) for Apache helicopters. MTADS will be incorporated into and integrated into the program to convert AH-64A Apaches to the "D" model Apache. MTADS provides a Second Generation Forward (SGF) Looking Infrared (FLIR) sensor suite for the Army's fleet of Apache aircraft. The SGF system enhances the Apache pilot's ability to engage targets during night operations and adverse weather conditions, improves reliability, and reduces operations and support costs.

**Multiyear procurement authority for utility helicopters (sec. 113)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide authority to the Secretary of the Army to enter into a multiyear contract for the procurement of UH-60M Black Hawk utility helicopters and, acting as the executive agent for the Department of the Navy, enter into a multiyear contract for the procurement of MH-60S Sea Hawk utility helicopters.

The budget request included \$505.7 million for the procurement of 41 UH-60M Black Hawk helicopters; \$24.7 million for the advanced procurement of UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters; \$453.4 million for the procurement of 26 MH-60S Sea Hawk helicopters; and \$125.7 million for the advanced procurement of MH-60S Sea Hawk helicopters under a multiyear procurement program.

The committee notes that based on a comparison of estimated prices for five single year contracts with the estimated price for one 5 year multiyear for the UH-60M airframe over fiscal years 2007-2011, there is a savings of approximately \$304.2 million. A similar

analysis of the MH-60S airframe shows an estimated savings of \$94.6 million. The committee also notes that the current UH-60M and MH-60S budget requests are based on a follow-on multiyear contract beginning in fiscal year 2007.

The committee believes that the Congress should provide the Secretary of the Army with the authority to obtain these savings, and encourages the Secretary of Defense to review other current and planned helicopter programs for similar efficiencies through joint service multiyear procurements.

### **Missile Procurement, Army**

#### **Advanced precision kill weapon system**

The budget request included \$34.1 million in Missile Procurement, Army (MPA), for the procurement of 600 Advanced Precision Kill Weapon Systems (APKWS). The committee understands the APKWS program was restructured on April 4, 2005, because the contractor was under-performing in the areas of cost, schedule, and performance; and APKWS would not have met the defined user requirement. The committee recommends a decrease of \$5.0 million in MPA to procure 135 fewer missiles, for a total authorization of \$29.1 million.

### **Weapons and Tracked Vehicles**

#### **Lightweight 155 millimeter Howitzer**

The budget request included \$46.8 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV), for the Lightweight 155 millimeter (LW-155) towed Howitzer, a joint U.S. Marine Corps (USMC)/Army program. In the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375), the Congress authorized a multiyear procurement contract as the program entered into a low rate initial production phase of the program. The Army requires additional LW-155s for the 7th Stryker Brigade Combat Team. This item is on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$32.4 million in WTCV for additional LW-155s, for a total authorization of \$79.2 million in WTCV.

### **Army Ammunition**

#### **M1028 120mm tank cartridge**

The budget request included \$8.3 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), for the M1028 120mm tank cartridge. The committee notes the utility of the M1028 in improving the M1A1 Main Battle Tank's urban warfare capability and improving tank survivability against massed assaulting infantry with hand held anti-tank and automatic weapons. The M1028 is currently funded to achieve 75 percent of the total war reserve requirement. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.5 million in PAA for the M1028 to excel the acquisition of the M1028mm tank cartridge.

#### **Modern demolition initiator**

The budget request included no funding in Procurement Ammunition, Army (PAA), for the modern demolition initiator (MDI). The

committee notes that MDIs are non-electric detonators used to initiate munitions and explosives. The benefits of MDI include safety in the modern electronic battle space, high reliability, interoperability with existing fielded demolition systems, and lethality. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.9 million in PAA for MDIs.

#### **Rapid wall breaching kit**

The budget request included no funding in Procurement Ammunition, Army (PAA), for the rapid wall breaching kit. The committee notes that rapid wall breaching kits are one-man portable devices capable of creating man-sized holes in triple brick masonry or double reinforced concrete structural walls. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PAA for rapid wall breaching kits.

#### **Ammunition peculiar equipment outloading modules**

The budget request included no funding for ammunition peculiar equipment outloading modules. The committee notes that a modern robotic-controlled strategic ammunition outloading module could be capable of supporting current readiness requirements while increasing ammunition plant safety, security, and capacity. Army officials report that a design exists for modernizing current outloading capabilities with robotic-controlled technologies at ammunition plants. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million in PAA for ammunition peculiar equipment outloading modules.

#### **Provision of industrial facilities**

The budget request included \$33.5 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), for the provision of industrial facilities, including the establishment, augmentation, and modernization of ammunition production capabilities. The committee notes that this represents an 18 percent reduction in this account from the funding level requested for fiscal year 2005. Additional funding for the provision of industrial facilities has been identified on the Chief of Staff of the Army unfunded priorities list.

The committee recommends an increase of \$82.4 million in PAA for the provision of industrial facilities, as follows: \$40.0 million to reduce the risk of production loss in acid concentration and nitrocellulose; \$22.4 million for small-caliber ammunition production facilities modernization; \$10.0 million to continue facility modernization initiated in fiscal year 2003 with environmentally sound insensitive-munitions (IM) manufacturing and precision load, assemble, and pack capability required to produce munitions with current and future IM type mix-cast-cure, melt-load and press-able explosive formulations; and \$10.0 million to modernize HMX/RDX nitrate explosive formulation capabilities for use in U.S. precision guided weapons production.

#### **Conventional ammunition demilitarization**

The budget request included \$102.9 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), for conventional ammunition demilitarization, including \$19.5 million for missile demilitarization. The

committee is concerned with the resourcing of the Army's strategic plan for conventional ammunition disposal, including the resourcing of missile recycling. The committee notes that the missile recycling center (MRC) energetics processing module (EPM) is an important component of the Army's missile demilitarization plan. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PAA for the MRC EPM.

The disposal of excess conventional ammunition is an integral phase of the life-cycle management of conventional ammunition. The Army 2004 report, "Strategic Plan: Demilitarization FY2005–2011," outlines a series of goals and milestones to reduce the excess conventional ammunition stockpile to manageable levels in future years: 100,000 short tons for ammunition and 30,000 missiles. In fiscal year 2005, the excess conventional ammunition stockpile includes at least 431,700 short tons of conventional ammunition and 77,566 missiles.

The committee notes that current projections indicate that the excess conventional ammunition disposal stockpile and the excess missile inventory are expected to continue to increase and exceed 546,000 short tons and 125,000 missiles, respectively, by fiscal year 2011. In addition, Army officials note that current projections for the growth rate of the excess stockpile do not include pending decisions related to the disposal of munitions in the War Reserve Stockpile, Allies–Korea and disposal of conventional mines. Therefore, the projection of the excess conventional ammunition stockpile in 2011 may be significantly understated.

The committee believes that failing to identify accurately the magnitude of the excess conventional ammunition stockpile and failing to reduce the excess conventional ammunition stockpile will present problems, including impeding access to needed ammunition in support of ongoing contingency operations, and increased risk and costs related to the security and sustainment of excess conventional ammunition. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to review and update the strategic plan for disposal of excess conventional ammunition and to report to the committee any changes that result from that review. In addition, the committee urges the Department of Defense Comptroller to fund disposal of conventional ammunition demilitarization to attain manageable stockpile levels outlined in the Army's strategic plan to the maximum extent possible.

### **Other Procurement, Army**

#### **Movement tracking system**

The budget request included \$207.1 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA), for the Family of Heavy Tactical Vehicles, including \$27.6 million for the Movement Tracking System (MTS). MTS provides commanders with the capability to communicate with and track the location of vehicles. The committee understands that the MTS has provided valuable communications and vehicle location information during Operation Iraqi Freedom. The committee notes that the Chief of Staff of the Army has identified additional funding for MTS devices for the 7th Stryker Brigade Combat Team on his unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends

an increase of \$1.6 million in OPA for MTS, for a total authorization of \$208.7 million.

**Night vision devices**

The budget request included \$164.7 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA), for night vision devices, including \$76.9 million for the procurement of AN/PVS-14 night vision devices and \$20.0 million for the procurement of enhanced night vision goggles (ENVG). These devices increase situational awareness, mobility, and lethality during low-light and nighttime operations. Additionally, the ENVG consists of a state-of-the-art, enhanced 3rd Generation image intensifier sensor, an uncooled long-wave infrared camera, and a miniature display to provide high resolution fused imagery to the individual soldier. Additional funding for these items is on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$20.2 million in OPA, for additional night vision devices.

**Modular causeway system**

The budget request included \$2.0 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA), for causeway systems. The modular causeway system (MCS) is an assemblage of interoperable and interchangeable components, which constitute the Army's primary means of augmenting existing port facilities or conducting joint logistics over the shore (JLOTS). JLOTS, in particular, will be significant as the concept of sea-basing matures. The committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million in OPA for the MCS.

**Subtitle C—Navy Programs**

# **Title I - Procurement** (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<b>Aircraft Procurement, Navy</b>						
		<b>Combat Aircraft</b>						
1506	1	AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP)		1,707				1,707
1506	2	EA-18G	4	318,386	4	318,386		318,386
1506	2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-8,211		-8,211		-8,211
1506	3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		26,486		26,486		26,486
1506	4	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	38	2,819,314	38	2,819,314		2,819,314
1506	4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-83,084		-83,084		-83,084
1506	5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		86,105		86,105		86,105
1506	6	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	9	1,064,516	9	1,064,516		1,064,516
1506	6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-71,214		-71,214		-71,214
1506	7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		67,274		67,274		67,274
1506	8	UH-1Y/AH-1Z	10	307,479	10	307,479		307,479
1506	9	MH-60S (MYP)	26	571,274	26	571,274		571,274
1506	9	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-107,905		-107,905		-107,905
1506	10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		125,698		125,698		125,698
1506	11	MH-60R	12	504,690	12	504,690		504,690
1506	11	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-69,269		-69,269		-69,269
1506	12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		119,078		119,078		119,078
1506	13	E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	2	237,272	2	237,272		237,272
1506	13	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-26,320		-26,320		-26,320
1506	14	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		38,000		38,000		38,000
		<b>Airlift Aircraft</b>						
1506	15	UC-35		10,312	1	77,900		88,212
1506	16	C-40A			[1]	[77,900]		
		C-40A						

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
1506	17	C-37						
		<b>Trainer Aircraft</b>						
1506	18	T-48 (T-39 REPLACEMENT)						
1506	19	T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	6	239,240			6	239,240
1506	20	JPATS		2,411				2,411
		<b>Other Aircraft</b>						
1506	21	KC-130J	12	1,138,098	-8	-781,000	4	357,098
		Realign program			[-8]	[-781,000]		
1506	21	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-45,355				-45,355
1506	22	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				46,000		46,000
		Realign program				[46,000]		
1506	23	F-5	9	4,517			9	4,517
		<b>Modification of Aircraft</b>						
1506	24	EA-6 SERIES		120,619				120,619
1506	25	AV-8 SERIES		34,862				34,862
1506	26	ADVERSARY		5,013				5,013
1506	27	F-18 SERIES		422,444		40,000		462,444
		Litening AT targeting pod for F/A-18D				[40,000]		
1506	28	H-46 SERIES		55,427				55,427
1506	29	AH-1W SERIES		7,656		7,800		15,456
		Night targeting system upgrade				[7,800]		
1506	30	H-53 SERIES		14,917		11,500		26,417
		H-53 EAPS barrier filters				[5,000]		
		H-53 crash attenuating crew chief seats				[6,500]		
1506	31	SH-60 SERIES		12,360		7,600		19,960
		SH-60 armed helicopter kits				[7,600]		



# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
1506	32	H-1 SERIES		7,395				7,395
1506	33	EP-3 SERIES		55,120				68,120
		USQ-146 electronic attack for EP-3					13,000	
							[13,000]	
1506	34	P-3 SERIES		163,348			7,000	170,348
		Anti-surface warfare improvement program					[7,000]	
1506	35	S-3 SERIES		751				751
1506	36	E-2 SERIES		13,654				13,654
1506	37	TRAINER A/C SERIES		14,004				14,004
1506	38	C-2A		29,575				29,575
1506	39	C-130 SERIES		42,698				42,698
1506	40	FEWSG		605				605
1506	41	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		19,914				19,914
1506	42	E-6 SERIES		11,219				11,219
1506	43	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		16,734				16,734
1506	44	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		20,762				20,762
1506	45	T-45 SERIES		49,980				49,980
1506	46	POWER PLANT CHANGES		26,334				26,334
1506	47	JPATS SERIES		719				719
1506	48	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS		323				323
1506	49	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		51,376				51,376
1506	50	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		214,202				214,202
1506	51	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM		13,752				13,752
1506	52	ID SYSTEMS		7,741				7,741
1506	53	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		81,002				81,002
		Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts						
1506	54	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,089,236				1,089,236

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

			FY 2006		Senate		Senate	
Account	Line	Program Title	Request		Change		Authorized	
			Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
Aircraft Support Equipment and Facilities								
1506	55	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		499,469			499,469	
1506	56	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		9,508			9,508	
1506	57	WAR CONSUMABLES		10,437			10,437	
1506	58	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		15,467			15,467	
1506	59	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		106,376			106,376	
1506	60	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,628			1,628	
1506	61	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
Total - Aircraft Procurement, Navy				10,517,126		-570,200		9,946,926
Weapons Procurement, Navy								
Ballistic Missiles								
1507	1	TRIDENT II						
1507	1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
Modification of Missiles								
1507	2	TRIDENT II MODS		932,680			932,680	
Support Equipment and Facilities								
1507	3	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		3,413			3,413	
Other Missiles								
Strategic Missiles								
1507	4	TOMAHAWK	379	353,409			379	353,409
Tactical Missiles								
1507	5	AMRAAM	101	81,507			101	81,507
1507	6	SIDEWINDER	165	37,823	46	7,600	211	45,423
AIM-9X captive air training missile					[46]	[7,600]		

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
1507	7	JSOW	420	144,449		420	144,449	
1507	8	SLAM-ER						
1507	9	STANDARD MISSILE	75	145,676		75	145,676	
1507	10	RAM	90	86,944		90	86,944	
1507	11	HELLFIRE						
1507	12	AERIAL TARGETS		101,882			101,882	
1507	13	DRONES AND DECOYS						
1507	14	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		10,336			10,336	
		Modification of Missiles						
1507	15	ESSM	116	99,833		116	99,833	
1507	16	STANDARD MISSILES MODS		53,531			53,531	
		Support Equipment and Facilities						
1507	17	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		4,112			4,112	
		Ordnance Support Equipment						
1507	18	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		45,410			45,410	
		Torpedoes and Related Equipment						
1507	19	SSTD		3,994			3,994	
1507	20	ASW TARGETS		24,557			24,557	
		Mod of Torpedoes and Related Equipment						
1507	21	MK-46 TORPEDO MODS		76,591			76,591	
1507	22	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS		61,309			61,309	
1507	23	QUICKSTRIKE MINE		3,018			3,018	
		Support Equipment						
1507	24	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		29,234			29,234	
1507	25	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		13,039			13,039	

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY 2006		Senate		Senate	
			Request	Change	Authorized	Change		
			Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
1507	26	Destination Transportation		3,188				3,188
		Other Weapons						
		Guns and Gun Mounts						
1507	27	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		22,515		20,000		42,515
		Allegany Ballistic Laboratory				[20,000]		
		Modification of Guns and Gun Mounts						
1507	28	CIWS MODS		195,648				195,648
1507	29	COAST GUARD WEAPONS		5,375				5,375
1507	30	GUN MOUNT MODS		84,142		14,000		98,142
		MK45 mod 4 gun mounts				[14,000]		
1507	31	PIONEER		1,964				1,964
1507	32	CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS		5,428				5,428
1507	33	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS		1,515				1,515
		Other						
1507	34	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
		Spares and Repair Parts						
1507	35	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		75,319				75,319
		Total - Weapons Procurement, Navy		2,707,841		41,600		2,749,441
		Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps						
		Proc Ammo, Navy						
		Navy Ammunition						
1508	1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	3,400	135,355			3,400	135,355
1508	2	JDAM		82,589				82,589

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
1508	3	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		35,159				35,159
1508	4	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		23,666				23,666
1508	5	PRACTICE BOMBS		56,569				56,569
1508	6	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		32,586				32,586
1508	7	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS		10,860				10,860
1508	8	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		70,174				70,174
1508	9	JATOS		4,566				4,566
1508	10	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION		25,923				25,923
1508	11	EXTENDED RANGE GUIDED MUNITIONS (ERGM)						
1508	12	76MM GUN AMMUNITION						
1508	13	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION		1,252				1,252
1508	14	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		40,144				40,144
1508	15	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		35,639				35,639
1508	16	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		13,910				13,910
1508	17	JUDGMENT FUND						
1508	18	AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		3,157				3,157
<b>Proc Ammo, MC</b>								
<b>Marine Corps Ammunition</b>								
1508	19	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES		37,452				37,452
1508	20	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES		13,731				13,731
1508	21	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		38,761				38,761
1508	22	.50 CALIBER		34,882				34,882
1508	23	40 MM, ALL TYPES		58,148				58,148
1508	24	60MM, ALL TYPES		16,224				16,224
1508	25	81MM, ALL TYPES		17,211				17,211
1508	26	120MM, ALL TYPES		7,231				7,231

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
1508	27	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		2,118				2,118
1508	28	9 MM ALL TYPES						
1508	29	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		5,315				5,315
1508	30	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES						
1508	31	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		31,810		15,000		46,810
		M795 155mm high explosive cartridge				[15,000]		
1508	32	EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE		5,738				5,738
1508	33	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		2,353		5,000		7,353
		Time fuze blasting igniter				[5,000]		
1508	34	FUZE, ALL TYPES		3,648				3,648
1508	35	NON LETHALS		1,127				1,127
1508	36	AMMO MODERNIZATION		7,350				7,350
1508	37	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		18,201				18,201
<b>Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Navy &amp; Marine Corps</b>				<b>872,849</b>		<b>20,000</b>		<b>892,849</b>
<b>Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy</b>								
<b>Other Warships</b>								
1611	1	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		564,913				651,613
		CVN-21 (CVN-78) - avoid one year delay						
1611	2	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	1	2,398,118		86,700		2,398,118
1611	2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PV)		-760,420		[86,700]		-760,420
1611	3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		763,786				763,786
1611	4	SSGN CONVERSION		334,322				334,322
1611	4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PV)		-47,806				-47,806
1611	5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
1611	6	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	1	2,572,341			1	2,572,341
1611	6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-1,078,778				-1,078,778
1611	7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		20,000				20,000
1611	8	SSN ERO						
1611	9	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		39,524				39,524
1611	10	SSBN ERO	1	364,636			1	364,636
1611	10	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-134,443				-134,443
1611	11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		62,248				62,248
1611	12	DD(X)		220,222				220,222
1611	12	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-220,222				-220,222
1611	13	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		715,992				765,992
		DD(X) AP for follow ship at follow yard						50,000
1611	14	DDG-51		225,427				225,427
1611	14	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
1611	15	DDG MODERNIZATION PROGRAM						25,000
		DDG-51 modernization program						[25,000]
		<b>Amphibious Ships</b>						
1611	16	LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP		197,769				197,769
1611	17	LPD-17	1	1,344,741			1	1,344,741
1611	17	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
1611	18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
1611	19	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		150,447				325,447
		LHA-R acceleration						175,000
		Auxiliaries, Craft and Prior Yr Program Costs						[175,000]
1611	20	LCU(X)		426,987				
1611	21	OUTFITTING						426,987

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY 2006		Senate		Senate	
			Qty	Cost	Change	Qty	Authorized	
1611	22	SERVICE CRAFT		56,255			56,255	
1611	23	LCAC SLEP	6	110,583		6	110,583	
1611	24	MINE HUNTER						
1611	25	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		394,523			394,523	
1611	26	POWER UNIT ASSEMBLY FACILITY						
Total - Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy				8,721,165	336,700		9,057,865	
Other Procurement, Navy								
Ships Support Equipment								
Ship Propulsion Equipment								
1810	1	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE		8,644			8,644	
1810	2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE		22,208			22,208	
Navigation Equipment								
1810	3	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		30,747			30,747	
Underway Replenishment Equipment								
1810	4	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT		918			918	
Periscopes								
1810	5	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP		76,613			76,613	
Other Shipboard Equipment								
1810	6	DDG MOD		2,998			2,998	
1810	7	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT		31,710			31,710	
1810	8	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD		2,852			2,852	
1810	9	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		32,889			32,889	
1810	10	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		19,912			24,412	
High performance metal fiber brushes					4,500			
					[4,500]			



## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY 2006		Senate		Senate	
			Qty	Cost	Change	Qty	Authorized	
1810	11	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		175,572			175,572	
1810	12	SUBMARINE BATTERIES		26,575			26,575	
1810	13	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		70,429			70,429	
1810	14	DSSP EQUIPMENT		12,718			12,718	
1810	15	CG MODERNIZATION		135,253			135,253	
1810	16	LCAC		19,953			19,953	
1810	17	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT		12,372			12,372	
1810	18	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		134,019	13,700		147,719	
		Advanced control monitoring system for shipboard systems			[4,000]			
		Canned lubrication pumps for LSD-41/49 class			[4,000]			
		Aircraft carrier elevator modifications			[5,700]			
1810	19	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS		897			897	
1810	20	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM		13,672			13,672	
		Reactor Plant Equipment						
1810	21	REACTOR POWER UNITS		373,865			373,865	
1810	22	REACTOR COMPONENTS		222,596			222,596	
		Ocean Engineering						
1810	23	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT		8,592			8,592	
		Small Boats						
1810	24	STANDARD BOATS		15,671			15,671	
		Training Equipment						
1810	25	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT		3,126			3,126	
		Production Facilities and Equipment						
1810	26	OPERATING FORCES IPE		25,657			25,657	
		Other Ship Support						
1810	27	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS		135,252			135,252	

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
1810	28	LCS MODULES		36,811				
		Spare MT-30 marine gas turbine engine for LCS					8,600	45,411
							[8,600]	
1810	29	<b>Drug Interdiction Support</b>						
		DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
		<b>Communications and Electronics Equipment</b>						
		<b>Ship Radars</b>						
1810	30	RADAR SUPPORT						
1810	31	TISS						
		<b>Ship Sonars</b>						
1810	32	SPQ-9B RADAR		5,913				5,913
1810	33	AN/SQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM		25,520				25,520
1810	34	SSN ACOUSTICS		226,914			5,000	231,914
		Submarine A-RCI installation					[5,000]	
1810	35	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		13,962			5,000	18,962
		Surface sonar dome window					[5,000]	
1810	36	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		12,263				12,263
		<b>ASW Electronic Equipment</b>						
1810	37	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM		27,332				27,332
1810	38	SSTD		22,898				22,898
1810	39	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		65,334				65,334
1810	40	SURTASS		3,848				3,848
1810	41	TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER		5,270				5,270
		<b>Electronic Warfare Equipment</b>						
1810	42	AN/SLQ-32		25,053			5,000	30,053
		Accelerate procurement of SLQ-32					[5,000]	
1810	43	INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS		3,787				3,787

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
		<b>Reconnaissance Equipment</b>						
1810	44	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT		62,721				62,721
		<b>Submarine Surveillance Equipment</b>						
1810	45	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG		92,806				92,806
		<b>Other Ship Electronic Equipment</b>						
1810	46	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM		16,474				16,474
1810	47	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY		91,511				91,511
1810	48	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT		59,226				59,226
1810	49	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTC		14,102				14,102
1810	50	ATDLS		84,045				84,045
1810	51	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT		2,277				2,277
1810	52	SHALLOW WATER MCM		14,715				14,715
1810	53	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)		4,366				4,366
1810	54	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV		3,285				3,285
1810	55	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP						
		<b>Training Equipment</b>						
1810	56	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT		62,027				62,027
		<b>Aviation Electronic Equipment</b>						
1810	57	MATCALS		19,584				19,584
1810	58	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		7,307				7,307
1810	59	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM		17,388				17,388
1810	60	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM		18,446				18,446
1810	61	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,870				3,870
1810	62	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM		7,733				7,733
1810	63	FACSFAC		3,609				3,609
1810	64	ID SYSTEMS		24,915				24,915

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
1810	65	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)		7,857				7,857
		<b>Other Shore Electronic Equipment</b>						
1810	66	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT		27,901				27,901
1810	67	DIMHRS						
1810	68	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS		20,422				20,422
1810	69	RADIAC		9,783				9,783
1810	70	GPETE		6,944				6,944
1810	71	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY		4,381				4,381
1810	72	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION		5,995				5,995
1810	73	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		19,721				19,721
		<b>Shipboard Communications</b>						
1810	74	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS		2,597				2,597
1810	75	PORTABLE RADIOS		10,058				10,058
1810	76	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		253,960				253,960
1810	77	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER \$5M		15,248				15,248
		<b>Submarine Communications</b>						
1810	78	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT		2,162				2,162
1810	79	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT		127,409				127,409
		<b>Satellite Communications</b>						
1810	80	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS		71,754				71,754
		<b>Shore Communications</b>						
1810	81	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		2,950				2,950
1810	82	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS		1,274				1,274
1810	83	NSIPS						
1810	84	JEDMICS						
1810	85	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS		59,208				59,208

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<b>Cryptographic Equipment</b>						
1810	86	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		96,201				96,201
		<b>Cryptologic Equipment</b>						
1810	87	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		22,281				22,281
1810	88	Other Electronic Support		31,377				31,377
		<b>Coast Guard Equipment</b>						
1810	89	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
		<b>Aviation Support Equipment</b>						
		<b>Sonobuoys</b>						
1810	90	SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES		58,422				58,422
		<b>Aircraft Support Equipment</b>						
1810	91	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		46,622				58,622
		Multi-spectral threat emitter system (MTES)					12,000	
		Joint threat emitter					[6,000]	
1810	92	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		7,860				7,860
1810	93	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT		11,984				11,984
1810	94	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT		27,042				27,042
1810	95	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		25,129				25,129
1810	96	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		1,434				1,434
1810	97	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT		26,946				26,946
1810	98	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES		38,036				38,036
1810	99	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		18,152				18,152
1810	100	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		6,458				6,458

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
		<b>Ordnance Support Equipment</b>						
		<b>Ship Gun System Equipment</b>						
1810	101	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM		6,057		5,000		11,057
		Maritime domain awareness				[5,000]		
1810	102	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT		11,077				11,077
		<b>Ship Missile System Equipment</b>						
1810	103	NATO SEASPARROW		38,442				38,442
1810	104	RAM GMLS		17,488		18,000		35,488
		SeaRAM				[18,000]		
1810	105	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM		33,428				33,428
1810	106	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		98,881				98,881
1810	107	SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
1810	108	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		75,075				75,075
1810	109	SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIP						
1810	110	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS		8,645				8,645
		<b>FBM Support Equipment</b>						
1810	111	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP		108,106				108,106
		<b>ASW Support Equipment</b>						
1810	112	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS		138,180				138,180
1810	113	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,836				4,836
1810	114	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,603				4,603
1810	115	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,232				7,232
		<b>Other Ordnance Support Equipment</b>						
1810	116	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP		28,403				28,403
1810	117	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		3,978				3,978

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY 2006		Senate		Senate	
			Request		Change		Authorized	
			Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
		<b>Other Expendable Ordnance</b>						
1810	118	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM		40,436		9,000		49,436
		NULKA decoys to minimum sustain rate				[9,000]		
1810	119	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		10,618				10,618
1810	120	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		31,760		4,000		35,760
		Submarine mobile electronic perf spt systems				[4,000]		
		<b>Civil Engineering Support Equipment</b>						
1810	121	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		1,796				1,796
1810	122	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		2,049				2,049
1810	123	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		31,033				31,033
1810	124	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		14,320				14,320
1810	125	TACTICAL VEHICLES		44,383				44,383
1810	126	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		149,702				149,702
1810	127	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		11,736				11,736
1810	128	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION		26,459				26,459
1810	129	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES		1,200				1,200
		<b>Supply Support Equipment</b>						
1810	130	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		12,946				12,946
1810	131	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		15,872				15,872
1810	132	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		5,785				5,785
1810	133	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS		73,383				73,383
		<b>Personnel and Command Support Equipment</b>						
		<b>Training Devices</b>						
1810	134	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		15,984				15,984

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

Account	Line	Program Title	FY 2006		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
			Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
1810	135	Command Support Equipment		60,768		15,600		76,368
		COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				[9,100]		
		Man overboard indicator systems				[6,500]		
		Electronic military personnel records system						
1810	136	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		426				426
1810	137	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		8,772		3,000		11,772
		Navy medical automated info tech insertion				[3,000]		
1810	138	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
1810	139	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,925				7,925
1810	140	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		31,773				31,773
1810	141	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		17,755				17,755
1810	142	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		238,276				238,276
1810	143	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
1810	144	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
		Other						
1810	146	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		268,741				268,741
		Spares and Repair Parts						
1810	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		10,899				10,899
		Total - Other Procurement, Navy		5,487,818		108,400		5,596,218
		Procurement, Marine Corps						
		Weapons and Combat Vehicles						
		Tracked Combat Vehicles						
1109	1	AAV7A1 PIP		26,134				26,134
1109	2	EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE		30,359				30,359



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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
1109	3	LAV PIP		59,699				59,699
1109	4	HIMARS						
1109	5	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (IRV)						
1109	6	MODIFICATION KITS (ARMOR AND FIRE SUPPORT)						
1109	7	M1A1 FIREPOWER ENHANCEMENTS		33,454				33,454
		<b>Artillery and Other Weapons</b>						
1109	8	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		5,965				5,965
1109	9	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	77	178,364		77		178,364
1109	10	MODIFICATION KITS (INFANTRY WEAPONS)						2,000
		Mk19 grenade machine gun modification kits						[2,000]
1109	11	MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM						
1109	12	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM	15	176,795		15		176,795
1109	13	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER \$5 MILLION		7,743				7,743
		<b>Weapons</b>						
1109	14	MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM		23,604				23,604
		<b>Other Support</b>						
1109	15	MODIFICATION KITS						
1109	16	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		10,638				10,638
1109	17	OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR		5,357				5,357
		<b>Guided Missiles and Equipment</b>						
		<b>Guided Missiles</b>						
1109	18	EXPEDITIONARY AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM (LAAD SUSTA		1,997				1,997
1109	19	JAVELIN						
1109	20	PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS) (MYP)						
1109	21	HIMARS ROCKETS						
1109	22	COMPLEMENTARY LOW ALTITUDE WEAPON SYSTEM		442				442

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
1109	23	PREDATOR (SRAW)						
1109	24	Other Support						
		MODIFICATION KITS						
		Communications and Electronics Equipment						
1109	25	Command and Control Systems		952				5,752
		UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER						
		Rapidly deploying interoperable shelter system (RDISS)						
		Repair and Test Equipment						
1109	26	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		25,749				25,749
1109	27	AUTO TEST SYSTEMS						
1109	28	GENERAL PURPOSE TOOLS & TEST SYSTEMS						
1109	29	CALIBRATION FACILITIES						
		Other Support (Tel)						
1109	30	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		23,757				23,757
1109	31	MODIFICATION KITS		23,611				23,611
		Command and Control System (Non-tel)						
1109	32	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM						
1109	33	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		2,043				2,043
1109	34	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		13,058				13,058
1109	35	MAGTF CSSE & SE						
1109	36	MULTIPLE ROLE RADAR SYSTEM						
1109	37	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS		14,837				14,837
		Repair and Equipment (Non-tel)						
1109	38	RADAR SYSTEMS		12,167				12,167
1109	39	RADAR SET AN/TPS-59						
1109	40	TRANSITION SWITCH MODULE						

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
		<b>Intell/Comm Equipment (Non-tel)</b>						
1109	41	TACTICAL REMOTE SENSOR SYSTEM						
1109	42	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		33,460				33,460
1109	43	SMALL UNIT REMOTE SCOUTING SYSTEM (SURSS)						
1109	44	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		65,973				65,973
1109	45	MOD KITS (INTEL)						
		<b>Repair and Test Equipment (Non-tel)</b>						
1109	46	VISUAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS (VIS)						
		<b>Other Comm/Elec Equipment (Non-tel)</b>						
1109	47	COMPLIMENTARY LOW ALTITUDE WEAPONS SYSTEM						
1109	48	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		20,795				20,795
		<b>Other Support (Non-tel)</b>						
1109	49	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		48,589				48,589
1109	50	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		17,255				17,255
1109	51	RADIO SYSTEMS		28,972				28,972
1109	52	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		54,324				54,324
1109	53	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		17,805				20,005
		Continuity of operations program						2,200
1109	54	MOD KITS MAGTF C4I						[2,200]
		<b>Support Vehicles</b>						
		<b>Administrative Vehicles</b>						
1109	55	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES		775				775
1109	56	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		11,776				11,776
		<b>Tactical Vehicles</b>						
1109	57	5/4T TRUCK HMMVV (MYP)		97,988				97,988
1109	58	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS						

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
1109	59	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT						
1109	60	LIGHTWEIGHT PRIME MOVER		3,445				3,445
1109	61	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP		28,366				28,366
1109	62	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		6,906				6,906
		<b>Other Support</b>						
1109	63	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		3,748				3,748
		<b>Engineer and Other Equipment</b>						
1109	64	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		3,450				3,450
1109	65	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE						
1109	66	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		21,887				21,887
1109	67	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		5,338				5,338
1109	68	DEMOLITION SUPPORT SYSTEMS						
1109	69	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		12,153				12,153
1109	70	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		16,105				16,105
1109	71	EOD SYSTEMS		71,185				71,185
		<b>Materials Handling Equipment</b>						
1109	72	AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT						
1109	73	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		5,064				5,064
1109	74	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)		10,914				10,914
1109	75	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		21,132				21,132
1109	76	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		3,421				3,421
		<b>General Property</b>						
1109	77	FAMILY OF INCIDENT RESPONSE						
1109	78	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		2,459				2,459
1109	79	FAMILY OF EOD EQUIPMENT						
1109	80	TRAINING DEVICES		17,722				17,722

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
1109	81	CONTAINER FAMILY		3,721				3,721
1109	82	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		19,745				19,745
1109	83	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)		3,786				3,786
1109	84	BRIDGE BOATS						
1109	85	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN		5,405				5,405
		<b>Other Support</b>						
1109	86	MODIFICATION KITS						
1109	87	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		10,412				10,412
1109	88	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (M)						
		<b>Spares and Repair Parts</b>						
1109	89	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		26,904				26,904
<b>Total - Procurement, Marine Corps</b>				<b>1,377,705</b>		<b>9,000</b>		<b>1,386,705</b>

**Prohibition on acquisition of next generation destroyer (DD(X)) through a single naval shipyard (sec. 121)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit a winner take all acquisition strategy for the next generation destroyer (DD(X)) program. The provision would define a winner take all acquisition strategy, in relation to this program, as one which would procure, including design and construction, these destroyers through a single shipyard.

In the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) presented with the fiscal year 2005 budget request, construction of more than one DD(X) a year was to have started in fiscal year 2007. The FYDP presented with the fiscal year 2006 budget request indicates that only one DD(X) a year will be procured in each year from fiscal years 2007 through 2011. This reduced procurement profile represents at least the third significant change for the DD(X) program in recent years. Additionally, the Secretary of the Navy has recently delivered an interim long-range plan for the construction of Naval vessels to Congress. This plan outlines a range of needed ships, with eight to 12 DD(X) destroyers establishing the range for that ship.

The committee is aware that the Navy has proposed a change in acquisition strategy for DD(X) due to the reduced procurement profile. The proposed change is to conduct a winner-take-all competition for the DD(X)-class of ships between the two shipyards which build surface combatants.

The committee is concerned with the sharp decline projected in the number of ships in the Navy, the low number of major combatants scheduled for construction, and the negative consequences for the U. S. shipbuilding industrial base that could result if a winner-take-all strategy for DD(X) were pursued. The committee believes that there is an unacceptable risk if the shipbuilding industry sizes itself to where only one surface combatant a year is being built. The committee urges the Navy to plan to build more than one major surface combatant ship a year as soon as possible. If fewer DD(X) destroyers are required, then acceleration of the follow-on surface combatant, the CG(X), should be pursued.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends additional funding for advance procurement of the second DD(X) destroyer at the second shipyard.

**Split funding authorization for CVN-78 aircraft carrier (sec. 122)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract to fund the detail design and construction of the aircraft carrier designated CVN-78 with the Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy (SCN) account, with funding split over fiscal years 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010.

The budget request includes \$564.9 million in SCN for the carrier replacement program, specifically for advance procurement of the CVN-78. The CVN-78 will be a new class of aircraft carrier, incorporating numerous new technologies. This budget request reflects the second one-year slip in the program in recent years. This slip would cause a delay in the delivery of the CVN-78 until fiscal year 2015, with the ship it is scheduled to replace, the USS *Enter-*

*prise* (CVN-65), scheduled to be decommissioned in fiscal year 2013. Additionally, this slip translates into a cost growth for CVN-78 of approximately \$400.0 million, according to the Navy.

The committee is concerned about this delay. The committee has been told there is no technical reason for the delay, but that the delay was driven by budget considerations. Both the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval operations testified that large capital assets such as aircraft carriers are difficult to fund under the traditional full-funding policy, and that more flexible methods of funding must be found and used. The program of record for CVN-78 has the detail design and construction funding split between two years. This provision would authorize that same funding to be split over four years, thereby allowing needed funding flexibility. The committee directs the Navy to provide an updated funding profile, fully funding the remaining costs of the ship from fiscal years 2007 through 2010, with delivery of the fiscal year 2007 budget request.

The committee is aware that the program requires additional funding in fiscal year 2006 to avoid this one-year delay. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$86.7 million in SCN for CVN-78.

#### **LHA replacement (LHA(R)) ship (sec. 123)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize to be appropriated \$325.4 million for design, advance procurement, and advance construction of the first LHA replacement (LHA(R)) ship, and would allow the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract for this purpose in fiscal year 2006.

The provision would also authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract for the detail design and construction of the LHA(R) in fiscal year 2007, with funds authorized in fiscal years 2007 and 2008, subject to the availability of appropriations for LHA(R) in each of those fiscal years.

The budget request included \$150.4 million in Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy (SCN), for the design, advance procurement, and advance construction of the LHA(R) amphibious assault ship. The LHA(R)-class will be the functional replacement for the LHA-1 class of amphibious assault ships, which is nearing the end of its service life. The Chief of Naval Operations has included additional funding for LHA(R) as the number one priority on his unfunded priorities list. The committee understands that additional funding would accelerate delivery of and reduce the acquisition cost of this ship, and recommends an increase of \$175.0 million in SCN for the LHA(R).

#### **Refueling and complex overhaul of the USS “Carl Vinson” (sec. 124)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract in fiscal year 2006 for the nuclear refueling and complex overhaul of the USS *Carl Vinson* (CVN-70). The provision would authorize \$1,493.6 million to be appropriated as the first increment in the incremental funding planned for this refueling. The provision would also stipulate that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under

the contract after fiscal year 2006 is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose.

### **Navy Aircraft**

#### **C-40A procurement**

The budget request included \$10.3 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for C-40A site activation, but included no funding for the procurement of C-40A aircraft.

The C-40A replaces aging C-9 aircraft and provides improved time critical logistics support. Procurement of the C-40A is included on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$77.9 million in APN for the procurement of one C-40A aircraft.

#### **Advanced targeting pods**

The budget request included \$422.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for modifications to the F/A-18 aircraft, but included no funding for LITENING advanced targeting pods (ATPs) for the F/A-18D aircraft. The LITENING ATP will supplement and replace the current targeting pod with a new system that provides increased combat effectiveness across several mission areas. The procurement of LITENING ATP is included on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$40.0 million in APN for the procurement of 24 LITENING ATPs for the F/A-18D aircraft.

#### **Night targeting system upgrade**

The budget request included \$307.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for UH-1Y utility and AH-1Z attack helicopters, but no funding for the procurement of night targeting system (NTS) upgrades. The current AH-1W NTS uses Generation I Forward Looking Infrared (FLIR) and requires an upgrade to the Generation III FLIR, which would significantly improve the ability of the AH-1W helicopter to fight at night and during low visibility conditions as well as improve reliability by replacing obsolete parts. The committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified additional funding for NTS upgrades on his unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.8 million in APN for the NTS upgrades, for a total authorization of \$315.3 million.

#### **H-53 modifications**

The budget request included \$14.9 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), but no funding for engine air particle separators (EAPS) barrier filters nor for crash-attenuating crew chief seats for the H-53 series helicopter.

The current H-53 EAPS suffers heavy wear and tear from pre-flight and maintenance requirements. The Navy is conducting a trade study to develop conceptual barrier filter alternatives for the H-53 series of helicopters. The committee notes that the results of this effort will require non-recurring engineering to incorporate a new EAPS barrier filter type separator into the H-53 series heli-



copters. The committee understands that new EAPS will result in lower maintenance costs and improved engine performance.

The committee also understands that the procurement and installation of crash-attenuating seats for both pilots in the H-53 series helicopter is ongoing. However, the crew chief is not provided with a crash-attenuating seat. The committee notes the lack of crashworthy seats for crew chiefs exposes them to higher risk of injury or death in the event of a hard landing or crash. The Department of the Navy has programmed for the procurement of 222 crashworthy seats in fiscal year 2011. The committee believes that this safety issue needs to be addressed immediately.

The committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified additional funding for H-53 EAPS barrier filters and crash-attenuation crew chief seats on his unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for non-recurring engineering for EAPS barrier filters and \$6.5 million to procure 222 crash-attenuating crew chief seats, for a total authorization of \$26.4 million in APN.

#### **SH-60 armed helicopter**

The budget request included \$12.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for modifications to the SH-60 helicopter, including \$7.6 million for kits to arm the helicopter. Navy helicopters, stationed aboard aircraft carriers and surface combatants, are being used to support operations in the global war on terror. These operations include armed reconnaissance, and additional funding for kits is included on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.6 million in APN for the procurement of additional armed helicopter kits.

#### **EP-3 aircraft electronic attack**

The budget request included \$55.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for modifications to the EP-3 aircraft. The EP-3 is a land-based, long-range aircraft, with electronic intercept devices for detection and tracking of enemy radars and communications. The EP-3 aircraft has been designated a high demand, low-density asset by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Additional funding for USQ-146 communications electronic attack systems for the EP-3 aircraft has been requested on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$13.0 million in APN for the procurement of USQ-146 electronic attack systems for the EP-3 aircraft.

#### **P-3 aircraft modifications**

The budget request included \$163.3 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for modifications to the P-3 aircraft, including \$11.9 million for the procurement and installation of anti-surface warfare improvement (AIP) program kits. AIP greatly expands the P-3 aircraft's capabilities to operate in the littorals with the addition of advanced technology sensors, expanded communications, upgraded weapon delivery capabilities, and improved operator situational awareness. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.0

million in APN for the procurement and installation of additional AIP kits for the P-3 aircraft.

### **Navy Weapons**

#### **AIM-9X captive air training missile**

The budget request included \$37.9 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy (WPN), for the procurement of 165 AIM-9X Sidewinder short range air-to-air missiles, including \$7.2 million for the procurement of 44 AIM-9X captive air training missiles (CATM). The Sidewinder is the Navy and Marine Corps' primary short range air-to-air weapon, and the advanced capabilities of AIM-9X require a high level of aircrew proficiency. There is currently an inventory shortfall of AIM-9X CATMs to support three F/A-18E/F squadrons, and the procurement of additional AIM-9X CATMs is included on the Chief of Naval Operations' and the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities lists. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.6 million in WPN for the procurement of 46 additional AIM-9X CATMs.

#### **Weapons industrial facilities**

The budget request included \$4.1 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy (WPN), for various activities at government-owned, contractor-operated weapons industrial facilities, but included no funding for facilities restoration at the Navy Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant, Allegany Ballistics Laboratory (ABL). Some of these facilities have exceeded their useful life and deteriorated beyond safe operations. The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million in WPN for the facilities restoration program at ABL.

#### **Gun mount modifications**

The budget request included \$84.1 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy (WPN), for modifications to gun mounts on naval ships, and included \$1.3 million for modifications to upgrade MK45 gun mounts to the Mod 4 configuration on guided missile destroyers. The MK45 gun is also used on Navy cruisers, and the Navy has a program to modernize its cruisers using this gun. The committee recommends an increase of \$14.0 million in WPN for upgrading cruiser MK45 gun mounts to the Mod 4 configuration.

### **Navy and Marine Corps Ammunition**

#### **M795 155mm high explosive cartridge**

The budget request included \$5.2 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC), for the M795 155mm high-explosive cartridge. Additional funding for the M795 155mm high-explosive cartridge has been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million in PANMC for the M795.

#### **Time fuze blasting igniter**

The budget request included \$770,000 in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC), for the time fuze blasting igniter. The budget request will achieve 40 percent of the ap-

proved acquisition object (AAO) for this item. Additional funding for the time fuze blasting igniter has been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PANMC for the time fuze blasting igniter.

### **Shipbuilding**

#### **DD(X) destroyer program**

The budget request included \$716.0 million in Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy (SCN), for advance procurement for the DD(X) destroyer program. Of this amount, \$666.0 million is for advance procurement of the lead ship of the class, and \$50.0 million is for advance procurement of the second ship of the class. These advance procurement funds are required to procure material to maintain ship construction schedules and for transition to detail design efforts.

In fiscal year 2005, \$84.4 million was authorized and appropriated for the design and advance procurement requirements associated with construction of the second ship at an alternative second source shipyard. The committee recommends an increase of \$50.0 million in SCN to be used only for advance procurement of the second ship of the DD(X) class at the second shipyard.

#### **DDG-51 Arleigh Burke-class destroyer modernization program**

The budget request included no funding for the DDG-51 Arleigh Burke-class destroyer modernization program. Section 121 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375) required the Navy to submit a report on this modernization program, and authorized and appropriated \$50.0 million to initiate this program in fiscal year 2005. The report was delivered in March 2005, and shows the potential for significant reductions in the size of the crew through technology insertion. The plan outlined in the report is to implement the modernization initiatives on the last two ships of the class, DDG-111 and DDG-112, which will be delivered in fiscal year 2010, before beginning a backfit on the oldest ships of the class starting with DDG-51. The financial analysis shows that a life-cycle savings of \$712.0 million could be achieved if this plan is implemented, primarily due to reduced crew size, while also achieving the additional benefits of: (1) improved situational awareness; (2) increased survivability; (3) improved maintainability; (4) increased commonality; (5) eliminated obsolete parts; (6) improved training; and (7) improved quality of life.

The committee believes this program requires continued funding in the near-term for the modernization effort, and recommends an increase of \$25.0 million in Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy, for the DDG-51 modernization program.

### **Other Procurement, Navy**

#### **High performance metal fiber brushes for shipboard motors and generators**

The budget request included \$19.9 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for submarine support equipment, but included no funding for high performance metal brushes for shipboard motors and generators. Metal fiber brushes have demonstrated the capability to significantly enhance performance and reduce maintenance costs for motors and generators. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.5 million in OPN for the continuing procurement of high performance metal fiber brushes.

#### **Items less than \$5.0 million**

The budget request included \$134.0 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for shipboard equipment items of less than \$5.0 million.

The budget request included no funding for the advanced control monitoring system. This system will update older, analog style shipboard controls with modern software-based applications and sensors for enhanced control and observation of critical shipboard systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in OPN for the advanced control monitoring system.

The budget request included no funding for shaft lubricating pumps on the Landing Ship Dock 41/49 (LSD-41/49) class of amphibious ships. The current mechanical shaft seal pumps on these vessels are requiring maintenance at increasing costs. The committee is aware that the Navy could realize a return on investment within three years through the installation of canned lube pumps on three older LSD 41/49-class ships and on a submarine tender. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in OPN for the procurement and installation of canned lube pumps to replace the mechanical shaft seal pumps.

The budget request included no funding for modifications to aircraft carrier elevators. The existing aircraft elevator stanchion and platform lockbar systems are subject to corrosion, binding, and component failure. Replacement of these components with modern control systems would enhance aircraft carrier operations while reducing maintenance and manpower costs. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.7 million in OPN for a variety of aircraft carrier elevator modifications.

The committee recommends a total increase of \$13.7 million in OPN for shipboard equipment items of less than \$5.0 million, for a total authorization of \$147.7 million.

#### **Littoral combat ship mission modules**

The budget request included \$36.8 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for mission modules for the littoral combat ship (LCS). These mission modules will enable the LCS to operate in the littorals by providing capability in the mine warfare, small boat neutralization, and anti-submarine warfare missions.

The budget request did not include funding for a spare engine for the first ship of the class, which will use the MT30 marine gas turbine engine. If there were a main engine casualty after delivery of

the ship, much valuable time would be lost in the testing and validation of its concept of operations without a spare engine. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.6 million in OPN for a spare MT30 marine gas turbine engine for the LCS.

#### **Submarine acoustic modernization installation**

The budget request included \$226.9 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for submarine acoustics, which funds all future upgrades of acoustic-rapid commercial, off-the-shelf insertion (A-RCI) equipment. A-RCI is a multi-phased, evolutionary development effort to maintain acoustic superiority for in-service submarines. Additional funding for installation of A-RCI has been requested on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in OPN for submarine acoustic modernization A-RCI installation.

#### **Surface sonar dome window**

The budget request included \$14.0 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for undersea warfare support equipment, including \$1.1 million for surface ship sonar domes and windows. The Navy has been developing a new design sonar dome based on a newer composite material. The first sonar dome using these materials failed under the extreme pressure test. The causes for this failure have been identified and the design modified. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in OPN for the surface sonar dome window.

#### **Surface electronic warfare improvement program**

The budget request included \$25.1 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for the procurement of AN/SLQ-32 electronic warfare equipment for surface ships. The AN/SLQ-32 consists of five configurations and performs the missions of early detection, analyses, threat warning, and protection from anti-ship missiles. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in OPN to accelerate procurement of AN/SLQ-32 equipment.

#### **Weapons range support equipment**

The budget request included \$46.6 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) 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 (MTES) or the joint threat emitter (JTE).

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. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million for the procurement of MTES and an increase of \$6.0 million for the procurement of JTE, a total increase of \$12.0 million in OPN for weapons range support equipment.

#### **Maritime domain awareness**

The budget request included \$6.1 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for the naval fires control system. The committee is aware of the direction from the Secretary of Defense to prioritize

efforts to develop a capability that would provide maritime domain awareness similar to that provided for air traffic awareness. The committee believes that integration of existing systems could be used to aid in achieving this capability. The integration of the distributed common ground system for the Navy with joint harbor operation centers would assist in providing fused data to establish a common operating picture of coastal areas for both the Navy and the Coast Guard. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in OPN to prototype this capability for evaluation of its contribution to establishing maritime domain awareness.

#### **Rolling airframe missile launcher system**

The budget request included \$17.5 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for the rolling airframe missile (RAM) launcher system, but included no funding for the continued integration of the RAM with the close-in weapons system, known as SeaRAM. The Navy had originally planned to equip its guided missile frigates with this capability to provide a layered self-defense for the ships. The committee does not agree with the decision to discontinue the procurement of SeaRAM for the frigates unless there is another more capable system to provide defense. The committee recommends an increase of \$18.0 million in OPN to procure two SeaRAM systems for installation on guided missile frigates to evaluate its effectiveness.

#### **NULKA anti-ship missile decoy**

The budget request included \$40.4 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for the procurement of 12 NULKA anti-ship missile decoy systems and 31 NULKA decoys. The NULKA decoy is a quick reaction offboard electronic countermeasure to defeat advanced radar homing anti-ship missiles.

The committee is aware that the minimum sustaining rate for the production of NULKA decoys is 67 decoys a year, and that the procurement of additional NULKA decoys is requested on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. Raising the procurement rate to the minimum sustaining rate would lower the unit cost from \$450,000 to less than \$250,000. The committee recommends an increase of \$9.0 million in OPN for the procurement of 36 additional NULKA decoys.

#### **Submarine training device modifications**

The budget request included \$31.8 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for submarine training device modifications, but included no funding for logic-based software to expand the distribution and capability of performance support systems (PSSs). The Navy is beginning to use these electronic PSSs to enhance training opportunities for deployed forces. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in OPN for integration of these PSSs across the fast attack submarine community.

#### **Command support equipment**

The budget request included \$60.8 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for command support equipment, but included no

funding to procure man overboard indicator (MOBI) systems or to improve the electronic military personnel records system (EMPRS).

The MOBI system provides devices, which are worn by sailors aboard ship, to allow rescue forces to respond quickly in the event a sailor falls overboard. The committee is aware that the Naval Safety Center has recommended to the Naval Sea Systems Command that MOBI systems should be deployed throughout the fleet. In the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, the Senate report accompanying S. 2400 (S. Rept. 108–260) directed the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, with the submission of the fiscal year 2006 budget request, on plans to implement the Safety Center's recommendations. The committee has not yet received the report. The committee believes MOBI will not only save lives, but will also reduce the time spent searching for sailors who have fallen overboard. The committee recommends an increase of \$9.1 million in OPN to procure additional MOBI systems.

EMPRS is the Navy's personnel records management system that contains information on more than 3.8 million personnel. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.5 million in OPN for EMPRS to improve data storage and enhance information technologies, for a total increase in OPN of \$15.6 million for command support equipment.

#### **Navy medical automated information technology insertion**

The budget request included \$8.8 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for medical support equipment, which provides funding for the Fleet Hospital program whose mission is to provide comprehensive medical support to the fleet and fleet Marine forces engaged in combat operations. Automated information technology can be used to track medical materiel, surgical instruments, biomedical support equipment, and common support equipment for expeditionary medical forces consisting of deployable hospitals and hospital ships. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in OPN for Navy medical automated information technology insertion.

### **Marine Corps Procurement**

#### **Modification kits**

The budget request included no funding in Procurement, Marine Corps (PMC), for weapons and weapon systems modification kits, but no funding for modification kits for the MK–19 grenade machine gun. Since the fielding of the MK–19, various enhancements have been developed that greatly improve the operational reliability, readiness, safety, and maintainability of the MK–19 weapon system. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PMC for the procurement of MK–19 modification kits, for a total authorization of \$2.0 million in PMC.

#### **Rapid deploying interoperable shelter systems**

The budget request included \$952,000 in Procurement, Marine Corps (PMC), for unit operations centers, but no funding for the rapid deploying interoperable shelter system (RDISS). The core in-

infrastructure component of the Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF) command operations center (COC) is the RDISS together with associated power generation and environmental control equipment. The RDISS provides a rapidly deployable, easily set up, and dependable shelter for the conduct of command and control in a high intensity combat environment. A MEF urgent universal needs statement requested the development of a mobile, rapidly deployable, highly integrated MEF and division-level COC. The Marine Corps has procured COCs in fiscal year 2005, but requires additional funding to procure and integrate RDISS in support of the COC. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.8 million in PMC, for the RDISS and integration of RDISS into the COC, for a total authorization of \$5.8 million.

#### **United States Marine Corps continuity of operations**

The budget request included \$17.8 million in Procurement, Marine Corps (PMC), for communication/electronics infrastructure support, including \$3.4 million for the United States Marine Corps (USMC) Continuity of Operations (COOP) Program. The USMC COOP provides an additional layer of defense for Marine Corps' tactical computer networks. The committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified additional funding for the USMC COOP on his unfunded priorities list. The committee believes that the Marine Corps must improve its ability to protect Marine Corps' networks by increasing computer network storage, improving network security, and reducing the number of legacy networks. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.2 million in PMC, for the USMC COOP, for a total authorization of \$20.2 million in PMC.

#### **Subtitle D—Air Force Programs**



# **Title I - Procurement** (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
		<b>Aircraft Procurement, Air Force</b>						
		<b>Combat Aircraft</b>						
		<b>Tactical Forces</b>						
3010	1	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		152,377				152,377
3010	2	F-22 RAPTOR	24	3,680,902	24			3,680,902
3010	2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-494,280				-494,280
3010	3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		576,877				576,877
3010	4	F-15E		108,316				173,316
		Additional aircraft						65,000
								[65,000]
3010	4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-108,316				-108,316
3010	5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
		<b>Airlift Aircraft</b>						
		<b>Tactical Airlift</b>						
3010	6	C-17A (MYP)	15	3,260,816	15			3,260,816
3010	6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-469,957				-469,957
3010	7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		445,423				445,423
3010	8	C-17 ICS						
		<b>Other Airlift</b>						
3010	9	C-40						
3010	10	C-130J		235,770	9	645,000		880,770
		Realign program			[9]	[645,000]		
3010	10	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-136,787				-136,787
3010	11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						90,000
		Realign program						[90,000]
3010	11a	Aircraft for performance of aeromedical evacuations						200,000

# **Title I - Procurement** (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
		<b>Trainer Aircraft</b>						
		<b>UPT Trainers</b>						
3010	12	INTRO TO FLIGHT/AIRMANSHIP PRG						
3010	13	<b>Operational Trainers</b>						
		<b>JPATS</b>	54	333,307			54	333,307
		<b>Other Aircraft</b>						
		<b>Helicopters</b>						
3010	14	V22 OSPREY						
3010	14	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	2	244,659			2	244,659
3010	15	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		-10,866				-10,866
		<b>Mission Support Aircraft</b>						
3010	16	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C		571				571
		<b>Other Aircraft</b>						
3010	17	TARGET DRONES		82,907				82,907
3010	18	GLOBAL HAWK	5	398,423			5	398,423
3010	18	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-70,764				-70,764
3010	19	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		69,993				69,993
3010	20	PREDATOR UAV	9	125,566			9	125,566
		<b>Modification of In-service Aircraft</b>						
		<b>Strategic Aircraft</b>						
3010	21	B-2A		59,134				59,134
3010	22	B-1B		27,875				45,875
		<b>B-1B digital communications improvements</b>				18,000		
3010	23	B-52		145,025				145,025
3010	24	F-117		17,221				17,221

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

Account	Line	Program Title	FY 2006		Senate		Senate	
			Qty	Cost	Change	Authorized		
Tactical Aircraft								
3010	25	A-10		52,159			52,159	
3010	26	F-15		151,518			151,518	
3010	27	F-16		380,960			380,960	
3010	28	F-22 RAPTOR		53,992			53,992	
3010	29	T/AT-37						
Airlift Aircraft								
3010	30	C-5		71,137	20,000		91,137	
C-5 avionics modernization program								
3010	31	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		20,000	[20,000]		20,000	
3010	32	C-9						
3010	33	C-17A		260,826			260,826	
3010	34	C-21		3,924			3,924	
3010	35	C-32A		194			194	
3010	36	C-37A		382			382	
3010	37	C-141						
Trainer Aircraft								
3010	38	GLIDER MODS		3,174			3,174	
3010	39	T-6		6,143			6,143	
3010	40	T-1		181			181	
3010	41	T-38						
3010	42	T-41 AIRCRAFT		202,694			202,694	
3010	43	T-43		2,014			2,014	
Other Aircraft								
3010	44	KC-10A (ATCA)		21,937			21,937	
3010	45	C-12		6,295			6,295	

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY 2006		Senate		Senate	
			Request		Change		Authorized	
			Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
3010	46	C-20 MODS		488			488	
3010	47	VC-25A MOD		978			978	
3010	48	C-40		194			194	
3010	49	C-130		185,651		49,700	235,351	
		C-130E/H avionics modernization programs				[12,000]		
		C-130E/H center wing box replacement				[37,700]		
3010	50	C-130J MODS		5,988			5,988	
3010	51	C-135		88,748		10,000	98,748	
		KC-135 Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) acceleration				[10,000]		
3010	52	COMPASS CALL MODS		27,421			27,421	
3010	53	C-29A MODS		3,816			3,816	
3010	54	DARP		85,470			85,470	
3010	55	E-3		49,292			49,292	
3010	56	E-4		85,342			85,342	
3010	57	E-8		15,506		44,400	59,906	
		E-8C Joint STARS re-engining				[44,400]		
3010	58	H-1		32,418			32,418	
3010	59	H-60		50,497			50,497	
3010	60	OTHER AIRCRAFT		70,953			70,953	
3010	61	PREDATOR MODS		30,286			30,286	
3010	62	CV-22 MODS		102			102	
		Other Modifications						
3010	63	CLASSIFIED PROJECTS						
		Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts						
3010	64	AIRCRAFT INITIAL SPARES + REPAIR PARTS		204,038			204,038	

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<b>Aircraft Support Equipment and Facilities</b>						
		<b>Common Support Equip</b>						
3010	65	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		124,420				124,420
		<b>Post Production Support</b>						
3010	66	B-1		13,466				13,466
3010	67	B-2A		7,304				7,304
3010	68	B-2A		22,111				22,111
3010	69	B-52		21,162				21,162
3010	70	C-130		20,502				20,502
3010	71	F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		13,170				13,170
3010	72	F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		17,833				17,833
		<b>Industrial Preparedness</b>						
3010	73	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		22,360				22,360
		<b>War Consumables</b>						
3010	74	WAR CONSUMABLES		24,058				24,058
		<b>Other Production Charges</b>						
3010	75	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		644,155			96,600	740,755
		Litening AT Targeting Pod for A/OA-10, F-16, and B-52					[96,600]	
3010	76	DEPOT MODERNIZATION		115,525				115,525
		<b>Classified Pgms</b>						
3010	77	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
		<b>Other Production Charges SOF</b>						
3010	78	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - SOF						

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
3010	79	DARP		68,432				68,432
		DARP						
		<b>Total - Aircraft Procurement, Air Force</b>		11,973,933		1,238,700		13,212,633
		<b>Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force</b>						
		<b>Procurement of Ammo, Air Force</b>						
		<b>Rockets</b>						
3011	1	SMALL ARMS						
		<b>Rockets</b>						
3011	2	ROCKETS		36,302				36,302
		<b>Cartridges</b>						
3011	3	CARTRIDGES		160,530				160,530
		<b>Bombs</b>						
3011	4	PRACTICE BOMBS		14,278				14,278
3011	5	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		240,231				240,231
3011	6	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON	302	120,379			302	120,379
3011	7	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	8,000	223,285			8,000	223,285
3011	8	WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISPE						
		<b>Flare, IR MJU-7B</b>						
3011	9	CAD/PAD		21,212				21,212
3011	10	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (		2,958				2,958
3011	11	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		4,354				4,354
3011	12	INITIAL SPARES						
3011	13	SPARES						
3011	14	MODIFICATIONS		892				892

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
3011	15	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5,000,000		3,948				3,948
		Fuzes						
3011	16	FLARES		143,620				143,620
3011	17	FUZES		53,176				53,176
		Weapons						
		Small Arms						
3011	18	SMALL ARMS		6,042				6,042
<b>Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force</b>				<b>1,031,207</b>				<b>1,031,207</b>
<b>Missile Procurement, Air Force</b>								
		Ballistic Missiles						
		Missile Replacement Equipment-Ballistic						
3020	1	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE		2,027				2,027
3020	2	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLIST		41,635				41,635
		Other Missiles						
		Tactical						
3020	3	JASSM	300	150,238		300		150,238
3020	4	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON		971				971
3020	5	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	196	44,963		196		44,963
3020	6	AMRAAM	166	120,668		166		120,668
3020	7	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	378	38,135		378		38,135
3020	8	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	512	59,052		512		59,052
		Industrial Facilities						
3020	9	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,225				1,225
3020	10	POLLUTION PREVENTION ACTIVITY		895				895

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<b>Modification of In-service Missiles</b>						
		<b>Class IV</b>						
3020	11	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE		3,251				3,251
3020	12	MM III MODIFICATIONS		672,633		10,000		682,633
		Minuteman III Propulsion Replacement Program				[10,000]		
3020	13	AGM-65D MAVERICK		233				233
3020	14	AGM-88C HARM		38				38
3020	15	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE		24,764				24,764
		<b>Spares and Repair Parts</b>						
		<b>Missiles and Repair Parts</b>						
3020	16	MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS		85,094				85,094
		<b>Other Support</b>						
		<b>Space Programs</b>						
3020	17	ADVANCED EHF	1	607,271				607,271
3020	17	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-78,293				-78,293
3020	18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
3020	19	WIDEBAND GAFILLER SATELLITES(		22,300				22,300
3020	20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		50,217				50,217
3020	21	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		9,575				9,575
3020	22	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	3	305,732				305,732
3020	22	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-29,646				-29,646
3020	23	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		42,000				42,000
3020	24	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SP		67,175				67,175
3020	25	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE)		42,713				42,713
3020	26	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM(						
3020	27	TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS(SPACE)		66,180				66,180



## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
3020	28	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(	5	838,347				838,347
3020	29	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)		111,166				111,166
		<b>Special Programs</b>						
3020	30	DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM		320,606				320,606
3020	31	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]		[ ]
3020	32	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]		[ ]
3020	33	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]		[ ]
3020	34	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		26,250				26,250
3020	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		1,842,872				1,842,872
		<b>Total - Missile Procurement, Air Force</b>		<b>5,490,287</b>			<b>10,000</b>	<b>5,500,287</b>
		<b>Other Procurement, Air Force</b>						
		<b>Vehicular Equipment</b>						
		<b>Passenger Carrying Vehicles</b>						
3080	1	ARMORED VEHICLE		503				503
3080	2	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		14,399				14,399
		<b>Cargo and Utility Vehicles</b>						
3080	3	TRUCK, STAKE/PLATFORM						
3080	4	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X						
3080	5	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X						
3080	6	TRUCK, MAINT/UTILITY/DELIVERY						
3080	7	TRUCK, CARRYALL						
3080	8	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		13,058				13,058
3080	9	HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MVP)		3,257				3,257
3080	10	TRUCK, TRACTOR, OVER 5T						

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
3080	11	CAP VEHICLES		821				821
3080	12	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0 MILLION (CARGO + UTIL)						
		<b>Special Purpose Vehicles</b>						
3080	13	TRUCK TANK 1200 GAL						
3080	14	TRUCK, TANK FUEL R-11						
3080	15	HMMV, ARMORED		2,190				2,190
3080	16	TRUCK, REFUSE						
3080	17	HMMV, UP-ARMORED		11,058				11,058
3080	18	TRACTOR A/C TOW MB-4						
3080	19	TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE						
3080	20	TRUCK HYDRANT FUEL						
3080	21	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (SPECIAL PURPOSE)						
		<b>Fire Fighting Equipment</b>						
3080	22	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEH		21,414				21,414
3080	23	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (FIRE FIGHTING EQUIP)						
		<b>Materials Handling Equipment</b>						
3080	24	TRUCK F/L 6000 LB						
3080	25	TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB						
3080	26	HALVERSEN LOADER		16,311		8,200		24,511
		Halverson Loader				[8,200]		
3080	27	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M						
		<b>Base Maintenance Support</b>						
3080	28	LOADER, SCOOP						
3080	29	LOADER- SCOOP- W/BACKHOE						
3080	30	TRUCK, DUMP 5CY						
3080	31	RUNWAY SNOW REMOVAL & CLEANING		22,026				22,026

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
3080	32	CRANE 7-50 TON						
3080	33	MODIFICATIONS						
3080	34	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (VEH)						
		<b>Cancelled Account Adjustment</b>		10,546				10,546
3080	35	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
		<b>Electronics and Telecommunications</b>						
		<b>Comm Security Equipment (COMSEC)</b>						
3080	36	COMSEC EQUIPMENT		58,176				58,176
3080	37	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)		2,399				2,399
		<b>Intelligence Programs</b>						
3080	38	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIP		4,744				4,744
3080	39	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT		1,523		12,500		14,023
		Jumbo digital transit cased system (J-DTS)				[12,500]		
		<b>Electronics Programs</b>						
3080	40	TRAFFIC CONTROL/LANDING		16,795				16,795
3080	41	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM		51,919				51,919
3080	42	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROV		76,752				76,752
3080	43	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST		35,723				35,723
3080	44	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL		44,690				44,690
3080	45	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX		23,009				23,009
3080	46	TAC SIGINT SPT						
3080	47	DRUG INTERDICTION SPT		416				416
		<b>Special Comm-Electronics Projects</b>						
3080	48	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		110,997				110,997
3080	49	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS		11,891				11,891
3080	50	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL		9,488				9,488

## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
3080	51	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYS		35,910				35,910
3080	52	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES		36,096				40,596
		Joint theater emitters				4,500		
						[4,500]		
3080	53	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COM		20,545				20,545
3080	54	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		4,517				4,517
3080	55	GCSS-AF FOS		12,738				12,738
3080	56	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM		41,709				41,709
3080	57	AIR OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)		21,816				21,816
		<b>Air Force Communications</b>						
3080	58	BASE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE		374,926				374,926
3080	59	USCENTCOM		31,059				31,059
3080	60	AUTOMATED TELECOMMUNICATIONS						
		<b>DISA Programs</b>						
3080	61	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE		3,689				3,689
3080	62	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE		9,096				9,096
3080	63	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE		9,396				9,396
3080	64	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK		51,778				51,778
3080	65	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE		114,189				114,189
3080	66	MILSATCOM SPACE		28,720				28,720
3080	67	SPACE MODS SPACE		25,063				25,063
		<b>Organization and Base</b>						
3080	68	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		131,120				131,120
3080	69	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER		24,726				24,726
3080	70	RADIO EQUIPMENT		7,458				7,458
3080	71	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)		5,871				5,871
3080	72	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT		3,193				3,193

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
3080	73	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		107,007				107,007
3080	74	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M		3,662				3,662
		Modifications						
3080	75	COMM ELECT MODS		24,714				24,714
		Other Base Maintenance and Support Equip						
		Test Equipment						
3080	76	BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE						
3080	77	PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY						
3080	78	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (TEST EQUIPMENT)						
		Personal Safety and Rescue Equipment						
3080	79	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		11,965				11,965
3080	80	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (SAFETY + RESCUE)						
		Depot Plant and Material Handling Equip						
3080	81	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT		14,617				14,617
3080	82	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (DEPOT PLANT)						
		Electrical Equipment						
3080	83	FLOODLIGHTS SET TYPE NF2D						
3080	84	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (ELECTRICAL EQUIP)						
		Base Support Equipment						
3080	85	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT		23,188				23,188
3080	86	MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT		14,695				14,695
3080	87	ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS						
3080	88	AIR BASE OPERABILITY		5,463				5,463
3080	89	PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
3080	90	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT		5,324				5,324
3080	91	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		23,370				23,370

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</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>
3080	92	AIR CONDITIONERS						
3080	93	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M		28,693				28,693
3080	94	PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
		<b>Special Support Projects</b>						
3080	95	TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQMT						
3080	96	DARP RC135		21,507				21,507
3080	97	DARP, MRIGS		147,952				147,952
3080	98	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
3080	99	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		270,788				270,788
3080	100	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM		14,631				14,631
3080	101	MODIFICATIONS						
3080	102	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
		<b>Spares and Repair Parts</b>						
3080	103	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		30,340				30,340
3080	104	REPLENISHMENT SPARES						
3080	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		11,697,053				11,697,053
<b>Total - Other Procurement, Air Force</b>				<b>14,002,689</b>	<b>25,200</b>			<b>14,027,889</b>

**Multiyear procurement authority for C-17 aircraft (sec. 131)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to exercise the option on the existing C-17 multiyear procurement contract for the procurement of up to 42 additional C-17 aircraft, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code. The existing multiyear procurement was authorized by section 131 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107). The provision would require the Secretary of Defense, prior to the exercise of the contract option, to certify to the congressional defense committees that the procurement of these additional C-17 aircraft is consistent with the results of the Mobility Capabilities Study to be completed in fiscal year 2005.

**Prohibition on retirement of KC-135E aircraft (sec. 132)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from retiring any KC-135E aerial refueling aircraft in fiscal year 2006.

Section 134(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136) required that an analysis of alternatives (AOA) on meeting aerial refueling requirements be conducted and delivered to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2004. In a letter to the congressional defense committees on February 24, 2004, the Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics provided the guidance that will be used for the conduct of the AOA. On February 27, 2004, the Secretary of the Air Force sent a letter to the committee stating the AOA would be completed in fiscal year 2005.

The budget request included a plan to retire 49 KC-135Es in fiscal year 2006. The committee believes it is premature to retire any KC-135Es until the AOA is completed and the Secretary of Defense has presented to the congressional defense committees a comprehensive plan for the recapitalization and modernization of the aerial refueling fleet.

**Use of Tanker Replacement Transfer Fund for modernization of aerial refueling tankers (sec. 133)**

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the use of funds in the Tanker Replacement Transfer Fund, which was established by section 8132 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-287), for the modernization of existing aerial refueling tankers, if the modernization of such tankers is consistent with the results of the analysis of alternatives for meeting the aerial refueling requirements of the Air Force, as required by section 134(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136). The use of funds under this provision would be in addition to the use of funds for a tanker acquisition program. Activities that contribute to the modernization of existing aerial refueling tankers could include a variety of modifications and upgrades to KC-135E/R aircraft that are consistent with the analysis of alternatives for meeting the aerial refueling requirements of the Air Force.

**Prohibition on retirement of F-117 aircraft (sec. 134)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Air Force from retiring any F-117 aircraft in fiscal year 2006. The committee budget request included a proposal to retire 10 F-117 aircraft. The F-117 remains the only stealthy tactical aircraft capable of delivering certain precision munitions currently in the inventory. The committee believes it is premature to retire any F-117 aircraft at this time.

**Prohibition on retirement of C-130E/H tactical airlift aircraft (sec. 135)**

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 2006.

The committee believes it would be premature to retire any C-130 aircraft until the results of the Mobility Capabilities Study, which is to be completed in fiscal year 2005, are known and intra-theater airlift requirements are determined.

**Procurement of C-130J/KC-130J aircraft after fiscal year 2005 (sec. 136)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to procure any C-130J/KC-135 aircraft after fiscal year 2005 through a negotiated contract under Part 15 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), relating to the acquisition of items under a negotiated contract (48 C.F.R. 15.000 et seq.), including a multiyear contract for such aircraft continuing in force from a fiscal year before fiscal year 2006.

The Air Force designated the C-130J aircraft as a commercial item in 1995 on the basis that the aircraft was a modification of commercial C-130 aircraft configurations that had been certified by the Federal Aviation Administration. Section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403) defines commercial items to include modified commercial items, as long as the modifications are either "minor modifications" or modifications of a type customarily available in the commercial marketplace. The Air Force designated the C-130J as a commercial item and determined that there would be a 95 percent commonality between the C-130J and the civilian commercial version of the plane and modifications from the commercial version would be minor.

However, the Department of Defense Inspector General has reported that the C-130J included features not customarily available in the commercial marketplace, such as aerial delivery (cargo and paratroop), defensive systems, secure voice communication, station keeping, night vision, imaging, and satellite communication. The Director, Operational Test and Evaluation has found that the combat delivery variant of the C-130J has more than 70 percent new development and system integration relative to commercial versions of the C-130.

The committee believes that the Air Force original decision to procure the C-130J as a commercial item unnecessarily limited cost oversight by the government by denying the government access to certified cost or pricing data from the manufacturer. The committee believes that an agreement to change the terms and con-



ditions of the existing C-130J contract from a commercial item contract to a standard defense contract is necessary to provide the government the oversight it needs to procure aircraft that are operationally effective and operationally suitable at a fair price.

The committee notes that the Air Force has announced its intent to renegotiate this contract to a FAR Part 15 contract. This provision is intended to support that decision.

#### **Aircraft for performance of aeromedical evacuations (sec. 137)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to procure aircraft for the purpose of providing aeromedical evacuation services to severely injured or ill personnel. The provision would require the aircraft to be capable of non-stop transatlantic flights, and be equipped with current aeromedical support facilities. The provision would ensure that the dedicated mission of the aircraft is aeromedical evacuation. The provision would authorize \$200.0 million to be appropriated for the procurement of up to two fully-equipped aircraft to perform the aeromedical evacuation mission.

Previously, the Air Force had dedicated C-9A aircraft for the aeromedical evacuation mission. The Air Force directed that all of these C-9A dedicated aeromedical evacuation aircraft be retired by 2004, and the last C-9A aeromedical evacuation mission in the continental United States was flown on August 11, 2003.

The committee has been informed by wounded military personnel that the use of organic cargo aircraft for medical evacuation has resulted in unnecessary suffering. The committee believes the large cargo and aerial refueling aircraft currently being used for aeromedical evacuation are not suited for the support of severely wounded or severely ill patients.

The committee has been informed by health care providers that they have had difficulty controlling pain experienced by wounded patients during the course of extended flights. Many victims of multiple injuries require highly sophisticated electronic monitoring equipment, some of which is incompatible with the electrical power source of the transport aircraft.

Increasingly the practice for victims of blast injury is to delay closure of major wounds until the patient arrives at a medical facility capable of providing tertiary care. Poor lighting, rapid changes in temperature, and differentials in atmospheric pressures are also of concern, particularly for those patients with traumatic head wounds. The committee believes that all of these concerns could be addressed by acquisition of dedicated aeromedical evacuation aircraft.

The committee recommends an increase of \$200.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for the procurement of up to two dedicated aeromedical evacuation aircraft.

### **Air Force Aircraft**

#### **F-15E procurement**

The budget request included no funding in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for the procurement of F-15E attrition reserve

aircraft. The F-15E is a dual-role fighter designed to perform air-to-air and air-to-ground missions. The procurement of F-15E attrition reserve aircraft is included on the Air Force Chief of Staff's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$65.0 million in APAF for the procurement of F-15E aircraft.

#### **C-130J/KC-130 multiyear procurement restoration**

The budget request included \$99.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), but included no funding to procure C-130J tactical airlift aircraft and no funding for advance procurement. The budget request included \$1,092.7 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for the procurement of 12 KC-130J aerial refueling aircraft, but included no funding for advance procurement. The budget request would terminate the C-130J multiyear procurement (MYP) contract that was authorized by the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314). In a May 10, 2005, letter to the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, the Secretary of Defense indicated his intent to reverse his decision to terminate the C-130J multiyear contract because of contract termination costs. Additionally, the Secretary informed the Chairman in this letter that a budget amendment for fiscal year 2006 would not be required to accomplish this goal.

The committee does not agree that a budget amendment is not necessary. Since there is no new information from the Department of Defense on the funding profile and numbers of aircraft by variant for C-130Js in fiscal year 2006, the committee exercised its discretion concerning the proper mix of these aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of \$645.0 million in APAF for the procurement of nine C-130J tactical airlift aircraft, and \$90.0 million in APAF for C-130J advance procurement. The committee also recommends a decrease of \$781.0 million in APN, leaving sufficient funds for the procurement of four KC-130J aerial refueling aircraft, and an increase of \$46.0 million in APN for KC-130J advance procurement.

#### **B-1 digital communication improvements**

The budget request included \$13.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for post production support to the B-1 aircraft and \$132.5 million in PE 64226F for B-1 capability improvements, but included no funding for the procurement and installation of the B-1 digital communication improvement. The B-1 digital communication improvement program preserves critical combat capability by providing Demand Assigned Multiple Access (DAMA)-compliant satellite data access for responsive in-flight mission and target changes. The existing temporary Combat Track II (CTII) radios are not DAMA compliant and will lose satellite access after fiscal year 2007. Procurement of the B-1 digital communication improvement is included on the Air Force Chief of Staff's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$18.0 million in APAF and an increase of \$8.0 million in PE 64226F for the procurement and installation of the B-1 digital communication improvement.

### **C-5 aircraft avionics modernization program**

The budget request included \$71.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for modifications to the C-5 aircraft, including \$69.3 million to continue the C-5 avionics modernization program (AMP). AMP upgrades the C-5 cockpit, installs communications, navigation and safety/air traffic management equipment, and replaces unreliable cockpit avionics. To accelerate this program, the committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million in APAF for C-5 AMP.

### **C-130E/H aircraft modifications**

The budget request included \$185.7 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for the procurement of aircraft modifications to the C-130, including \$50.6 million for the procurement of Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) modifications and \$7.1 million for the procurement and installation of one C-130 Center Wing Box (CWB) with expired service life.

The AMP provides full Global Air Traffic Management and Navigation Safety compliant aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of \$12.0 million in APAF for the procurement of AMP for C-130E/H aircraft.

The CWB replacement increases the service life of the C-130. The Air Force has recently removed from service 30 C-130Es with CWBs whose service life has expired. Procurement of CWBs is included on the Air Force Chief of Staff's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$37.7 million in APAF for the procurement of CWBs for C-130E/H aircraft, for a total authorization of \$235.4 million in APAF for the C-130E/H aircraft.

### **KC-135 global air traffic management**

The budget request included \$88.8 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for modifications to the C-135 and KC-135 aircraft, including \$77.7 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 \$10.0 million in APAF for the procurement of additional KC-135 GATM modifications.

### **E-8C joint surveillance and target attack radar system reengining**

The budget request included \$15.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for the procurement of aircraft modifications to the E-8C aircraft, but included no funding for reengining the E-8C aircraft.

The reengining of the E-8C would provide significant improvements in reliability and performance over current TF33-102C engines and also reduce total life cycle costs. The reengining of the E-8C aircraft is included on the Air Force Chief of Staff's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$44.4 million in APAF for the procurement of non-recurring engineering ac-

tivities required to initiate a reengining program to install JT8D engines on the E-8C aircraft.

#### **Advanced targeting pods**

The budget request included \$644.2 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for the procurement of aircraft support equipment and facilities, including \$40.8 million for the procurement of advanced targeting pods (ATPs). The ATP will supplement and replace the current targeting pod with a new system that provides increased combat effectiveness across several mission areas. The LITENING ATP is currently in use by the Active Duty, Air National Guard, and Air Force Reserve Command. The Combat Air Force is over 100 ATPs short of the requirement to equip legacy aircraft, and the procurement of additional ATPs is included on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$96.6 million in APAF for the procurement of 66 additional LITENING ATPs.

#### **Air Force Missiles**

##### **Minuteman III mods for propulsion replacement program**

The budget request included \$672.6 million in PE 11213F, Missile Procurement Air Force (MPAF), of which \$289.7 million is for the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile propulsion replacement program. The committee notes that the Department of Defense's diversion of funds away from this program will result in procurement of fewer motors in fiscal year 2006, resulting in an inefficient rate of production with consequent cost increases. The committee further notes that this program is contained on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priorities list.

The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 11213F for MPAF to be used for the propulsion replacement program for the Minuteman III ICBM force.

#### **Other Air Force Procurement**

##### **Halvorsen loader**

The budget request included \$16.3 million in Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF), for the Halvorsen loader, a state-of-the-art handler for off/on loading aircraft cargo. Currently, 44 Halvorsen loaders are supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom, seven Halvorsen loaders are supporting Operation Enduring Freedom, and eight were used to support tsunami relief operations. Additional funding for Halvorsen loaders is on the Chief Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.2 million in OPAF for the procurement of 12 Halvorsen loaders, for a total authorization of \$24.5 million.

The committee understands that the Future Years Defense Program calls for buying a total of 385 Halvorsen loaders. However, the Air Force could ultimately buy as many as 512 Halvorsen loaders, if the Air Force were to decide to replace all of the existing 25,000 pound class (25K) loaders in the force. Given that the Halvorsen loader is more capable and more easily maintained than the 25K loaders it is replacing, the committee encourages the Air

Force to review its procurement plans. If the Air Force were to decide to buy more Halvorsen loaders, the committee believes that the Air Force should investigate whether there might be significant savings achievable if the Air Force were to acquire those loaders under a multiyear procurement contract.

#### **Distributed common ground system components**

The budget request included \$1.5 million in Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF), for Intelligence Communications Equipment, but did not include funding to continue fielding of the jumbo digital transit cased system (J-DTS) components of the distributed common ground system (DCGS).

J-DTS is a component of the DCGS architecture that enables users in remote locations to receive imagery and other intelligence information from a variety of intelligence collection platforms, including Global Hawk, Predator, and U-2 aircraft. In some cases, remote users are able to actually control the sensors on the intelligence platform. Fielding of J-DTS to additional Air Force intelligence squadrons will enable multiple units to participate in real-world intelligence operations on a daily basis; provide better training to more Air Force intelligence specialists; and reduce the high operational tempo on the limited number of intelligence squadrons currently equipped to receive intelligence information in remote locations.

The committee recommends an increase of \$12.5 million in OPAF, for Intelligence Communications Equipment, to field additional J-DTS equipment to Air Force intelligence squadrons.

#### **Joint threat emitters**

The budget request included \$36.1 million in Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF), for combat training ranges, including \$17.5 million for joint threat emitters. The joint threat emitter (JTE) system simulates electronic combat signals and is designed to provide realistic electronic warfare training for pilots and aircrew members. The JTE replaces older, maintenance intensive threat emitters, and is specifically designed to allow for “spiral” upgrades to ensure future threats are quickly integrated into the system. JTE has proven to be an effective training tool to prepare pilots for combat. Additional funding for JTE is included on the Air Force Chief of Staff’s unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.5 million in OPAF for the accelerated procurement of joint threat emitters.

### **Subtitle E—Other Matters**

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
		<b>Procurement, Defense-Wide</b>						
		<b>Major Equipment</b>						
		<b>Major Equipment, OSD/WHIS</b>						
300	1	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		98,045				98,045
		<b>Major Equipment, NSA</b>						
300	2	CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]		[ ]
300	3	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		7,790				7,790
300	4	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PGM	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]		[ ]
300	5	DEFENSE COUNTERDRUG PROGRAM	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]		[ ]
		<b>Major Equipment, WHS</b>						
300	6	WHS MOTOR VEHICLES		26,307				26,307
300	7	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS						
		<b>Major Equipment, DISA</b>						
300	8	DRUG INTERDICTION						
300	9	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		27,072				27,072
300	10	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM		8,912				8,912
300	11	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM		5,498				5,498
300	12	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,686				2,686
300	13	TELEPORT PROGRAM		98,320				98,320
300	14	GLOBAL INFORMATION GRID						
300	15	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		33,491				33,491
300	16	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS NETWORK		25,568				25,568
		<b>Major Equipment, DIA</b>						
300	17	INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]		[ ]
300	18	DEFENSE HUMINT INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]		[ ]

# **Title I - Procurement**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Cost</u>
							<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
		<b>Major Equipment, DLA</b>						
300	19	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		8,328				8,328
		<b>Major Equipment, DCAA</b>						
300	20	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		1,497				1,497
		<b>Major Equipment, TJS</b>						
300	21	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		42,473				42,473
		<b>Major Equipment, DHRA</b>						
300	22	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		7,496				7,496
		<b>National Geospatial Intelligence Agency</b>						
300	23	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
		<b>Defense Threat Reduction Agency</b>						
300	24	VEHICLES		200				200
300	25	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		16,319				16,319
		<b>Defense Security Cooperation Agency</b>						
300	26	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		780				780
		<b>Major Equipment, AFIS</b>						
300	27	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS		6,521				6,521
		<b>Major Equipment, DODDE</b>						
300	28	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS		1,500				1,500
		<b>Major Equipment, DCMA</b>						
300	29	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		12,068				12,068
		<b>Major Equipment, DTSA</b>						
300	30	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		407				407
		<b>Major Equipment, CIFA</b>						
300	31	TSCM EQUIPMENT	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
300	32	Major Equipment, NDU NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY						
		Special Operations Command						
		Aviation Programs						
300	33	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT		129,748			7,700	137,448
		MH-47 IR suppressors					[7,700]	
	34	SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS		13,897				13,897
	35	MC-130H AIR REFUELING SYSTEM		18,268				18,268
300	36	MH-47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM		83,737				83,737
300	37	MH-60 SOF MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		29,629				29,629
300	38	MC-130H, COMBAT TALON II		66,288				66,288
300	39	CV-22 SOF MOD	2	117,923				117,923
300	40	AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION						
	41	C-130 MODIFICATIONS		67,270				67,270
300	42	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT		1,045				1,045
		Shipbuilding						
300	43	ASDS ADVANCE PROCUREMENT		71,694				71,694
		Fence, pending milestone C						
300	44	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS)		12,350				12,350
300	45	MK8 MOD1 SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE		2,151				2,151
		Ammunition Programs						
300	46	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT		38,126				38,126
300	47	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION		11,158				22,158
		Time delayed firing devices/sympathetic detonators						
							11,000	
							[11,000]	



## Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY 2006		Senate		Senate	
			Request	Change	Authorized	Cost		
			Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
300	48	Other Procurement Programs						
		COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS		69,898		30,000		99,898
		Multi-band inter/intra team radio				[13,500]		
		Multi-band multi-mission radio				[16,500]		
300	49	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		27,642		12,000		39,642
		Joint threat warning system				[12,000]		
300	50	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		119,372		3,300		122,672
		Rucksack portable UAV				[3,300]		
300	51	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
300	52	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS		2,275				2,275
300	53	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES		16,511				16,511
300	54	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS		17,732				17,732
300	55	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		5,114				5,114
300	56	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
300	57	TACTICAL VEHICLES		4,541				4,541
300	58	USSOCOM REQUIREMENTS - TITLE IX						
300	59	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM GDIP	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]		[ ]	[ ]
300	60	SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT		1,088				1,088
300	61	DRUG INTERDICTION						
300	62	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		22,271				22,271
300	63	SPECIAL OPERATIONS MISSION PLANNING ENVIRONM						
300	64	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS		233,824		16,800		250,624
		Miscellaneous programs (see annex)				[16,800]		
300	65	PSYOP EQUIPMENT		46,649				46,649

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

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Senate</u>
			<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
			<u>Qty</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Qty</u>
			<u>Cost</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Cost</u>
		<b>Chemical/Biological Defense</b>			
		<b>CBDP</b>			
300	66	INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION	198,045	10,200	208,245
		Military mail screening equipment		[10,200]	
300	67	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	97,183		97,183
300	68	DECONTAMINATION	2,950		2,950
300	69	JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	62,341		62,341
300	70	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION	31,841		31,841
300	71	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE	258,299	16,000	274,299
		Automatic chemical agent detector and alarm		[16,000]	
300	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	365,694		365,694
		<b>Total - Procurement, Defense-Wide</b>	<b>2,677,832</b>	<b>107,000</b>	<b>2,784,832</b>

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

		<u>FY 2006</u>		<u>Senate</u>		<u>Senate</u>	
		<u>Request</u>		<u>Change</u>		<u>Authorized</u>	
<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Cost</u>
		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					
	6	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT					
		<b>Total - National Guard &amp; Reserve Equipment</b>					
		Defense Production Act Purchases					
360	1	DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES				1,501,400	78,117,237
		<b>Total - Defense Production Act Purchases</b>					
		<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT</b>		76,615,837		1,501,400	78,117,237

**Advanced SEAL Delivery System (sec. 151)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the availability of funds for advance procurement of a pressure hull and other long lead items associated with building the second Advanced SEAL Delivery System (ASDS) until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics has made a favorable Milestone C decision regarding the ASDS program.

The ASDS is a miniature, combatant submarine being developed for the infiltration and exfiltration of naval special operations forces. Unlike current underwater delivery systems, ASDS would transport Navy SEALs over longer distances in a dry environment, enhancing the operators' ability to accomplish their mission once ashore.

Significant technical and cost growth problems have plagued this program since its inception. For the past six years, the committee has expressed increasing concern about the cost of this system and the significant performance shortfalls the program has exhibited. At the urging of the committee, the Department of Defense designated ASDS as an Acquisition Category I program in 2003, and is exercising milestone decision authority to assess the future of this program.

The first ASDS underwent an operational evaluation (OPEVAL), starting in April 2003, to determine the effectiveness and suitability of the boat for use in combat. The OPEVAL results were promising, but revealed significant performance shortfalls. As a result, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136) prohibited expenditure of advance procurement funds for items associated with the second ASDS until after a favorable Milestone C decision, and a detailed report from the Secretary of Defense. In the Fall of 2004, the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition, conducted a major program review; requested a delay in the Milestone C review and related advance procurement until the first quarter of fiscal year 2006; indicated his desire and the willingness of the prime contractor to restructure the program to a firm, fixed-price contract for future boats; and established the requirement for an additional period of operational test and evaluation in the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2005, prior to a Milestone C decision.

The ASDS program has achieved some progress over the past year in addressing remaining technical challenges associated with development. Most acoustical challenges have been addressed and a plan has been developed to address the remaining issues. Problems associated with the current battery technology have been mitigated, and a new, more promising lithium-ion battery technology will be installed on the boat in May 2005. Structural and maintenance challenges associated with the tail assembly of the ASDS appear to have been resolved with the redesign of the tail section.

The requirement for an ASDS remains critical for our special operations forces. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics will determine in the Milestone C review

if the current ASDS program meets operational requirements, whether the ASDS program should continue, and what contractual adjustments are warranted.

While encouraged by recent progress, the committee remains concerned about the technical challenges and cost growth that have occurred in the ASDS program. The Milestone C decision has been postponed until December 2005, following a final operational test and evaluation. The committee opposes the commitment of fiscal year 2006 advance procurement funding prior to a favorable Milestone C decision and a comprehensive report from the Secretary of Defense. The committee reiterates the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees of the results of the Milestone C decision on ASDS, and to include in his report: a detailed summary of the program's revised cost estimate and future cost estimates, as validated by the Cost Analysis and Improvement Group; a detailed acquisition strategy; and a plan to demonstrate realistic solutions to key technical and performance problems identified during testing and operations.

The provision would also direct the Comptroller General to review the adequacy of the final operational test and evaluation plan developed by the Navy, review the results of the operational test, and update the March 2003 Comptroller General Report (GAO-03-442), "Defense Acquisition, Advanced SEAL Delivery System Program Needs Increased Oversight."

The committee directs that no amount of the \$71.7 million authorized to be appropriated for advance procurement of ASDS in fiscal year 2006 be obligated or expended until after a favorable Milestone C decision, as certified to the congressional defense committees in the required Secretary report.

### **Defense-wide Programs**

#### **MH-47 infrared engine exhaust suppressor**

The budget request included \$129.7 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Rotary Wing Upgrades, but did not include funding to complete fielding of infrared engine exhaust suppressor sets for U.S. Army MH-47E/D (IES-47) special operations aircraft.

The MH-47 Chinook aircraft has proven to be a critical workhorse in the global war on terrorism, providing heavy lift, even at high operating altitudes. While a durable system, the MH-47 is vulnerable to heat-seeking weapons. Installation of infrared exhaust suppressors significantly reduces this vulnerability. U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) has a requirement for 61 IES-47 sets to equip all MH-47E/D aircraft, plus four spares for a total of 65 sets. Currently, 45 sets are scheduled for procurement, leaving 20 sets yet to be funded. Fully equipping the MH-47E/D fleet is the highest priority of the Commander, SOCOM, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of \$7.7 million in PDW, for SOF, Rotary Wing Upgrades, to complete fielding of the 20 remaining IES-47 sets.

### **Time delayed firing device/sympathetic detonators**

The budget request included \$11.2 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Ordnance Acquisition, including \$1.4 million for time delayed firing device/sympathetic detonators (TDFD/SYDET), but did not include enough funding to fully replenish the inventory, particularly with regard to having sufficient munitions to train new operators.

TDFD/SYDET is a time delayed detonating device that greatly enhances the capabilities and efficiency of SOF operators conducting offensive military operations. Sufficient supplies are required to ensure operators have the best possible detonators for actual missions and that the detonator is available to instructors training new SOF operators. TDFD/SYDET is one of the highest priorities of the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of \$11.0 million in PDW, for SOF Ordnance Acquisition, to procure an additional 5,500 TDFD/SYDET units for SOF operators and trainers.

### **Multi-band inter/intra team radio**

The budget request included \$69.9 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Communications Equipment and Electronics, but did not include funding to complete fielding of the multi-band inter/intra team radio (MBITR).

The MBITR AN/PRC-148 radio system provides SOF teams the ability to communicate over a variety of frequencies utilizing a single handheld radio with embedded security. The MBITR replaces numerous fixed frequency radios and related batteries and replacement parts, resulting in a significant reduction in the combat load of SOF operators. Continued fielding of the MBITR radio system is one of the highest priorities of the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of \$13.5 million in PDW, for SOF Communications Equipment and Electronics, to field an additional 1,131 MBITR radios to SOF operators.

### **Multi-band multi-mission radio**

The budget request included \$69.9 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Communications Equipment and Electronics, including \$1.4 million for the multi-band multi-mission radio (MBMMR) system, but did not include sufficient funding to enable fielding of this important communications capability to deploying SOF units.

The MBMMR radio system provides voice and data capability over a variety of frequencies, and can operate in local or satellite communications modes. This radio enables SOF teams to utilize one radio to communicate with a variety of military and other organizations and replaces the variety of radios currently needed to accomplish required communications responsibilities. Continued fielding of the MBMMR radio system is one of the highest priorities of the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of \$16.5 million in PDW, for SOF Communications Equipment and Electronics, to field an additional 500 MBMMR radios to SOF teams.

#### **Joint threat warning system**

The budget request included \$16.3 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Intelligence Systems, to begin procurement of the Joint Threat Warning System (JTWS), but the amount requested will only equip a small portion of special operations forces with this much improved threat warning capability for ground, air, and maritime forces.

The JTWS is a modular, lightweight ground signals intelligence system that can be mounted on a variety of SOF delivery platforms, providing threat warning, situational awareness, and enhanced force protection for SOF elements. JTWS is an evolutionary acquisition program that builds upon previous efforts to separately acquire similar warning systems for air, ground, and maritime applications. Accelerating the procurement of this capability is one of the highest priorities of the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of \$12.0 million in PDW, for SOF Intelligence Systems, to procure additional ground, air, and maritime JTWS systems.

#### **Rucksack portable unmanned aerial vehicle**

The budget request included \$20.2 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Small Arms and Weapons, for the rucksack portable unmanned aerial vehicle (RPUAV), but did not include enough funding to fully meet the operational needs of the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM), for fiscal year 2006.

The RPUAV is a man-portable unmanned aerial vehicle system that can be transported, launched, controlled, and recovered by a single SOF operator. The RPUAV provides small SOF teams with an important reconnaissance, surveillance, and target acquisition asset, and greatly enhances their situational awareness and force protection. The RPUAV is one of the highest priorities of the Commander, SOCOM, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.3 million in PDW, for SOF, Small Arms and Weapons, to procure an additional 19 RPUAV systems to meet fiscal year 2006 requirements.

#### **Military mail screening equipment**

The budget request included \$143.8 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for the chemical/biological installation force protection program. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.2 million in PDW for the chemical/biological installation force protection program, to begin the procurement and fielding of chemical and biological agent detection and sampling equipment to establish a robust capability to screen military mail at 62 sites (three mail transfer centers, three distribution centers outside the continental United States, and 56 military post offices). This increase would also provide for augmentation of current laboratory analytical capability to provide the capacity necessary to process the increased vol-

ume of samples from the new sites. Additional analytical capability, supported by a robust quality assurance and quality control program, would maintain the current Chemical Biological Defense Program laboratory standard, which would ensure confidence in the sampling results from the additional sites.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to promptly develop and implement a plan to ensure that mail within the military mail system is safe for delivery, to include the screening of all mail in order to detect the presence of biological, chemical or radiological weapons, agents or pathogens, or explosive devices. The committee recommends authorizing additional funding for this purpose in fiscal year 2006 to ensure that resources are available to begin implementation of the plan as soon as possible.

#### **Automatic Chemical Agent Detector and Alarm**

The budget request included \$258.3 million in Procurement, Defense-Wide (PDW), for contamination avoidance equipment. The requested funding supports the procurement of chemical and biological detection, warning and reporting, and reconnaissance systems, such as the Automatic Chemical Agent Detector and Alarm (ACADA). The committee notes that a number of Active Duty Army and National Guard units are deployed worldwide in support of military operations. These units must have the best possible defense against chemical threats. The committee recommends an increase of \$16.0 million in PDW to meet procurement shortfalls in fielding ACADA systems.

### **ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST**

#### **Army multi-band inter/intra team radio system**

The committee is concerned with the limited industrial capacity to produce and deliver large quantities of hand-held, secure Type-1 multi-band inter/intra team radio systems (MBITR) required for Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. Currently, the Army has only one source for the MBITR radio. The committee believes that a second source for the acquisition of MBITR radios would address existing shortfalls, accelerate fielding, and ensure an ongoing supply of these critical systems.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to study the feasibility and the costs and benefits of providing for the participation of a second source in the production of MBITR radios. The Secretary will provide a report of this study to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2006.

#### **Cooperative engagement capability**

In the statement of managers accompanying the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105-261), the conferees directed the Secretary of the Navy to report to the congressional defense committees at least quarterly on interoperability problems among cooperative engagement capability (CEC) and other combat direction systems. The report was also to contain planned solutions.



The committee has recently received the 24th consecutive report on CEC and combat direction system interoperability. The committee is satisfied that the Navy is now well aware of the potential interoperability problems that this system was facing, and has developed plans and programs to manage the interoperability risks in the future. Therefore, the committee does not believe that the Secretary of the Navy should continue to report on the interoperability problems of CEC with combat direction systems.

#### **F/A-22 aircraft**

The budget request included \$3.2 billion in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for the procurement of 24 F/A-22 combat aircraft, and an increment of \$65.5 million in PE 27138F to procure one dedicated test aircraft, for a total of 25 F/A-22 Raptor aircraft.

The committee has been notified of the results of the dedicated initial operational test and evaluation (DIOT&E) that was conducted on the F/A-22. While the DIOT&E report determined the F/A-22 aircraft to be operationally effective in the air supremacy mission, the committee is concerned that the aircraft was determined to be not operationally suitable. One discrepancy of particular concern is the inadequate ground cooling for avionics in high temperature conditions. The committee believes this discrepancy must be corrected before the F/A-22 aircraft design could be considered stable. The committee also notes that tests to demonstrate the limited air-to-ground attack capability of the F/A-22 included in the current design were not conducted during the DIOT&E, but are scheduled for follow-on testing beginning in July 2005.

The committee notes that the situation with late delivery of F/A-22 aircraft addressed in previous years is improving, but the committee remains concerned that the program is still behind the original contract schedule.

The committee will continue to closely monitor developments with the testing and production deliveries of the F/A-22 aircraft.

#### **Intra-theater airlift**

The Department of Defense has not yet briefed the congressional defense committees on the results of the Mobility Capabilities Study (MCS). The Secretary of Defense directed that this study be accomplished to update the results of the Mobility Requirements Study for Fiscal Year 2005 (MRS-05), which was completed in fiscal year 2001. This update is required to address the new National Military Strategy. One component of the MCS is expected to be a review of intra-theater airlift capacity.

The committee believes that decisions on the modernization and recapitalization of the fleet of intra-theater airlift aircraft should be based on the results of the MCS. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than December 1, 2005, that identifies the options available to meet any identified shortfalls in intra-theater airlift capacity. Before an option to start a new program to meet any intra-theater airlift shortfall is initiated, the committee directs the Secretary to ensure that an analysis of alternatives is conducted.

### **Littoral combat ship**

The Navy recently completed construction of the experimental littoral craft and has been authorized to procure one flight 0 littoral combat ship (LCS). Funding for the second flight 0 vessel from the second contractor team is included in the fiscal year 2006 budget request. These ships were intended to provide experience upon which the Navy would base decisions on how to proceed with acquisition of flight 1 LCS vessels, now scheduled to begin in fiscal year 2008.

The original plan put forth by the Navy implied that the contracts for flight 1 vessels would be awarded competitively. The Navy now appears to be changing the acquisition approach to narrowing the selection of flight 1 proposals to a selection from between the two successful bidders for the flight 0 program. The committee understands that this could be the most convenient approach from an administrative standpoint, but is concerned that this would discourage other potential contractor teams from continuing work to mature concepts and technologies for potential implementation on later LCS vessels.

Therefore, the committee directs the Navy to report to the congressional defense committees at the same time as the submission of the fiscal year 2007 budget on its acquisition strategy for the flight 1 portion of the LCS program. That report should provide details on the testing and experimentation that the Navy intends to conduct prior to awarding the flight 1 contracts; the acquisition strategy for acquiring flight 1 vessels, including any reasons for having changed that strategy if it has changed; and the Navy's plans for transitioning technologies from other Navy research and development activities, with particular emphasis on technologies being developed in the DD(X) program that may be appropriate for applying to the LCS program.

### **Maritime prepositioning force, future**

The committee is concerned about whether the concept of sea basing is technically feasible and fiscally prudent. The committee is also concerned that the requirement for sea basing has not been refined beyond a concept of operations. The premise for the requirement for the sea base is that access to ports or bases ashore may be denied, or that sea basing will reduce vulnerabilities of large logistics bases ashore. The sea base concept is that a large ground force can be assembled at sea, delivered on the surface and the air to an area of conflict, and subsequently sustained from the sea base. The Navy is touting the centerpiece of the sea base as being the Maritime Prepositioning Force, Future (MPF(F)). The Mission Need Statement for MPF(F) was approved by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council in May 2001, yet the Department of Defense is still trying to define key performance parameters. The budget request included \$66.3 million in PE 48042N for the purpose of developing enabling technologies for MPF(F).

Enabling technologies include landing platforms, ship-to-ship cargo transfer, automated cargo handling, underway replenishment in heavy seas, and others. The committee believes it is important to ensure these technologies can actually support the movement of supplies and equipment in heavy seas, at a rate that will actually

sustain a ground force engaged in combat, before the country makes large investments in MPF(F) ships.

The Navy has made a number of proposals in this budget request. One is to build only one surface combatant and one submarine a year through the years included in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP). Another is to delay the completion of the first ship of the new class of aircraft carrier, the CVN-78, for the second time in two years. Finally, the Navy has proposed to reduce the force of active aircraft carriers from 12 to 11. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services, one witness who represented the shipbuilding industry stated that the single most important factor in controlling costs of ships was to offer program stability. Constantly changing budgets, acquisition strategies, and procurement profiles are as disruptive to maintaining cost and schedule stability as constantly changing technical requirements. The Navy's shipbuilding budget is already underfunded, and the addition of a new platform could only make the situation worse.

Section 1022(a)(1) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314) requires the Secretary of Defense to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that funding is adequate to support a 30 year shipbuilding plan, with a discussion of the necessary naval vessel force structure to meet the National Security Strategy of the United States or the most recent Quadrennial Defense Review. The Navy has submitted an interim 30 year shipbuilding plan, which does not yet appear to be endorsed by the Department, and does not appear to be fully funded in the FYDP. In written testimony before the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services, a Congressional Research Service analyst describes this plan in the following way: "The March 2005 report does not present a 30 year shipbuilding plan. Instead, it presents a 30 year projection of potential Navy force levels from which potential annual shipbuilding rates can be only partially inferred." The force structures in the Navy plan are for either 260 ships or 325 ships, both of which include MPF(F) ships, which are intended to enable the sea basing concept. While the committee recommends authorization of the budget request for \$66.3 million in PE 48042N for development of technologies for MPF(F), the committee believes that the Navy should not proceed to a shipbuilding program for MPF(F) before the requirements for MPF(F) are more refined, and that enabling technologies have demonstrated a high probability of achieving successful operations.

#### **Transmission Enterprise Program**

The committee notes that the Army has taken action to implement the Transmission Enterprise Program (TEP), an effort to stabilize U.S. combat vehicle transmission production, while continuing to meet needs driven by the Iraq war. The committee further notes that the fiscal year 2006 budget request included no funding specifically dedicated to the TEP. The committee commends the Army for its efforts to implement the program and encourages the Army to continue funding the TEP in fiscal year 2006.



## **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 2006 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 administration 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 2006**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Title II -- RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVALUATION</u>	<u>Authorization Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	9,733,824	-17,000	9,716,824
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	18,037,991	360,100	18,398,091
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	22,612,351	24,217	22,636,568
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	18,803,416	39,880	18,843,296
Operational Test & Evaluation	168,458		168,458
<b>TOTAL RDT&amp;E</b>	<b>69,356,040</b>	<b>407,197</b>	<b>69,763,237</b>

## **Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations**

### **Science and technology**

The committee notes the critical role that investments in defense science and technology (S&T) and basic research play in developing the revolutionary military capabilities of the future. These programs also train the next generation of U.S. scientists, engineers, and technology entrepreneurs who will maintain complex weapons and defense systems and who will assist in solving future national security challenges. The committee remains concerned about the overall funding level for defense science and research. The committee notes that the fiscal year 2006 budget request for S&T is below the previous year's requested level. If in any year from fiscal year 2001 to 2009 the budget request for these research programs does not increase by 2 percent over inflation, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) requires the Department of Defense to certify the impact of the S&T budget on national security and to initiate a Defense Science Board study assessing the impact of the proposed budget on defense technology and the national defense.

The committee notes that the recent National Research Council report entitled "Assessment of Department of Defense Basic Research" contained a number of findings and recommendations. The report found that "in real terms the resources provided for Department of Defense basic research have declined substantially over the past decade." The report also found that there has been a recent deemphasis on "unfettered exploration" in the basic research program, which "historically has been a critical enabler of the most important breakthroughs in military capabilities." The committee is troubled by the lack of support for real innovative work at the Department, which could have serious consequences for the development of necessary future military capabilities. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of over \$30.0 million in the Department's basic research accounts.

The committee notes that the National Research Council report also made a number of recommendations to improve the execution of the basic research program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2006, which evaluates the National Research Council recommendations to improve the Department's basic research program, and details a plan and schedule for the implementation of appropriate recommendations.

Finally, the committee has provided increases in the S&T program to support specific focus areas in fiscal year 2006, including: close to \$50.0 million for unmanned systems; approximately \$63.0 million for power technology advances; nearly \$116.0 million for force protection, transformational technologies, and training innovations; \$42.0 million in manufacturing research and process technologies; over \$105.0 million to support counterterrorism efforts; and \$68.0 million for combat casualty care and military medicine, including a targeted \$40.0 million for prevention, mitigation, and treatment of blast injuries.

**Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and  
Limitations**

**Contract for the procurement of Future Combat System  
(sec. 211)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to ensure that the Future Combat System (FCS), including all projects and equipment that are a part of the FCS program, be developed and procured through a contract under the authority of Part 15 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), relating to acquisition of items by negotiated contract (48 C.F.R. 15.000 et seq.) rather than through a contract under the authority of section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136, 10 U.S.C. 2371 note).

The committee has expressed concern regarding the Army's use of an "other transaction authority" (OTA) contract vehicle to manage the FCS program. The committee does not believe that the \$20.9 billion agreement entered between the Army and the Lead Systems Integrator for the FCS program is consistent with the language and intent of section 845 authority. Section 845 authority is intended to be used for limited prototype projects, particularly those in which the Department of Defense seeks to engage non-traditional defense contractors that may be averse to the requirements imposed by a standard Department contract.

The committee notes that the Army has announced its intent to renegotiate this contract to a FAR Part 15 contract. This provision is intended to support that decision.

**Joint field experiment on stability and support operations  
(sec. 212)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a joint field experiment focused on the transition from major combat operations to stability and support operations required to restore security, provide for immediate humanitarian needs, and begin the reconstruction activities necessary to assist a host nation in achieving self-sufficiency. The committee expects that responsibility for the conduct of the joint field experiment would be delegated to the Commander, U.S. Joint Forces Command.

Recent experience in Iraq and Afghanistan has highlighted the importance of planning and training U.S. personnel to prepare for the conduct and support of stability operations in post-conflict situations. The Defense Science Board 2004 Summer Study entitled "Transition to and from Hostilities" identified the challenges the United States will face in its future stabilization and reconstruction efforts, and offered recommendations for enhancing U.S. effectiveness across the spectrum of activities from peacetime through stabilization and reconstruction. These recommendations focused on management discipline and on building and maintaining certain fundamental capabilities, now lacking, that are critical to success in stability and support operations.

In response to recent experience and the Defense Science Board study, the Secretary is taking steps to place greater emphasis on the stability operations mission in the Department of Defense plan-



ning and guidance so that the mission is fully integrated across all Department of Defense activities. The committee commends the initiative the Secretary has taken to date and urges him to continue to give this effort a high priority, to include sufficient resources, senior-level management attention, and outreach efforts to other agencies and departments of the U.S. Government who play important roles in stability and support activities.

The committee notes the establishment within the Department of State of the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization whose mission is to lead, coordinate, and institutionalize U.S. Government civilian capacity to prevent or prepare for post-conflict situations; and to help stabilize and reconstruct societies in transition from conflict or civil strife, so these societies can reach a sustainable path toward peace, democracy, and a market economy. The committee commends the Department of Defense's active support of and cooperation with this new office in the Department of State, and urges the Department of Defense to continue to deepen its coordination with the Department of State on planning for and participating in post-conflict stability operations and reconstruction efforts.

The committee believes that a joint field experiment will provide valuable insights for the Department of Defense as it endeavors to integrate stability and support operations into mainstream military operations and doctrine. The committee is concerned, however, that the Department of Defense is only one element of stability and support activities in the post-conflict environment. The committee strongly urges the participation of other departments and agencies of the U.S. Government, as well as coalition partners, in both the conduct of the joint field experiment and the formulation of recommendations to ensure that a comprehensive U.S. Government and coalition approach to future stability and support activities is developed.

The committee directs that costs associated with the conduct of this joint field experiment shall be paid from the amount authorized to be appropriated for joint experimentation, PE63727N, in fiscal year 2006.

### **Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense**

#### **One-year extension of Comptroller General assessments of ballistic missile defense programs (sec. 221)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend until fiscal year 2007 the requirement for the Comptroller General to provide an assessment of the extent to which the Missile Defense Agency achieved the goals established for that fiscal year for each ballistic missile defense program of the Department of Defense. The provision would also modify the submittal date from February 15 to March 15 to provide additional time to complete this requirement.

#### **Fielding of Ballistic Missile Defense Capabilities (sec. 222)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the use of funds, authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2006 or 2007 for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Missile

Defense Agency, for the development and fielding of ballistic missile defense capabilities.

**Plans for test and evaluation of operational capability of the ballistic missile defense system (sec. 223)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the appropriate joint and service operational test and evaluation components of the Department of Defense, in coordination with the Missile Defense Agency, to prepare a plan to test, evaluate, and characterize the operational capability of block 2006 and subsequent blocks of the ballistic missile defense system. Each plan prepared under this provision shall be appropriate for the level of technological maturity of the block to be tested, and shall be subject to the review and approval of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E). Additionally, DOT&E shall provide a report at the conclusion of testing for each block of the ballistic missile defense system containing an assessment as to whether or not such testing was adequate to evaluate the operational capability of the block and a characterization as to the operational effectiveness, suitability, and survivability of the block capability, as appropriate for the level of technological maturity of the block to be tested.

**Subtitle D—High-Performance Defense Manufacturing Technology Research and Development**

**High performance defense manufacturing technology research and development (sec. 230)**

The committee recommends a set of provisions that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to identify advanced manufacturing processes and techniques whose utilization would result in significant productivity and efficiency gains in the defense manufacturing base. The provision would direct the Under Secretary to pursue the development of innovative manufacturing processes and advanced technologies and to facilitate the creation of extended production enterprises, which leverage information technology and innovative organizational models.

In addition, the provision would direct the Under Secretary to take appropriate actions, such as establishment of agreements with relevant Department of Defense components, including the Joint Defense Manufacturing Technology Panel, to accelerate transition of transformational processes and technologies from science and technology to the defense manufacturing base. The provision would also direct the Under Secretary to develop and implement a set of activities to continuously identify and utilize improvements in innovative manufacturing processes and to diffuse best practices to industry. This may include taking steps to identify incentives for adoption of manufacturing advances in the industrial base.

Finally, to ensure that technology efforts in industry are well coordinated with future defense technology requirements, the Under Secretary may initiate one or more technology roadmapping exercises. These roadmaps would be developed jointly with industry, and would plan the development and adoption of manufacturing processes and technologies needed for future defense capabilities.

**Subtitle E—Other Matters****Expansion of eligibility for leadership of Department of Defense Test Resource Management Center (sec. 241)**

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate the requirement that the director and the deputy director of the Defense Test Resource Management Center be selected by the Secretary of Defense from among current and former civilian and military employees of the Department of Defense. Under this provision, candidates should be chosen based on their experience with test and evaluation programs regardless of employment history with the Department.

**Technology transition (sec. 242)**

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the role of the Technology Transition Council, which was established in the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) to provide advice and assistance to the manager of the Technology Transition Initiative. The provision would stipulate the duty of the council to support the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics in the development of policies to facilitate the rapid transition of technologies from the science and technology base into acquisition programs. The Council would provide advice and support to all technology transition efforts. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense, working through the Technology Transition Council, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees outlining a strategy for technology transition and detailing the impact of internal Department of Defense processes and regulations on technology transition efforts. The report would also make recommendations for improvement of technology transition and for elimination of any identified impediments. The report shall be submitted with the fiscal year 2007 budget request.

The committee is concerned that the council has been focused on one transition program, and has not met at the principal-level frequently enough to provide advice and leadership on technology transition programs across the Department. The committee believes the council should meet at least semi-annually at the principal-level, if it is to adequately fulfill its mission.

The budget for technology transition has grown by 23 percent in the last four years. During this same time period, the Department created additional programs to rapidly field new capabilities and equipment. Test and evaluation has been accelerated to accommodate immediate needs. Taken together, these developments underscore the importance of an active, senior Technology Transition Council. Senior leadership attention should focus on ensuring success of these technology transition programs, identifying and overcoming barriers to utilization of the most innovative solutions and recommending any needed policy direction for the test and evaluation process.

**Prevention, mitigation, and treatment of blast injuries (sec. 243)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to designate a senior official as the executive agent to coordinate and manage a joint service comprehensive blast injury prevention, mitigation, and treatment program. The provision would require review and assessment of a coordinated, department-wide research effort to include: blast characterization; modeling and simulation of safe stand-off distances; “detect and defeat” capabilities; and armor design and material testing for blast, ballistic, and fire protection. The provision would also require design of a comprehensive flexible armor system and support for emerging military medical technologies, devices, and treatments specific to blast injuries.

The provision would require the executive agent to:

- (1) conduct studies of blast injury, with an emphasis on traumatic brain injury;
- (2) develop improved clinical treatment and diagnostic protocols;
- (3) develop integrated treatment approaches for service members who suffer multiple injuries from blast;
- (4) conduct three or more pilot projects to study the incidence in returning soldiers of traumatic brain injury;
- (5) develop protocols for medical tracking of members for up to five years following blast injury; and
- (6) refine and improve educational interventions for blast injury survivors and their families.

It is the committee’s intent that the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs’ Head Injury Project at Walter Reed Army Medical Center lead clinical and diagnostic services required by this provision.

The provision would also require: (1) the establishment of a training program for medical and non-medical personnel on the prevention, mitigation, and treatment of blast injuries intended to improve field and clinical training on early identification of blast injury; and (2) the expansion of treatment programs, including those at the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs’ Brain Injury Center, intended to enhance the evaluation and care of members of the Armed Forces with consequence of blast injury, especially traumatic brain injury.

The provision would further require the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2007. The report would include: (1) a description of Department of Defense activities and efforts to improve the prevention, mitigation, and treatment of blast injuries; (2) a consolidated budget presentation on these programs; (3) a description of capability gaps in addressing blast injuries; (4) an explanation of collaborative work with other agencies, departments, and governments; (5) a description of efforts to disseminate blast injury research and treatment efforts; and (6) an update on the development status of comprehensive personnel protection systems.

The committee notes the change in historical patterns of wounding in the global war on terrorism due to the proliferation of blast weapons. High velocity gun shot wounds, once the predominant

cause of military casualties, represent less than 10 percent of wounds today. Advances in military medicine, protective equipment, and highly successful training efforts have led to the highest survival rates in military history, making treatment and care, especially for new or poorly understood injuries, important.

Over one-third of all U.S. injuries in Operation Iraqi Freedom and close to half of fatalities are the result of blasts. Multiple site injuries from blasts are common. Over 60 percent of head and neck injuries are the result of blasts. The committee believes it is time to focus attention and resources on a coordinated approach to addressing the blast threat from the beginning—pre-detonation defeat—through the end—full understanding of blast injuries and appropriate diagnosis, treatment, and care.

The committee recommends an increase of over \$40.0 million in targeted research, development, test and evaluation program elements for accelerated work specific to confronting blast injury prevention, mitigation, and treatment challenges. The committee also recommends an increase of \$20.0 million in the Defense Health Program to facilitate expansion of clinical trials, treatments, and studies required by this provision.

### **Additional Matters of Interest**

#### **Army**

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
			<b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVALUATION, ARMY</b>			
2040	0601101A	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	20,542		20,542
2040	0601102A	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	137,898	17,500	155,398
			Advanced ground vehicle reliability research		[1,000]	
			Functionally integrated reactive surface technologies (FIRST)		[2,000]	
			Integrated desert terrain analysis research		[3,000]	
			Brain imaging deception detection		[2,500]	
			Moldable fabric armor		[2,000]	
			Low temperature vehicle research		[2,000]	
			Document exploitation		[5,000]	
2040	0601103A	3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	67,201		67,201
2040	0601104A	4	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	81,953	6,500	88,453
			Integrated systems in sensing, imaging and communications		[2,000]	
			NOLES composite materials		[2,500]	
			Strategic defense systems manufacturing		[2,000]	
2040	0601105A	5	FORCE HEALTH PROTECTION			
2040	0602105A	6	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	17,559	5,000	22,559
			Mine detection and blast mitigation		[3,000]	
			Lightweight blast containment vessel		[2,000]	
2040	0602120A	7	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	32,147	5,000	37,147
			Army small airship		[3,000]	
			Advanced detection of explosives		[2,000]	
2040	0602122A	8	TRACTOR HIP	7,804		7,804
2040	0602211A	9	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	34,295		34,295

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2040	0602270A	10	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	19,129	4,000	23,129
			Real-time laser threat warning development		[4,000]	
2040	0602303A	11	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	62,524	10,000	72,524
			Tech enhancement for area protection		[5,000]	
			Unmanned systems initiative		[5,000]	
2040	0602307A	12	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	21,139		21,139
2040	0602308A	13	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	16,013	3,000	19,013
			Surveillance and targeting robotics platform (Red Owl)		[3,000]	
2040	0602601A	14	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	64,883	9,500	74,383
			Advanced electric drive		[3,500]	
			Defense transportation energy research		[3,000]	
			Unmanned vehicle control technologies		[3,000]	
2040	0602618A	15	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	49,163	2,000	51,163
			Gun barrel coatings		[2,000]	
2040	0602622A	16	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	2,519		2,519
2040	0602623A	17	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,703		5,703
2040	0602624A	18	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	37,824	8,000	45,824
			Active coatings technology		[3,500]	
			Ultra wideband sensors		[2,000]	
			Rarefaction wave gun		[2,500]	

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2040	0602705A	19	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	39,554	12,000	51,554
			Flexible display initiative		[4,000]	
			Portable solid oxide fuel cell demonstrator		[2,000]	
			Hybrid advanced soldier power		[3,000]	
			Zinc air battery research		[3,000]	
2040	0602709A	20	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	23,823		23,823
2040	0602712A	21	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	19,293		19,293
2040	0602716A	22	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	17,482		17,482
2040	0602720A	23	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	16,417		16,417
2040	0602782A	24	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	21,787	2,000	23,787
			Ultra wideband chip set		[2,000]	
2040	0602783A	25	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	3,590		3,590
2040	0602784A	26	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	47,046		47,046
2040	0602785A	27	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	15,207		15,207
2040	0602786A	28	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	21,707	2,500	24,207
			Biosecurity research for food safety		[2,500]	



**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2040	0602787A	29	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	74,694	17,800	92,494
			Bio-foam sealant protein hydrogel		[2,600]	
			Non-limiting silver dressing		[1,200]	
			Armor characterization for blast, ballistic and fire protection		[3,000]	
			Hemorrhage control dressing		[2,000]	
			Warfighter face and eye protection		[1,000]	
			Surgical safety system		[2,000]	
			Bio-defense gene knockout technology		[2,000]	
			Colorimetric biosensor		[3,000]	
			Post traumatic stress disorder research		[1,000]	
2040	0603001A	30	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	63,754		63,754
2040	0603002A	31	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	45,160		75,560
			Untethered health care program		30,400	
			Expanded diagnosis digital imaging		[1,000]	
			Wireless medical network		[2,000]	
			Tissue engineering development on elastin biomaterials		[1,400]	
			Acute care of blast effects and head injuries		[3,000]	
			Soldier treatment and regeneration		[4,000]	
			Recombinant activated factor VII		[2,000]	
			Composite face and eye protection		[3,000]	
			Fibrogen bandage development		[1,000]	
			Applied emergency hypothermia research		[3,000]	
			Human operator performance research		[2,000]	
			Surgical wound disinfection and biological agents		[3,000]	
			Alternative vaccine delivery methods		[2,000]	
					[3,000]	

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2040	0603003A	32	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	48,318	15,400	63,718
			Excalibur UAV		[7,900]	
			Rotorcraft system monitoring		[1,500]	
			Universal control - FADEC		[4,000]	
			Reconfigurable tooling systems		[2,000]	
2040	0603004A	33	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	74,927	9,000	83,927
			Nanotechnology manufacturing		[3,000]	
			Mid-range munitions		[6,000]	
2040	0603005A	34	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOG	142,866	29,000	171,866
			Abrams track improvement		[3,000]	
			Power electronic systems research		[2,000]	
			Hydraulic hybrid vehicle technology		[5,000]	
			Advanced thermal management controls		[4,000]	
			Solid oxide fuel cell materials and manufacturing		[3,000]	
			Fastening and joining research		[2,000]	
			Next generation non-tactical vehicle propulsion		[2,000]	
			Armored composite cab development program		[3,000]	
			Antiballistic windshield armor		[3,000]	
			Non-line of sight cannon		[2,000]	
2040	0603006A	35	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNC	12,066		12,066
2040	0603007A	36	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOL	6,783	3,000	9,783
			Coordinated training		[3,000]	
2040	0603008A	37	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	45,322		45,322
2040	0603009A	38	TRACTOR HIKE	8,777		8,777

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2040	0603015A	39	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS Automated virtual environment ICT joint fires and effects trainer	19,982	7,000 [3,500] [3,500]	26,982
2040	0603020A	40	TRACTOR ROSE	4,956		4,956
2040	0603103A	41	EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY Explosive demilitarization	9,865	1,000 [1,000]	10,865
2040	0603105A	42	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	6,842		6,842
2040	0603125A	43	COMBATING TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT Advanced mobile microgrid liquid fueler	6,306	4,000 [4,000]	10,306
2040	0603238A	44	GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE/AIR DEFENSE/PRECISION STRIKE TECH	12,111		12,111
2040	0603270A	45	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	16,801		16,801
2040	0603313A	46	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY Stryker active protection system demonstration	70,066	12,000 [12,000]	82,066
2040	0603322A	47	TRACTOR CAGE	15,406		15,406
2040	0603606A	48	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,327		25,327
2040	0603607A	49	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	6,581		6,581
2040	0603654A	50	LINE-OF-SIGHT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION			
2040	0603710A	51	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	51,761		51,761
2040	0603728A	52	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	12,606		12,606
2040	0603734A	53	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY Advanced structures and composites	7,301	3,000 [3,000]	10,301
2040	0603772A	54	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECH	42,475		42,475
2040	0603024A	55	UNIQUE ITEM IDENTIFICATION (UID)	1,500		1,500

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2040	0603305A	56	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION(NON SPACE)	14,573	10,000	24,573
			Army command and control visualization system		[3,000]	
			Army MD interactive M&S management cap		[2,000]	
			Next generation interceptor materials		[5,000]	
2040	0603308A	57	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (SPACE)	9,284	5,000	14,284
			Sensor and communications platform		[5,000]	
2040	0603327A	58	AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	83,063	4,000	87,063
			ASMD architecture analysis program		[2,000]	
			Single integrated space picture			
2040	0603619A	59	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV			5,733
2040	0603627A	60	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV	5,733		
2040	0603639A	61	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION			26,712
2040	0603653A	62	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	26,712		3,393
2040	0603747A	63	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	3,393		18,907
2040	0603766A	64	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV	18,907		6,885
2040	0603774A	65	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	6,885		11,366
2040	0603779A	66	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	5,166	6,200	
			Casting emissions reduction program		[6,200]	
2040	0603782A	67	WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL	131,081		131,081
2040	0603790A	68	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,902		4,902
2040	0603801A	69	AVIATION - ADV DEV	6,249		6,249
2040	0603802A	70	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ADV DEV			
2040	0603804A	71	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV	13,375		13,375
2040	0603805A	72	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION A	10,659		10,659

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2040	0603807A	73	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV Extended shelf life red blood cells IV fluid warming system Lightweight portable oxygen	10,134	4,500 [1,000] [1,000] [2,500]	14,634
2040	0603827A	74	SOLDIER SYSTEMS - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT			10,595
2040	0603850A	75	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (JMIP)			2,762
2040	0603856A	76	SCAMP BLOCK II			
2040	0603869A	77	MEDIUM EXTENDED AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM (MEADS) CONCEPTS			
2040	0604201A	78	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	23,451		23,451
2040	0604220A	79	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE OH-58D	13,964		13,964
2040	0604223A	80	COMANCHE			
2040	0604270A	81	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	32,179		32,179
2040	0604280A	82	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO JTRS program execution	156,665	-39,400 [-39,400]	117,265
2040	0604321A	83	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	7,973		7,973
2040	0604328A	84	TRACTOR CAGE	16,099		16,099
2040	0604329A	85	COMMON MISSILE			
2040	0604601A	86	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	34,627		34,627
2040	0604604A	87	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	1,886		1,886
2040	0604609A	88	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-SDD			
2040	0604611A	89	JAVELIN			
2040	0604622A	90	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES Future tactical truck system advanced concept technology demo	3,415	10,000 [10,000]	13,415
2040	0604633A	91	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	4,508		4,508

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
2040	0604642A	92	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES HMMWV bloc improvement program		5,000 [5,000]	5,000
2040	0604645A	93	ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-SDD	3,065,629		3,065,629
2040	0604646A	94	NON-LINE OF SIGHT LAUNCH SYSTEM	231,554		231,554
2041	0604647A	95	NON-LINE OF SIGHT CANNON	107,587		107,587
2040	0604710A	96	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - SDD	26,449		26,449
2040	0604713A	97	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	3,383		3,383
2040	0604715A	98	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - SDD	61,090		61,090
2040	0604716A	99	TERRAIN INFORMATION - SDD			
2040	0604726A	100	INTEGRATED METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT SYSTEM			
2040	0604741A	101	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - SDD	29,012		29,012
2040	0604742A	102	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	40,572		40,572
2040	0604746A	103	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	54		54
2040	0604760A	104	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - SDD	22,057		22,057
2040	0604766A	105	TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS - SDD			
2040	0604768A	106	ARMY TACTICAL MISSILE SYSTEM (ATACMS)			
2040	0604770A	107	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTAF)			
2040	0604778A	108	POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (SPACE)			
2040	0604780A	109	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	37,471		37,471
2040	0604783A	110	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	5,092		5,092
2040	0604801A	111	AVIATION - SDD			
2040	0604802A	112	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - SDD	87,034		87,034
2040	0604804A	113	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - SDD	13,353		13,353

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
2040	0604805A	114	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - SDD	393,062	-268,900	124,162
			JTRS program execution		[-268,900]	
2040	0604807A	115	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPME	5,627		5,627
2040	0604808A	116	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - SDD	80,560		80,560
2040	0604814A	117	ARTILLERY MUNITIONS	113,368		113,368
2040	0604817A	118	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	2,973		2,973
2040	0604818A	119	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTW	66,980		66,980
2040	0604819A	120	LOSAT			
2040	0604820A	121	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	5,080		5,080
2040	0604822A	122	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS)	71,119		71,119
2040	0604823A	123	FIREFINDER	46,061		46,061
2040	0604827A	124	SOLDIER SYSTEMS - WARRIOR DEM/VAL	57,818		57,818
2040	0604854A	125	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS	5,476		5,476
2040	0604865A	126	PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION			
2040	0604869A	127	PATRIOT/MEADS COMBINED AGGREGATE PROGRAM (CAP)	288,785	1,000	289,785
			Patriot/MEADS protected sim and test link		[1,000]	
2040	0605013A	128	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	63,662		63,662
2040	0604256A	129	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	23,796		23,796
2040	0604258A	130	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	10,855	3,000	13,855
			UAV ice protection		[3,000]	
2040	0604759A	131	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	64,498		64,498
2040	0605103A	132	RAND ARROYO CENTER	23,800		23,800
2040	0605301A	133	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	154,535		154,535
2040	0605326A	134	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	31,653		31,653

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
2040	0605502A	135	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	369,943		369,943
2040	0605601A	136	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	62,687		62,687
2040	0605602A	137	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	38,306		38,306
2040	0605604A	138	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	17,688		17,688
2040	0605605A	139	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	2,748		2,748
2040	0605606A	140	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	8,829		8,829
2040	0605702A	141	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	15,517		15,517
2040	0605706A	142	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	4,710		4,710
2040	0605709A	143	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	75,993		75,993
2040	0605712A	144	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	57,305		57,305
2040	0605716A	145	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	9,437		9,437
2040	0605718A	146	SIMULATION & MODELING FOR ACQ, RQTS, & TNG (SMART)	54,269		54,269
2040	0605801A	147	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	32,237	6,000	38,237
2040	0605803A	148	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES		[6,000]	
			High performance computing research			
2040	0605805A	149	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	16,922		16,922
2040	0605857A	150	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	4,014		4,014
2040	0605898A	151	MANAGEMENT HQ - R&D	12,908		12,908
2040	0603778A	152	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	114,297		114,297
2040	0102419A	153	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	106,420		106,420
2040	0203610A	154	DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS AGAINST WMD			
2040	0203726A	155	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	16,064		16,064
2040	0203735A	156	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	12,030		12,030
2040	0203740A	157	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	44,903		44,903



# **Title II-RDT and E** (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
2040	0203744A	158	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	409,103		409,103
2040	0203752A	159	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	2,066		2,066
2040	0203758A	160	DIGITIZATION	12,343		12,343
2040	0203759A	161	FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2)	20,201		20,201
2040	0203801A	162	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	16,188		16,188
2040	0203802A	163	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	23,560		23,560
2040	0203806A	164	TRACTOR RUT			
2040	0203808A	165	TRACTOR CARD	6,797		6,797
2040	0208010A	166	JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRL-TAC)	24,906		24,906
2040	0208053A	167	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	12,854		12,854
2040	0208058A	168	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	3,261		3,261
2040	0301359A	169	SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
2040	0301555A	170	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]		[ ]
2040	0301556A	171	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
2040	0303028A	172	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	2,992		2,992
2040	0303140A	173	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	22,903	1,000	23,903
			Retinal/iris multimodal biometrics		[1,000]	
2040	0303141A	174	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	79,752		79,752
2040	0303142A	175	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	58,659		58,659
2040	0303150A	176	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	13,647		13,647
2040	0303158A	177	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	1,696		1,696
2040	0305114A	178	TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEM			
2040	0305204A	179	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES (JMIP)	139,610		139,610
2040	0305206A	180	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS (JMIP)	5,398		5,398

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
2040	0305208A	181	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS (JMIP)	91,587		91,587
2040	0702239A	182	AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	994		994
2040	0708045A	183	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	68,505	17,000	85,505
			Advanced modeling technology for titanium machining		[4,500]	
			Manufacturing systems demonstration		[4,000]	
			Super-pulse laser processing technology		[3,500]	
			Packaging and interconnection technology		[3,000]	
			Virtual parts engineering research		[2,000]	
2040	1001018A	184	NATO JOINT STARS	569		569
2040	XXXXXXXX	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,966		3,966
<b>Total, RDT&amp;E Army</b>				<b>9,733,824</b>	<b>-17,000</b>	<b>9,716,824</b>

**Army basic research**

The budget request included \$137.9 million in PE 61102A, for defense research sciences. The committee is concerned with the long term viability of the defense research program, especially those efforts geared at developing innovative solutions to address emerging and future challenges. Ongoing work in the areas of materials and composites for flexible armor, neuroscience, textiles with embedded sensors, efficient vehicle operations, and basic terrain analysis modeling and simulation are a few of the many research examples that contribute to meeting the needs of the warfighter. The committee recommends an increase of \$12.5 million in PE 61102A for expansion of Army basic science, including \$2.5 million for research in brain imaging deception detection; \$2.0 million for moldable fabric armor to increase force protection options; \$2.0 million for functionally integrated reactive surface technologies to develop protective, intelligent, and adaptive textiles; \$2.0 million to enable transition of low temperature vehicle research; \$3.0 million for desert terrain analysis research; and \$1.0 million for advanced ground vehicle reliability research.

**Document exploitation**

The budget request included no funding for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army, for Security Defense Research Sciences, in PE 61102A, for development of advanced document exploitation equipment.

Portable, rugged document exploitation equipment is currently not widely available to military personnel operating in deployed, austere environments. The technology exists to develop lightweight equipment that can scan documents, quickly search for important information in native languages, and transmit potentially valuable documents back to exploitation facilities quickly, thus providing battlefield commanders with rapid exploitation of captured information. Recent experiences in Afghanistan and Iraq have demonstrated the value of such capabilities and the requirement for additional, improved capabilities.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 61102A, to continue development, product improvement, and fielding of portable document exploitation systems.

**Army university research**

The budget request included \$82.0 million in PE 61104A, for university and industry research centers. Significant advances in materials technologies, materials processing, and secure communications require continued fundamental research to serve as the building blocks for Army future combat systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.5 million in PE 61104A for university research, including \$2.0 million for strategic defense systems manufacturing technology basic research; \$2.5 million for expanded continuation of the nanotubes optimized for lightweight exceptional strength composite project; \$2.0 million for integrated systems in sensing, imaging, and communications research to provide secure optical connections.

### **Advanced mine detection and blast mitigation**

The budget request included \$17.6 million in PE 62105A, for materials technology. Army materials research efforts in blast resistant structures, composites, and the equipment to test them contribute to immediate and long term force protection needs. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 62105A for expansion of promising materials technology research, including \$3.0 million for advanced mine detection and blast mitigation and \$2.0 million for lightweight blast containment vessel development, improved computational simulation capabilities, and early testing of optimized vessel designs.

### **Army small airship**

The budget request included \$32.1 million in PE 62120A, for sensors and electronic survivability. Asymmetric threats and unpredictable battlefields increase the importance of sensors in spotting and preventing hostile action and in targeting assets. An adaptive, modular, autonomous vehicle capable of operating in a variety of environments and performing various functions during a single mission should provide the warfighter with an important stand off tool.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 62120A to provide focused attention on solving some of the technical challenges involved in autonomous control, adaptability between tethered and untethered flight, and load exchange for a small airship surveillance system.

### **Detection and neutralization of improved explosive devices**

The budget request included \$32.1 million in PE 62120A, for sensors and electronics survivability and \$49.5 million in PE 62782N, for mine and expeditionary warfare applied research. The Department of Defense is pursuing a broad short and long term research effort to confront the threat posed by improvised explosive devices (IEDs). Substantial achievements made in the areas of sensors, jammers, and pre detonation devices support current operations. As efforts continue to move solutions to the field as quickly as possible, an additional avenue of exploration is underway to invent more comprehensive tools for IED neutralization. Many IEDs are remotely initiated using inexpensive commercial electronics. These control mechanisms may all be subject to a low level of electricity leakage, which could be detected at a considerable distance with special equipment.

The committee supports the Department's efforts to explore alternative and imaginative approaches to combating the IED threat in the long-term. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62120A to accelerate development of an innovative remote sensor monitoring technology designed to lead to a mobile test bed for advanced stand-off detection of explosives. The committee further recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 62782N for development of a field prototype detection and neutralization device.

### **Real-time laser threat warning development**

The budget request included \$19.1 million in PE 62270A, for electronic warfare technology. The Army supports key goals in the area of battlespace survivability and acquisition of enemy targets under this account. The ability to detect heat seeking missiles and those guided by lasers with real-time location of the laser source and identification of the source characteristics would enhance missile countermeasure efforts. The committee recommends an increase in PE 62270A of \$4.0 million to continue development of a prototype to field test a high performance, low cost laser threat warning and missile countermeasure system utilizing MEMS-based beam steering technology.

### **Army unmanned systems initiative**

The budget request included \$62.5 million in PE 62303A, for missile technology. As use of unmanned aerial vehicles increases, integration tools, testing processes, and training procedures must keep pace. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 62303A for an unmanned systems initiative and expanded testing of unmanned vehicles and teams of vehicles during long, autonomous flights. The program would also develop airspace management procedures for vehicles with different payloads, and would provide joint training for control of vehicle weapons assignments and on the use of communication protocols.

### **Technology enhancement for area protection**

The budget request included \$62.5 million in PE 62303A for missile technology. The committee is aware that the Army has identified the enhanced area air defense system (EAADS) as the key element in defending against rockets, artillery and mortars, as well as unmanned aerial vehicles and cruise missiles. While the Army continues to develop radar elements to support EAADS, the committee is aware of the need to evolve the systems integration tools and technologies necessary to operate a comprehensive battlefield system to address the threat.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 62303A for the enhanced area protection and survivability science and technology program to develop technologies to be integrated into force protection systems to support EAADS requirements, as well as near-term force protection for Operation Iraqi Freedom.

### **Multifunctional robot platform**

The budget request included \$16.0 million in PE 62308A, for advanced concepts and simulations. Various robotic platforms with force protection applications under development by the Army show promise in addressing sniper, mortar, and rocket propelled grenade threats. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 62308A for rapid integration of optical technology and advanced acoustic detection and direction finding hardware into the robot enhanced detection outpost with lasers platform (RedOwl).

### **Combat vehicle and automotive technology**

The budget request included \$64.9 million in PE 62601A, for combat vehicle and automotive technology. Component technologies

explored under this account support the Army's current and future combat and tactical vehicle fleets. Present engine systems fail to provide adequate measurement and data retrieval necessary to increase engine efficiency, resulting in faster fuel burn rates.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million in PE 62601A for development of advanced electric drives designed to result in easily replaceable, quiet, robust engines with greater power density and torque.

The committee further recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in PE 62601A to address the needs of the Department of Defense for alternative fuels and fundamental research on robotic ground vehicles. Specifically, the committee recommends increases of \$3.0 million for a defense transportation energy research project focused on military use of advanced fuels; and \$3.0 million for unmanned vehicle control technologies to increase control, vision, and navigation systems in robotic ground vehicles.

#### **Gun barrel coatings**

The budget request included \$49.2 million in PE 62618A, for ballistics technology. Gun barrel wear accounts for nearly 80 percent of annual armament costs. Hard ceramic coatings such as titanium nitride could increase the wear and the life of such armaments by as much as five to eight times over current processes, with a projected proportionate reduction in armament costs. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62618A for the development of hard, wear-resistant coatings for the inside surfaces of gun barrels.

#### **Active coatings technology**

The budget request included \$37.8 million in PE 62624A, for weapons and munitions technology. Selected research in the areas of advanced, adaptable armor and coatings to protect personnel and equipment from ballistic and blast threats is approaching the testing phase. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million in PE 62624A for research and development of longer lasting, cost-effective coatings that adapt to conditions in real-time.

#### **Sonic rarefaction wave gun technology**

The budget request included \$37.8 million in PE 62624A, for weapons and munitions technology. The Army's plan to acquire lighter, faster, more expeditionary vehicles affects requirements for vehicle-mounted weapons systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million in PE 62624A for the rarefaction wave gun. This gun shows potential for 50 percent weight and heat reductions and 75 percent reduced recoil while at the same time maintaining current muzzle energy.

#### **Ultra wideband sensors**

The budget request included \$37.8 million in PE 62624A, for weapons and munitions technology. Today's military faces battlefields in neighborhoods, small towns, and cities as often as in open deserts, forests, or jungles. Advanced sensors and imaging resolution combined with unmanned platforms make possible extended visibility and situational awareness. One current challenge to

achieving full battlespace awareness involves through-the-wall sight. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62624A for advanced research on a hand-portable through-wall radar system.

#### **Army man-portable power**

The budget request included \$39.6 million in PE 62705A, for electronics and electronic devices. The Army needs battery systems to deliver reliable, lightweight, constant and, when needed, high surge power, especially for the dismounted soldier. The zinc air battery system has the potential to provide at least twice the energy density as other battery systems and up to 4 times or more the high discharge or constant power rate as common battery systems.

The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million in PE 62705A for accelerated advances in man-portable power, including \$3.0 million to develop prototype designs for the zinc air battery; \$2.0 million for a portable solid oxide fuel cell power generation demonstrator capable of using JP-8 fuel; and \$3.0 million for a hybrid advanced soldier power system that, when coupled with device-specific adapters, would power existing and legacy gear for 72-hour autonomous missions.

#### **Flexible Display Initiative**

The budget request includes \$39.6 million in PE 62705A, for electronics and electronic devices, including \$5.0 million, for the Flexible Display Center. Equipment, materials, and technology on flexible displays and microelectronics facilitate creation of next generation communication products, which are key to the Army's transformation efforts. The Army's planned funding for flexible display research is insufficient for the manufacturing capability necessary to support the Army's stated goals for displays and does not include a tools and materials component. The competitively bid, peer-reviewed Flexible Display Initiative achieves a 62 percent industry cost share in leveraging the Army's research funding. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 62705A for the Flexible Display Initiative to undertake additional materials and manufacturing technology projects aimed at ensuring the Army meets flexible display goals in a timely manner.

#### **Ultra wideband chipset**

The budget request included \$21.8 million in PE 62782A, for command, control, and communications technology. The Army invested in ultra wideband radio technology with the potential to provide extremely covert communications platforms, situational awareness, and through-wall and ground penetrating radar. The developed technology, which is compatible with, but not dependent on current and future communication systems, requires transition funds for integration and pre-production prototyping. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62782A for transition of the ultra wideband radio frequency chipset to meet Army power consumption, range, and bit rate requirements.

### **Biosecurity research for food safety**

The budget request included \$21.7 million in PE 62786A, for warfighter technology, but no funding for food security and safety monitoring capabilities. The Army must protect the U.S. military's food supply and associated supply chain infrastructures. Technologies to rapidly and reliably detect food contaminants would positively impact soldier health, performance, and effectiveness. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million in PE 62786A for development of methods and equipment to detect real-time biohazards in the food supply.

### **Army medicine for mitigation and treatment of blast injuries**

The budget request included \$74.7 million in PE 62787A, for medical technology and \$45.2 million in PE 63002A, for medical advanced technology. Care for uniformed personnel, including adaptation to changing wound patterns and long-term quality of life for injured combat veterans, are key priorities for the committee and are the focus of a Blast Injury Prevention, Mitigation, and Treatment Initiative under section 243 of this Act.

The committee recommends a series of increases in PE 62787A and PE 63002A to advance emerging, life saving medical technologies and to accelerate testing, trials, and production of new devices and treatments. Specifically, the committee recommends project increases in PE 62787A totaling \$9.8 million and in PE 63002A totaling \$18.0 million for the following projects.

Under PE 62787A, the committee recommends:

- (1) \$2.6 million for a biofoam bleeding sealant for battlefield trauma for further development of existing protein hydrogel technology and acceleration of approval to field the product to forward surgical teams;
- (2) \$1.2 million for non-linting silver antimicrobial wound dressing technology that would combine infection protection and fluid transport over a period of days for use in forward locations or in the event that medical care is not readily available;
- (3) \$2.0 million for the hemorrhage control (Chitosan) dressing, to support an Army unfunded need to conduct research on internal application of the bandage;
- (4) \$1.0 million for warfighter face and eye injury protection and a two-year accelerated development process to test performance of a new composite face shield; and
- (5) \$3.0 million to augment Army work in characterization of armor for blast, ballistic, and fire protection.

Under PE 63002A, the committee recommends:

- (1) \$3.0 million for advanced tissue engineering techniques to rapidly deploy replacement blood vessels and other tissues, which have been demonstrated to form new cell layers in a matter of hours, compared to days or weeks under current treatments;
- (2) \$2.0 million for advances in solid treatment regeneration and the science of regenerative medicine to explore novel approaches to restoration of biological function after injury and the science of tissue engineering, cellular therapies, bio-sur-



gery, and artificial and bio-hybrid organ devices to reduce mortality and morbidity from battlefield injuries;

(3) \$4.0 million for acute care of blast effects and head injuries including a focused effort on research and data collection specific to blast injuries involving concussions and persistent symptoms;

(4) \$3.0 million for accelerated research and approval of forward use of recombinant activated factor VII by medics at the point of injury to greatly increase survival times prior to surgery;

(5) \$1.0 million for the advanced development of the composite warfighter face and eye protection;

(6) \$2.0 million for applied emergency hypothermia research to support innovative suspended animation and delayed resuscitation treatment directed at saving those severely injured in combat; and

(7) \$3.0 million for continued development of the fibrogen bandage.

#### **Bio-defense detection and treatment**

The budget request included \$74.7 million in PE 62787A, for medical technology and \$45.2 million in PE 63003A, for medical advanced technology. The Army needs easy-to-use devices to reliably detect the presence of bio-warfare agents. Upon detection and identification, the Army also requires new medicines to protect military personnel from biological agents. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 62787A for accelerated research and development of a colorimetric biosensor device that would provide deployed units with a rapid, one-step, disposable bacterial pathogen detector.

The committee further recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62787A for enhanced research on a bio-defense gene knockout technology designed to enable treatment and prevention regimes against bio-warfare agents. The proposed technology would improve current, single-agent defenses and would counter agents possessing drug resistant or other bio-engineered features.

Finally, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63002A for bio-defense medical technologies; \$3.0 million for expansion of research to apply alternative vaccine delivery technologies to combination treatments against anthrax, plague, toxic shock, and botulism; and \$2.0 million for continued research and timely clinical trials on the surgical wound disinfection and biological agents project.

#### **Posttraumatic stress disorder diagnostic tools**

The budget request included \$74.7 million in PE 62787A, for medical technology. Accurate and timely diagnosis of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) supports recovery and a higher quality of life for combat veterans. Additional basic research, early clinical trials, and development of predictive tools lead to accurate identification of PTSD conditions and would assist medical personnel in distinguishing posttraumatic stress from traumatic brain injuries. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in PE 62787A for PTSD research.

### **Surgical safety system**

The budget request included \$74.7 million in PE 62787A, for medical technology. One of many areas of exploration for improved combat medical care involves advanced information technologies for remote monitoring and improved patient management in deployed surgical environments. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62787A for the surgical safety system to support goals of the Army's Operating Room of the Future concept.

### **Human operator performance research**

The budget request included \$45.2 million in PE 63003A, for medical advanced technology. Soldiers confront numerous risk factors and toxic agents present in military environments. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63003A for a program to assess, develop, and advance computer-based testing technologies. The resulting diagnostic capabilities would determine human reactions to proposed toxic agent treatments and countermeasures.

### **Wireless and digital medical improvements**

The budget request included \$45.2 million in PE 63002A, for medical advanced technology, but no funding for acceleration of wireless capabilities and records digitization. The use of wireless networks and computerized medical files reduces time spent by military medical personnel in processing, accessing, and updating medical records. Development of a wireless, adaptable network would accelerate accurate and efficient patient care, reduce errors, and facilitate transfer of medical records.

The committee recommends an increase in PE 63002A of \$1.4 million for a pilot program to implement use of wireless medical records at Walter Reed Medical Center. The committee further recommends increases of \$1.0 million in PE 63002A for the untethered healthcare project and development of technologies to facilitate remote triage and improve casualty status and assessment and \$2.0 million for expanded diagnosis through digital imaging recognition. This research will produce digitally accessible files to help attending physicians accelerate the diagnosis and treatment of service members in-theater and in medical care facilities.

### **Reconfigurable tooling systems**

The budget request included \$48.3 million in PE 63003A, for advanced aviation technology. Many Army aircraft and unmanned aerial vehicles contain components composed of fiber-reinforced materials. When these parts require repair, delays in maintenance and availability of replacements adversely affect readiness. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63003A for completion of a portable, reconfigurable tooling system capable of creating the specific repair tools and aviation composite materials at the maintenance site.

### **Rotorcraft system monitoring**

The budget request included \$48.3 million in PE 63003A, for aviation advanced technology. Helicopters play an important role in support, relief, and combat missions throughout the world. Timely

improvement of maintenance techniques, procedures, and automatic optimized digital engine controls are critical to supporting the increased use of and reliance on these platforms. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.5 million in PE 63003A, including \$1.5 million for integrated rotorcraft system monitoring and \$4.0 million for the universal control-full authority digital engine control project.

#### **Unmanned tactical combat vehicles**

The budget request included \$48.2 million in PE 63003A, for aviation advanced technology and \$82.5 million in PE 63114N, for power projection advanced technology, but no funding for a prototype unmanned combat aerial vehicle designed specifically for emergency rapid response. The committee is aware of the near-term requirement for a cost-effective, survivable, tactical unmanned combat aerial vehicle (UCAV) capable of reaching conflict areas in a timely manner, engaging and destroying targets of opportunity, providing overhead coverage at trouble spots, such as roadside ambushes, and operating without runways or launch mechanisms. The committee recommends an increase in PE 63003A of \$7.9 million and in PE 63114N of \$1.0 million to address this requirement through construction of two proof of principle Excalibur demonstrators.

#### **Mid-range munition**

The budget request included \$74.9 million in PE 63004A, for weapons and munitions advanced technology, including \$10.0 million for the mid-range munition. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in PE 63004A to accelerate development of the mid-range munition to meet targeted prototyping, demonstration, and fielding time frames.

#### **Nanotechnology manufacturing**

The budget request included \$74.9 million in PE 63004A, for weapons and munitions advanced technology. Research efforts to produce composite structures and new materials constructed from the nano-scale for weapons, munitions, and fire control applications will require unique, efficient manufacturing processes. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63004A for nanotechnology manufacturing.

#### **Abrams track improvement**

The budget request included \$142.9 million in PE 63005A, for combat vehicle and automotive advanced technology. The Army strives to reduce life cycle costs and maintenance requirements while increasing reliability for mission critical hardware such as the Abrams tank, even as operations in current theaters tax mechanical limits. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63005A for production and qualification testing of a new Abrams track, which could reduce life cycle costs by 20 percent while increasing reliability, availability, and maintainability of the component and the equipment.

**Combat vehicle advanced development**

The budget request included \$142.9 million in PE 63005A, for combat vehicle and automotive advanced technology. The committee recommends an increase of \$26.0 million in PE 63005A for the expanded development of automotive technologies in support of Army transformation goals for a lighter, more lethal force with heightened security and survivability. Specifically, the committee recommends increases of: \$4.0 million for advanced thermal management; \$2.0 million for a collaborative approach to a non-line-of-sight cannon and mortar; \$3.0 million for a composite armored cab; \$2.0 million for fastening and joining research; \$2.0 million for power electronic systems research; \$5.0 million for hydraulic hybrid vehicle technology; \$2.0 million for next generation nontactical vehicle propulsion; \$3.0 million for solid oxide fuel cell materials and manufacturing; and \$3.0 million for an anti-ballistic windshield armor designed for rapid installation, better operator visibility, and higher levels of projectile protection.

**Coordinated training**

The budget request included \$6.8 million in PE 63007A, for manpower, personnel, and training advanced technology. The Army is working to ensure that the “human component” of warfighting keeps pace with the transformation in systems, weapons, equipment, and requirements. Development of more effective collective training methods, which include a standardized program to capture the latest lessons learned from current combat operations, would reduce the time required for training and practicing critical new skills. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63007A for continued development of the battle command team training program and incorporation of realistic, relevant, and timely practice events for use by commanders and battle staff.

**Advanced simulated training**

The budget request included \$20.0 million in PE 63015A, for next generation training and simulation systems. The joint fires and effects training system typifies leading edge simulator technology currently in use. The committee commends the Army for its innovative approach to highly immersive and successful training and simulation environments. Realistic training has been credited in part with a reduction in casualty rates as troops preparing for deployment learn from those who are in theater or who are just returning.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million in PE 63015A for development of additional, deployable modules for the joint fires and effects training system. The committee further recommends an increase of \$3.5 million in PE 63015A for the final phase of the CAVE automatic virtual environment project to produce a fully self-sustaining visualization laboratory in support of environmental science research and military training for desert conditions.

**Explosive demilitarization**

The budget request included \$9.9 million in PE 63103A, for explosive demilitarization technology. The Army supports programs

under this account to develop safe, efficient, environmentally-compliant technologies to enhance existing methods for munitions resource recovery, recycling, and treatment. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in PE 63103A for development of a demilitarization approach that incorporates an innovative solid fuel feed technology with a modified reactor.

#### **Alternative fuel supplies**

The budget request included \$6.3 million in PE 63125A, for combating terrorism technology development. Adequate, reliable, and cost-efficient fuel supplies are important for military operations in changing environments with logistical supply chain challenges. Portable, alternative fuel systems continue to offer possible long-term solutions, if successfully configured to meet military requirements. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 63125A for continued development of advanced mobile microgrid fueler systems to demonstrate innovations in converting biomass to synthetic gas or synfuel. The advanced fueler system would complement the ongoing Army Advanced Mobile Microgrid program, and would provide a reduced logistical footprint when deployed and backup power in case of grid failure.

#### **Stryker vehicle active protection system demonstration**

The budget request included \$70.1 million in PE 63313A for missile and rocket advanced technology development, including \$5.0 million for integration of the close-in active protection system (CIAPS) into the High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV), but no funding for CIAPS integration into a Stryker vehicle. In fiscal year 2005, the Army demonstrated that a prototype CIAPS mounted on a light armored vehicle could defeat rocket propelled grenades (RPGs). The committee supports any initiative that fields systems that provides additional force protection capabilities to our troops. HMMWVs and Stryker vehicles deployed to Operation Iraqi Freedom require RPG protection. The committee understands that the need and opportunity for integrating CIAPS technology on Stryker emerged after planning for the fiscal year budget request was completed. The committee recommends an increase of \$12.0 million in PE 63313A for a Stryker active protection system, for a total authorization of \$82.1 million in PE 63313A.

#### **Advanced structures and composites**

The budget request included \$7.3 million in PE 63734A, for military engineering advanced technology. Early in a military deployment, the majority of military personnel live in soft shelters or tents. In current conflicts, nearly every position is vulnerable to attack. The Army is exploring lightweight, affordable, rapidly deployable, forward construction methods that provide ballistic protection. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63734A to accelerate solutions that employ hybrid wood and advanced fiber material and structure systems to combine cost efficiency, ease of assembly, and ballistic protection.

### **Army command and control visualization system**

The budget request included \$14.6 million in PE 63305A for Army system integration (non space), but no funding for interactive modeling and simulation management capabilities.

The committee notes that effective modeling and simulation is necessary for the development of missile defense and other military capabilities. Next generation architectural solutions for command and control and situational awareness are now being developed. The committee recognizes that funding could be used to mature technology and continue to combine government furnished components and commercial, off-the-shelf products to support the warfighter from the classroom to the field.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63305A to support continued development of interactive modeling and simulation management capabilities of the Army Space and Missile Defense Command to support the warfighter.

### **Interactive modeling and simulation management**

The budget request included \$14.6 million in PE 63305A for missile defense systems integration, but no funding for interactive modeling and simulation management capability.

The committee notes that effective modeling and simulation is essential to the development of missile defense and other military capabilities. Likewise, a process to coordinate and manage activities related to the verification and validation of modeling and simulation tools is needed to support these capabilities.

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63305A for development of technologies and processes to support verification and validation of modeling and simulation.

### **Next generation interceptor materials**

The budget request included \$14.6 million in PE 63305A for Army missile defense system integration, but no funding for next generation interceptor (NGI) materials research.

Next generation ballistic missile interceptors will be designed to intercept longer range and more complex threats. To intercept complex threats, lightweight and highly maneuverable kill vehicles are required. The NGI materials research program proposes developing both a lightweight composite missile launcher and an advanced composite kill vehicle airframe. The Department of the Army and the Missile Defense Agency has assessed this item to have high military value.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63305A for next generation interceptor materials research for development of lightweight composite missile launchers and advanced composite kill vehicle airframes.

### **Long loiter sensor and communications platform**

The budget request included \$9.3 million in PE 63308A for Army missile defense system integration, but no funding for near-space long loiter sensor and communications.

The Army currently maintains a fleet of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) that utilize Air Force space-borne sensors and communications devices to provide direct surveillance and reconnaissance

support to the warfighter in theater. The committee understands that a near-space long loiter craft able to continually view the entire theater of operations could provide significant operational cost savings by decreasing the numbers of UAVs and other sensors necessary for reconnaissance, surveillance, and blue force tracking.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63308A to refine the requirements, conduct concept evaluations, and develop integrated test beds to assess the capabilities of programs related to sensor payloads for near-space long loitering craft.

#### **Architecture Analysis Program**

The budget request included \$81.0 million in PE 63327A for air and missile defense system engineering, but no funding for the Air, Space, and Missile Defense Architecture Analysis Program (A3P).

A3P is a modeling and simulation effort to assist in the systems analysis of air, space, and missile defense capabilities to provide an effective defense against cruise missiles, unmanned aerial vehicles, aircraft, rockets, artillery, and ballistic missiles of all ranges. The committee recognizes that these simulation capabilities are necessary to support air, space, and missile defense efforts across a broad spectrum of military operations from major theater wars to homeland security.

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63327A for A3P to support air, space, and missile defense modeling and simulation.

#### **Single Integrated Space Picture**

The budget request included \$83.1 million in PE 63327A for Air and Missile Defense Systems Engineering, of which \$15.0 million is for the Single Integrated Space Picture (SISP) program.

SISP is an initiative within the Combatant Commanders Integrated Command and Control System program to provide an integrated picture of space capabilities, threats, and operations. The committee notes that the Army Missile and Space initiative has included work to develop decision support software for use by space operators in support of joint operations center commanders. The software is designed to receive and integrate information from multiple sources, providing a consolidated picture to improve space situational awareness. The committee recommends an addition of \$2.0 million in PE 63327A for the continued development, production, and field demonstration of this software.

#### **Casting Emissions Reduction Program**

The budget request included \$5.17 million in PE 63779A for environmental quality technology demonstration/validation, but no funding for the Casting Emissions Reduction Program (CERP). The CERP is validating advanced materials and processes for the reduction of hazardous emissions from foundry operations, advancing emission measurement methods for the Department of Defense and related industries, and is supporting lightweight metals technology transfer to fulfill military requirements. The committee recommends funding CERP to continue to improve manufacturing technologies used to produce casting materials such as aluminum

and titanium to assist the Army in achieving its goal of becoming a lighter, more highly-mobile fighting force.

The committee recommends an increase of \$6.2 million in PE 63779A for the CERP.

#### **Advanced Army medical systems**

The budget request included \$10.1 million in PE 63807A, for medical systems advanced development. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.5 million in PE 63807A to accelerate deployment of medical treatments to mitigate blast injuries. Specifically, the committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million for an Army requirement to pursue approval of the intravenous fluids warming system; \$2.5 million to produce a safe, portable oxygen system for patients during evacuations; and \$1.0 million to extend the shelf life of red blood cells by 6 weeks.

#### **Joint Tactical Radio System**

The budget request included a total of \$923.7 million for the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) development across the Department of Defense. JTRS is intended to provide seamless, real-time communications among warfighters—through voice, data, and video—within and across the services through software programmable radio technology. Service requirements are “clustered” so that similar requirements can be met with a single acquisition effort. The lead service for each acquisition effort serves as the cluster manager. The Army is the manager for JTRS clusters 1 and 5 radios; the Special Operations Command is the manager for cluster 2 radios; and the Navy and Air Force are the managers for cluster 3 and 4 radios, respectively. In March 2005, the Department restructured the JTRS program to include a new Joint Program Executive Office (PEO), which will coordinate JTRS development.

The budget request included \$156.7 million in PE 64280A, for JTRS waveform development and Program Management Office (PMO) activities; \$393.1 million in PE 64805A, including \$375.0 million for JTRS cluster 1 and JTRS cluster 5 hardware development; and \$23.5 million in PE 64201A for JTRS aviation hardware development and integration. This funding supports Army JTRS responsibilities as the Joint Program Management Office and clusters 1 and 5 manager.

The committee has supported the JTRS program in the past and continues to believe that a software programmable radio is achievable despite the technical challenges associated thus far with JTRS program development. However, the committee is concerned about recent events regarding JTRS.

- a. The program faces a 30-month delay due to a JTRS hardware redesign to meet National Security Agency certification requirements.

- b. On January 14, 2005, the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, issued a partial “stop work” order to the JTRS cluster 1 contractor so that the contractor could focus the program on the early operational assessment of the program’s maturity and capabilities.

- c. On April 25, 2005, the JTRS cluster 1 contractor was issued a “show cause” letter indicating the JTRS program



would be terminated in 30 days unless the contractor could satisfactorily answer questions regarding cost, performance, and schedule.

The committee believes that the stop work and potential contract termination actions will require a significant amount of time for resolution and will require a JTRS program restructure or rebase-line. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$39.4 million in PE 64280A for a total authorization of \$117.3 million; a decrease of \$193.9 million in PE 64805A for cluster 1 and cluster 5 radio development to reflect a “stop work” order; and a decrease of \$75.0 million in PE 64805A for cluster 1 radio development, for a total authorization of \$124.2 million for PE 64805A, including \$106.1 million for JTRS cluster 1 and JTRS cluster 5 hardware development.

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–287) appropriated \$111.5 million for the procurement of JTRS cluster 1 radios, originally intended to be procured under a low rate initial procurement contract for a first quarter fiscal year 2007 multi-service operational test and evaluation. Based on recent events, these funds cannot be executed as appropriated. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to request reprogramming of fiscal year 2005 JTRS procurement funding into PE 64280A to continue development of the JTRS waveform and common operating environment and architecture so as not to affect the development and fielding of other JTRS clusters. The committee is concerned that the Department has not placed sufficient emphasis and funding on developing new antenna technologies and should make this a priority when the JTRS program is restructured.

#### **Tactical vehicle modifications**

The budget request included no funding in PE 64642A, for light tactical wheeled vehicle development. The Army’s current operation tempo demands that advances in lightweight materials, advanced load handling, intelligent control systems, ballistic protection systems, embedded diagnostics, and suspension systems be developed and spiraled into the field as soon as possible. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 64642A for the research and development of spiral technologies for the wheeled tactical vehicle fleet, for a total authorization of \$5.0 million.

#### **Future tactical truck system**

The budget request included \$3.4 million in PE 64622A, for family of heavy tactical vehicle development, which conducts system development and demonstration of heavy tactical vehicles to support combat and combat support missions.

The budget request included \$1.0 million in PE 62601A, for the Future Tactical Truck System (FTTS). The committee understands that a key enabler of the Army’s tactical wheeled vehicle strategy is the Expedited Modernization Initiative Procedure process, an initiative designed to identify and use industry’s investments in advanced technologies. The EMIP process will be conducted in parallel with the FTTS Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration (ACTD) that will assess key technologies and emerging service

sustainment concepts to help develop the requirements for Army and Marine Corps trucks of the future, as well as to identify advanced technologies that also address current tactical wheeled vehicle needs. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 64622A for the FTTS ACTD, for a total authorization of \$13.4 million.

#### **Protected simulation and test link**

The budget request included \$288.8 million in PE 64869A for Patriot/MEADS combined aggregate program, but no funding for the protected simulation and test link (PSTL).

The United States is currently engaged in a cooperative developmental effort with Germany and Italy to modernize the Patriot/MEADS missile defense system. Current United States technology protection rules dictate that simulation models associated with critical U.S. technology not be released to foreign partners. The committee notes that PSTL is a software application that will provide the capability for protected simulation models to interact with those models that can be shared with international partners, thereby facilitating the design and development of the Patriot/MEADS system as an international joint venture.

The committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in PE 64869A for PSTL.

#### **Unmanned aerial vehicle ice protection**

The budget request included \$10.9 million in PE 64258A, for target systems development. As unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) fly further, longer, and higher, they confront some of the same challenges as manned aircraft. The committee supports programs designed to address current in-flight icing protection shortfalls with low-weight, low-cost, low-power options made specifically for installation on current and future UAV configurations. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 64258A for fabrication and testing of a self-activated, automatic deicing system for UAVs.

#### **High performance computing research**

The budget request included \$32.3 million in PE 65803A, for technical information activities. Use of computer simulation tools allows for the rapid analysis of alternative designs for armor, structures, specialized weapons, and aircraft components. Faster and more accurate modeling of potential structural improvements and composite material performance could lead to stronger and more flexible force protection systems for personnel and equipment. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in PE 65803A for advances in high performance computing research and improved simulations to evaluate the blast resistance of structures and armor.

#### **Retinal/iris multimodal biometrics technology for secure identification**

The budget request included \$22.9 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army, in PE 33140A, for Information Systems Security Program, but included no funding for continued

research on retinal/iris multimodal biometrics (RIMB) technology for secure identification.

RIMB technology has shown promise as an enhanced form of secure identification to protect information systems from unauthorized users. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in PE 33140A, for the continued development of RIMB technology, consistent with the short- and long-term technology development, deployment, and integration goals of the Department of Defense for biometric identification systems.

### **Army manufacturing technologies**

The budget request included \$68.5 million in PE 78045A, for end-item industrial preparedness activities. As the Army continues to transform to a flexible, expeditionary force, logistical support for existing systems must be maintained and improved. Methods and processes designed to ensure sustained operational capability of weapons and support systems must move into the “virtual” world as many original parts and maintenance suppliers no longer exist. The Army can not afford to cope with manpower and time drains imposed by long logistical chains. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 78045A, to support the virtual parts program, which will form a one-stop virtual engineering production environment to assist in ensuring the sustained operational capability of weapons and support systems.

The committee further recommends an increase of \$10.5 million in PE 78045A, to accelerate packaging, processing, and manufacturing systems. Specific precision manufacturing requirements exist on turbine engines, which use advanced alloys and ceramic materials that conventional machine techniques and tools fail to process. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million for the super-pulse laser processing technology. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for the manufacturing system demonstration, and \$3.0 million for packaging and interconnection technology to reduce the weight and cost of electronic and optoelectric subsystems and for the adaptation of emerging technologies.

And finally, the committee notes that the strength-weight ratio of titanium makes it an ideal material for use in Army manned ground vehicles. The committee recognizes that this material also poses challenges as it is difficult, time consuming, and expensive to process. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.5 million in PE 78045A for accelerated development of an advanced modeling technology for titanium machining. Use of advanced software to simulate a virtual machining environment could enable increased processing speeds and deeper cuts, resulting in faster production of titanium parts to meet Army requirements for survivable manned ground vehicles.

### **Navy**

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
			<b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVALUATION, NAVY</b>			
1319	0601103N	1	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	75,910	8,000	83,910
			Blast impact resistant composites		[1,000]	
			Remote sensing research		[2,500]	
			Neural engineering research		[2,000]	
			Multifunctional materials for naval structures		[2,500]	
1319	0601152N	2	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	15,500	3,000	18,500
			Navy S&T outreach		[3,000]	
1319	0601153N	3	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	356,885	5,000	356,885
1319	0602114N	4	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	94,148		99,148
			Free electron laser		[5,000]	
1319	0602123N	5	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	101,650	11,300	112,950
			Nanomagnetic materials		[2,000]	
			Small watercraft propulsion demonstrator		[3,000]	
			High frequency acoustic signal processor		[2,000]	
			Polymeric aircraft components		[2,000]	
			Undersea perimeter security technology		[2,300]	
1319	0602131M	6	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	37,590	1,000	38,590
			Combat headborne system research		[1,000]	
1319	0602233N	7	HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY			
1319	0602234N	8	MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY			

# **Title II-RDT and E** (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1319	0602235N	9	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH Critical area protection systems SensorNet	57,693	6,500 [2,000] [12,000]	64,193
1319	0602236N	10	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH Space research Multifunction composites for next Navy seaframes Automated video threat recognition Rapid detection of biowarfare agents in water Seabasing research	82,856	4,000 [3,500] [2,500] [3,000] [-5,000]	86,856
1319	0602271N	11	RF SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH Gallium nitride RF power	47,302	2,000 [2,000]	49,302
1319	0602435N	12	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH Integrated littoral sensor network	49,793	2,500 [2,500]	52,293
1319	0602651M	13	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	6,000		6,000
1319	0602747N	14	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	71,362		71,362
1319	0602782N	15	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH UAV team coordination Prototype IED detection and neutralization	49,520	6,000 [3,000]	55,520
1319	0603114N	16	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY Information sharing for ISRTE Excalibur UAV	82,538	4,000 [3,000] [1,000]	86,538

# **Title II-RDT and E** (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1319	0603123N	17	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	71,488	29,900	101,388
			Wireless sensor system		[2,000]	
			Mobile manufacturing repair cell		[5,000]	
			Wide bandgap semiconductor substrate materials		[8,000]	
			Small arms acoustic and infrared flash detection		[3,900]	
			High temperature superconducting generators		[5,000]	
			Ship service fuel cell		[6,000]	
1319	0603235N	18	COMMON PICTURE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	60,589	4,000	64,589
			Improved shipboard combat information		[4,000]	
1319	0603236N	19	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	68,540	7,000	75,540
			Full body protective apparel		[3,000]	
			Automated cargo and container handling systems		[4,000]	
1319	0603271N	20	RF SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	75,070	6,000	81,070
			Joint UAV electronic attack		[3,000]	
			APY-6 real time precision targeting radar		[3,000]	
1319	0603640M	21	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	56,434	16,200	72,634
			Armored patrol vehicle		[3,000]	
			Laser integrated target engagement system		[5,200]	
			Expeditionary warfare water purification		[7,000]	
			Advanced combat headborne system		[1,000]	
1319	0603651M	22	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,394		2,394
1319	0603706N	23	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT			
1319	0603727N	24	NAVY TECHNICAL INFORMATION PRESENTATION SYSTEM	187,943	9,900	197,843
			Modeling and simulation for urban operations		[9,900]	

# **Title II-RDT and E** (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1319	0603729N	25	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	16,068		16,068
1319	0603747N	26	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	27,603		27,603
1319	0603757N	27	JOINT WARFARE EXPERIMENTS			
1319	0603758N	28	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	49,288		49,288
1319	0603782N	29	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	31,897		31,897
1319	0603207N	30	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	27,094		27,094
1319	0603216N	31	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	6,255		6,255
1319	0603237N	32	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	41,464		41,464
1319	0603254N	33	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	7,050		7,050
1319	0603261N	34	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	3,938		3,938
1319	0603382N	35	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	30,166		30,166
1319	0603502N	36	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	122,122	2,000	124,122
			Surface Navy integrated undersea tactical technology		[2,000]	
1319	0603506N	37	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	47,039		47,039
1319	0603512N	38	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	167,823		167,823
1319	0603513N	39	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	22,150	9,500	31,650
			Amorphous metal permanent magnet generator		[1,500]	
			High temperature superconductor AC synchronous motor		[8,000]	
1319	0603525N	40	PILOT FISH	141,369		141,369
1319	0603527N	41	RETRACT LARCH	82,717		82,717
1319	0603536N	42	RETRACT JUNIPER	54,887		54,887
1319	0603542N	43	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	1,845		1,845
1319	0603553N	44	SURFACE ASW	17,343	4,500	21,843
			Improved surface vessel torpedo launcher		[4,500]	

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1319	0603559N	45	SSGN CONVERSION	24,020	20,000	44,020
			UUV integration with SSGN		[20,000]	
1319	0603561N	46	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	162,953	-40,000	122,953
			Undersea Superiority System - undefined		[-40,000]	
1319	0603562N	47	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	7,125		7,125
1319	0603563N	48	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	11,899		11,899
1319	0603564N	49	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	27,021		27,021
1319	0603570N	50	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	168,373		168,373
1319	0603573N	51	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS			
1319	0603576N	52	CHALK EAGLE	116,230		116,230
1319	0603581N	53	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	576,454		576,454
1319	0603582N	54	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	76,975		76,975
1319	0603609N	55	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	36,940		36,940
1319	0603611M	56	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	253,675	8,500	262,175
			Regenerative filtration technology		[8,500]	
1319	0603612M	57	USMC MINE COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	3,265		3,265
1319	0603635M	58	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	500	32,400	32,900
			Follow-on to multipurpose assault weapon (FOTS)		[14,000]	
			Non-lethal urban ops laboratory		[5,500]	
			Clearing facilities with novel technology		[2,900]	
			Non-lethal technology weaponization		[2,600]	
			Anti-sniper infrared targeting system		[7,400]	
1319	0603654N	59	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	34,418		34,418
1319	0603658N	60	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	88,135		88,135



**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
1319	0603713N	61	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	24,620		24,620
1319	0603721N	62	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	21,977	5,000	26,977
			Marine mammal detection and mitigation		[5,000]	
1319	0603724N	63	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	1,595		1,595
1319	0603725N	64	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	4,158		4,158
1319	0603734N	65	CHALK CORAL	52,769		52,769
1319	0603739N	66	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	8,909		8,909
1319	0603746N	67	RETRACT MAPLE	308,708		308,708
1319	0603748N	68	LINK PLUMERIA	81,723		81,723
1319	0603751N	69	RETRACT ELM	57,036		57,036
1319	0603755N	70	SHIP SELF DEFENSE	9,592		9,592
1319	0603764N	71	LINK EVERGREEN	58,153		58,153
1319	0603787N	72	SPECIAL PROCESSES	47,908		47,908
1319	0603790N	73	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	10,335		10,335
1319	0603795N	74	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	14,195		14,195
1319	0603851M	75	NONLETHAL WEAPONS	43,981		43,981
1319	0603857N	76	ALL SERVICE COMBAT IDENTIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM (A:	15,696		15,696
1319	0603860N	77	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	39,260		39,260
1319	0603879N	78	SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP) SYSTEM ENGINEER (S	36,721		36,721
1319	0603889N	79	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS			
1320	0604272N	80	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (C	9,956		9,956
1319	0604327N	81	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS			
1319	0604707N	82	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENG	44,469		44,469
1319	0604787N	83	JOINT WARFARE TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMS	23,385		23,385

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1319	0604212N	84	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	81,112		81,112
1319	0604214N	85	AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	15,556		15,556
1319	0604215N	86	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	84,308		84,308
1319	0604216N	87	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	48,144		48,144
1319	0604218N	88	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	4,558		4,558
1319	0604221N	89	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	7,401		7,401
1319	0604230N	90	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	2,275		2,275
1319	0604231N	91	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	51,177	2,000	53,177
			Logistics common operating picture		[2,000]	
1319	0604234N	92	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	629,682		629,682
1319	0604245N	93	H-1 UPGRADES	42,012		42,012
1319	0604261N	94	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	29,522	3,000	32,522
			Automatic radar periscope detection and discrimination		[3,000]	
1319	0604262N	95	V-22A	206,376		206,376
1319	0604264N	96	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	10,902		10,902
1319	0604269N	97	EA-18	409,097		409,097
1319	0604270N	98	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	42,667		42,667
1319	0604273N	99	VHXX EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	935,932		935,932
1319	0604280N	100	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM - NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	250,766		250,766
1319	0604300N	101	SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	1,114,791	10,000	1,124,791
			DD(X) IPS - permanent magnet motor		[10,000]	
1319	0604307N	102	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	216,313		216,313
1319	0604311N	103	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	11,443		11,443
1319	0604312N	104	TRI-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE			

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
1319	0604329N	105	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	9,965		9,965
1319	0604366N	106	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	145,634		145,634
1319	0604373N	107	AIRBORNE MCM	54,659		54,659
1319	0604503N	108	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	95,499	6,000	101,499
			Affordable towed array construction		[6,000]	
1319	0604504N	109	AIR CONTROL	10,151		10,151
1319	0604507N	110	ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR	1,079		1,079
1319	0604512N	111	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	33,029		33,029
1319	0604518N	112	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	6,908		6,908
1319	0604558N	113	NEW DESIGN SSN	155,807	44,000	199,807
			VA-class multi mission module		[30,000]	
			VA-class large aperture bow array		[10,000]	
			Network centric capability tech insertion		[4,000]	
1319	0604561N	114	SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	2,928		2,928
1319	0604562N	115	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	40,690	7,000	47,690
			Submarine common open architecture tech insertion		[3,500]	
			Automated submarine command and control center		[3,500]	
1319	0604567N	116	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	55,672		55,672
1319	0604574N	117	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	2,220		2,220
1319	0604601N	118	MINE DEVELOPMENT	15,392		15,392
1319	0604603N	119	UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS			
1319	0604610N	120	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	31,826		31,826
1319	0604618N	121	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION			
1319	0604654N	122	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,880		8,880

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1319	0604703N	123	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	3,097		3,097
1319	0604721N	124	BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTENSION SYSTEM	18,456		18,456
1319	0604727N	125	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	13,517		13,517
1319	0604755N	126	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	45,931	5,200	51,131
			Autonomous unmanned surface vessel		[5,200]	
1319	0604756N	127	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	46,026		46,026
1319	0604757N	128	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	24,012	9,000	33,012
			NULKA decoy development		[9,000]	
1319	0604761N	129	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	5,002		5,002
1319	0604771N	130	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	7,202	12,500	19,702
			Hemostatic therapy trials		[3,000]	
			Advanced research on QuikClot		[2,000]	
			Hemoglobin-based oxygen carrier research		[4,000]	
			Non-invasive vectored vaccine research		[3,500]	
1319	0604777N	131	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	52,717		52,717
1319	0604784N	132	DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	54,256		54,256
1319	0604800N	133	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	2,393,013		2,393,013
1319	0604910N	134	SMART CARD	715		715
1319	0605013M	135	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	19,150		19,150
1319	0605013N	136	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	60,859		60,859
1319	0605014N	137	DEFENSE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM			
1319	0605172N	138	MULTINATIONAL INFORMATION SHARING (MNIS)	33,557		33,557
1319	0605212N	139	CH-53X RDTE	271,941		271,941
1319	0605500N	140	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	964,067		964,067

# **Title II-RDT and E** (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
1319	0508713N	141	NAVY STANDARD INTEGRATED PERSONNEL SYSTEM (NSIPS)			
1319	0604256N	142	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	23,918		23,918
1319	0604258N	143	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	52,963		52,963
1319	0604759N	144	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	39,682		39,682
1319	0605152N	145	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	9,629		9,629
1319	0605154N	146	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	49,891		49,891
1319	0605155N	147	FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	2,266		2,266
1319	0605502N	148	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
1319	0605804N	149	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	714		714
1319	0605853N	150	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	44,847		44,847
1319	0605856N	151	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,451		3,451
1319	0605861N	152	RD&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	63,508		63,508
1319	0605862N	153	RD&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	1,632		1,632
1319	0605863N	154	RD&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	77,131		77,131
1319	0605864N	155	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	320,133		320,133
1319	0605865N	156	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	13,101		13,101
1319	0605866N	157	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	2,829		2,829
1319	0605867N	158	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	13,030		13,030
1319	0605873M	159	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	28,224		28,224
1319	0804758N	160	SERVICE SUPPORT TO JFCOM, JNTC	10,000		10,000
1319	0909999N	161	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
1319	0603660N	162	ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	[ ]		[ ]
1319	0603661N	163	RETRACT VIOLET	[ ]		[ ]
1319	0101221N	164	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	90,022		90,022

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1319	0101224N	165	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	44,063		44,063
1319	0101226N	166	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	8,527		8,527
1319	0101402N	167	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	31,443		31,443
1319	0203761N	168	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	24,653		24,653
1319	0204136N	169	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	88,720	3,200	91,920
			Shared reconnaissance pod logistics support		[3,200]	
1319	0204152N	170	E-2 SQUADRONS	2,256		2,256
1319	0204163N	171	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	32,694		32,694
1319	0204229N	172	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TM)	20,342		20,342
1319	0204311N	173	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	23,453		23,453
1319	0204413N	174	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAF	4,768		4,768
1319	0204571N	175	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	42,248		42,248
1319	0204574N	176	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,422		1,422
1319	0204575N	177	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	13,987		13,987
1319	0205601N	178	HARM IMPROVEMENT	90,832		90,832
1319	0205604N	179	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	86,364		86,364
1319	0205620N	180	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	4,519		4,519
1319	0205632N	181	MK-48 ADCAP	21,619		21,619
1319	0205633N	182	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	81,546		81,546
1319	0205658N	183	NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	3,917		3,917
1319	0205675N	184	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	64,054		64,054

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1319	0206313M	185	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS G/ATOR development USMC DCGS and Net Centric Center Critical Infrastructure Protection Center	237,081	11,800 [3,500] [4,800] [3,500]	248,881
1319	0206623M	186	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEM Expeditionary fire support system Multi-role intermediate support craft	48,409	24,500 [11,000] [9,500]	72,909
1319	0206624M	187	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT Ultrasonic consolidation of embedded sensors Battlefield management system	10,476	1,500 [1,500]	11,976
1319	0207161N	188	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	9,384		9,384
1319	0207163N	189	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	3,584		3,584
1319	0301303N	190	MARITIME INTELLIGENCE	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
1319	0301323N	191	COLLECTION MANAGEMENT	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
1319	0303217N	192	TECHNICAL RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEILLANCE	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
1319	0303109N	193	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	541,980		541,980
1319	0303140N	194	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	28,660		28,660
1319	0303158N	195	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	5,000		5,000
1319	0304111N	196	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
1319	0305149N	197	COBRA JUDY	121,261		121,261
1319	0305160N	198	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METO)	9,122		9,122
1319	0305188N	199	JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)	55,326		55,326
1319	0305192N	200	JOINT MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM - DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE	4,290		4,290

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
1319	0305204N	201	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES (JMIP)	99,349	39,000	138,349
			Additional six Firescout VTUAVs and sensors		[39,000]	
1319	0305205N	202	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES			
1319	0305206N	203	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS (JMIP)	27,918		27,918
1319	0305207N	204	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS (JMIP)	21,322		21,322
1319	0305208N	205	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS (JMIP)	12,354	3,200	15,554
			DCGS integration with AFATDS		[3,200]	
1319	0307207N	206	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (JMIP)	133,642		133,642
1319	0308601N	207	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	6,812		6,812
1319	0702207N	208	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	10,012		10,012
1319	0708011N	209	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	57,753		57,753
1319	0708730N	210	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)		10,000	10,000
			National shipbuilding research program - ASE		[10,000]	
1319	XXXXXXXX	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,125,515		1,125,515
<b>Total, RDT&amp;E Navy</b>				<b>18,037,991</b>	<b>360,100</b>	<b>18,398,091</b>



### **Navy university research**

The budget request included \$75.9 million in PE 61103N, for university research initiatives. The committee is concerned with the low priority placed on long-term research on naval sciences by the Department of Defense. The development of faster, more efficient, and durable systems for the naval environment requires increases in targeted research on multifunctional advanced composites, innovative sensors technology, advanced engineered materials, and blast resistant composites. These research projects have the potential to address current threats by providing energy absorbing ship hulls, blast resistant grid and foam stiffened structures, and advanced remote sensing at higher resolutions. Additional basic science in the pursuit of breakthroughs at the intersection of engineering, computer science, and neuroscience shows promise in providing seamless control of unmanned systems.

The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million in PE 61103N for university basic defense research, including \$2.5 million to accelerate exploration of multifunctional materials; \$2.5 million for advanced remote sensing; \$1.0 million for blast and impact resistant composites; and \$2.0 million for neural engineering for human-machine interfaces.

### **Navy science and technology outreach**

The budget request included \$15.5 million in PE 61152N, for In-House Laboratory Independent Research, which supports intramural Navy research and efforts to revitalize the workforce for key science and technology capabilities. As many future military systems continue to increase in technological complexity, a robust workforce with discipline-specific scientific skills and knowledge is necessary. The Navy's special needs in areas such as ocean sciences, advanced materials, and electronics will be met through the participation of current Navy laboratory personnel in training and mentoring the next generation of scientists and engineers. Training researchers and innovators is a long-term project requiring near-term attention.

The committee recommends an increase in PE 61152N of \$3.0 million to support continuation of a pilot program—Naval Research Science and Technology for America's Readiness (N-Star). N-Star leverages the resources and expertise available in Navy facilities to engage and mentor students who have science and engineering aptitude and interests.

### **Free electron laser**

The budget request included \$94.4 million in PE 62114N, for power projection applied research, including \$10.0 million for directed energy and the free electron laser. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 62114N for accelerated research and development of high power free electron laser (FEL) devices based on the successful demonstration of high power FELs using energy recovered from the super-conducting accelerator technology. The Navy identified free electron lasers as a possible future directed energy weapon for the defense of Navy assets.

### **Littoral and undersea security**

The budget request included \$101.7 million in PE 62123N, for force protection applied research. Navy ships and infrastructure are vulnerable to attack from suicide divers and other asymmetric hazards. Existing systems to detect and defeat such threats require constant monitoring and fixed installations. Research programs exploring alternatives, such as high frequency passive acoustic arrays and special cameras and sensors, have the potential to provide automatically monitored, easily constructed, portable, and reliable systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.3 million in PE 62123N for exploration of undersea security options, including \$2.0 million for development of a prototype real-time high frequency acoustic processor and \$2.3 million for undersea perimeter security technologies.

### **Nanomagnetic materials**

The budget request included \$101.7 million in PE 62123N, for force protection applied research. Future naval capabilities such as the electric warship require significant amounts of electric power for propulsion, on-board power consumption, and ship-based use of power by military aircraft. The Navy needs new technology solutions capable of meeting the demanding performance requirements of high power density machines and power electronics. Current electrical power systems use magnetic materials developed for lower power demand functions. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62123N for development of nano-engineered materials with unprecedented magnetic properties, mechanical strength, and temperature capabilities.

### **Polymeric aircraft components**

The budget request included \$101.7 million in PE 62123N, for force protection applied research. Polymeric aircraft components provide the Navy with an option for lower cost, lightweight aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62123N to support the Navy's efforts to develop technologies for production of polymeric aircraft components.

### **Small watercraft propulsion demonstrator**

The budget request included \$101.7 million in PE 62123N, for force protection applied research. The Navy requires a fast, unmanned watercraft to launch and recover unmanned underwater vehicles in hostile environments. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 62123N for research on and fabrication of a small watercraft propulsion demonstrator with a 60-knot retrieval capability.

### **Advanced combat headborne system**

The budget request included \$37.6 million in PE 62131M, for Marine Corps landing force technology and \$56.4 million in PE 63640M, for Marine Corps advanced technology demonstrations. As part of an initiative in blast injury prevention, mitigation, and treatment, the committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in PE 62131M and \$1.0 million in PE 63640M to meet a Marine Corps requirement to expand and accelerate the research and de-

sign of an advanced integrated combat headborne system. The redesigned system would improve form, fit, and function; and increase protection to the eye, face, neck, and head, while maintaining comfort, communications integration, and weight reduction.

#### **Critical area protection systems**

The budget request included \$57.7 million in PE 62235N, for common picture applied research. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63235N for critical area protection systems for high resolution situational awareness to support antiterrorism and force protection missions. These systems could provide land-based antiterrorism and force protection units with persistent surveillance capabilities and a common operating picture.

#### **SensorNet**

The budget request included \$57.7 million in PE 62235N, for common picture applied research. The U.S. Government, the nation's laboratories, and industry are showing progress in developing and improving sensing capabilities. Full utilization of these capabilities requires communication and research on and development of a prototype information architecture for connection of sensors. The committee recommends an increase of \$12.0 million in PE 62235N for continuation of SensorNet, a project to demonstrate sensor-linking within an installation and from facility to facility.

#### **Space research**

The budget request included \$57.7 million in PE 62235N, for common picture applied research. The committee recommends a reduction of \$7.5 million in this account for a newly initiated program of space research as part of the Innovative Naval Prototype program. The committee believes that new space research efforts should be carefully coordinated with other space programs in the Department of Defense and should be consistent with the overall Department Space Science and Technology Strategy.

#### **Automated video threat recognition**

The budget request included \$82.8 million in PE 62236N, for warfighter sustainment applied research. The accelerated need for persistent surveillance in a variety of situations led the Navy to increase emphasis on alternatives to active radars. Video, as a passive sensor, could serve threat detection needs for naval facilities, ports, and other areas in which even the most alert human sentry may fail to identify every approaching danger. The committee recommends an increase in PE 62236N of \$2.5 million for transition of a successfully completed Phase II Small Business Innovative Research program to develop an automated video surveillance threat recognition algorithm.

#### **Multifunctional composite structures**

The budget request included \$82.8 million in PE 62236N, for warfighter sustainment applied research. The Navy's increased interest in using advanced composites for ship construction is designed to produce components with reduced electronic and acoustic

signatures and lower total ownership costs. Existing and developing composite material technologies present an opportunity to enhance seaframe speed, agility, safety, and tactical advantage. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million in PE 62236N for development of new systems and techniques for the rapid implementation of multifunctional composite structures.

#### **Portable water bio-defense**

The budget request included \$82.9 million in PE 62236N, for warfighter sustainment applied research. Current biological warfare detector technology applicable to water analysis is generally large, stationary, and time consuming. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 62236N for a rapid, portable, accurate detection capability for biological warfare agents in water.

#### **Seabasing research**

The budget request included \$82.9 million in PE 62236N, for warfighter sustainment applied research, including a new start of \$13.9 million for seabasing research. The committee recommends a reduction of \$5.0 million in this account for the newly initiated research program on seabasing technologies. The committee is concerned that this new program is not well defined to support seabasing concepts of operation, which are still under development by the Navy.

#### **Gallium nitride radio frequency power**

The budget request included \$47.3 million in PE 62271N, for radio frequency (RF) systems applied research. The Department of Defense requires enhanced RF power performance for a range of current and next generation systems, including surface naval radars, airborne communications systems, airborne radars, and electronics. Gallium nitride RF power has the potential to provide higher power density, higher temperature operation, and increased bandwidth, compared to current RF technologies. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62271N for gallium nitride RF power technologies.

#### **Integrated littoral sensor network**

The budget request included \$71.5 million in PE 62435N, for force protection advanced technology, but no funding specifically for testing of a portable suite of sensors to counter water borne and other hazards in the littorals. Detection, characterization, and location of man-made and natural waterborne hazards and threats, including pathogens and toxins, is an immediate national security need. The committee recommends an increase in PE 62435N of \$2.5 million for generation of a set of tools with portable sensors designed to improve accuracy and timeliness of short- and long-term detection of hazards in coastal waters and ports.

#### **Coordination and integration of unmanned system teams**

The budget request included \$49.5 million in PE 62782N, for mine and expeditionary warfare applied research. As unmanned systems continue to evolve and perform more dangerous and time consuming tasks on behalf of the warfighter, such systems must

work individually, or in groups, in a manner that does not place an additional burden on the operator. Increased fundamental science and engineering focused on the tough problems of enabling autonomous cooperation within different groups of unmanned vehicles would ensure these tools reach expected potential as assets to the warfighter. The committee recommends an increase in PE 62782N of \$3.0 million for work to integrate and coordinate teams of unmanned vehicles.

#### **Information sharing for intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance**

The budget request included \$82.5 million in PE 63114N, for power projection advanced technology. The Navy possesses the technology to effectively target and destroy fixed assets using global position system guided weapons. This capability is limited by target concealment or motion. Real-time tracking, precision location, and in-flight command and control of weapons systems continue to pose problems.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63114N to accelerate research and development of a robust airborne and ground information processing architecture. The system would support multiple-source and simultaneous collection of data for aircraft on intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, targeting, and engagement (ISRTE) operations. The architecture would have the capacity to handle numerous and different electronic files such as large imagery files, geographical information, intelligence reports, and data received from multiple platforms and would advance an important aspect of the Navy intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance plan for engagement of mobile targets.

#### **Force protection advanced technology**

The budget request included \$71.5 million in PE 63123N for forced protection advanced technology. This program addresses applied research associated with providing the capability of platform and force protection technologies for all naval platforms.

The budget request included no funding for wireless sensor technology for the intelligent monitoring of the health of shipboard equipment and machinery. This is a key component to reduce workloads, and it could be inserted into one of the programmed sea trials for newly delivered ships. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63123N to develop, install, and support a number of intelligent component health monitoring systems in a sea trial.

The budget request included no funding for development of a mobile manufacturing and repair cell. This cell would reduce operating and support costs while maintaining equipment readiness in theater. It could be deployed by ship and large ground vehicles, and would provide precision, on-demand manufacturing of critical parts. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63123N for the development of a mobile manufacturing and repair cell.

The budget request included no funding for the continued development of wide bandgap 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 \$8.0 million in PE 63123N for the continued development of wide bandgap semiconductor substrate materials.

The budget request included no funding for a small, light system for small arms acoustic and infrared flash detection and remote threat response to enemy small arms fire against our Marines. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.9 million in PE 63123N to develop a prototype and test such a system.

The budget request included no funding for the continued design and risk assessment and development of prototypes for high temperature superconducting (HTS) generators. The reduced size of HTS generators would increase flexibility in ship architecture, provide enhanced power density and transient response, and improve overall ship performance and survivability. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63123N for the continued development of HTS generators.

The budget request included no funding for the continued development of a ship service fuel cell (SSFC). An advanced prototype fuel cell power system demonstrator has been developed. Additional performance characterization of the demonstrator is required, followed by endurance and latent defect testing at the DD(X) land-based engineering site. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in PE 63123N for the continued development of a SSFC.

The committee recommends a total authorization of \$101.4 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology.

#### **Improved shipboard combat information center**

The budget request included \$60.6 million in PE 63235N, for common picture advanced technology. Command Information Center (CIC) duty officers receive large quantities of critical data, especially during combat operations. They must comprehend and process this information quickly. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 63235N for near-term development of an improved shipboard CIC and to demonstrate integration of emerging technologies in automation to improve operations for multiple current and future platform designs.

#### **Warfighter sustainment advanced technology**

The budget request included \$68.5 million in PE 63236N for the development of warfighter sustainment advanced technology, but included no funding for body armor development or for automated container and cargo handling systems.

While protective vests have saved many lives, there is a requirement for flexible, lightweight, full body armor that will protect limbs as well. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63236N for the development of full body protective apparel.

The Navy and Marine Corps continue to develop a concept of operations for sea basing. One of the technical hurdles that must be achieved to turn this concept into reality is the transfer of cargo at sea, in varying sea states. There have been some subscale technologies tested as small business innovative research programs,

but this needs to evolve to full-scale testing of automated container and cargo handling systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 63236N for the development of automated container and cargo handling systems.

The committee recommends a total authorization of \$75.5 million in PE 63236N.

#### **Navy persistent surveillance**

The budget request included \$70.1 million in PE 63271N, for radio frequency (RF) systems advanced development. Real-time precision target radar supports the Navy's time critical strike mission. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63271N to fully configure the APY-6 radar to meet broad area maritime surveillance and other emerging unmanned aerial vehicle requirements.

The Navy pursues electronic attack (EA) capabilities for a variety of missions with air, sea, and land applications. The Department of Defense Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Roadmap recommends development and operational assessment of an unmanned combat aerial vehicle capable of performing several missions including EA. To augment existing systems while extending the life of current low-density/high-demand electronic attack assets, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63271N for an acceleration of joint unmanned aerial vehicle electronic attack capabilities.

#### **Armored patrol vehicle**

The budget request included \$56.4 million in PE 63640M, for Marine Corps advanced technology demonstrations. Additional research to capture emerging technologies in the areas of mobility, materials, power generation, propulsion, survivability, durability, signature reduction, and modularity will speed protection systems for an expanded class of vehicles. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63640M for initial development of an armored patrol vehicle to address threats posed by blast, projectiles, and shock waves.

#### **Laser integrated target engagement system**

The budget request included \$56.4 million in PE 63640M, for Marine Corps advanced technology demonstrations. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.2 million in PE 63640M for a Marine Corps unfunded requirement to modify the laser integrated target engagement system (LITES). The program would finance one prototype and laboratory testing of a Marine Corps version of the Air Force forward air controllers capability.

#### **Water purification system**

The budget request included \$56.4 million in PE 63640M, for Marine Corps advanced technology demonstrations. Air deliverable, high capacity water purification systems meet a critical need during all military missions. Research on high efficiency, compact technology will help alleviate the significant logistical burden of transporting water. The committee recommends an increase in PE 63640M of \$7.0 million for final development and production of expeditionary warfare water purification systems.

### **Modeling and simulation for urban operations**

The budget request included \$187.9 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy, for Joint Experimentation, in PE 63727N, but did not include sufficient funding to continue development of the modeling and simulation for urban operations program. The committee notes that such a capability is of great importance to battlefield commanders facing complex urban environments such as that faced by U.S. Armed Forces in Fallujah, Iraq last year. Preliminary work has been initiated on such a capability with promising results, both for battlefield commanders and for defense and homeland security officials charged with planning for consequence management of potential terrorist attacks on the homeland. The modeling and simulation for urban operations program is the second highest priority of the Commander, U.S. Joint Forces Command, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of \$9.9 million in PE 63727N, to continue development of the modeling and simulation for urban operations program.

### **Surface Navy integrated undersea tactical technology**

The budget request included \$122.1 million in PE 63502N for surface and shallow water mine countermeasures, but included no funding for the surface Navy integrated undersea tactical technology (SNIUTT) program. SNIUTT would provide surface ship mine countermeasures sonar operators with the simulated training necessary to recognize mine-like contacts. This concept was originally used by aviation mine countermeasures sonar operators, and SNIUTT would leverage this former program. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63502N for SNIUTT.

### **Shipboard system component development**

The budget request included \$22.2 million in PE 63513N for shipboard system component development, including \$9.2 million for the development of integrated power systems. The budget request included no funding specifically for either the amorphous metal permanent magnet generator (PMG) set or the high temperature superconductor alternating current (HTS-AC) synchronous marine propulsion motor.

An amorphous metal PMG would reduce both weight and size when compared to conventional generator sets. Additional funding would upscale the current 30 kilowatt prototype to 750 kilowatts. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.5 million in PE 63513N for the amorphous metal PMG.

A 36.5 megawatt HTS-AC synchronous marine propulsion prototype motor is being fabricated and tested. A follow-on effort can be initiated to modify the motor and power electronic drive system designs to meet the evolving specifications of the Navy's newest surface combatants. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million in PE 63513N for the continued development of the HTS-AC synchronous marine propulsion motor.

The committee recommends a total authorization of \$31.7 million in PE 63513N.



### **Improved surface vessel torpedo launcher**

The budget request included \$17.3 million in PE 63553N for anti-submarine warfare advanced development, but included no funding for the improved surface vessel torpedo launcher. This launcher would use an automotive airbag inflator launch concept in a new launcher, contoured into the deck of future ships. Additional funding would allow testing of the production model of the breech replacement version of the launcher. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.5 million in PE 63553N for the advanced development of the improved surface vessel torpedo launcher.

### **Guided missile submarine conversion**

The budget request included \$24.0 million in PE 63559N for design work for guided missile submarines (SSGN). Four former Ohio-class ballistic submarines are currently being converted into this new class of submarine, which will have the capability to provide covert striking power against targets ashore and to covertly deliver and support an expeditionary force on land.

One of the most promising technologies for the SSGNs will be the ability to deploy unmanned undersea vehicles. To capitalize on the experimentation to demonstrate feasibility that has already been completed, additional funding is required to develop and experiment with the requisite stowage, launch, and recovery systems to gain understanding of ship integration technologies. The large displacement mission reconfigurable unmanned undersea vehicle (LD-MRUUV) would provide flexibility to deploy new payloads and sensors. The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million in PE 63559N for integration of LD-MRUUV into the SSGN as part of the conversion program.

### **Advanced submarine system development**

The budget request included \$163.0 million in PE 63562N for advanced submarine system development. Of this amount, \$50.0 million is for the design of a future undersea superiority system alternative to the reduced submarine program to include consideration of new propulsion systems. The committee is aware that this effort was directed by the Department of Defense shortly before submission of the budget request, and that it was also directed that these funds not just be added to existing systems. No specific plans on the use of these funds have been provided to the committee.

The committee has received a study on Fleet Platform Architecture that was prepared by the Office of Force Transformation in response to section 216 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136), and is aware that this study recommends investigating alternate propulsion systems for submarines.

In written testimony before the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services, the Congressional Research Service addressed alternate propulsion systems for submarines. The air-independent propulsion equipped non-nuclear-powered submarine would offer increased low speed submerged endurance over the conventional diesel-electric, but comparable submerged endurance at high speed. The testimony concluded that these alternatives to nuclear-powered submarines are not well suited for sub-

marine missions that require: (1) long, completely stealthy transits from home port to the theater of operation; (2) submerged periods in the theater of operation lasting more than two or three weeks; or (3) submerged periods in the theater of operation lasting more than a few hours or days that involve moving the submarine at something more than low speed. The committee is concerned with the reduced capabilities and lack of operational flexibility the submarine forces would possess with these new propulsion systems.

The committee is also aware of and supports the “Tango Bravo” program, being conducted jointly by the Navy and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). The technologies being investigated in this program include shaftless propulsion and weapons external to the pressure hull, all of which could contribute to a smaller, less expensive nuclear-powered submarine with capabilities equivalent to those of the *Virginia*-class submarine.

Numerous analyses have supported an attack submarine force of at least 55 boats. However, the Secretary of the Navy, in an interim report to Congress on the annual long-range plan for the construction of naval vessels, projects that the number of attack submarines required in the future will be between 37 and 41 boats. The committee is concerned that this reduced number of submarines will fall short of the number required by the combatant commanders. The committee believes that funds at this time should be directed at the class of submarines currently in production, and that the production rate should be increased above that shown in the Future Years Defense Program as soon as possible.

The committee recommends a decrease of \$40.0 million in PE 63562N, specifically in the future undersea superiority system project for development of propulsion alternatives, and that the remaining funding be used to complement the development of technologies being investigated in the Tango Bravo program by DARPA.

### **Regenerative filtration technology**

The budget request included \$253.7 million in PE 63611M for the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle (EFV), but no funding for regenerative filtration technology. Recent advances in nuclear, biological, and chemical filtration technology have brought about the development of regenerative systems that use canisters with chemical beds that can be used and cleaned while the vehicle is operating. Current technology requires filter replacement in a secure environment. In fiscal year 2005, the Marine Corps completed Phase I of the plan to develop a regenerative filtration system for the EFV, which will provide three units of the prototype system for testing. Phase II of this project consists of the completion of the system development and demonstration phase of the project. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.5 million in PE 63611M for acceleration of Phase II of regenerative filtration technology development, for a total authorization of \$262.2 million.

### **Marine Corps ground and supporting arms systems**

The budget request included \$500,000 in PE 63635M, for the development of the follow-on to shoulder-launched multi-purpose as-

sault weapon (FOTS), but no funding for the development of non-lethal weapons nor a sniper detection system.

The FOTS program will qualify and field an accurate, shoulder-fired, assault weapon designed to defeat a variety of ground targets on the battlefield, particularly in urban environments like those encountered by Marine Corps forces engaged in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. FOTS will replace the Shoulder-Launched Multi-Purpose Assault Weapon, which has been in the Marine Corps inventory for over 20 years. The committee believes the Marine Corps needs to accelerate the development of this weapon system.

Nonlethal weapon development includes research in support of clearing facilities with novel technology and nonlethal and scalable weaponization. These initiatives aim to minimize collateral damage to infrastructure and personnel, while neutralizing facilities and the threats that might be posed to these facilities and the personnel that occupy them. Additionally, an urban operations environmental laboratory will provide assessment and analysis of the affects of nonlethal technologies to ensure minimum environmental and collateral damage when used in urban activities. The committee believes that the Marine Corps must have a broad range of responses to contain and manage emerging threats before, during, and after conflict, and with minimum collateral damage. Therefore, the committee supports these initiatives.

The Marine Corps requires a means to locate hostile fire to address survivability for forces in urban environments such as Iraq. No existing system can locate sources of sniper fire quickly and dependably. However, the committee believes that technology exists to develop a system that uses a thermal source-of-fire indicator to pinpoint the location from which a shot has been fired.

The committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified additional funding for FOTS development, nonlethal weapon development, and a sniper detection system development on his unfunded priorities list.

The committee recommends the following:

- (1) an increase of \$14.0 for FOTS development;
- (2) an increase of \$5.5 million for the nonlethal weapons urban operations laboratory to expand the assessment, analysis, neutralization, and development of capabilities to ensure minimum environmental and collateral damage with nontraditional and traditional capabilities;
- (3) an increase of \$2.9 million to conduct research in support of clearing facilities with novel technology;
- (4) an increase of \$2.6 million for nonlethal technology weaponization to conduct additional research, education, and training to meet the goals of modern nonlethal and scalable options for Marine Corps forces deployed around the world; and
- (5) an increase of \$7.4 million to develop an anti-sniper infrared targeting system.

The committee recommends a total authorization of \$32.9 million in PE 63635M.

### **Marine mammal detection and mitigation**

The budget request included \$4.54 million in PE 63721N, for environmental protection. The committee notes that there continues to be intense interest in the issue of sonar and other sound impacts on marine mammals. Research of this type will increase the scientific body of knowledge necessary to maintain the combat training necessary for military readiness while also protecting marine mammals. Better systems to detect marine mammals will aid in development of systems and procedures to mitigate potential impacts. Data collected from such systems will also be invaluable in better understanding migration routes, population densities, and habits.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63721N for marine mammal detection and mitigation.

### **Navy logistics common operating picture**

The budget request included \$51.2 million in PE 64231N for the Tactical Command System, but contained no funding for the Navy logistics common operating picture (LOGCOP). Navy LOGCOP is a logistics decision support and management tool based on predictive software technology that was developed under a Navy-sponsored small business innovative research program. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 64231N for the development of Navy LOGCOP.

### **Automatic radar periscope detection and discrimination**

The budget request included \$29.5 million in PE 64261N for acoustic search sensors, including \$12.2 million for the automatic radar periscope detection and discrimination (ARPDD) project. ARPDD provides a fully automated periscope detection, classification, and tracking capability to reliably detect periscopes and masts in complex, cluttered environments. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 64621N to accelerate the ARPDD project.

### **DD(X) destroyer integrated propulsion system**

The budget request included \$1,114.8 million in PE 64300N for DD(X) destroyer total ship systems engineering. The budget request included no funding for completing the development of the integrated power system for this ship, since final developmental testing of the integrated power system is expected to be completed in fiscal year 2005 prior to the ship's critical design review and the subsequent transition of funding to the Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy account for detail design.

In proof of concept tests prior to shipment to the Navy's land-based test facility, the primary propulsion motor planned for the integrated power system, the permanent magnet motor (PMM), experienced a failure. The failure was determined to be caused by insulation, resulting in damage to the stators of the motor. To maintain schedule to meet the ship critical design review, the Navy has decided to fall back to an alternate propulsion motor, the advanced induction motor (AIM), for demonstration at the land-based test facility. Use of the AIM would add 300 tons to the weight of the DD(X). Funding is not adequate to pursue both technologies.

The committee believes that continued development of the PMM is warranted, if not for incorporation in the lead ship, for incorporation in following ships. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 64300N for continued development and testing of the PMM for the DD(X) destroyer.

#### **Affordable towed array construction**

The budget request included \$95.5 million in PE 64503N for submarine systems equipment development, but included no funding for the continued development of new, highly reliable, low cost fiber optic towed arrays. Funding is required to accelerate system performance verification testing, demonstrate array architectural flexibility, implement automated manufacturing equipment, and qualify commercial suppliers. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in PE 64503N for the development of affordable towed array construction.

#### **New Design SSN**

The budget request included \$155.8 million in PE 64558N for the continuing development of the *Virginia*-class submarine. The development efforts in this program are to evaluate a broad range of system and technology alternatives to directly support and enhance the mission capability of this class of submarine.

The budget request included no funding to develop the multi-mission module concept, with the focus to identify flexible payload concepts. The committee believes that the baseline *Virginia*-class design allows for integration of innovative payloads and sensors, which would enhance its capability. The committee recommends an increase of \$30.0 million in PE 63558N for multi-mission module development.

The budget request included no funding to develop a large aperture bow array for the *Virginia*-class submarine. This array has the potential to allow for the rapid insertion and spiral development of future sensor technologies, increasing sonar performance at a lower cost than the current spherical array. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 64558N for development of a large aperture bow array.

The budget request included no funding to transition the small business innovative research programs for advanced processing builds and multipurpose processor rapid commercial, off-the shelf insertion. Transition of these efforts would lead to an infrastructure for the *Virginia*-class submarine that could support insertion of network-centric intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 64558N for network-centric capability technology insertion.

The committee recommends a total authorization of \$199.8 million in PE 64558N.

#### **Submarine tactical warfare system**

The budget request included \$40.7 million in PE 64562N for submarine tactical warfare systems development. This program develops commercial, off-the-shelf based software and hardware upgrades to integrate improved weapons and tactical control capabilities for all submarine classes.

The budget request included no funding specifically for the insertion of common open architecture technology. Open architecture is key to enabling timely weapons system software upgrades. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million in PE 64562N for submarine common open architecture technology insertion.

The budget request included no funding to initiate the development of the automated submarine command and control center. This development would reduce the number of personnel necessary for submarine attack center operations. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million in PE 64562N for development of the automated submarine command and control center.

The committee recommends a total authorization of \$47.7 million in PE 64562N.

#### **Autonomous unmanned surface vessel**

The budget request included \$45.9 million in PE 64755N for detection and control for ship self-defense, but included no funding for the continued development of the autonomous unmanned surface vessel (AUSV), which is being developed as a concept demonstrator for potential anti-terrorism force protection missions and to protect harbors and coastal facilities. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.2 million in PE 64755N for the continued development of the AUSV.

#### **NULKA anti-ship missile decoy development**

The budget request included \$24.0 million in PE 64757N for development of soft kill technologies for ship self-defense and \$1.0 million for the continuing development of the NULKA decoy. NULKA is an offboard, active decoy designed to counter a wide variety of present and future radar-guided anti-ship missiles. Continued development of NULKA is necessary to counter anti-ship missiles that may migrate to other frequency bands or use dual mode seekers. The committee recommends an increase of \$9.0 million in PE 64757N for the continued development of the NULKA decoy.

#### **Navy medical research**

The budget request included \$7.2 million in PE 64771N, for medical development. The Department of Defense medical research continues to produce results in the form of vaccines and treatments to address the threat posed by biological weapons and naturally occurring illnesses in areas of military operation. Enhanced distribution techniques and more efficient delivery of treatments would further reduce logistical and personnel requirements, while increasing protection. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million in PE 64771N for non-invasive vectored vaccine research to explore a new approach to production of a consistent, highly immunogenic, and easily manufactured and administered vaccine.

Research on methods to prevent and address severe blood loss due to combat injuries challenges both the Army and Navy medical communities. Various blood preservation developments combined with innovations in blood loss treatments and blood replacement therapies yield life saving advances. Additional work in these areas would reduce treatment side effects and prolong the viability of blood substitutes. The committee recommends an increase of \$9.0

million in PE 64771N, including \$3.0 million to facilitate hemostatic therapy trials; \$2.0 million for advanced research and development to improve the QuickClot treatment for internal use; and \$4.0 million for evaluation of the safety and efficacy of a room and elevated temperature stable hemoglobin-based oxygen carrier.

#### **Shared Reconnaissance Pod logistics support**

The budget request included \$88.7 million in PE 24136N for F/A-18 improvements, but included no funding for Shared Reconnaissance Pod (SHARP) logistics support. The SHARP system is an electro-optical/infrared system that is capable of collecting long- and medium-range imagery and can record or data link the imagery to provide the combatant commander information with which to identify possible targets. The development of logistics support for 21 SHARP systems—including interactive electronic technical manuals, completion of specific tasks associated with the Automated Maintenance Environment, and fleet aircrew and maintenance training curricula and maintenance training aids—are required for SHARP to achieve full operational capability. SHARP logistics support is included on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.2 million in PE 24136N for SHARP logistics support.

#### **Marine Corps communications systems**

The budget request included \$237.1 million in PE 26313M, for communications systems development, including \$18.3 million for the development of the ground/air task orientated radar (G/ATOR) and \$5.8 million for the development of the distributed common ground/surface system (DCGS). The budget request included no funding for the Critical Infrastructure Protection Center (CIPC).

The G/ATOR program is a single material solution for the Multi-Role Radar System (MRRS) and Ground Weapons Locator Radar (GWLR) requirements that replaces and consolidates the capability of numerous legacy radars, including the AN/TPS-63 air surveillance, AN/MPQ-62 force control, AN/TPS-73 air traffic control, and AN/UPS-3 air defense radar systems. Current radar performance does not meet operational forces' requirements. Additional funding for G/ATOR development is on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million in PE 26313M for G/ATOR.

The DCGS is a collection of service systems that will contribute to joint and combined war fighter needs for intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance support. The DCGS integrated backbone (DIB) is the architecture that will tie the services' DCGS systems together into one family of systems. The committee notes that the Marine Corps portion of the DCGS has not been integrated into the DIB. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.8 million in PE 26313M to complete integration efforts.

The mission of CIPC is to foster system security engineering solutions for critical infrastructure protection by integrating information operations, emergency management, and other critical infrastructure protection initiatives. The committee notes that the Marine Corps has an ongoing requirement to perform information systems security functions that could be addressed by the CIPC. The

committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million in PE 26313M, for information system security development.

The committee recommends a total authorization of \$248.9 million in PE 26313M.

#### **Marine Corps ground combat and supporting arms systems**

The budget request included \$48.4 million in PE 26623M for the development of Marine Corps ground combat and supporting arms systems, including \$1.8 million for the Family of Raid and Reconnaissance equipment program and \$7.1 million for the Expeditionary Fire Support System (EFSS), but no funding for the Light Armored Vehicle (LAV) Sense and Respond Support System.

EFSS will be the primary indirect fire support system for the vertical assault element of the ship-to-objective maneuver force and is intended to fill the third “leg” of the Marine Corps’ indirect fires triad, complementing longer-range systems such as the M777 155mm lightweight towed Howitzer and the High Mobility Artillery Rocket System. Munition development lags equipment development. Additional funding for EFSS is on the Commandant of the Marine Corps’ unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$11.0 million to modify existing munitions from the family of 120mm rifled mortar rounds for use with EFSS.

The Family of Raid and Reconnaissance equipment program supports the research, development, and procurement actions for multiple airborne and specialized reconnaissance-related programs. Without a flexible multi-mission support platform, the Marine Corps cannot take full advantage of its recent investment in the Underwater Reconnaissance Capability (URC). URC consists of an advanced diver propulsion device, state-of-the-art hydrographic mapping equipment, and other critical maritime reconnaissance equipment to include the Multi-Role Intermediate Support Craft (MRISC), a replacement for the outdated and inefficient Combat Rubber Raiding Craft. The Marine Corps is currently evaluating commercial, off-the-shelf variants and additional funding would accelerate that evaluation. The committee recommends an increase of \$9.5 million for the MRISC.

For the last two years, the Marine Corps has been studying the creation of a Sense and Respond Support System to monitor overall system health of the LAV. The Marine Corps needs to develop the technology to embed a variety of sensors in metal parts of the LAV. Successful implementation of this technology will decrease maintenance “down” time, increase readiness, and be a better predictor of vehicle life throughout its life cycle. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for development of a LAV SRSS.

The committee recommends a total authorization of \$72.9 million in PE 26623M.

#### **Battlefield management system**

The budget request included \$10.5 million in PE 26624M, for the development of combat service support equipment, but no funding for the battlefield management system (BMS). The committee understands that the Marine Corps is currently exploring ways to improve situational awareness for Marine Corps armored ground vehicles and mechanized infantry at the platoon, company, and bat-



talion level by providing target acquisition, fire coordination, sensor-to-shooter target management, mounted navigation, and instant dissemination of situational awareness information. The Marine Corps is ready to initiate Phase II of the program which will address Phase I technical issues of integrating BMS into the M1A1 Tank and the Amphibious Assault Vehicle. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.5 million in PE 26624M for BMS development, for a total authorization of \$12.0 million.

#### **RQ-8B Firescout vertical takeoff and landing unmanned aerial vehicle**

The budget request included \$77.6 million in PE 35204N for the development of tactical unmanned aerial vehicles, including \$60.1 million for the development of the RQ-8B Firescout vertical takeoff and landing unmanned aerial vehicle (VTUAV). The Firescout VTUAV was designed to provide real-time intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance data to tactical users. A Firescout system is composed of three air vehicles, sensors, and control systems. The Firescout VTUAV will be common to the three modules to be incorporated on the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS). Additional funding for the Firescout VTUAV was included on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list to support the first LCS deliveries.

The committee recommends an increase of \$39.0 million in PE 35204N to procure six additional Firescout air vehicles and sensor packages to support the completion of developmental and operational testing and integration with the first deliveries of LCS.

#### **Distributed common ground system—Navy**

The budget request included \$12.4 million in PE 35208N for development of the distributed common ground system for the Navy (DCGS-N), but included no funding for integration of the advanced field artillery tactical data system (AFATDS), which provides automated command and control for the firepower aboard Navy ships. The converged architecture enabled by DCGS-N provides unparalleled flexibility to the warfighter and rapid response capability against relocatable, time critical targets. Currently, fire control information must be manually transferred between DCGS-N and AFATDS. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.2 million in PE 35208N for the integration of AFATDS into the DCGS-N architecture.

#### **National shipbuilding research program—advanced shipbuilding enterprise**

The budget request included no funding in PE 78730N for maritime technology. In recent years, funding provided by this line was used for the national shipbuilding research program—advanced shipbuilding enterprise (NSRP-ASE). This enterprise is a collaborative effort between the Navy and industry, which has yielded new processes and techniques that reduce the cost of building and repairing ships. The program has already documented a positive return on investment.

Section 242 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375) expressed

the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of Defense should continue to fund this program at a sustaining level. With a shrinking industrial base for shipbuilding already driving higher costs, this type of initiative is essential to providing efficiencies. The committee believes it is shortsighted not to invest in improved processes that would reduce the cost of shipbuilding. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 78730N for the NSRP-ASE.

#### **Air Force**

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
			<b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVALUATION, AIR FORCE</b>			
3600	0601102F	1	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	223,894	6,500	230,394
			Hypersonics research		[4,000]	
			Nanophotonic components		[2,500]	
3600	0601103F	2	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	105,029	2,500	107,529
			Secure and assured information sharing research		[2,500]	
3600	0601108F	3	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	11,894		11,894
3600	0602102F	4	MATERIALS	74,156	7,000	81,156
			Blast resistant barriers		[4,000]	
			Complex structures for manned and unmanned aerial vehicles		[2,000]	
			Nanoparticle materials coatings research		[1,000]	
3600	0602201F	5	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	96,679		96,679
3600	0602202F	6	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	79,442	1,000	80,442
			Nanoparticle multi-agent detection		[1,000]	
3600	0602203F	7	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	107,523	12,000	119,523
			Hypersonics research and engine integration		[12,000]	
3600	0602204F	8	AEROSPACE SENSORS	93,263		93,263
3600	0602500F	9	MULTI-DISCIPLINARY SPACE TECHNOLOGY	81,339		81,339
3600	0602601F	10	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	84,540	8,000	92,540
			Deployable structures experiment		[3,000]	
			Integrated control for autonomous space systems		[3,000]	
			Nano-reinforced and multifunction space structures		[2,000]	
3600	0602602F	11	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	58,058		58,058

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Senate</u>
				<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
3600	0602605F	12	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	37,709	3,000	40,709
			Adaptive optics laser communications		[3,000]	
3600	0602702F	13	COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	93,316		93,316
3600	0602805F	14	DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM			
3600	0602890F	15	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	45,678		45,678
3600	0603112F	16	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	36,714	7,000	43,714
			Laser eye protection		[5,000]	
			Metals affordability initiative		[2,000]	
3600	0603203F	17	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	35,157		35,157
3600	0603205F	18	FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY			
3600	0603211F	19	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	25,133		25,133
3600	0603216F	20	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	77,268	15,500	92,768
			More electric gas turbine		[3,000]	
			Versatile affordable advanced turbine engines		[2,500]	
			Supersonic cruise missile engine		[10,000]	
3600	0603231F	21	CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	29,775		29,775
3600	0603270F	22	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	23,923		23,923
3600	0603311F	23	BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY			
3600	0603333F	24	UNMANNED AIR VEHICLE DEV/DEMO			
3600	0603400F	25	JOINT UNMANNED COMBAT AIR SYSTEMS (J-UCAS) ADVANCED	77,800		77,800

# **Title II-RDT and E** (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
3600	0603401F	26	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	60,915	28,000	88,915
			Radically segmented launch vehicle		[4,000]	
			AC coupled interconnect		[3,000]	
			Thin film amorphous solar arrays		[10,000]	
			Beta energy cells for defense and intelligence		[3,000]	
			Integrated spacecraft engineering tool		[3,000]	
			Ballistic Missile Technology		[5,000]	
3600	0603444F	27	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	5,848	5,000	10,848
			High accuracy network determination system		[5,000]	
3600	0603500F	28	MULTI-DISCIPLINARY ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT SPACE TECH	53,437	5,000	58,437
			Laser threat warning attack reporting		[5,000]	
3600	0603601F	29	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	18,660		18,660
3600	0603605F	30	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	26,955		26,955
3600	0603723F	31	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY			
3600	0603789F	32	C3I ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	30,125	3,200	33,325
			Enable network centric warfare		[3,200]	
3600	0603801F	33	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	280,135		280,135
3600	0603850F	34	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE			
3600	0603924F	35	HIGH ENERGY LASER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	5,801		5,801
3600	0207423F	36	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS			
3600	0401840F	37	AMC COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM			
3600	0804757F	38	JOINT NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER			
3600	0603260F	39	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,580		4,580
3600	0603287F	40	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	21,937		21,937

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
3600	0603421F	41	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III	87,364		87,364
3600	0603430F	42	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE) AEHF	665,257	100,000 [100,000]	765,257
3600	0603432F	43	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	2,185		2,185
3600	0603434F	44	NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL :			
3600	0603438F	45	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	14,205		14,205
3600	0603742F	46	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	51,893		51,893
3600	0603790F	47	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	3,973		3,973
3600	0603791F	48	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	574		574
3600	0603845F	49	TRANSFORMATIONAL SATCOM (TSAT)	835,769	-200,000 [-200,000]	635,769
			Delay TSAT			
3600	0603850F	50	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	15,344		15,344
3600	0603851F	51	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE	44,672		44,672
3600	0603854F	52	WIDEBAND GAFILLER SYSTEM RDT&E (SPACE)	93,858		93,858
3600	0603858F	53	SPACE-BASED RADAR	225,839	-75,000 [-75,000]	150,839
			Delay SBR			
3600	0603859F	54	POLLUTION PREVENTION	2,735		2,735
3600	0603860F	55	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	11,211		11,211
3600	0604015F	56	NEXT GENERATION BOMBER	25,135		25,135
3600	0604327F	57	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS)			
3600	0604400F	58	JOINT UNMANNED COMBAT AIR SYSTEMS (J-UCAS) ADVANCED	272,300		272,300
3600	0604731F	59	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV)			
3600	0604855F	60	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE LAUNCH	23,480	10,000 [10,000]	33,480
			Tactical satellite demonstrations			

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
3600	0604856F	61	COMMON AERO VEHICLE (CAV)	27,394		27,394
3600	0207423F	62	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	969		969
3601	0305178F	63	NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL	323,665		323,665
3600	0603840F	64	GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE (GBS)	18,283		18,283
3600	0604012F	65	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	2,912		2,912
3600	0604222F	66	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	15,154	-1,000	14,154
			Robust nuclear earth penetrator		[-1,000]	
3600	0604226F	67	B-1B	132,496	8,000	140,496
			B-1B digital communications improvements		[8,000]	
3600	0604233F	68	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	8,593		8,593
3600	0604239F	69	F-22	76,203		76,203
3600	0604240F	70	B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	285,205		285,205
3600	0604270F	71	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	82,587		82,587
3600	0604280F	72	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	124,225		124,225
3600	0604287F	73	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	11,153		11,153
3600	0604329F	74	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	85,988		85,988
3600	0604421F	75	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	24,651	6,000	30,651
			Ground-based space control test bed		[6,000]	
3600	0604429F	76	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	120,985		120,985
3600	0604441F	77	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	756,630		756,630
3600	0604479F	78	MILSTAR LDR/MDR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)			
3600	0604600F	79	MUNITIONS DISPENSER DEVELOPMENT	21,738		21,738
3600	0604602F	80	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	7,786		7,786
3600	0604604F	81	SUBMUNITIONS	5,475		5,475

# **Title II-RDT and E** (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Senate</u>
				<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Authorized</u>
3600	0604617F	82	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	10,173		10,173
3600	0604618F	83	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION			
3600	0604706F	84	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	7,315		7,315
3600	0604735F	85	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	6,122		6,122
3600	0604740F	86	INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)	161		161
3600	0604750F	87	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,369		1,369
3600	0604754F	88	TACTICAL DATA LINK INFRASTRUCTURE			
3600	0604762F	89	COMMON LOW OBSERVABLES VERIFICATION SYSTEM (CLOVER	8,692		8,692
3600	0604800F	90	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	2,474,763		2,474,763
3600	0604851F	91	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE	32,415		32,415
3600	0604853F	92	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)	26,093		26,093
3600	0605011F	93	RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT	24,384		24,384
3600	0605807F	94	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	50,000		50,000
3600	0207256F	95	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE			
3600	0207434F	96	LINK-16 SUPPORT AND SUSTAINMENT	157,677		157,677
3600	0207443F	97	FAMILY OF INTEROPERABLE OPERATIONAL PICTURES (FIOP)	29,296		29,296
3600	0207450F	98	E-10 SQUADRONS	397,011		397,011
3600	0207701F	99	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	26,423		26,423
3600	0305176F	100	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR			
3600	0401318F	101	CV-22	39,532		39,532
3600	0604256F	102	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	32,546		32,546
3600	0604759F	103	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	55,339	5,000	60,339
			FPS-16 radar mobilization and upgrade		[5,000]	
3600	0605101F	104	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	28,354		28,354

18  
88



# **Title II-RDT and E** (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
3600	0605306F	105	RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY	4,188		4,188
3600	0605502F	106	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH			
3600	0605712F	107	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	34,615		34,615
3600	0605807F	108	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	642,665		642,665
3600	0605860F	109	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	13,773	15,000	28,773
			Ballistic missile range safety technology		[15,000]	
3600	0605864F	110	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	48,157		48,157
3600	0605976F	111	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION - TEST AND E	60,561		60,561
3600	0605978F	112	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT - TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	26,238		26,238
3600	0305193F	113	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) (JI			
3600	0804731F	114	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	331		331
3600	0909900F	115	FINANCING FOR EXPIRED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
3600	0909980F	116	JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT	3,739		3,739
3600	1001004F	117	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	7,827		7,827
3600	0605024F	118	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0605798F	119	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	22,784		22,784
3600	0101113F	120	B-52 SQUADRONS	1,989		1,989
3600	0101120F	121	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	2,250		2,250
3600	0101122F	122	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	29,134		29,134
3600	0101313F	123	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM - USSTRATCOM	5,013		5,013
3600	0101314F	124	NIGHT FIST - USSTRATCOM	9,875		9,875
3600	0101815F	125	ADVANCED STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	18,237		18,237
3600	0102326F	126	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATI	30,093		30,093
3600	0203761F	127	WARFIGHTER RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS (WRAP) RAPID TRA			

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
3600	0207028F	128	JOINT EXPEDITIONARY FORCE EXPERIMENT			
3600	0207131F	129	A-10 SQUADRONS	51,835	25,000	76,835
			A-10 propulsion upgrade		[25,000]	
3600	0207133F	130	F-16 SQUADRONS	155,666		155,666
3600	0207134F	131	F-15E SQUADRONS	124,647		124,647
3600	0207136F	132	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	9,394		9,394
3600	0207138F	133	F/A-22 SQUADRONS	403,517		403,517
3600	0207141F	134	F-117A SQUADRONS	13,600		13,600
3600	0207161F	135	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	15,639		15,639
3600	0207163F	136	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	33,262		33,262
3600	0207224F	137	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY	113,825		113,825
3600	0207247F	138	AF TENCAP	10,829		10,829
3600	0207248F	139	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM	276,219		276,219
3600	0207253F	140	COMPASS CALL	4,650		4,650
3600	0207268F	141	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	153,265		153,265
3600	0207277F	142	CSAF INNOVATION PROGRAM	1,737		1,737
3600	0207325F	143	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	66,997		66,997
3600	0207410F	144	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	68,099		68,099
3600	0207412F	145	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	9,289		9,289
3600	0207417F	146	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	121,565		121,565
3600	0207423F	147	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	28,938		28,938
3600	0207424F	148	EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM			
3600	0207433F	149	ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY	300,673		300,673
3600	0207438F	150	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	40,472		40,472

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
3600	0207445F	151	FIGHTER TACTICAL DATA LINK	122,160		122,160
3600	0207446F	152	BOMBER TACTICAL DATA LINK	144,863		144,863
3600	0207448F	153	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	14,838		14,838
3600	0207449F	154	COMMAND AND CONTROL (C2) CONSTELLATION	41,071		41,071
3600	0207581F	155	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTAR)	78,084		78,084
3600	0207590F	156	SEEK EAGLE	19,510		19,510
3600	0207591F	157	ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION	290,589		290,589
3600	0207601F	158	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	30,541		30,541
3600	0207605F	159	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	6,369		6,369
3600	0207697F	160	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	4,222		4,222
3600	0208006F	161	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	138,475		138,475
3600	0208021F	162	INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	15,204		15,204
3600	0301310F	163	NATIONAL AIR INTELLIGENCE CENTER	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0301314F	164	COBRA BALL	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0301315F	165	MISSILE AND SPACE TECHNICAL COLLECTION	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0301324F	166	FOREST GREEN	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0301386F	167	GDIP COLLECTION MANAGEMENT	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0301398F	168	MANAGEMENT HQ - GDIP	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0302015F	169	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	18,909		18,909
3600	0303131F	170	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWO	57,344		57,344
3600	0303140F	171	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	109,292	3,000	112,292
			Homeland defense civil support threat studies		[1,000]	
			Infrastructure assurance and security research		[2,000]	
3600	0303141F	172	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	20,555		20,555

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
3600	0303150F	173	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,541		3,541
3600	0303158F	174	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	5,200		5,200
3600	0303601F	175	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	273,974		273,974
3600	0304111F	176	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0304260F	177	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE (JUMP)	78,920		78,920
3600	0304311F	178	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0305099F	179	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	7,139		7,139
3600	0305110F	180	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	29,143		29,143
3600	0305111F	181	WEATHER SERVICE	28,675		28,675
3600	0305114F	182	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (AT			
3600	0305116F	183	AERIAL TARGETS	6,641		6,641
3600	0305124F	184	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0305128F	185	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	491		491
3600	0305142F	186	APPLIED TECHNOLOGY AND INTEGRATION	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0305148F	187	AIR FORCE TACTICAL MEASUREMENT AND SIGNATURE INTELL			
3600	0305159F	188	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0305160F	189	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (SPACE)	3,908		3,908
3600	0305164F	190	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (S	125,778		125,778
3600	0305165F	191	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTRO	188,301		188,301
3600	0305172F	192	COMBINED ADVANCED APPLICATIONS	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0305174F	193	SPACE WARFARE CENTER	411		411
3600	0305182F	194	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	48,854		48,854
3600	0305193F	195	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) (JI	3,618		3,618
3600	0305202F	196	DRAGON U-2 (JMP)	10,158		10,158

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
3600	0305205F	197	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES			
3600	0305206F	198	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS (JMIP)	51,769		51,769
3600	0305207F	199	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS (JMIP)	8,101		8,101
3600	0305208F	200	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS (JMIP)	40,402		40,402
3600	0305219F	201	PREDATOR UAV (JMIP)	61,007	5,000	66,007
			Viper strike munitions for Predator UAV		[5,000]	
3600	0305220F	202	GLOBAL HAWK UAV (JMIP)	308,533		308,533
3600	0305221F	203	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGET (TIARA)	8,647		8,647
3600	0305887F	204	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION WARFARE	978		978
3600	0305906F	205	NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM	85,222		85,222
3600	0305910F	206	SPACETRACK (SPACE)	151,102	25,000	176,102
			S-band radar		[10,000]	
			Space-based space surveillance		[15,000]	
3600	0305913F	207	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	32,783		32,783
3600	0305917F	208	SPACE ARCHITECT	12,878		12,878
3600	0307141F	209	NASS, IO TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION & TOOL DEV	15,182		15,182
3600	0308699F	210	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	3,295		3,295
3600	0401115F	211	C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	233,028		233,028
3600	0401119F	212	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	226,479		226,479
3600	0401130F	213	C-17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	165,762		165,762

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
3600	0401132F	214	C-130J PROGRAM	6,681		6,681
3600	0401133F	215	AEROMEDICAL EVACUATION	2,077		2,077
3600	0401134F	216	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCIM)	55,743		55,743
3600	0401218F	217	KC-135S	1,498		1,498
3600	0401219F	218	KC-105	13,472		13,472
3600	0401221F	219	KC-135 TANKER REPLACEMENT	99,210		99,210
3600	0408011F	220	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	2,156		2,156
3600	0702207F	221	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,408		1,408
3600	0702239F	222	AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			
3600	0702806F	223	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	3,404		3,404
3600	0708011F	224	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	36,934	4,000	40,934
			Nanomaterials manufacturing		[4,000]	
3600	0708012F	225	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
3600	0708026F	226	PRODUCTIVITY, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, MAINTAIN. PROG			
3600	0708610F	227	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	44,503		44,503
3600	0708611F	228	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	10,316	6,900	17,216
			Aging aircraft logistics management		[3,000]	
			Aircraft systems and support infrastructure		[1,000]	
			Semi-autonomous robot for aircraft maintenance		[2,900]	
3600	0804757F	229	JOINT NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER	2,924		2,924

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
3600	0808716F	230	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	111		111
3600	0901202F	231	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	978		978
3600	0901212F	232	SERVICE-WIDE SUPPORT (NOT OTHERWISE ACCOUNTED FOR)			
3600	0901218F	233	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	7,445		7,445
3600	0901220F	234	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	16,383	-16,383	
			Terminate personnel service delivery program		[-16,383]	
3600	0901538F	235	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPM	17,531		17,531
3600	XXXXXXXX	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	6,069,810		6,069,810
			<b>Total, RDT&amp;E Air Force</b>	<b>22,612,351</b>	<b>24,217</b>	<b>22,636,568</b>

**Air Force basic science**

The budget request included \$223.9 million in PE 61102F, for Air Force defense research sciences. Innovative work supported by the Air Force basic research accounts is key to ensuring that our military has future capabilities and equipment to meet emerging threats. Applications such as air combat systems and ground support optoelectronics have foundations in novel nanomaterials used for the development of optical devices which are, in turn, components of information processing systems. The ability to quickly, securely, and reliably process information enables information dominance, one of a number of broad defense objectives. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million in PE 61102F, for nanophotonic components, the building blocks of electronic materials in a number of aircraft, ship, and soldier systems.

Air Force missions in the areas of reducing time to target and rapid response to global threats require basic and applied research on missile propulsion systems. Research on hypersonic engine designs have produced some early results over the last year. Design tools to predict and monitor performance of propulsion and control systems are needed, as are trained experts to move promising research forward. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 61102F to expand basic hypersonics research and to develop a strong academic program in hypersonics flow physics.

**Secure, assured information sharing**

The budget request included \$105.0 million in PE 61103F, for university research initiatives. Air Force university research supports defense related basic science in a wide range of scientific and engineering disciplines important to maintaining U.S. military technology superiority. One basic science pursuit of increasing significance involves investigation into information management in the “need to know” and “need to share” environments. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million in PE 61103F to expand research on novel approaches to information sharing requirements and to address policies, procedures, and technology to meet differing security protection levels and requirements.

**Blast resistant barriers**

The budget request included \$74.2 million in PE 62102F, for materials research. The committee supports research focused on the development of materials, composites, and structural designs to protect personnel and equipment from the threat of vehicle borne and other explosive device delivery methods. A variety of commercial and “makeshift” barricades currently provide protection to bases, facilities, and structures in the homeland and abroad. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 62102F for research and development of blast resistant barriers, including engineering of materials for different structural designs, testing, and establishment of blast barrier standards.

**Air Force materials research**

The budget request included \$74.2 million in PE 62102F, for materials research. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in PE 62102F for nano-particle materials coating research.



This research has the potential to develop advanced aeronautical coatings to improve the reliability and corrosion resistance of Air Force platforms.

The Department of Defense has a need for improved, affordable aerospace structures. Composite materials offer the potential for cost and weight savings along with improved air and space vehicle performance. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62102F for accelerated development of complex composite structures for manned and unmanned air vehicles.

#### **Nano-technologies for chemical and biological defense**

The budget request included \$79.4 million in PE 62202F, for human effectiveness applied research. Progress has been made in development of multiple-step processes for the detection, identification, and neutralization of single biological agents. A system capable of executing all three steps at once for a wide range of bio-agents, in different environments, would add value to existing capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in PE 62202F to augment ongoing research on the use of pulsed power plasma produced nano-particles to detect, identify, and defeat pathogens in a one-step process.

#### **Hypersonics engine research and integration**

The budget request included \$107.5 million in PE 62203F, for aerospace propulsion, including \$18.9 million for advanced aerospace propulsion technologies and hypersonic weapons and aircraft concepts. The committee notes that the X-43A successfully achieved Mach 9.8 during test flights last year, and believes that the joint Air Force and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) X-43 effort represents an important technology pathway to achieving a hypersonic operational capability.

The committee recommends an increase of \$12.0 million in PE 62203F to support a more aggressive hypersonics scramjet research program, to facilitate additional ground testing of the X-43 engine, and to evaluate initial concepts for integration of engine and vehicle designs. The committee strongly encourages NASA and the Air Force to work jointly on this program and to support the multi-engine demonstrator in future budget requests.

The committee notes that magnetohydrodynamics (MHD) may have applications when integrated with hypersonic vehicles now under development. The committee believes a better understanding of the advantages of the technology, the technical challenges to its use, and the potential for incorporation into hypersonic vehicle designs would be beneficial. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, by March 15, 2006, surveying both classified and unclassified MHD research conducted in the past and provide recommendations on whether military applications may be derived from MHD technology.

#### **Space technology**

The budget request included \$84.5 million in PE 62601F, for space technology. In response to Department of Defense guidance,

the Air Force research community embarked on an effort to support the space dominance mission. Integration of multiple functions into single space structures capable of autonomous fabrication and assembly represents a key focus of investigation in this area. Nano-reinforced structural space systems and advanced multifunctional space structures show promise in facilitating major improvements in space structure utility and performance. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62601F for expanded research in both of these structural areas and for examination of concepts for weight and cost reduction of space structural systems.

The committee further recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in PE 62601F, including \$3.0 million for the deployable space structures experiment, a general effort to lower the cost of spacecraft by instituting commonality and modularity in the construction of satellites; and \$3.0 million for integrated control for autonomous space systems, a program focused on development of advanced satellite control and measurement technologies needed to operate Air Force space and airbreathing systems.

#### **Adaptive optics research**

The budget request included \$37.7 million in PE 62605F, for directed energy research. Advanced digital communications allow for high levels of data transfer and rapid processing of visual images in support of network centric warfare. The Air Force has been doing work with lasers to expand communications bandwidth and to increase digital communication capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 62605F to accelerate this work and to support adaptive optics research for laser communications systems.

#### **Integrated spacecraft engineering tool**

The budget request included \$60.9 million in PE 63401F for Advanced Spacecraft Technology, but no funding for the integrated spacecraft engineering tool (ISET).

ISET would be used to build software models to enable satellite system designers, builders, and operators to accurately and reliably model and predict the performance of space systems. This would provide significant cost savings in the development and integration of future satellite systems and aid in the analysis of alternatives for prospective space systems.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63401F to develop, demonstrate, and validate an integrated spacecraft engineering tool—to support rapid prototyping, and to collaborate research, development, testing, and evaluation of advanced spacecraft and aerospace vehicles.

#### **Laser eye protection**

The budget request included \$36.7 million in PE 63112F, for advanced materials for weapon systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63112F to address an Air Force requirement for laser eye protection.

### **Metals affordability initiative**

The budget request included \$36.7 million in PE 63112F, for advanced materials for weapons systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63112F for unfunded priority Air Force research on specialty aerospace metals as part of the Metals Affordability Initiative. This type of research could lead to cheaper and higher performance aerospace metals and alloys, which will contribute significantly to future military air and space capabilities.

### **Aerospace propulsion and power technologies**

The budget request included \$77.3 million in PE 63216F, for aerospace propulsion and power technology. Traditional oil lubrication of propulsion and power systems carries operation and maintenance costs that could be avoided through the use of alternative technologies. The committee recommends an increase in PE 63216F of \$3.0 million to advance the more electric gas turbine research to a technology readiness level for prototype development and testing. Application of this technology could improve performance, reliability, and cost-effectiveness of propulsion and power systems by replacing oil lubrication with magnetic and electrical components in gas turbine engines.

The Air Force is pursuing research on reusable high-speed turbine engines for a hypersonic cruise missile. The Air Force Science and Technology unfunded priority list includes a request for additional research on a Mach 4+ turbine engine for rapid long-range strike and operational responsive space lift. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 63216F for the advanced supersonics cruise missile, to meet the Air Force unfunded requirement in this area and to accelerate and expand ground demonstrations to include critical integration technologies such as the supersonic inlet, exhaust nozzle and afterburner subsystems.

### **Versatile affordable advanced turbine engines**

The budget request included \$77.3 million in PE 63216F, for aerospace propulsion and power technologies. The Versatile Affordable Advanced Turbine Engine (VAATE) program is a joint program between the Departments of Defense and Energy, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and industry to develop, demonstrate, and transition advanced, multiuse turbine engine technologies. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million in PE 63216F to meet Air Force requirements for accelerated development of these technologies that could be key to the evolution of long-endurance, high efficiency engines for emerging unmanned aerial combat systems.

### **Ballistic missile technology**

The budget request included \$60.9 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology.

The committee is aware of the need to develop common advanced guidance technology applicable to Air Force and Navy strategic ballistic missile systems and future space vehicles. These efforts support capabilities needed to fulfill validated requirements for land-based strategic deterrence and prompt global strike.

The committee recommends an increase in \$5.0 million in PE 63401F for advanced technology demonstrations in guidance and control, flight computers, vehicle structures, and range safety technology.

#### **AC coupled interconnect**

The budget request included \$60.9 million in PE 63401F, for advanced spacecraft technology.

The committee notes that the Air Force has been exploring ways for satellites to operate more effectively on the limited power offered by solar cells. AC coupled interconnect is a new technique that would provide for the connecting of electronic chips in computer and electronic equipment at more efficient rates. In 2004, a key demonstration of this technology resulted in chips communicating with each other at 6 GHz. Additional funding would produce a complete technology for connecting electronic chips for all fields of application, including satellites.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63401F for AC coupled interconnect development.

#### **Energy cells for defense and intelligence applications**

The budget request included \$60.9 million in PE 603401F, for advanced spacecraft technology, but no funding for the development of Beta Energy Cells (BEC).

The committee understands that BEC can be used to charge batteries and super capacitors to greatly extend the operational life of critical military and intelligence systems.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 603401F to complete the development phase of BEC research and make prototype products available to defense and intelligence users.

#### **Radically Segmented Launch Vehicle**

The budget request included \$61.0 in PE 63401F, for advanced spacecraft technology, but no funding for the Radically Segmented Launch Vehicle (RSLV)

The RSLV program addresses a broad range of Department of Defense mission requirements for low-cost, routine, and responsive space launch. Program development and risk reduction for responsive space launch is currently performed under a joint Air Force, National Air and Space Administration, and Defense Advanced Research Project Agency program management arrangement. The committee is supportive of efforts to acquire an operationally responsive space capability to support the warfighter.

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 63401F to perform engineering development, prototype hardware fabrication, and ground testing of the RSLV for the purpose of mitigating technical risk and validating cost savings potential.

#### **Thin film amorphous solar arrays**

The budget request included \$60.9 million in PE 63401F, for advanced spacecraft technology, but no funding for thin film amorphous solar arrays.

The committee is aware of the need to reduce the cost of satellite launches, which is driven to a large extent by the weight of satellite payloads. The committee believes research on thin film amorphous solar arrays has the potential to produce solar arrays that are significantly less expensive, lighter, and more efficient than current solar arrays.

The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 63401F for thin film amorphous solar array research and development.

#### **High Accuracy Network Determination System**

The budget request included \$5.8 million in PE 63444F, for the Maui space surveillance system, but no funding for the High Accuracy Network Determination System (HANDS).

The Air Force satellite control network maintains careful management of satellites that perform missions of crucial importance to national security, such as detecting ballistic missile launches against the United States as well as space launches and nuclear detonations. HANDS technology has the potential to increase the accuracy of the data gathered in support of this mission.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63444F to research, develop, and demonstrate capabilities of HANDS technology.

#### **Laser threat warning attack reporting**

The budget request included \$53.4 million in PE 63500F, for the multidisciplinary advanced development space program.

The committee notes that U.S. space systems are becoming increasingly vulnerable to deliberate hostile or intrusive attacks from lasers deployed by foreign governments and terrorist groups. The purpose of the laser threat warning attack reporting (LTWAR) for space program is to develop electro-optical sensors capable of detecting such laser radiation incidents on space systems.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63500F to accelerate the LTWAR.

#### **Enable network centric warfare**

The budget request included \$30.1 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force, for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence Advanced Development, but included no funding for science and technology efforts to continue development and fielding of advanced capabilities that will facilitate the ability of air platforms to engage in airborne networking and improve their ability to participate in network centric operations.

The enable network centric warfare program is an urgent need requirement that was identified by the Commander, U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), after the fiscal year 2006 President's budget request had been submitted. The concept of network centric warfare is being implemented within the Department of Defense, but challenges remain in developing the capabilities to fully enable airborne platforms to be integrated into network centric operations. This integration effort is expected to result in a reliable, secure, and assured network centric communications infrastructure for ground mobile and airborne platforms that will improve the ability

of battlefield commanders to see the battlespace and coordinate the use of weapons systems.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.2 million in PE 63789F, to accelerate development and fielding of operational airborne networking equipment for network centric operations and more quickly meet the urgent need requirement of the Commander, U.S. CENTCOM.

### **Military satellite communications**

The budget request included \$835.8 million in PE 63845F, for the Transformational Satellite Communications system (TSAT) and \$665.3 million in PE 63430F, for the Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) system.

The committee recognizes the increasing importance of communications to net-centric military operations and remains supportive of the TSAT effort to provide substantial increases in bandwidth to the military and intelligence user. The committee notes, however, that while TSAT has been an acquisition program since January 2004, only one of its seven critical technologies is mature, according to the Government Accountability Office's 2005 assessment of major weapon programs.

The committee has been concerned that the technical risks in the program are very high given the state of critical technology development. In hearings before Congress in 2004 and 2005, then-Under Secretary of the Air Force, Peter Teets, acknowledged that if the TSAT program were to experience unanticipated problems, the Air Force would adjust its strategy by taking "acquisition off-ramps." These off-ramps or back-up technologies are associated with critical technologies from the Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) satellite program.

Given the technological risks associated with TSAT, the committee recommends that the Air Force provide funding to the AEHF program for the development and procurement of a fourth AEHF satellite. The committee directs the Air Force to focus TSAT funding and development efforts primarily on those activities directly related to maturing critical technologies. Finally, the committee recommends that the Air Force consider incorporating available maturing TSAT technologies into the fourth AEHF satellite, if feasible. This approach is in accordance with the Department of Defense's updated space acquisition policy, which states that evolutionary acquisition is the preferred strategy for rapid acquisition of mature technology for the user. Procuring a fourth, incrementally enhanced AEHF satellite could serve to shorten the time in moving from AEHF to TSAT capabilities as well as reduce the overall risks in achieving TSAT capabilities.

In accordance with these recommendations, the committee recommends a decrease of \$200.0 million in PE 63845F for TSAT and an increase of \$100.0 million in PE 63430F for AEHF.

### **Space radar**

The budget request included \$225.8 million in PE 63858F, for space radar (SR).

In the statement of managers accompanying the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005

(Public Law 108–375), the conferees expressed the view that while they were strongly supportive of radar satellites, the Air Force cost estimates for the notional space based radar (SBR) architecture, as presented in the fiscal year 2005 budget request, made the system potentially unaffordable. The conferees noted that affordability would be dependent on the development of a single radar satellite system to meet both military and intelligence community needs and the integration of the space-based radar into an architecture consisting of other intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities. Consequently, the Department of Defense was directed to restructure the SBR effort to focus on continued technology maturation, architectural analysis, and system evolution.

The committee believes that while the Air Force has taken steps to address congressional concerns, the restructured space radar (SR) program still lacks sufficient programmatic and cost definition. The committee welcomes realignment of the SR program budget to focus on early development and demonstration of ground infrastructure and ground capabilities that may have benefits beyond the space radar program. While the committee supports a demonstration project to help validate technology readiness and ascertain costs for the objective system, the committee questions the Air Force decision to pursue an on-orbit demonstration as opposed to an earlier, less costly airborne experiment. Moreover, the inability of the Air Force to provide a firm cost estimate for the demonstration project illustrates the uncertainty of the approach. While the joint memorandum on the space radar program signed by the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence on January 13, 2005, is a welcome sign, the lack of agreement on a specific cost share for the program is an indication that much has yet to be decided before Congress can provide its full support for this program. Finally, the committee notes that two important reports to Congress, addressing various options for the space-based radar architecture and key features of an ISR system-of-systems architecture, have yet to be completed and received by this committee—another indication that Department plans for space radar remain uncertain.

The committee recommends a decrease of \$75.0 million in PE 63858F, and strongly urges the Department to consider an airborne demonstration in fiscal year 2006 or early fiscal year 2007 to inform a Key Decision Point B decision for the objective Space Radar program as soon as possible. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by January 15, 2006, on the Department's plan for the objective Space Radar program, including associated costs. Finally, the committee recommends that the Department seek solid commitments from the Director of National Intelligence regarding cost and requirements sharing for space radar before the fiscal year 2007 budget request submission.

#### **Tactical satellite demonstrations**

The budget request included \$23.5 million in PE 64855F for operationally responsive launch, but no funding for tactical satellite demonstrations.

The U.S. space transportation policy of January 6, 2005, directs the government to demonstrate before 2010 an initial capability for operationally responsive access to and use of space to support national security requirements. The Air Force is pursuing a joint warfighting space concept to provide prompt space support for the warfighter by rapidly launching rockets with small, militarily useful satellites that would be controlled by the warfighter. The objective is to develop tactical satellites that could be stored and, when directed, launched and ready to support operations within a few days compared to the two-year lead time that is currently needed for satellite launches. The committee has been supportive of this concept as a way to improve space support to the warfighter and reduce the cost and development time for military space systems. The Air Force and other service partners have funded the first satellite experiment and most of the satellite work for the second joint warfighting space satellite, JWS-2, (otherwise known as TacSat-3) but no funds are currently budgeted for other important demonstration pieces, including the launch. The committee notes that the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priorities list includes a \$13.5 million request for this purpose.

The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 64855F to fund the launch and range costs for JWS-2, and one year of satellite operations.

#### **Robust nuclear earth penetrator**

The budget request included \$15.2 million in PE 64222F for development of nuclear weapons support, including \$1.0 million for the development of nuclear weapons and counterproliferation technologies to support joint Air Force and National Nuclear Security Administration efforts associated with logistics and aircraft integration for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP). The committee notes that the evaluation of RNEP feasibility by the Department of Energy is not scheduled to be completed prior to 2007. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$1.0 million in PE 64222F for efforts associated with logistics and aircraft integration for the RNEP.

#### **Space control test capabilities**

The budget request included \$24.7 million in PE 64421F, for Air Force counterspace systems.

The "National Space Policy" of September 1996 specifies that the United States will develop, operate, and maintain space control capabilities to ensure freedom of action in space and, if directed, deny such freedom of action to adversaries. The committee recognizes that continuing development by the Army Aviation and Missile Research, Development and Engineering Center of software applications used to integrate offensive and defensive space control systems into a single system-of-systems simulated testbed could contribute to near-term capabilities for space control and situational awareness.

The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in PE 64421F for continued test and development of command and control capabilities for ground-based space control assets.



### **FPS-16 radar mobilization and upgrade**

The budget request included \$55.3 million in PE 64759F, for major test and evaluation investments. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 64759F for upgrade and mobilization of an additional fixed positioning system (FPS)-16 radar. Updating the radar with fully digital electronics would increase reliability, decrease maintenance time and cost, and enhance radar performance and data products. Mobilization of the radar will facilitate flexibility and increase optimal tracking coverage.

### **Ballistic missile range safety technology**

The budget request included \$13.8 million in PE 65860F for the rocket systems launch program, but no funding for ballistic missile range safety technology (BMRST).

The committee is aware that BMRST is a global positioning system based launch range safety system that has the potential to provide significant technical and reliability advantages and cost savings over current radar systems. The committee notes that several launch ranges have requested BMRST systems for local range certification as well as down-range reentry support.

The committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million in PE 65860F to support expanded BMRST system capability, critical certification, and testing requirements.

### **A-10 aircraft propulsion improvements**

The budget request included \$51.8 million in PE 27131F for the continued development of the A-10 aircraft; including \$33.9 million for A-10 propulsion improvements. The Air Force intends to operate this aircraft until fiscal year 2028; and aircrews have continued to rank propulsion as a major operational deficiency. The committee recommends an increase of \$25.0 million in PE 27131F to continue the propulsion modernization effort for the A-10 aircraft.

### **Information systems security research**

The budget request included \$109.3 million in PE 33140F, for the information systems security program. A recent National Defense University report entitled "Information Assurance: Trends in Vulnerabilities, Threats and Technologies" noted that a series of internal and external studies and policy pronouncements from the Department of Defense over the last two decades contains a basic premise, that: "the explosive changes in information technology would transform the future of military operations. The benefits of this change have been well documented but its potential vulnerabilities have been less commonly described—or addressed for corrective action." To augment the Department's work in developing solutions to information security vulnerabilities and to review associated legal and regulatory issues, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 33140F, including \$2.0 million for infrastructure assurance and security research conducted in collaboration with the Air Intelligence Agency and \$1.0 million for homeland defense threat information studies and analysis of the legal and regulatory challenges involved in cyber security.

### **Viper Strike munition for Predator**

The budget request included \$61.0 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force, for Predator UAV, in PE 35219F, for the continued development of the Predator unmanned aerial vehicle system, but did not include additional funding for the development of the Viper Strike lightweight precision munition that can be integrated onto the Predator air frame. The Viper Strike precision munition represents a transformational capability, providing pinpoint accuracy against moving, stationary, and armored targets, even in low visibility environments. The Viper Strike is an important step forward in linking powerful sensors to precision munitions to allow the rapid engagement of high-value targets on the complex 21st century battlefield. Funding would allow fielding of this important capability in the global war on terrorism to battlefield commanders in fiscal year 2006, while the Air Force establishes a program of record for future years.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 35219F, for development and early fielding of 55 Viper Strike precision munitions.

### **S-band radar**

The budget request included \$151.1 million in PE 35910F for spacetrack, but no funding for the S-band radar.

The S-band sensor system detects and tracks all low-earth orbiting objects and is the only planned system capable of providing the information required for space situational awareness and space control. Air Force funding reductions to the space surveillance system, of which S-band radar is an important component, led to eliminating funding for S-band radar in the fiscal year 2006 budget request. The committee understands it is the intention of the Air Force to continue funding this program in fiscal years 2008 to 2011. The committee believes, therefore, that additional funding will accelerate deployment and mitigate additional system costs.

The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 35910F for the S-band radar project.

### **Space-Based Space Surveillance**

The budget request included \$151.1 million in PE 35910F, for spacetrack, of which \$114.2 million is for the Space-Based Space Surveillance (SBSS) program.

The SBSS is a sensor that will conduct deep space and low-earth orbit surveillance in support of U.S. space control and situational awareness requirements. The committee notes that funding cuts in fiscal year 2005 delayed the SBSS launch for one year from 2008 to 2009, causing a potential gap in space surveillance capabilities. Additional funding for SBSS was included in the Air Force Chief of Staff's unfunded priorities list.

The committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million in PE 35910F for SBSS to purchase long-lead hardware to support assembly, integration, and testing in fiscal year 2006.

### **Nano-materials manufacturing**

The budget request included \$36.9 million in PE 78011F, for industrial preparedness. As research advances lead to robust com-

posite material designs assembled from the nano-scale level, manufacturing processes must develop in parallel to expedite production and use of new structures. The committee recommends an increase in PE 78011F of \$4.0 million for nano-materials manufacturing.

#### **Air Force support systems**

The budget request included \$10.3 million in PE 78611F, for support systems development. Fuel tank coatings require periodic inspection for adhesion and corrosion and may demand removal and reapplication. Current procedures are costly as well as hazardous to maintenance personnel. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.9 million in PE 78611F to complete development of a semi-autonomous robot that would replace personnel in the dangerous work inside aircraft fuel tanks and would provide cost savings, particularly in the maintenance of legacy aircraft.

The Department of Defense's pursuit of "cradle to grave" weapon systems management shows promise in improving supply chains and logistics. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 78611F for an aging aircraft logistics management integrated data environment. The integrated system would enable an "as-is" depiction of the C-5/C-17 weapons systems at any given point in time. Logistics and supply chain decision-making improvements support cost savings and increased levels of readiness.

The committee further recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in PE 78611F for the aircraft systems and support infrastructure project and for research into five specific focus areas: structure and materials; avionics, electronics and software; information technology; environmental compliance; and depot industrial processes.

#### **Personnel and pay information technology systems**

The committee understands that the Department of Defense plans to begin implementing its Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System (DIMHRS) for personnel and pay in fiscal year 2006. In development since 1998, this program is intended, in part, to address long-standing problems with military personnel pay. These problems have only been exacerbated in recent years by the call-up of numerous reservists and guardsman to serve in the ongoing global war on terrorism. The DIMHRS implementation plan for a single consolidated military personnel and pay system across the entire Department is a laudable goal, long overdue, and one which the committee supports.

The first phase of the DIMHRS implementation begins in fiscal year 2006 with the Army, and is planned to continue through the end of fiscal year 2007. Additional phases, or "spirals," are still under development. However, the committee is concerned that the program is under funded by \$49.0 million in fiscal year 2006.

The committee has also been briefed on a separate effort planned within the Air Force to enhance their legacy personnel and pay system, called Personnel Service Delivery (PSD). This proposed system appears to duplicate many of the features and attributes of the DIMHRS system already under development. Additionally, the PSD program has not yet received certification from the Secretary of Defense, as required by section 332 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law

108–375). The budget request included \$16.4 million in PE 91220F and \$25.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, for the Air Force's PSD effort.

The committee is concerned that the Air Force is continuing to invest in efforts that duplicate DIMHRS. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction in PE 91220F, of \$16.4 million; and a reduction in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, of \$25.6 million to eliminate funding for the PSD effort. The committee also recommends an increase in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, of \$49.0 million for the DIMHRS program.

#### **Defense-wide**

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
			<b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE</b>			
0400	0601101E	1	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	130,090		130,090
0400	0601111D8Z	2	GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH Focus center research program		4,000 [4,000]	4,000
0400	0601114D8Z	3	DEFENSE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RESEARCH	9,164		9,164
0400	0601120D8Z	4	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	10,282		10,282
0400	0601384BP	5	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM SPECTRA	72,533	1,850 [1,850]	74,383
0400	0602000D8Z	6	INSENSITIVE MUNITIONS - EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT	5,176		5,176
0400	0602227D8Z	7	MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	9,845		9,845
0400	0602228D8Z	8	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) STUDY	13,887		13,887
0400	0602234D8Z	9	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	29,914		29,914
0400	0602301E	10	COMPUTING SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY			
0400	0602302E	11	EMBEDDED SOFTWARE AND PERVASIVE COMPUTING			
0400	0602303E	12	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	198,831		198,831
0400	0602304E	13	COGNITIVE COMPUTING SYSTEMS	200,799		200,799
0400	0602383E	14	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	145,354		145,354
0400	0602384BP	15	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM Portable chemical/biological detection sensor system Automated MIST Next generation chem/bio suit Multi-purpose bio-defense immuno-arrays Mustard gas antidote	187,787	13,200 [2,000] [1,200] [2,000] [5,000] [3,000]	200,987

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
0400	0602702E	16	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	361,562	-33,020	328,542
			Agile interceptor		[-3,000]	
			Guided projectiles		[-3,800]	
			Riverine crawler		[-3,420]	
			Program reduction		[-18,000]	
			Pre-conflict anticipation and shaping		[-4,800]	
0400	0602712E	17	MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	294,188		294,188
0400	0602715E	18	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	206,487	1,000	207,487
0400	0602716BR	19	WMD DEFEAT TECHNOLOGY	241,736	[1,000]	241,736
			Human performance research	106,708		106,708
0400	0602716E	20	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY			
0400	0602717BR	21	WMD DEFENSE TECHNOLOGIES			
0400	0602787D8Z	22	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY			
0400	1160401BB	23	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,595		13,595
0400	1160407BB	24	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,215		2,215
0400	0603002D8Z	25	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY			
0400	0603121D8Z	26	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	34,529		34,529
0400	0603122D8Z	27	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	55,301	13,000	68,301
			Explosive effects		[8,000]	
			Bio-engineered agent assessment tool		[3,000]	
			Fuel cell power for continuity of operations		[2,000]	
0400	0603160BR	28	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES - PROLIFERATION PREV	96,143	4,000	100,143
			Fiber radiation detectors		[3,000]	
			Radiation portal monitors		[1,000]	

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
0400	0603175C	29	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY Massively parallel optical interconnects BMD Technology	136,241	-23,000 [2,000] [-25,000]	113,241
0400	0603225D8Z	30	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	25,102		25,102
0400	0603285E	31	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS			
0400	0603286E	32	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS Long Gun	75,866	-6,400 [-6,400]	69,466
0400	0603287E	33	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	223,811		223,811
0400	0603384BP	34	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED Anthrax/plague oral vaccine research Miniaturized chemical detectors	164,481	7,750 [3,750] [4,000]	172,231
0400	0603400D8Z	35	JOINT UNMANNED COMBAT AIR SYSTEMS (JUCAS) ADVANCED	35,000		35,000
0400	0603648D8Z	36	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS			
0400	0603704D8Z	37	SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT			
0400	0603711BR	38	ARMS CONTROL TECHNOLOGY			
0400	0603712S	39	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS Embedded passives research and development Diminishing manufacturing source (DMS) Manufacturing supply chain Vehicle fuel cell program	22,360	14,500 [3,000] [1,500] [3,000] [7,000]	36,860
0400	0603713S	40	DISTRIBUTION PROCESS OWNER TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	10,000		10,000
0400	0603716D8Z	41	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	64,101		64,101
0400	0603727D8Z	42	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	10,205		10,205

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
0400	0603739E	43	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	214,378	-8,000	206,378
			Small scale systems packaging		[2,000]	
			Combat optical fiber technology		[-3,000]	
			Networked microsystems		[-5,000]	
			Visible/short wave IR-photon counting		[-2,000]	
0400	0603750D8Z	44	ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	163,649	24,700	188,349
			Crossed field radiation technology		[2,000]	
			Communications and control alert framework		[4,700]	
			Certification of flexible JP-8 pilot		[18,000]	
0400	0603755D8Z	45	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	189,747	5,000	194,747
			Prevent and detect cyber-based threats		[1,500]	
			Simulation center upgrade		[3,500]	
0400	0603760E	46	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	216,408		216,408
0400	0603762E	47	SENSOR AND GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY			
0400	0603763E	48	MARINE TECHNOLOGY			
0400	0603764E	49	LAND WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	139,100	-47,000	92,100
			Future Combat Systems research support		[-15,000]	
			Multi-modal missile		[-6,000]	
			Non-lethal weapons new start		[-6,000]	
			Program reduction		[-14,000]	
			Tactical urban operations		[-6,000]	
0400	0603765E	50	CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	162,534		162,534
0400	0603766E	51	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	136,899	-3,000	133,899
			Multi-dimensional robot		[-3,000]	



**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
0400	0603767E	52	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	189,452	-5,000	184,452
			Program reduction		[-5,000]	
0400	0603768E	53	GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	103,272		103,272
0400	0603769SE	54	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPN	14,689		14,689
0400	0603781D8Z	55	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	25,209		25,209
0400	0603805S	56	DUAL USE APPLICATION PROGRAMS			
0400	0603826D8Z	57	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	110,717		110,717
0400	0603832D8Z	58	JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	34,928		34,928
0400	0603941D8Z	59	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	28,614		28,614
0400	0603942D8Z	60	TECHNOLOGY LINK	3,435		3,435
0400	0605160D8Z	61	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT			
0400	1160402BB	62	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMEN	104,315	-6,200	98,115
			Voice activated handheld translator		[2,300]	
			Special Operations portable power source		[5,000]	
			Mark V replacement		[1,500]	
			Advanced tactical laser reduction		[-15,000]	
0400	0603228D8Z	63	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	6,683		6,683
0400	0603527D8Z	64	RETRACT LARCH	11,755		11,755
0400	0603709D8Z	65	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	18,275		18,275
0400	0603714D8Z	66	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	30,632		30,632
0400	0603851D8Z	67	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROG			
0400	0603879C	68	ADVANCED CONCEPTS, EVALUATIONS AND SYSTEMS			
0400	0603881C	69	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	1,143,610		1,143,610

# **Title II-RDT and E** (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
0400	0603882C	70	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT GMD enhanced testing	3,266,196	175,000 [100,000]	3,441,196
0400	0603883C	71	Aegis SM-3 development and deployment	483,863	[75,000]	483,863
0400	0603884BP	72	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE BOOST DEFENSE SEGMENT CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	100,796	4,300 [4,300]	105,096
0400	0603884C	73	Miniaturized CO oxidation technology BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	529,829	10,000 [10,000]	539,829
0400	0603886C	74	Airborne infrared surveillance system BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM INTERCEPTOR	229,658	-50,000 [-50,000]	179,658
0400	0603888C	75	BMD System interceptors	617,456		617,456
0400	0603889C	76	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST & TARGETS BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PRODUCTS	455,152	-30,000 [-30,000]	425,152
0400	0603890C	77	BMD Products BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS CORE	447,006	-30,000 [-30,000]	417,006
0400	0603891C	78	BMD System Core SPECIAL PROGRAMS - MDA	349,522	-50,000 [-50,000]	299,522
0400	0603920D8Z	79	BMD Special Programs HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	14,305		14,305
0400	0603923D8Z	80	COALITION WARFARE	5,777		5,777
0400	0604016D8Z	81	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	5,141		5,141
0400	0604400D8Z	82	JOINT UNMANNED COMBAT AIR SYSTEMS (J-UCAS) ADVANCED			
0400	0604648D8Z	83	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	3,000		3,000
0400	0604722D8Z	84	JOINT SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOP			
0400	0605017D8Z	85	REDUCTION OF TOTAL OWNERSHIP COST	24,824		24,824

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
0400	0303191D8Z	86	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	3,566		3,566
0400	0604051D8Z	87	DEFENSE ACQUISITION CHALLENGE PROGRAM (DACP)	28,975		28,975
0400	0604384BP	88	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	280,908	1,800	282,708
			Military mail screening system development		[1,800]	
0400	0604618D8Z	89	MANPADS DEFENSE PROGRAM	13,349		13,349
0400	0604709D8Z	90	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	13,745		13,745
0400	0604764K	91	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	9,325		9,325
0400	0604771D8Z	92	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	11,075		11,075
0400	0605013BL	93	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	19,574		19,574
0400	0605015BL	94	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT-STANDARD PROC	5,074		5,074
0400	0605016D8Z	95	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	75,987		75,987
0400	0605018SE	96	DEFENSE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM	20,322		20,322
0400	0605019D8Z	97	ACQUISITION DOMAIN	3,600		3,600
0400	0605140D8Z	98	TRUSTED FOUNDRY	31,655		31,655
0400	0605648D8Z	99	DEFENSE ACQUISITION EXECUTIVE (DAE) PILOT PROGRAM	1,000		1,000
0400	0303129K	100	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	13,367		13,367
0400	0303140K	101	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM			
0400	0303141K	102	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	17,952		17,952
0400	0303158K	103	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	14,580		14,580
0400	0305840K	104	ELECTRONIC COMMERCE	6,698		6,698
0400	0305840S	105	ELECTRONIC COMMERCE			
0400	0901200D8Z	106	BMMP DOMAIN MANAGEMENT AND SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	11,802		11,802
0400	0603704D8Z	107	SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT	19,916		19,916
0400	0603757D8Z	108	TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (T2)			

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
0400	0603835D8Z	109	TRANSFORMATION INITIATIVES PROGRAM	10,152		10,152
0400	0603858D8Z	110	UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE DETECTION AND CLEARANCE			
0400	0604140D8Z	111	CAPITAL ASSET MANAGEMENT SYSTEM-MILITARY EQUIPMENT	4,812		4,812
0400	0604774D8Z	112	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	13,475		13,475
0400	0604875D8Z	113	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	9,254		9,254
0400	0604940D8Z	114	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT	128,759	5,000	133,759
			UAV systems and operations validation		[5,000]	
0400	0604943D8Z	115	THERMAL VICAR	7,278		7,278
0400	0605104D8Z	116	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	31,075		31,075
0400	0605110BR	117	CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT			
0400	0605110D8Z	118	USD(A&T)-CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	1,999		1,999
0400	0605114D8Z	119	BLACK LIGHT			
0400	0605116D8Z	120	GENERAL SUPPORT TO C3I			
0400	0605117D8Z	121	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	36,895		36,895
0400	0605123D8Z	122	INTERAGENCY EXPORT LICENSE AUTOMATION			
0400	0605124D8Z	123	DEFENSE TRAVEL SYSTEM	20,441		20,441
0400	0605126J	124	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	81,504		81,504
0400	0605128D8Z	125	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)			
0400	0605130D8Z	126	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	35,738		35,738
0400	0605161D8Z	127	NUCLEAR MATTERS	12,442		12,442
0400	0605170D8Z	128	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	10,706		10,706
0400	0605200D8Z	129	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	5,282		5,282
0400	0605384BP	130	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM			
0400	0605502BR	131	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH	81,425		81,425

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
0400	0605502C	132	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH - MDA			
0400	0605502D8Z	133	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0400	0605502E	134	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0400	0605710D8Z	135	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS - C3I		10,000	10,000
			Foreign Supplier Assessment Center		[10,000]	
0400	0605790D8Z	136	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH/CHALLENGE ADMIN	1,983		1,983
0400	0605798S	137	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	5,393		5,393
0400	0605799D8Z	138	FORCE TRANSFORMATION DIRECTORATE	19,927	20,000	39,927
			Joint operational small satellites		[20,000]	
0400	0605801K	139	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES (DTIC)	49,969		49,969
0400	0605801KA	140	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	8,853		8,853
0400	0605803SE	141	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUA	8,873		8,873
0400	0605804D8Z	142	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	49,472		49,472
0400	0605898E	143	MANAGEMENT HQ - R&D	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0301555G	144	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0301556G	145	SPECIAL PROGRAM			
0400	0303169D8Z	146	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RAPID ACQUISITION	5,580		5,580
0400	0305193D8Z	147	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) (JI	13,940		13,940
0400	0305193G	148	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) (JMIP)			
0400	0901585C	149	PENTAGON RESERVATION	17,386		17,386
0400	0901598C	150	MANAGEMENT HQ - MDA	99,327		99,327
0400	0901598D8W	151	IT SOFTWARE DEV INITIATIVES	1,694		1,694
0400	0604130V	152	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR SECURITY (DISS)	16,850		16,850
0400	0605127T	153	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE (PFP) INFORMATION MANAGEMENT S	5,660		5,660

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
0400	0607384BP	154	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEM	10,093		10,093
0400	0208043J	155	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,570		1,570
0400	0208045K	156	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	65,517		65,517
0400	0208052J	157	JOINT ANALYTICAL MODEL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			
0400	0301011G	158	CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0301301L	159	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0301318BB	160	HUMINT (CONTROLLED)	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0301398L	161	MANAGEMENT HQ - GDIP	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0301555BB	162	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0301566BB	163	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0302016K	164	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	659		659
0400	0302019K	165	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRA	5,466		5,466
0400	0303126K	166	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS - DCS	1,470		1,470
0400	0303131K	167	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWO	7,438		7,438
0400	0303140D8Z	168	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	12,546		12,546
0400	0303140G	169	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	462,211		462,211
0400	0303148K	170	DISA MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	3,426		3,426
0400	0303149J	171	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	3,549		3,549
0400	0303149K	172	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	6,311		6,311
0400	0303150K	173	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	52,331		52,331
0400	0303153K	174	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	14,097		14,097
0400	0303165K	175	DEFENSE COLLABORATION TOOL SUITE (DCTS)			
0400	0303170K	176	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	79,018		79,018
0400	0303610K	177	TELEPORT PROGRAM	12,180		12,180

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
0400	0304210BB	178	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	21,116		21,116
0400	0304345BQ	179	NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305102BQ	180	DEFENSE GEOSPACIAL - INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305125D8Z	181	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	11,363		11,363
0400	0305127BZ	182	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305146BZ	183	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (JMIP)	20,406		20,406
0400	0305146D8Z	184	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (JMIP)			
0400	0305183L	185	DEFENSE HUMAN INTELLIGENCE (HUMINT) PROGRAM (DHIP)	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305190D8Z	186	C3I INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS			
0400	0305191D8Z	187	TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (JMIP)			
0400	0305193L	188	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) (JI)	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305199D8Z	189	NET CENTRICITY	8,387		8,387
0400	0305202G	190	DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305206G	191	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS (JMIP)	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305207G	192	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS (JMIP)	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305208BQ	193	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS (JMIP)	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305208G	194	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS (JMIP)	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305208L	195	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS (JMIP)	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305883L	196	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET (HDBT) INTEL SUPPORT	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305884L	197	INTELLIGENCE PLANNING AND REVIEW ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305885G	198	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305889G	199	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0307141G	200	NASS, IO TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION AND TOOL DEV	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0307207G	201	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (JMIP)	[ ]		[ ]

**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0400	0708011S	202	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS Advanced manufacturing technologies	18,219	6,500 [1,500] [5,000]	24,719
0400	0708012S	203	Laser additive systems manufacturing for titanium and alloy parts			
0400	0902298J	203	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	2,900		2,900
0400	1001018D8Z	204	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS)	5,762		5,762
0400	1160279BB	205	NATO JOINT STARS	25,474		25,474
0400	1160403BB	206	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH/SMALL BUS TECH TR			
0400	1160404BB	207	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AVIATION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELC	104,330		104,330
0400	1160405BB	208	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	63,513		63,513
		209	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	33,167	2,500 [2,500]	35,667
			Wireless management and control system			
0400	1160408BB	210	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	66,313	7,400 [4,900]	73,713
			Maritime UAV sensor			
			Lightweight solar panels			
0400	1160421BB	211	SPECIAL OPERATIONS CV-22 DEVELOPMENT	29,954		29,954
0400	1160425BB	212	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AIRCRAFT DEFENSIVE SYSTEMS	38,824		38,824
0400	1160426BB	213	OPERATIONS ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS) DEVI	2,040		2,040
0400	XXXXXXX	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,441,033		3,441,033
			<b>Total, RDT&amp;E Defense-Wide</b>	<b>18,803,416</b>	<b>39,880</b>	<b>18,843,296</b>



**Title II-RDT and E**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Acct</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
			<b>OPERATIONAL TEST &amp; EVALUATION, DEFENSE</b>			
0460	0603941D8Z	1	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY			
0460	0604940D8Z	2	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT	43,928		43,928
0460	0605118D8Z	3	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	10,340		10,340
0460	0605131D8Z	4	LIVE FIRE TESTING	114,190		114,190
0460	0605804D8Z	5	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION			
			<b>Total, Operational Test &amp; Evaluation, Defense</b>	<b>168,458</b>		<b>168,458</b>
			<b>TOTAL RDT&amp;E</b>	<b>69,356,040</b>	<b>407,197</b>	<b>69,763,237</b>

**Focus center research program**

The budget request included no funding in PE 60111D8Z, for government/industry co-sponsorship of university research.

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 60111D8Z for a component of the focus center research program managed by the Director, Defense Research and Engineering. This partnership achieved successful transition of technologies to advance capabilities of weapons systems, radars, missile seekers, and information networks. The program also supports microelectronics research and training of future scientists and engineers.

**Superstructural particle evaluation**

The budget request included \$72.5 million in PE 61384BP, for chemical and biological defense basic research. Basic science challenges continue to plague efforts to develop comprehensive methods for countering threats posed by chemical and biological warfare agents. The committee commends the Department of Defense for supporting basic research to address both the chemical and biological threat, and recommends an increase of \$1.85 million in PE 61384BP to accelerate promising work in superstructural particle evaluation and characterization with targeted reaction analysis (SPECTRA). This program would allow for testing of agents at the cellular level and the possible rapid development of a series of bio-protection substances. These protection methods could improve survivability and alleviate symptoms of exposure to chemical and biological warfare agents.

**Chemical and biological defense applied research**

The budget request included \$187.8 million in PE 62384BP, for chemical and biological defense applied research. The Department of Defense requires improved prediction models for timely monitoring of exposure to different chemical warfare agents and toxic industrial chemicals. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.2 million in PE 62384BP for an automated man-in-simulant-test (MIST) program to facilitate testing and development of a new generation of protective clothing. The new testing capability would allow for reliable reproduction of the same test and would lower test operating costs and shorten the time between tests.

The Department requires a flexible analytical tool for bio-defense to support force protection and intelligence and threat assessment activities. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 62384BP for continuing research into the development of multipurpose bio-defense immuno-arrays. The immuno-arrays would allow for rapid, inexpensive characterization of new and novel pathogens and expedited development of countermeasures to biological threats, thereby enhancing force protection and threat assessment capabilities.

Current chemical and biological protective suits used by the military have deficiencies, including limited life; limited moisture vapor permeability; and the need for post-contamination containment. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62384BP for development and demonstration of self-decontaminating prototype chemical and biological protective suits, which would address some of these limitations.

One of the objectives of the applied chemical and biological research program is to develop lightweight, effective, and fast agent detectors for widespread use. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62384BP for research and development of a portable chemical/biological sensor system using quartz crystal microbalance technology. Such a system would have potential application for autonomous vehicles and individual soldiers.

#### **Mustard gas antidote**

The budget request included \$21.5 million in PE 62384BP, for medical chemical defense applied research. This program emphasizes the prevention of chemical casualties and addresses capability gaps in the area of prophylaxes for chemical warfare agents. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 62384BP for mustard gas antidote research. The committee commends the Department of Defense for current research focused on a mustard gas antidote using signal transduction inhibition antioxidant liposomes (STIMAL), and notes that STIMAL research has demonstrated the ability to substantially reduce or eliminate the effects of a range of chemical and biological weapons.

#### **Tactical technology**

The budget request included \$361.6 million in PE 62702E, for tactical technology. The committee recommends a decrease of \$33.02 million in PE 62702E, including decreases of \$6.8 million in unjustified growth for two missile programs—agile interceptor and guided projectiles; \$3.42 million from the riverine crawler under-water vehicle, which would duplicate similar unmanned systems already under development; and \$4.8 million from the newly initiated preconflict anticipation and shaping program, which does not contain sufficient justification.

#### **Human performance in hazardous environments**

The budget request included \$206.5 million in PE 62716BR, for weapons of mass destruction (WMD) defeat, but no funds for a central repository of information on human vulnerabilities to, and performance in, adverse environments which result from weapons' effects. Command authorities need information regarding immediate occupational health and environmental safety implications to protect forces conducting and supporting military operations. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in PE 62716BR for demonstration and validation of emerging products, which would provide information on human performance in hazardous environments.

#### **Technology Support Working Group**

The budget request included \$55.3 million in PE 63122D8Z for combating terrorism technology support. The Technology Support Working Group (TSWG) manages efforts under this account that focus on interagency rapid prototyping research and development programs for combating terrorism technologies in response to user requirements.

Current threats underscore the need to protect bridges, tunnels, oil pipelines, and other critical infrastructures against exposure to

attack. Design engineers lack the basic structural response data for retrofit and new construction for many of these unique and important structures. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million for a defense against explosive effects program to close existing capability gaps, to develop infrastructure protection guidelines, and to validate and enhance existing and new analytical tools for use by armed services and homeland defense officials.

Genetic engineering of bio-agents may provide a powerful countermeasure to bio-detection systems currently in use and in development, and may also increase vaccine and therapy defeat capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63122D8Z for the bio-engineered agent assessment tool, which has the potential to deliver a unique set of real-time chemical and biological identification and analysis capabilities, to address the threat of biological terrorism which employs engineered agents.

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63122D8Z for the development of fuel cell technologies for continuity of operations missions. Fuel cell technology has potential advantages over traditional backup power options as it could provide continuous, low maintenance, extended operation, and is useable in confined spaces.

#### **Radiation detection technology**

The budget request included \$6.6 million in PE 63160BR for proliferation prevention and defeat radiation detection technology. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63160BR for procuring glass scintillation fiber radiation detectors and developing new portable applications, including backpack detectors, panels for aircraft, and detectors included in clothing systems. The committee further recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in PE 63160BR for the development of a state-of-the-art radiation portal monitor using High Purity Germanium technology that will surpass the performance and accuracy of portal monitors currently in use. The committee notes the importance of developing higher quality, more cost-effective nuclear radiation detectors to enhance our ability to detect and identify hazardous materials that pose a proliferation threat.

#### **Ballistic missile defense reductions**

The budget request included \$136.3 million in PE 63175C for ballistic missile defense technology; \$455.2 million in PE 63889C for ballistic missile defense products; \$447.0 million in PE 63890C for ballistic missile defense systems core; and \$345.0 million in PE 63891C for special programs—MDA. The committee notes that within each of these program elements there is funding specified for activities in fiscal year 2008 and beyond that lack sufficient budget justification.

The committee recommends a decrease of \$25.0 million in PE 63175C for ballistic missile defense technology; a decrease of \$30.0 million in PE 63889C for ballistic missile defense products; a decrease of \$30.0 million in PE 63890C for ballistic missile defense systems core; and a decrease of \$50.0 million in PE 63891C for special programs—MDA.

### **Massively parallel optical interconnects**

The budget request included \$136.0 million in PE 63175C for ballistic missile defense technology.

Massively parallel optical interconnects for micro-satellite data communications is an advanced technology that would greatly increase the reliability and precision of satellite guidance for advanced tactical missiles. The committee is aware of the key role played by satellite guided-precision munitions during Operation Iraqi Freedom, and supports efforts to improve upon this capability in a timely manner.

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63175C to enable the technology associated with massively parallel optical interconnects to advance to the deployment stage.

### **Missile technology**

The budget request included \$75.9 million in PE 63286E, for advanced aerospace systems. The committee recommends a decrease of \$6.4 million in PE 63286E for the Long Gun program. The committee notes that this project duplicates the Navy's affordable weapon system effort, which is not yet part of long-range Navy acquisition plans. There is no validated requirement for the effort and no funding programmed in the Navy budget to transition the technology.

### **Anthrax and plague oral vaccine research and development**

The budget request included \$63.1 million in PE 63384BP, for advanced technology development specific to medical bio-defense. The committee supports the Department of Defense's efforts under this account to develop and test safe and effective prophylaxes and therapies for pre- and post-exposure to biological threats and agents. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.75 million in PE 63384BP for Phase I clinical trials and initial production of the oral anthrax plague vaccine. This effort parallels the Department's plague vaccine development program and may provide superior protection against pneumonic plague.

### **Miniaturized RAMAN chemical identification system**

The budget request included \$164.5 million in PE 63384BP, for the chemical and biological defense advanced technology program. The ability to rapidly characterize substances such as explosives, chemical agents, toxic industrial chemicals, narcotics, and other hazardous materials under a variety of conditions poses difficult challenges. Combining real-time, reliable sensing and identification techniques into a hand-held device has been an even more complicated task.

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 63384BP for accelerated development of a small, lightweight chemical identification system, which uses the RAMAN spectroscopy technology. These additional resources are intended to ensure a power supply that lasts nearly twice as long as currently available, in a device that is under one quarter the weight but which maintains the substance identification speed of larger stationary machines.

### **Diminishing manufacturing sources**

The budget request included \$22.4 million in PE 63712S, for general logistics research and development technology demonstrations. The military faces challenges in maintaining a supply of replacement and repair parts for legacy systems, a costly problem with readiness implications and no coordinated solution. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.5 million in PE 63712S for continuation of a project designed to create a single repository of information for addressing the diminishing manufacturing source problem.

The Department of Defense needs a capability to develop and evaluate methods and processes for manufacturing printed circuit boards with buried passive components and other advanced technologies relevant to warfighter needs. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63712S for the embedded passives research and development test bed to enable advanced domestic capability in the military crucial technology area of electronic systems.

The committee further recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63712S to support the manufacturing supply chain and for increased involvement of small- and medium-sized firms in meeting surge production requirements.

### **Vehicle fuel cell program**

The budget request included \$22.4 million in PE 63712S, for general logistics research and development technology demonstrations. A recent Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) report entitled "Potential Use of Hydrogen as a Defense Logistics Fuel" noted that hydrogen power may offer benefits to the warfighter such as stealth and sustainment and could provide multiple potential sources of fuel. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.0 million in PE 63712S for acceleration of the Department of Defense vehicle fuel cell program, particularly in development of a hydrogen logistics fuel for use in both tactical and nontactical military vehicles. Consistent with the recommendations made by DLA, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a Hydrogen Logistics Initiative to develop a comprehensive and integrated strategy and plan for the appropriate use of hydrogen and acquisition of hydrogen to meet Department requirements for the future.

### **Advanced electronics**

The budget request included \$214.4 million in PE 63739E, for advanced electronics. The committee recommends a decrease of \$10.0 million in PE 63739E, including decreases of \$3.0 million from the combat optical fiber technology program, which requires additional fundamental research prior to developmental work; \$5.0 million from the networked microsystems program; and \$2.0 million from the visible short wave infra-red photon counting project. These programs are new starts in fiscal year 2006. The committee recommends spending levels more appropriate for the start-up year of such programs.

### **Small scale systems packaging**

The budget request included \$214.4 million in PE 63739E, for advanced electronics technology. Small scale systems, devices and

interconnections on the order of micro- and nano-scale in size are becoming more frequent components in military systems. Research on individual components shows promise, but efforts at integration of small scale components systems are not keeping pace with advances in research. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63739E to address challenges in packaging small scale components into systems.

#### **Advanced ferrite antenna**

The budget request included \$163.6 million in PE 63750D8Z, for advanced concept technology demonstrations. Use of the advanced ferrite antenna would allow replacement of large antennas and reduction of the antenna footprint. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63750D8Z for crossed field radiation technology to test the advanced ferrite antenna to meet Navy and military standards.

#### **Communications and control alert framework**

The budget request included \$163.6 million in PE 63750D8Z, for advanced concept technology demonstrations. The Department of Defense's complex command and control structure poses management challenges critical to the successful prosecution of any single mission. Important collaborations with other agencies and governments create further complications. The layers of permission for sharing of information, combined with time-sensitive needs to disseminate data across networks and between operating domains, presents an ideal project for exploration by the advanced concepts technology demonstration process.

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.7 million in PE 63750D8Z to bridge the gap between initial research on the command and control alert framework system and full accomplishment of design objectives for testing of a comprehensive, flexible data-sharing system. The alert system would allow local data managers to control information access and would enable participants to filter data streams and reduce information overload.

#### **Flexible JP-8 military fuel certification**

The budget request included \$163.6 million in PE 63750D8Z, for advanced concept technology demonstrations. The Department of Defense continues to support efforts aimed at near- and far-term solutions for energy sources, particularly those for transportation. One such research program involves development of a clean jet fuel source. In support of efforts to examine new forms of energy and to meet the Department's clean fuel targets, the committee recommends an increase of \$18.0 million in PE 63750D8Z for final certification of a flexible JP-8 military fuel pilot program to facilitate transition to an advanced concept technology demonstration.

#### **Prevention and detection of cyber threats**

The budget request included \$189.8 million in PE 63755D8Z, for the high performance computing modernization program. The President's Information Technology Advisory Committee noted in a February 2005 report entitled "Cyber Security: A Crisis of Prioritization" that "the information technology infrastructure of

the United States, which is now vital for communication, commerce, and control of our physical infrastructure, is highly vulnerable to terrorist and criminal attacks.” The Department of Defense uses networks to communicate with bases, research facilities, and other installations. These networks are vulnerable to a number of types of attack that could be used to break into communication lines and to substitute false information for authentic commands. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.5 million in PE 63755D8Z to support increased research into addressing cyber-based emerging threats and growing challenges presented by various forms of computer-facilitated attack.

#### **Simulation center upgrade**

The budget request included \$189.8 million in PE 63755D8Z, for the high performance computing modernization program. The Department of Defense must possess the latest, state-of-the-art computing equipment and capabilities, particularly for the processing and storage of classified data. While the Department has requested funds to operate facilities charged with development, testing, and integration of strategic defense technologies and simulations, no funding is requested for equipment upgrades. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million in PE 63755D8Z for upgrades to the Space and Missile Defense Command simulation center to meet computational demands for end-to-end simulation, testing, and evaluation of advanced interceptors and sensors.

#### **Land warfare technology**

The budget request included \$139.1 million in PE 63764E, for land warfare technology. The committee recommends a decrease of \$47.0 million in PE 63764E due to unjustified program growth and excessive funding levels for new starts. Specifically, the committee recommends decreases of \$15.0 million in the future combat systems support program, which would have increased by 66 percent in one year under the budget request; \$6.0 million in the multimodal missile program, for which \$12.4 million was requested for a program in the concept stage; \$6.0 million from a non-lethal weapons program new start, which should more closely follow the needs of the Joint Non-Lethal Weapons Directorate; and \$6.0 million from the tactical urban operations program, to promote an effort more focused specifically on the particular needs of the urban warfighter.

#### **Network centric warfare technology**

The budget request included \$136.9 million in PE 63766E, for network centric warfare technology. The committee recommends a decrease of \$3.0 million in PE 63766E from the multi-dimensional mobility robot program, a newly initiated program that duplicates other unmanned ground equipment development programs.

#### **Sensor technology**

The budget request included \$189.5 million in PE 63767E, for sensor technology. The committee recommends a decrease of \$5.0 million in PE 63767E from the network centric sensing engage-



ment programs, due to unjustified program growth and duplication of ongoing sensor integration work.

#### **Advanced tactical laser**

The budget request included \$61.8 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for Special Operations Advanced Technology Development, in PE 116407BB, for continuing development of the advanced tactical laser (ATL).

The ATL Advanced Concepts Technology Demonstration is a long-standing effort to weaponize directed energy technology into an existing tactical platform. While a potentially promising concept, the program has faced formidable technical challenges and continues to encounter new challenges, especially in the area of power generation to satisfy the high energy requirements to power the weapon system. Proposed funding for the program has increased considerably in fiscal year 2006, and is inconsistent with the technical challenges remaining to be solved before the program can move forward.

The committee recommends a decrease of \$15.0 million in PE116407BB, while the goals of the program are realigned and remaining technical challenges associated with the advanced tactical laser program are addressed.

#### **Mark V patrol boat replacement craft prototype**

The budget request included \$104.3 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for Special Operations Advanced Technology Development, in PE 116402BB, but did not include funding to complete the development, testing, and evaluation of the Mark V patrol boat replacement craft prototype.

The Mark V patrol boat is an important component of the Naval Special Warfare Command's overall special operations capabilities, but has proven to be very hard on the special operators who operate the boat or utilize it for insertion and extraction of special operations forces. The incidence of stress fractures and spinal injuries associated with the rough ride of a Mark V operating in medium to heavy seas has been very high. The Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, has expressed concerns and initiated actions to improve the performance of the current Mark V through the introduction of shock-mitigating seats and to begin development of a replacement craft. A new design has been developed and a prototype craft incorporating composite technologies, shock-mitigation techniques, and improved hull design is near completion. Additional funding is required to complete testing, and evaluation of the prototype craft.

The committee recommends an increase of \$1.5 million in PE 116402BB, for final development, testing, and evaluation of the Mark V patrol boat replacement craft prototype.

#### **Special operations portable power source program**

The budget request did not include funding for the development of solid oxide fuel cell systems for special operators. Such systems are designed to reduce the weight burden of batteries by a factor of 10. Current battery systems are large and heavy, burdening the

logistical chain, and limiting operators and the flight ranges of their unmanned aerial vehicles.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for Special Operations Advanced Technology Development, in PE 116402BB, for the portable power source program.

#### **Voice activated handheld translator**

The budget request did not include funding for the development of a voice activated handheld translator for special operations forces. This technology, deployed in Afghanistan in 2002, allows special operators to communicate with local populations when they do not speak the local language or have a reliable linguist with them. Research is required to refine, test, and demonstrate the translator capabilities, including two-way translation.

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.3 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for Special Operations Advanced Technology Development, in PE 116408BB, for development of a voice activated handheld translator.

#### **Aegis ballistic missile defense**

The budget request included \$3.3 billion in PE 63882C for the ballistic missile defense midcourse defense segment, of which approximately \$811.2 million is included for the Aegis ballistic missile defense (BMD) system.

The Aegis BMD element is intended to provide U.S. surface combatants the capability to detect, track, intercept, and destroy short-to intermediate-range ballistic missiles in the ascent, midcourse, and terminal phases of flight. The committee notes that the Aegis BMD system has demonstrated capability through a rigorous test program that includes five out of six successful flight intercepts of short-range ballistic missiles between 2002 and 2005, with the last test conducted under operationally realistic conditions.

Aegis BMD will provide missile defense protection for U.S. deployed forces, allies, and friends against the most imminent threats. The Commander, U.S. Pacific Command testified in March 2005 before the Committee on Armed Services that: (1) the threat posed by ballistic missiles in his area of responsibility is growing; (2) a capability to protect our forces with an effective tiered system against ballistic missiles remains “a key capability for the future and is a top priority for development;” and (3) our production inventory of PAC-3s and SM-3 missiles “must pace the increasing threat.”

The committee recommends an increase of \$75.0 million in PE 63882C for improvements to the Aegis BMD system and to accelerate production of SM-3 missiles. The committee makes these recommendations in light of the successful Aegis BMD test program and mindful of the importance of keeping pace with the growing threat. The committee directs that these funds be used to: (1) purchase long-lead materials for the Aegis BMD signal processor to provide significant system discrimination capabilities against missiles with separating warheads; (2) purchase additional test equipment necessary to accelerate SM-3 missile production rates; (3)

provide long-lead funding for an additional 15 SM-3 missiles to begin delivery in fiscal year 2007; (4) accelerate implementation of the engage-on-remote and launch-on-remote upgrades; and (5) accelerate integration of the two-color seeker for the SM-3 kill vehicle.

#### **Ground-based midcourse ballistic missile defense**

The budget request included \$3.3 billion in PE 63882C for the ballistic missile defense midcourse segment, of which approximately \$2.3 billion is for the ground-based midcourse defense (GMD) segment to cover continued development, ground and flight testing, fielding, and support.

Consistent with the National Missile Defense Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-38), the committee continues to support fielding of the GMD element as part of the missile defense test bed and for use in an emergency. The committee notes that the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, and the Department of Defense Director for Operational Test and Evaluation endorse this dual-use approach for continuing development and fielding of this important defensive capability.

The committee is aware of the successful flight intercept tests achieved by the developmental prototype ground-based interceptor over the past five years. The committee is concerned, however, about the inability of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to complete two recent GMD flight tests, using the operationally configured interceptor, as well as the lengthy turnaround time for GMD tests. This seems to indicate, according to the acting Director for Operational Test and Evaluation, that “there is a quality problem.” The committee commends the Director of the MDA for establishing an Independent Review Team to assess recent test failures and to improve mission assurance. According to the preliminary findings of the review team, as recounted by the Director of MDA during an April 7, 2005, hearing of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services, MDA needs to pay greater attention to the test certification process and devote more resources to integrated ground testing.

The committee recommends an increase of \$100.0 million in PE 63882C specifically to enhance the testing program for the GMD element in accordance with the findings of the Independent Review Team. The committee directs that these funds be used toward purchases of additional ground test missile units, enhanced integrated ground test capabilities, more comprehensive component testing, and other items for GMD testing. The Director of the MDA is to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by January 15, 2006, indicating specifically how this increase will be allocated.

#### **Miniaturized carbon monoxide oxidation technology**

The budget request included \$100.8 million in PE 63884BP, for chemical and biological defense advanced technology demonstrations. Urban and other combat environments often produce situations in which warfighters confront fire and carbon monoxide (CO) threats such as in caves, bunkers, tunnels, burning oil wells, aircraft, vehicles, or structures and buildings. The Department of De-

fense currently lacks gas mask canisters or small escape devices that contain CO filters and protection. A small, lightweight, long-lasting CO removal technology would increase protection and utility of existing systems and would add value to new systems under development. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.3 million in PE 63884BP to complete testing, development, and evaluation of the Mini-COT technology to meet the Department of Defense's need for CO protection.

### **Airborne Infrared System**

The budget request included \$529.8 million in PE 63884C for ballistic missile defense sensors, but no funding for the Airborne Infrared System (AIRS).

AIRS is a system of infrared and visible sensors, a surveillance radar and adjunct data processing and storage that can track ballistic missiles and their warheads in all phases of flight. The committee believes that such a system, if and when deployed, could provide important test, operational, and technical intelligence capabilities in support of ballistic missile defense.

The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 63884C for AIRS research and development. This increase will allow the Missile Defense Agency to proceed with final engineering development and "in-line" demonstrations of system connectivity, a closed loop fire control system, and prototype design for integration on manned or unmanned vehicles.

### **Kinetic Energy Interceptor**

The budget request included \$229.7 million in PE 63886C for Ballistic Missile Defense System Interceptors, of which \$218.7 million is for Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI) block 2010/2012.

The committee notes that the KEI effort has been restructured to serve as risk mitigation for the Airborne Laser (ABL), which has been chosen as the primary boost-phase intercept program. Accordingly, the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) has reduced funding for KEI by approximately \$883.0 million in fiscal year 2006 and \$5.0 billion over fiscal years 2006–2009. MDA has built into the KEI program a one-year delay in first flight to fiscal year 2008 in order to focus efforts on demonstrating critical technologies and reducing development risks. This new flight test date coincides with the plans of the MDA for a lethal shoot down of a target missile with ABL. The committee understands that should ABL fail to demonstrate a lethal shoot down in fiscal year 2008, a decision could be made at that point to switch to KEI as the primary boost-phase interceptor.

In light of the decision by the MDA to focus on ABL as the prime boost-phase defense system, the committee believes the funding request for KEI risk reduction efforts is excessive. The committee recommends a decrease of \$50.0 million in PE 63886C for KEI; and recommends that remaining funds be directed toward reducing high-risk technology challenges in the areas of booster thrust, differentiating between plume and missile hard body, and thrust vector control.

### **Military mail screening system development and demonstration**

The budget request included \$280.9 million in PE 604384BP for chemical/biological defense system development and demonstration. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.8 million in PE 604384BP to validate system design and performance for fielded chemical agent detection and biological agent sampling systems to be used at military mail centers and post offices.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to promptly develop and implement a plan to ensure that mail within the military mail system is safe for delivery, to include the screening of all mail in order to detect the presence of biological, chemical or radiological weapons, agents or pathogens, or explosive devices. The committee recommends authorizing additional funding for this purpose in fiscal year 2006 to ensure that resources are available to begin implementation of the plan as soon as possible.

### **UAV systems and operations validation program**

The budget request included \$128.8 million in PE 64940D8Z, for central test and evaluation investment development. Testing of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) for autonomous control and safety in piloted airspace would allow for full operational use of these systems in evolving battlefields that require both manned and unmanned air support. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 64940D8Z for UAV systems and operations validation program to facilitate short- and long-range flight testing of autonomous systems.

### **Foreign supplier assessment center**

The budget request included \$35.7 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for foreign comparative testing, but did not include funding for the Foreign Supplier Assessment Center (FSAC) concept.

The FSAC concept was established to assess potential foreign suppliers wanting to provide products and services, including components for weapon systems, automation hardware, and various forms of software to the Department of Defense. The FSAC is fulfilling a critical need to identify and categorize potential foreign suppliers; conduct tests and evaluation of products and services for appropriate security purposes; and develop recommendations and risk mitigation plans. However, the full requirement to assess foreign supplier of critical defense components will not be realized without significant additional investment.

The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 65710D8Z, for the continued expansion and operation of the FSAC concept.

### **Operationally responsive space payloads**

The budget request included \$19.9 million in PE 65799D8Z for the Office of Force Transformation in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

As noted in the Senate report accompanying S. 2400 (S. Rept. 108–260) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year

2005, the committee believes that acquisition of inexpensive launch vehicles and smaller satellites provide the promise of enhancing the effectiveness of U.S. military and intelligence space operations and mitigating some of the long-standing development problems that have afflicted U.S. space programs over the past decade. In support of this effort, OFT has sponsored the development of experimental satellites intended to demonstrate the rapid design and fabrication of operationally useful satellite payloads.

The committee notes that insufficient funding is requested for fiscal year 2006 to continue development of a modular, standard bus and complete the experimentation necessary to demonstrate tactical satellite capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million dollars in PE 65799D8Z for the development of operationally responsive payloads, to include funding for payloads, satellite busses, integration, command and control, and joint warfighter experimentation.

Section 913 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) directed the Secretary of Defense to create a separate, dedicated program element for operationally responsive national security payloads and buses. The committee notes that such a program element was not included in the fiscal year 2006 budget request, but has subsequently been created by the Department of Defense as PE 62001D8Z with the title: joint operational small satellites. The committee fully expects that the \$20.0 million increase in PE 65799D8Z will be applied toward PE 62001D8Z for the funding of responsive satellites to provide direct support to the joint operational and tactical level warfighter.

### **Industrial preparedness**

The budget request included \$18.2 million in PE 78011S, for industrial preparedness. The committee notes that the laser additive manufacturing process rapidly produced titanium wing pylons to replace aluminum parts, which experienced mechanical problems during sustained combat operations. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 78011S for application of the laser additive manufacturing process to repair parts and to produce new parts for other aerospace-grade components that face similar degradation. The current processes and materials used for production of these parts are time consuming, expensive, and require long-lead times, which may negatively impact readiness.

The committee further recommends an increase of \$1.5 million in PE 78011S for research on improved manufacturing processes for defense-related technologies, including sensors, energy systems, and nanotechnology.

### **Special operations wireless management and control project**

The budget request included \$33.2 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for Special Operations Intelligence Systems Development, in PE 116405BB, including \$11.7 million for the Joint Threat Warning System (JTWS), but did not include funding to develop new capabilities for the JTWS in the evolving wireless communications environment.

The special operations wireless management and control project will continue development of capabilities that can be integrated into the JTWS to provide special operations forces with tactical capabilities to maintain situational awareness of the wireless communications environment being used by potential adversaries. The JTWS is one of the highest priorities for the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million in PE 116405BB, to continue development of a wireless management and control capability for the JTWS.

#### **Maritime unmanned aerial vehicle sensor**

The budget request included \$66.3 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for Special Operations Forces (SOF) Operational Enhancements, in PE 116408BB, but did not include funding to develop new sensor capabilities for the maritime unmanned aerial vehicle (MUAV).

An urgent requirement for a new signals intelligence sensor for the MUAV was validated after submission of the fiscal year 2006 President's budget request. This sensor would provide a critical new capability for the MUAV and enhance the operational effectiveness of SOF. This MUAV is one of the highest priorities of the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.9 million in PE 116408BB, for the development of a MUAV sensor.

#### **Lightweight portable solar panels**

The budget request did not include funding for lightweight portable solar panels. These flexible lightweight panels serve as portable chargers, converting sunlight to electricity to keep batteries constantly charged. This eliminates the need for operators to carry heavy battery packs during emergency and remote operations. The rugged folding panels are easy to carry and deploy, and they provide power even if damaged, or employed in partial shade.

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for Special Operations Forces Operational Enhancements, in PE 116408BB, for lightweight solar panels.

### **Items of Special Interest**

#### **Canopy hard-coats**

The committee believes that industry has made a marked advancement in the development of canopy hard-coats that may significantly extend the life and reduce the cost of canopies used on naval aircraft. Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of the Navy to accelerate the testing of new canopy hard-coats currently in development under the auspices of the Patuxent Naval Air Station Materials Laboratory. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary to evaluate these hard-coats on canopies provided by Navy canopy suppliers.

### **CH-53X helicopter development**

The committee recognizes the essential contribution that heavy-lift assets make both in wartime and peacetime and is concerned by the intense usage of current assets in Afghanistan, the Horn of Africa, and Iraq. In 2003, an independent analysis of alternatives concluded that a program to remanufacture the existing aircraft would cause the Navy to shut down one-third of the Marine Corps heavy-lift squadrons for up to 5 years due to the number of aircraft that would be diverted from fleet squadrons to the remanufacturing program. The Navy decided to pursue a new production strategy in accordance with that recommendation.

The Joint Requirements Oversight Council approved a CH-53X operational requirements document on December 9, 2004. Marine Corps witnesses testified before the Committee on Armed Services that the CH-53X is an urgent warfighting requirement, that all alternatives have been analyzed, and that there are no other suitable alternatives to new manufacture of the CH-53X.

The committee supports the requirement for CH-53X new production program but has concerns regarding program execution and schedule. The Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-287) appropriated \$102.3 million for a risk reduction initiative in the CH-53X development program. Since March 18, 2005, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition (ASN (RDA)) has released roughly \$50.0 million of these funds. The ASN (RDA) is withholding the remaining funds until an independent review team can assess whether the funding in the Future Years Defense Program is sufficient to execute the CH-53X program.

The committee supports this program. However, the committee is concerned that the Navy is not moving aggressively to execute risk reduction actions, thus potentially delaying the fielding of this critical system. The committee also appreciates the concerns expressed by the ASN (RDA) about program affordability. The committee, therefore, encourages the Navy to move expeditiously to resolve these concerns and to release the remaining \$52.3 million in risk reduction funding so that the requested fiscal year 2006 program can be completed.

### **Construction of Navy Research Vessels**

The budget request included \$356.9 million in PE 61153N, for defense research sciences, including \$4.0 million for design of the next generation of ocean research vessels for the University National Ocean Laboratory (UNOLS) fleet. The academic research community uses UNOLS to conduct experiments and research for the Navy. The committee is concerned with the Navy's plans to fund the construction of academic research vessels in the basic science account in fiscal year 2007. While the ocean class research vessel, a key research tool, provides the Navy with a robust understanding of its battlespace, such diversion of research funds would adversely affect the goals of the innovative research account.

The committee authorizes the \$4.0 million requested in PE 61153N for design of the new research vessel in fiscal year 2006, but directs the Navy to request the planned \$25.0 million in fiscal year 2007 for ship construction funds in the Navy Shipbuilding and



Conversion account. The committee expects that the Navy will continue to use the Shipbuilding and Conversion account to provide for the recapitalization of ocean class research vessels in the Future Years Defense Program.

#### **Department of Defense computer science research**

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense is reducing its investment in long-term computer science research, without due consideration of the potential negative ramifications of such reductions on the development of next generation networking, information technology, and information assurance systems on which our military will depend in the future. The committee notes that the President's Information Technology Advisory Committee and the Defense Science Board have both released reports this year that call attention to the potential impacts of reduced funding on the part of the Department in fundamental computer science.

The committee directs the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology to carefully examine the long-term practical and policy implications of the Department's investment strategy for computing research and to provide the outcome of this review to the congressional defense committees with the fiscal year 2007 budget request. The review should include an explanation of the Department's role in the overall federal computing research portfolio and a review of the Department's structure and investment plan for these programs.

#### **Unmanned aerial vehicles for resupply missions**

The committee notes that dedicated unmanned aerial vehicles for movement of equipment and supplies could support Army expeditionary forces while reducing logistics, procurement, and operational costs. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2006, a report on the requirements, technical feasibility, and cost of integrating unmanned aerial vehicles for resupply into its future force unmanned aviation concepts.



## **TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**

### **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 2006 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 administration 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 2006**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
<b><u>Title III – OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE &amp; OTHER PROGRAMS</u></b>			
<b><u>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE</u></b>			
Operation and Maintenance, Army	25,316,595	-365,135	24,951,460
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	30,759,889	-212,400	30,547,489
Operation and Maintenance, MC	3,804,926	37,100	3,842,026
Operation and Maintenance, AF	31,521,136	-95,217	31,425,919
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	18,453,469	131,000	18,584,469
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,987,382	2,000	1,989,382
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,245,695		1,245,695
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	199,934		199,934
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	2,501,686	58,000	2,559,686
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	4,509,719	18,300	4,528,019
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	4,724,091	48,900	4,772,991
Transfer Accounts	1,369,689	40,000	1,409,689
Miscellaneous Appropriations	508,331		508,331
<b>SUBTOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE</b>	<b>126,902,542</b>	<b>-337,452</b>	<b>126,565,090</b>

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
<b><u>OTHER PROGRAMS</u></b>			
<b><u>DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM</u></b>			
Defense Health Program, O&M	19,247,137	104,200	19,351,337
Blast injury prevention, mitigation and treatment initiative		[20,000]	
Extension of TRICARE Prime for Survivors		[2,000]	
Physical exams for Reservists		[82,200]	
Defense Health Program, RDTE	169,156	5,000	174,156
Enhanced vision lenses		[5,000]	
Defense Health Program, Procurement	375,319		375,319
<b>Subtotal Defense Health Program</b>	<b>19,791,612</b>	<b>109,200</b>	<b>19,900,812</b>
<b><u>DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
Drug Enforcement and Policy Support	895,741		895,741
<b>Subtotal Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities</b>	<b>895,741</b>		<b>895,741</b>
<b><u>OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL</u></b>			
Office of the Inspector General, O&M	208,687		208,687
Office of the Inspector General, RDTE			
Office of the Inspector General, Procurement	1,000		1,000
<b>Subtotal Office of the Inspection General</b>	<b>209,687</b>		<b>209,687</b>

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
<b>CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION</b>			
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, O&M	1,241,514		1,241,514
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, RDTE	47,786	20,000	67,786
Assembled chemical weapons alternatives		[20,000]	
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Procurement	116,527		116,527
<b>Subtotal Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction</b>	<b>1,405,827</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>1,425,827</b>
<b>SUBTOTAL OTHER PROGRAMS</b>	<b>22,302,867</b>	<b>129,200</b>	<b>22,432,067</b>
 <b>REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS</b>			
Defense Working Capital Funds	316,340		316,340
Defense Working Capital Funds - DeCA	1,155,000		1,155,000
National Defense Sealift Fund	1,048,504	-637,200	1,011,304
Lease buyout for only three MPS ships		[-637,200]	
<b>SUBTOTAL REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS</b>	<b>3,119,844</b>	<b>-637,200</b>	<b>2,482,644</b>
 <b>TOTAL O&amp;M AND OTHER PROGRAMS</b>	<b>152,325,253</b>	<b>-845,452</b>	<b>151,479,801</b>

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operation and Maintenance, Army			
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u></b>			
		<b><u>LAND FORCES</u></b>			
2020a	010	DIVISIONS	866,129		866,129
2020a	020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	430,353		430,353
2020a	030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	351,673		351,673
2020a	040	EAC SUPPORT FORCES	951,681		951,681
2020a	050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,260,976		1,260,976
		<b><u>LAND FORCES READINESS</u></b>			
2020a	060	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,870,382	110,800	1,981,182
		Virtual combat convoy trainer		[7,700]	
		Battle command training capability		[3,900]	
		Home station range operations		[73,700]	
		Cognitive air defense simulators		[3,000]	
		Grenade range improvements		[1,000]	
		Range fiber optic LAN installation		[1,500]	
		Advanced combat helmet with modular integrated communications headset		[20,000]	
2020a	070	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	615,063	8,000	623,063
		Corrosion prevention and control program		[8,000]	
2020a	080	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,229,926		1,229,926

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<b><u>LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT</u></b>			
2020a	090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	5,347,826		5,347,826
2020a	100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	1,825,518	-33,800	1,791,718
		Program under execution		[-33,800]	
2020a	110	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	220,288		220,288
2020a	120	UNIFIED COMMANDS	102,343		102,343
2020a	130	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	230,202		230,202
		<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>15,302,360</b>	<b>85,000</b>	<b>15,387,360</b>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION</u></b>			
		<b><u>MOBILITY OPERATIONS</u></b>			
2020a	140	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	248,241	6,000	254,241
		Quaduple specialty containers		[6,000]	
2020a	150	ARMY PREPOSITIONING STOCKS	99,917		99,917
2020a	160	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	8,833		8,833
		<b>TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION</b>	<b>356,991</b>	<b>6,000</b>	<b>362,991</b>



**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u></b>			
		<b><u>ACCESSION TRAINING</u></b>			
2020a	170	OFFICER ACQUISITION	103,722		103,722
2020a	180	RECRUIT TRAINING	32,125		32,125
2020a	190	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	36,538		36,538
2020a	200	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	270,351		270,351
		<b><u>BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING</u></b>			
2020a	210	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	510,526	6,000	516,526
		Satellite communications for learning (SCOLA)		[6,000]	
2020a	220	FLIGHT TRAINING	635,105		635,105
2020a	230	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	114,854		114,854
2020a	240	TRAINING SUPPORT	668,981		668,981
		<b><u>RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING</u></b>			
2020a	250	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	481,868		481,868
2020a	260	EXAMINING	121,937		121,937
2020a	270	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	262,410		262,410
2020a	280	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	154,232	-51,700	102,532
		Army civilian intern program		[-51,700]	

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2020a	290	JUNIOR ROTC	141,416		141,416
		<b>TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>	<b>3,534,065</b>	<b>-45,700</b>	<b>3,488,365</b>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
		<b><u>SECURITY PROGRAMS</u></b>			
2020a	300	SECURITY PROGRAMS	919,796	5,000	924,796
		Unattended ground sensors		[5,000]	
		<b><u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS</u></b>			
2020a	310	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	581,060		581,060
2020a	320	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	570,178		570,178
2020a	330	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	389,696	3,000	392,696
		Information Assurance Vulnerability Alert Cell		[3,000]	
2020a	340	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	354,162		354,162
		<b><u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u></b>			
2020a	350	ADMINISTRATION	606,588	3,000	609,588
		Aviation and missile life cycle management pilot program		[3,000]	
2020a	360	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	850,053		850,053
2020a	370	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	238,344		238,344
2020a	380	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	189,720		189,720

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2020a	390	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	850,059		850,059
2020a	400	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	197,361		197,361
2020a	410	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	45,451		45,451
		<b>SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS</b>			
2020a	420	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS	289,447		289,447
2020a	430	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	41,264		41,264
		<b>JUDGMENT FUND</b>			
2020a	440	JUDGMENT FUND			
		<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>6,123,179</b>	<b>11,000</b>	<b>6,134,179</b>
		Military to civilian conversions		-90,000	-90,000
		Audits of DOD financial statements		-70,000	-70,000
		Civilian personnel under execution		-17,000	-17,000
		Working Capital Fund excess balances		-124,735	-124,735
		Working Capital Fund excess carryover		-94,700	-94,700
		Defense Information System Network costs		-25,000	-25,000
		<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Army</b>	<b>25,316,595</b>	<b>-365,135</b>	<b>24,951,460</b>

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance (Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operation and Maintenance, Navy			
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u></b>			
		<b><u>AIR OPERATIONS</u></b>			
1804n	010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	3,574,529		3,574,529
1804n	020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	857,918		857,918
1804n	030	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	58,661		58,661
1804n	040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	114,331		114,331
1804n	050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	473,514		473,514
1804n	060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	961,921		961,921
1804n	070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	124,133		124,133
		<b><u>SHIP OPERATIONS</u></b>			
1804n	080	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	2,999,986		2,999,986
1804n	090	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	588,395	2,700	591,095
		NULKA decoy cartridge		[2,700]	
1804n	100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	3,967,408		3,967,408
1804n	110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	833,251	4,500	837,751
		Stainless steel sanitary spaces		[4,500]	
		<b><u>COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT</u></b>			
1804n	120	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	298,100		298,100

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1804n	130	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	18,422	4,000	22,422
		Manufacturing Technical Assistance and Production Program		[4,000]	
1804n	140	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	156,814		156,814
1804n	150	WARFARE TACTICS	367,830		367,830
1804n	160	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	259,807		259,807
1804n	170	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,321,953		1,321,953
1804n	180	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	172,958		172,958
1804n	190	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,703	11,000	14,703
		Electric start system		[8,000]	
		Marine gas turbine photonic sensor		[3,000]	
		<b><u>WEAPONS SUPPORT</u></b>			
1804n	200	CRUISE MISSILE	181,294		181,294
1804n	210	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	830,094		830,094
1804n	220	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	69,722		69,722
1804n	230	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	473,584	16,000	489,584
		Mk 45 gun system overhauls		[16,000]	
		<b><u>WORKING CAPITAL FUND SUPPORT</u></b>			
1804n	240	NWCF SUPPORT			

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<b><u>BASE SUPPORT</u></b>			
1804n	250	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION Program under execution	1,344,971	-26,200	1,318,771
1804n	260	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	3,417,244	[-26,200]	3,417,244
		<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>23,470,543</b>	<b>12,000</b>	<b>23,482,543</b>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION</u></b>			
		<b><u>READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES</u></b>			
1804n	270	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE Restore lease payments for ten MPS ships	533,527	127,600	661,127
		<b><u>ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS</u></b>			
1804n	280	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	3,158		3,158
1804n	290	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	125,629		125,629
		<b><u>MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS</u></b>			
1804n	300	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	28,245		28,245
1804n	310	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	1,653		1,653
1804n	320	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	19,879		19,879
		<b>TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION</b>	<b>712,091</b>	<b>127,600</b>	<b>839,691</b>

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u></b>			
		<b><u>ACCESSION TRAINING</u></b>			
1804n	330	OFFICER ACQUISITION	123,975		123,975
1804n	340	RECRUIT TRAINING	10,153		10,153
1804n	350	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	103,539		103,539
		<b><u>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</u></b>			
1804n	360	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	494,195		494,195
1804n	370	FLIGHT TRAINING	364,692		364,692
1804n	380	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	134,935		134,935
1804n	390	TRAINING SUPPORT	243,596		243,596
		<b><u>RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION</u></b>			
1804n	400	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	282,293		282,293
1804n	410	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	155,646		155,646
1804n	420	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	70,983		70,983
1804n	430	JUNIOR ROTC	42,875		42,875
		<b>TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>	<b>2,026,882</b>		<b>2,026,882</b>

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
		<b><u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u></b>			
1804n	440	ADMINISTRATION	739,521		739,521
1804n	450	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	3,517		3,517
1804n	460	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	100,751		100,751
1804n	470	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	212,813		212,813
1804n	480	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	250,278		250,278
1804n	490	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	773,261		773,261
1804n	500	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES			
		<b><u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT</u></b>			
1804n	510	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	188,257		188,257
1804n	520	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS			
1804n	530	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	306,919		306,919
1804n	540	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	841,706		841,706
1804n	550	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT			
1804n	560	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	46,373		46,373
1804n	570	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	46,334		46,334
1804n	580	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	75,132		75,132
		<b><u>INVESTIGATIONS AND SECURITY PROGRAMS</u></b>			
1804n	590	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	374,329		374,329



### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<b>SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS</b>			
1804n	640	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	10,663		10,663
1804n	650	PRESIDENTIAL DRAWDOWN AUTHORITY			
		<b>CANCELLED ACCOUNTS</b>			
1804n	660	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
1804n	670	JUDGMENT FUND			
		<b>OTHER PROGRAMS</b>			
1804n	999	OTHER PROGRAMS	580,519		580,519
		<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>4,550,373</b>		<b>4,550,373</b>
		Military to civilian conversions		-90,000	-90,000
		Audits of DOD financial statements		-65,000	-65,000
		Defense Information System Network costs		-25,000	-25,000
		Civilian personnel under execution		-172,000	-172,000
		<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy</b>	<b>30,759,889</b>	<b>-212,400</b>	<b>30,547,489</b>

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps			
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u></b>			
		<b><u>EXPEDITIONARY FORCES</u></b>			
1106n	010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	479,482	25,700	505,182
		Acclimate high performance undergarments		[2,500]	
		Ultra-light camouflage net system		[8,000]	
		Family of mountain cold weather clothing and equipment		[8,000]	
		Combat casualty care equipment upgrade		[5,200]	
		Portable tent lighting		[2,000]	
1106n	020	FIELD LOGISTICS	416,501	9,300	425,801
		Corrosion prevention and control programs		[2,000]	
		Advanced vapor corrosion inhibitor delivery system		[2,500]	
		Corrosion assessment teams		[4,800]	
1106n	030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	113,791		113,791
		<b><u>USMC PREPOSITIONING</u></b>			
1106n	040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	69,343		69,343
1106n	050	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	5,081		5,081
		<b><u>BASE SUPPORT</u></b>			
1106n	060	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	483,005		483,005

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1106n	070	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	1,344,113	2,100	1,346,213
		Communications support for USMC NOC		[2,100]	
		<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>2,911,316</b>	<b>37,100</b>	<b>2,948,416</b>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u></b>			
		<b><u>ACCESSION TRAINING</u></b>			
1106n	080	RECRUIT TRAINING	10,885		10,885
1106n	090	OFFICER ACQUISITION	374		374
		<b><u>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</u></b>			
1106n	100	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	40,259		40,259
1106n	110	FLIGHT TRAINING	178		178
1106n	120	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	10,687		10,687
1106n	130	TRAINING SUPPORT	134,048		134,048
		<b><u>RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION</u></b>			
1106n	140	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	115,498		115,498
1106n	150	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	51,221		51,221
1106n	160	JUNIOR ROTC	16,905		16,905

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<b><u>BASE SUPPORT</u></b>			
1106n	170	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	67,804		67,804
1106n	180	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	120,369		120,369
		<b>TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>	<b>568,228</b>		<b>568,228</b>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
		<b><u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u></b>			
1106n	190	SPECIAL SUPPORT	243,195		243,195
1106n	200	SERVICE-WIDE TRANSPORTATION	38,352		38,352
1106n	210	ADMINISTRATION	27,737		27,737
1106n	220	BASE SUPPORT			
		<b><u>CANCELLED ACCOUNT</u></b>			
1106n	230	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT			
		<b><u>BASE SUPPORT</u></b>			
1106n	240	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, AND MODERNIZATION	3,151		3,151

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1106n	250	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	12,947		12,947
		<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>325,382</b>		<b>325,382</b>
		<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps</b>	<b>3,804,926</b>	<b>37,100</b>	<b>3,842,026</b>
		<b>Operation and Maintenance, Air Force</b>			
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u></b>			
		<b>AIR OPERATIONS</b>			
3400f	010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	4,043,366	86,000	4,129,366
		B-1 deployable phase maintenance kit		[34,000]	
		B-52 deployable phase maintenance kit		[52,000]	
3400f	020	PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	287,173	-3,500	283,673
		Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator		[-3,500]	
3400f	030	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	607,049		607,049
3400f	040	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,401,092		1,401,092
3400f	050	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	1,479,650		1,479,650
3400f	060	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,057,399		2,057,399
3400f	070	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,027,414		1,027,414
3400f	080	BASE SUPPORT	2,286,473		2,286,473

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<b><u>COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS</u></b>			
3400f	090	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	1,201,149		1,201,149
3400f	100	NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	242,433		242,433
3400f	110	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	701,889	9,600	711,489
		Joint Protection Enterprise Network (JPEN)		[3,600]	
		Joint Task Force-North (JTF-N)		[6,000]	
3400f	120	JCS EXERCISES	29,130		29,130
3400f	130	MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HQ	255,866		255,866
3400f	140	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	340,755	6,200	346,955
		Mobile Consolidated Command Center (MCCC)		[6,200]	
		<b><u>SPACE OPERATIONS</u></b>			
3400f	150	LAUNCH FACILITIES	349,313		349,313
3400f	160	LAUNCH VEHICLES	94,113		94,113
3400f	170	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	253,670		253,670
3400f	180	SATELLITE SYSTEMS	73,610		73,610
3400f	190	OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	277,926		277,926
3400f	200	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	180,604		180,604
3400f	210	BASE SUPPORT	554,727		554,727
		<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>17,744,801</b>	<b>98,300</b>	<b>17,843,101</b>

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION</u></b>			
		<b><u>MOBILITY OPERATIONS</u></b>			
3400f	220	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,660,080		2,660,080
3400f	230	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C31	51,326		51,326
3400f	240	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	176,764		176,764
3400f	250	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	393,248	96,600	489,848
		KC-135 depot maintenance		[59,000]	
		C-130 depot maintenance		[37,600]	
3400f	260	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	154,650		154,650
3400f	270	BASE SUPPORT	526,338		526,338
		<b>TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION</b>	<b>3,962,406</b>	<b>96,600</b>	<b>4,059,006</b>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u></b>			
		<b><u>ACCESSION TRAINING</u></b>			
3400f	280	OFFICER ACQUISITION	79,026		79,026
3400f	290	RECRUIT TRAINING	6,411		6,411
3400f	300	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	99,856		99,856
3400f	310	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	34,304		34,304
3400f	320	BASE SUPPORT	75,128		75,128

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<b><u>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</u></b>			
3400f	330	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	360,192		360,192
3400f	340	FLIGHT TRAINING	809,154		809,154
3400f	350	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	178,515		178,515
3400f	360	TRAINING SUPPORT	112,980		112,980
3400f	370	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	14,095		14,095
3400f	380	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	157,248		157,248
3400f	390	BASE SUPPORT	588,784		588,784
		<b><u>RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION</u></b>			
3400f	400	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	136,567		136,567
3400f	410	EXAMINING	3,435		3,435
3400f	420	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	187,656		187,656
3400f	430	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	148,557		148,557
3400f	440	JUNIOR ROTC	57,573		57,573
		<b>TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>	<b>3,049,481</b>		<b>3,049,481</b>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
		<b><u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS</u></b>			
3400f	450	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	881,829		881,829
3400f	460	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	651,796		651,796



**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
3400f	470	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	192,354		192,354
3400f	480	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	48,627		48,627
3400f	490	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	248,043		248,043
3400f	500	BASE SUPPORT	1,079,261		1,079,261
		<b><u>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
3400f	510	ADMINISTRATION	348,301		348,301
3400f	520	SERVICE-WIDE COMMUNICATIONS	533,574		533,574
3400f	530	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	244,970	-25,617	219,353
		Terminate personnel service delivery program		[-25,617]	
3400f	540	RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES			
3400f	550	ARMS CONTROL	48,071		48,071
3400f	560	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	709,368		709,368
3400f	570	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	42,852		42,852
3400f	580	CIVIL AIR PATROL	24,288		24,288
3400f	590	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	13,438		13,438
3400f	600	BASE SUPPORT	311,498		311,498
		<b><u>SECURITY PROGRAMS</u></b>			
3400f	610	SECURITY PROGRAMS	1,365,179		1,365,179

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
3400f	620	<u>SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS</u> INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	20,999		20,999
		<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>6,764,448</b>	<b>-25,617</b>	<b>6,738,831</b>
		Military to civilian conversions		-90,000	-90,000
		Homeland Defense Education Consortium		1,000	1,000
		Defense Information System Network costs		-25,000	-25,000
		Working Capital Fund excess balances		-85,500	-85,500
		Audits of DOD financial statements		-65,000	-65,000
		<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force</b>	<b>31,521,136</b>	<b>-95,217</b>	<b>31,425,919</b>
		<b>Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide</b>			
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES</u></b>			
		<b><u>DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
0100d	010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	580,883		580,883
0100d	020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	2,205,693		2,205,693
		<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:</b>	<b>2,786,576</b>		<b>2,786,576</b>

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u></b>			
		<b><u>DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
0100d	030	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	105,601		105,601
		<b><u>RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION</u></b>			
0100d	040	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	67,158		67,158
		<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:</b>	<b>172,759</b>		<b>172,759</b>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
		<b><u>DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
0100d	050	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	147,992		147,992
0100d	060	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	100,468	15,000	115,468
		Nation Guard Youth Challenge		[15,000]	
0100d	090	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	379,947		379,947
0100d	100	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	5,481		5,481
0100d	120	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES	38,412		38,412
0100d	130	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	305,835		305,835
0100d	140	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	16,105		16,105
0100d	150	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY AGENCY	21,697		21,697
0100d	160	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	320,099		320,099

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0100d	170	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY Counseling and assistance to military families Child care	1,769,628	70,000 [30,000] [40,000]	1,839,628
0100d	180	DOD HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY Increase DIMHRS funding	402,798	49,000 [49,000]	451,798
0100d	190	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,044,322		1,044,322
0100d	200	DEFENSE INFORMATION SERVICES AGENCY	1,045,125		1,045,125
0100d	210	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	143,966		143,966
0100d	220	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	282,468		282,468
0100d	240	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT Increase planning assistance to local communities	30,463	60,000 [60,000]	90,463
0100d	250	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE Information assurance scholarships	758,858	-58,300 [3,000]	700,558
0100d	250a	Capital cost sharing-eliminate subsidy READINESS AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION INITIATIVE	20,000	[-61,300] 20,000	40,000
0100d	260	Increase funding for Compatible Use Buffer Program WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE	473,483	[20,000]	473,483

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0100d	999	<b>OTHER PROGRAMS</b>			
		OTHER PROGRAMS	8,186,987		8,186,987
		<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:</b>	<b>15,494,134</b>	<b>155,700</b>	<b>15,649,834</b>
		Impact aid		30,000	30,000
		Impact aid for children with disabilities		5,000	5,000
		Special assistance to local education agencies		15,000	15,000
		Parents as Teachers		1,000	1,000
		Citizen Soldier Support Program		2,000	2,000
		Military to civilian conversions		-15,000	-15,000
		Defense Information System Network costs		-20,000	-20,000
		DISA Working Capital Fund excess balances		-42,700	-42,700
		<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide</b>	<b>18,453,469</b>	<b>131,000</b>	<b>18,584,469</b>
		<b>Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve</b>			
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u></b>			
		<b><u>LAND FORCES</u></b>			
2080a	010	DIVISIONS	25,875		25,875

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2080a	020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	19,133	2,000	21,133
		Extended Cold Weather Clothing System		[2,000]	
2080a	030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	248,116		248,116
2080a	040	EAC SUPPORT FORCES	129,191		129,191
2080a	050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	372,625		372,625
		<b><u>LAND FORCES READINESS</u></b>			
2080a	060	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	177,121		177,121
2080a	070	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	81,562		81,562
2080a	080	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	97,309		97,309
		<b><u>LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT</u></b>			
2080a	090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	462,716		462,716
2080a	100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	204,370		204,370
2080a	110	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	5,763		5,763
		<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>1,823,781</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>1,825,781</b>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
		<b><u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u></b>			
2080a	120	ADMINISTRATION	58,298		58,298
2080a	130	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	9,293		9,293

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2080a	140	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	7,577		7,577
2080a	150	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	88,433		88,433
		<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>163,601</b>		<b>163,601</b>
		<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve</b>	<b>1,987,382</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>1,989,382</b>
		<b>Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve</b>			
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u></b>			
		<b><u>AIR OPERATIONS</u></b>			
1806n	010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	518,962		518,962
1806n	020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	16,250		16,250
1806n	030	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	2,179		2,179
1806n	040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	141,907		141,907
1806n	050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	374		374
		<b><u>SHIP OPERATIONS</u></b>			
1806n	060	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	61,711		61,711
1806n	070	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	537		537
1806n	080	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	71,895		71,895
1806n	090	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	631		631

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<b><u>COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT</u></b>			
1806n	100	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	7,613		7,613
1806n	110	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	217,255		217,255
		<b><u>WEAPONS SUPPORT</u></b>			
1806n	120	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,070		5,070
		<b><u>BASE SUPPORT</u></b>			
1806n	130	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	62,788		62,788
1806n	140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	109,878		109,878
		<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>1,217,050</b>		<b>1,217,050</b>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
		<b><u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u></b>			
1806n	150	ADMINISTRATION	4,871		4,871
1806n	160	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT			
1806n	170	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	9,037		9,037
1806n	180	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	3,907		3,907
1806n	190	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	5,385		5,385
1806n	200	OTHER SERVICE-WIDE SUPPORT	5,445		5,445



### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
1806n		<u>CANCELLED ACCOUNTS</u>			
	210	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
1806n		<u>OTHER PROGRAMS</u>			
	999	OTHER PROGRAMS			
		<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>28,645</b>		<b>28,645</b>
		<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve</b>	<b>1,245,695</b>		<b>1,245,695</b>
		<b>Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve</b>			
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u></b>			
		<u>EXPEDITIONARY FORCES</u>			
1107n	010	OPERATING FORCES	45,812		45,812
1107n	020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	13,964		13,964
1107n	030	TRAINING SUPPORT	26,079		26,079

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<b><u>BASE SUPPORT</u></b>			
1107n	040	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	10,105		10,105
1107n	050	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	70,729		70,729
		<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>166,689</b>		<b>166,689</b>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
		<b><u>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
1107n	060	SPECIAL SUPPORT	11,975		11,975
1107n	070	SERVICE-WIDE TRANSPORTATION	815		815
1107n	080	ADMINISTRATION	7,898		7,898
1107n	090	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,066		8,066
		<b><u>BASE SUPPORT</u></b>			
1107n	100	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,491		4,491
		<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>33,245</b>		<b>33,245</b>
		<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve</b>	<b>199,934</b>		<b>199,934</b>

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve			
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
		<u>AIR OPERATIONS</u>			
3740f	010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,585,504		1,585,504
3740f	020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	85,545		85,545
3740f	030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	377,817	58,000	435,817
		KC-135 depot maintenance		[53,700]	
		C-130 depot maintenance		[4,300]	
3740f	040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	55,764		55,764
3740f	050	BASE SUPPORT	288,387		288,387
		<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>2,393,017</b>	<b>58,000</b>	<b>2,451,017</b>
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
3740f	060	ADMINISTRATION	64,017		64,017
3740f	070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	15,854		15,854
3740f	080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	21,095		21,095
3740f	090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	7,052		7,052

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
3740f	100	AUDIOVISUAL	651		651
		<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>108,669</b>		<b>108,669</b>
		<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve</b>	<b>2,501,686</b>	<b>58,000</b>	<b>2,559,686</b>
		<b>Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard</b>			
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u></b>			
		<b><u>LAND FORCES</u></b>			
2065a	010	DIVISIONS	600,818		600,818
2065a	020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	530,869		530,869
2065a	030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	322,856		322,856
2065a	040	EAC SUPPORT FORCES	606,026		606,026
2065a	050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	26,077		26,077
		<b><u>LAND FORCES READINESS</u></b>			
2065a	060	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	227,670	12,500	240,170
		Communicator Automated Emergency Notification System		[2,500]	
		Extended Cold Weather Clothing System		[2,000]	
		Virtual battlefield system one		[8,000]	
2065a	070	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	126,496		126,496

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2065a	080	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	255,367		255,367
		<b><u>LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT</u></b>			
2065a	090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	610,219		610,219
2065a	100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	391,544		391,544
2065a	110	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	406,794		406,794
2065a	120	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	65,363		65,363
		<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>4,170,099</b>	<b>12,500</b>	<b>4,182,599</b>
		<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
		<b><u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u></b>			
2065a	130	ADMINISTRATION	111,552		111,552
2065a	140	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	52,814		52,814
2065a	150	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	50,653		50,653

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
2065a	160	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	124,601		124,601
		<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>339,620</b>		<b>339,620</b>
		New National Guard CERFP teams		4,000	4,000
		Sustainment of National Guard CERFP teams		1,800	1,800
		<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard</b>	<b>4,509,719</b>	<b>18,300</b>	<b>4,528,019</b>
		<b>Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard</b>			
		<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>			
		<b>AIR OPERATIONS</b>			
3840f	010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	2,938,127		2,938,127
3840f	020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	497,447		497,447
3840f	030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	612,807		612,807
3840f	040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	169,791		169,791
3840f	050	BASE SUPPORT	467,517	45,500	513,017
		KC-135 depot maintenance		[35,800]	
		C-130 depot maintenance		[9,700]	
		<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>4,685,689</b>	<b>45,500</b>	<b>4,731,189</b>

### Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
		<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
		<u>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>			
3840f	060	ADMINISTRATION	28,949		28,949
3840f	070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	9,453		9,453
		<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>38,402</b>		<b>38,402</b>
		New National Guard CERFP teams		2,300	2,300
		Sustainment of National Guard CERFP teams		1,100	1,100
		<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard</b>	<b>4,724,091</b>	<b>48,900</b>	<b>4,772,991</b>
		<u>TRANSFER ACCOUNTS</u>			
0810a	010	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND, ARMY	407,865		407,865
0810n	020	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND, NAVY	305,275		305,275
0810f	030	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND, AIR FORCE	406,461		406,461
0810d	040	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND, DEFENSE	28,167		28,167
0811d	050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION USED SITES	221,921	40,000	261,921
		<b>TOTAL, O&amp;M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS</b>	<b>1,369,689</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>1,409,689</b>
		<u>MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS</u>			

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Account</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
0104d	060	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	11,236		11,236
0838d	070	SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS			
0118d	080	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	20,000		20,000
4965d	090	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE			
0833d	100	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE			
0833d	110	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE			
0833d	120	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE			
0141d	130	IRAQ FREEDOM FUND, DEF			
0819d	140	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	61,546		61,546
1236d	150	KAHOOLAWE	415,549		415,549
0134d	160	FORMER SOVIET UNION (FSU) THREAT REDUCTION			
		<b>TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS</b>	<b>508,331</b>		<b>508,331</b>
		<b>TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:</b>	<b>126,902,542</b>	<b>-337,452</b>	<b>126,565,090</b>



## **Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations**

### **Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions**

#### **Elimination and simplification of certain items required in the annual report on environmental quality programs and other environmental activities (sec. 311)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 2706 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate and simplify portions of the annual report on environmental quality programs and other environmental activities. The recommended changes would remove the requirement to list planned or ongoing projects which exceed \$1.5 million dollars. The reporting of fines and penalties against the Department of Defense would be simplified to a trend analysis and a list of all such fines or penalties that exceed \$500,000. The recommended changes would also simplify the reporting of the amounts expended and expected to be expended for environmental activities overseas.

The committee believes that these modifications will make the gathering and reporting of the data less burdensome and more efficient while still maintaining the necessary detail to ensure adequate oversight.

#### **Payment of certain private cleanup costs in connection with the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (sec. 312)**

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Secretary of Defense to execute environmental restoration agreements with owners of covenant properties. Under section 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, title 42, United States Code section 9620(h), the United States is required to provide a deed covenant guaranteeing it will perform remediation of contamination discovered after a property transfer. Therefore, the Department of Defense has permanent, irrevocable liability for cleanup of any contamination on former Department property that was unknown and discovered after the transfer. However, there is no current authority for the Department to pay a land owner their costs for undertaking remedial action on their own.

Currently, when an owner discovers contamination on their covenant property, they must notify the service from which they purchased the covenant property. The services then respond to each covenant property in the order of risk and health-based prioritization. This leaves many landowners without an efficient remedy and the potential burden and cost of pursuing a remedy in court. The owner may be forced to choose this latter approach if they have already cleaned up the covenant property, and they are seeking to be reimbursed. This approach can be more expensive to U.S. taxpayers, since the covenant property owner may cleanup the site to standards beyond what is necessary or appropriate and then seek full reimbursement in the courts.

The committee recognizes that potential land purchasers, such as developers, are becoming increasingly apprehensive about purchasing former Department property. This may threaten the suc-

cessful transfer of the Department's inventory after the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure round and frustrate economic redevelopment efforts. This provision would allow the Department to enter into agreements with the owners of covenant property. The covenant property owner can accept the agreement or not, at their discretion. The agreement would set out the process the landowner would follow if contamination is later found on the covenant property. The agreement would resolve such issues as: notice to the Federal Government, time limits to reply, cleanup standards to be used (although the agreement may not change the cleanup standards applicable to the site as established by law), and the reimbursement process.

### **Subtitle C—Other Matters**

#### **Aircraft carriers (sec. 321)**

The committee recommends a provision that would make \$288.0 million of Operation & Maintenance, Navy (OMN) from this or any other act, for fiscal years 2005 and 2006, available only for repair and maintenance to extend the life of the USS *John F. Kennedy*.

The provision would also prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from reducing the number of active aircraft carriers in the Navy below 12 until the later of: (1) 180 days after the next Quadrennial Defense Review is delivered to Congress; or (2) the date on which the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, certifies to the congressional defense committees that such agreements have been entered into to provide port facilities for the permanent forward deployment of the number of aircraft carriers necessary in the Pacific Command (PACOM) area of responsibility (AOR) to fulfill PACOM roles and missions, including agreements for the forward deployment of a nuclear aircraft carrier after the retirement of the current two conventional aircraft carriers. The provision would also define an active aircraft carrier to include an aircraft carrier that is temporarily unavailable for worldwide deployment due to routine or scheduled maintenance.

The committee is concerned that the Navy's decision to reduce the number of aircraft carriers from 12 to 11 was not based on careful and thorough analysis, but rather was budget-driven. In testimony before the Committee on Armed Services in February 2005, the Chief of Naval Operations testified that when he first submitted the proposed Navy budget for fiscal year 2006, it included 12 aircraft carriers. Further, the last two Quadrennial Defense Reviews, in 1997 and 2001, both supported a force structure of 12 aircraft carriers. The reduction to 11 aircraft carriers was made after the Office of Management and Budget directed a budget cut for the Department of Defense.

The committee is also aware of the importance of permanent forward deployment of at least one aircraft carrier in the PACOM AOR. The USS *Kitty Hawk*, permanently forward deployed in Yokosuka, Japan, is scheduled for retirement in fiscal year 2008. The only other conventionally-powered aircraft carrier is the USS *John F. Kennedy*. The USS *John F. Kennedy* was scheduled to begin a complex overhaul (COH) maintenance period in fiscal year 2005, and funds for this COH were authorized and appropriated in

fiscal year 2005 for this purpose. The ongoing Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy review might also expand the permanent forward deployment requirements for aircraft carriers, particularly in the PACOM AOR.

The committee believes it is prudent for the USS *John F. Kennedy* to receive its COH and that 12 aircraft carriers remain in the U.S. Navy until such time as an in-depth analysis is conducted and forward-basing agreements are reached.

**Limitation on transition of funding for east coast shipyards from funding through Navy working capital fund to direct funding (sec. 322)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the Secretary of the Navy from using direct funding for east coast Naval shipyards. The Navy would be required to continue funding these shipyards through the Navy Working Capital Fund until the later of 6 months after the congressional defense committees receive a complete report on the use of direct funding at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, or October 1, 2006.

During fiscal year 2003, the Navy changed the way workload was budgeted and paid for at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, despite the committee's concerns, as outlined in the Senate report accompanying S. 1050 (S. Rpt. 108-46) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. The committee understands that the Navy intends to transition the east coast shipyards out of the Working Capital Fund and begin direct, or mission, funding in the near future. However, the effects of the transition of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard out of the Navy's Working Capital Fund have not been adequately studied. While it appears that consolidating intermediate level and depot maintenance activities may have economic benefits, the Navy has not fully examined the Puget Sound pilot program.

Before any action is taken with regard to changing funding for the east coast shipyards, the committee requires that the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a study describing the lessons learned and costs and benefits of transferring the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard to direct funding.

**Use of funds from National Defense Sealift Fund to exercise purchase options on maritime prepositioning ship vessels (sec. 323)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to obligate and expend any funds in the National Defense Sealift Fund to exercise options to purchase those three maritime prepositioning ships (MPS) whose current charters expire in calendar year 2009. This authorization is granted notwithstanding the provisions of section 2218(f)1 of title 10, United States Code.

The budget request included \$1,648.5 million for the National Defense Sealift Fund, including \$749.8 million for the buyout of 13 MPS leases in fiscal year 2006.

The committee notes that the time remaining on the leases of these 13 ships varies between four and six years, and does not see the urgency of buying out all of the leases at this time. The com-

mittee recommends buyouts of only those leases that expire in calendar year 2009, and recommends a decrease of \$637.2 million from the National Defense Sealift Fund. The committee recommends an increase of \$127.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy, for the continued lease of the other 10 MPS vessels.

**Purchase and destruction of weapons overseas (sec. 324)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the use of Department of Defense operation and maintenance funds to purchase weapons overseas from any person, foreign government, international organization, or other entity, for the purpose of protecting U.S. forces engaged in military operations overseas. The provision would permit the destruction of the purchased weapons. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to promptly notify the congressional defense committees of any use of this authority.

This provision would clarify the authority of the Department to purchase weapons in foreign countries where U.S. Armed Forces are engaged in military operations, when such a program is undertaken for force protection purposes. Providing this authority would eliminate the need for the Department to use its “emergency and extraordinary expense” authority to fund such programs. The committee believes that providing clear statutory authority to the Department to conduct such programs is desirable, given the security environment in Afghanistan and Iraq and the need to respond promptly to similar threats elsewhere in prosecuting the global war on terrorism.

**Increase in maximum contract amount for procurement of supplies and services from exchange stores outside the United States (sec. 325)**

The committee recommends a provision that would increase from \$50,000 to \$100,000 the dollar limit for purchases by defense entities from military exchanges for goods and services outside the United States. This proposal would help ensure a readily available source of supplies for military entities, especially during times of emergency.

**Extension of authority to provide logistics support and services for weapon systems contractors (sec. 326)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend by 3 years the authority under section 365 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) by which the Defense Logistics Agency could provide logistics support and services to a contractor in support of its performance on a contract for the construction, modification, or maintenance of a weapons system. The authority granted expires on September 30, 2007. Section 365 required the Secretary of Defense to issue regulations before the granted authority could be used; and these regulations currently are in the process of being finalized. Moving the expiration date to 2010 would correspond to the original 5-year pilot period envisioned under section 365.

**Army training strategy (sec. 327)**

In order to increase flexibility, responsiveness, jointness, and versatility, the Army is reorganizing the Active and Reserve component force structure into a brigade-based force. According to the Army, this initiative, referred to as “Modularity,” will ensure land-force dominance across the full spectrum of contemporary and future operations. The Army anticipates completing reorganization of combat brigades by 2007 and the reorganization of functional supporting brigades sometime thereafter.

The committee notes, however, that the current unit training strategy and the resources that support that strategy continue to be division-based. For example, the current capacity of the combat training centers does not meet the planned requirements for a brigade-based force that will have at least 82 maneuver brigades and an additional number of functional supporting brigades to be determined by the Army.

A clear unit training strategy, with well-defined goals and requirements, for the Modular force is essential in order to ensure Army readiness. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of the Army to develop and implement a training strategy for the Modular force. The provision would also require the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act on the requirements to be fulfilled in order to implement the Army’s training strategy for the Modular force. The report shall include the following: (1) a discussion of the training strategy, including a description of performance goals and metrics; (2) a discussion and description of the training range requirements necessary to implement the training strategy; (3) a discussion and description of the training aids, devices, simulations, and simulators necessary to implement the training strategy; (4) a list of the funding requirements, itemized by fiscal year and specified in a format consistent with the Future Years Defense Program to accompany the President’s budget, necessary to resource range requirements and necessary to provide training aids, devices, simulations, and simulators; (5) a schedule for the implementation of the training strategy; and (6) a discussion of the challenges that the Army anticipates in the implementation of the training strategy.

Finally, the provision would direct the Comptroller General to monitor the implementation of the training strategy and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. The report shall contain an assessment of the progress of the Army to implement the training strategy.

**Limitations on financial management improvement and audit initiatives within the Department of Defense (sec. 328)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Department of Defense from obligating or expending any funds for activities related to the Department’s financial management improvement effort until the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees an integrated and comprehensive fi-

nancial management plan and a determination that each activity proposed to be funded would likely result in real and sustainable improvements in the Department's financial management systems and controls.

The committee believes that the most effective way to fix the Department's financial management problems is to attack the problems at the root, by fixing the Department's business systems and processes so that they provide timely, reliable, and complete data for management purposes. Although senior Department officials have consistently agreed with this assessment, the Department has requested hundreds of millions of dollars to hire auditors, with the stated objective of achieving an auditable financial statement by fiscal year 2007—long before the Department will be able to address the problems with its business systems and processes.

By requiring that the Department pursue audit activities only in accordance with a comprehensive financial management improvement plan that coordinates such activities with needed systems improvements, the provision recommended by the committee would ensure that the Department first addresses the underlying problems with its systems and processes.

#### **Study on use of ethanol fuel (sec. 329)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on the use of ethanol fuel in the military services and defense agencies. The study shall include: an evaluation of the historical use of ethanol fuel by the military services and defense agencies, including the quantity of ethanol fuel procured by the Department of Defense for the services and defense agencies during the five-year period ending on the date of the study; a forecast of ethanol fuel requirements for the military services and defense agencies for fiscal years 2007 through 2012; an assessment of the current and future commercial availability of ethanol fuel, to include production, storage, transportation, distribution, and commercial sale of such fuel; an assessment of the use by the military services and defense agencies of the ethanol fuel commercial infrastructure; a review of the actions of the Department to coordinate with State, local and private entities to support the expansion and use by the military services and defense agencies of public access alternative fuel refueling stations that are accessible to the public; and an assessment of the existing fueling infrastructure on military installations in the United States, including storage and distribution capabilities, which could be adapted or converted to the delivery of ethanol fuel use, the cost of such conversion, and the feasibility and advisability of such conversion. The provision would direct the Secretary to submit a report on the results of the study to the congressional defense committees not later than February 1, 2006.

The committee notes that Department policy provides for the acquisition of alternative fuel vehicles, including ethanol fuel-capable vehicles. The committee also notes that ethanol fuel consumption by the military services and defense agencies increased by 25 percent from fiscal year 2003 to 2004. Despite this increase, the committee is concerned that there are a number of challenges that may be limiting the availability of ethanol fuel for the military services

and defense agencies. As a result, the Department may not be fully achieving reductions in petroleum consumption with the 25,000 ethanol fuel-capable vehicles in the Department's inventory.

## **BUDGET ITEMS**

### **Other Defense Programs**

#### **Enhanced vision**

The budget request included no funding in PE63115HP, for enhanced vision technology for the Defense Health Program. The committee is aware that the Surgeon General of the Air Force has a requirement for application of enhanced vision technology to provide improved visual capability to military pilots in the form of goggles or glasses. Enhanced vision technology has been shown to be capable of improving human vision capability beyond 20/20, potentially to the theoretical limits of human vision.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE63115HP for enhanced vision technology for the Defense Health Program. The committee expects that this increase will be used for extension of proven enhanced vision technology for military aerospace applications.

#### **Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives Program**

The budget request included \$33.0 million for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) Chemical Demilitarization research and development program. The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million to accelerate work on the ACWA Chemical Demilitarization research and development program for the Pueblo Chemical Agent-Destruction Pilot Plant and the Blue Grass Chemical Agent-Destruction Pilot Plant.

The committee is troubled by the inconsistent and frequently changing programmatic guidance that has been provided by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to the Secretary of the Army and the program manager for the ACWA program over the last two years, resulting in cost increases and schedule delays. The committee notes its satisfaction with the April 15, 2005, memo from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics in which he directed the release of fiscal year 2005 ACWA funds to the ACWA program manager. He also directed that the ACWA program manager determine expeditiously the most prudent design approach to maximize the opportunity to meet the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) extended 100% destruction deadline.

The committee is dissatisfied with the Department of Defense's oversight and management of the entire chemical weapons demilitarization program. A series of reports by the Government Accountability Office have concluded that the program is not meeting its goals and objectives because of its bifurcated management, lack of a comprehensive strategy, and an inadequate funding stream.

The committee is increasingly concerned that the budget request for the entire chemical demilitarization program does not provide sufficient funding to ensure that the United States will meet its treaty obligations under the CWC to completely destroy the U.S.

chemical weapons stockpile by April 2012 at the latest. In addition, any delay in execution of this program unnecessarily prolongs the safety and environmental risks to local communities, and the possibility that a chemical weapons storage site could be the object of a terrorist attack or attempt to acquire chemical weapons.

In light of these concerns, section 931 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375) directed the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics and the Secretary of the Army to jointly prepare a strategic plan for future activities for destruction of the United States' stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions. The plan is to include realistic budgeting for stockpile destruction and related support programs; contingency planning for foreseeable or anticipated problems; and a management approach and associated actions that will address compliance with the obligations of the United States under the CWC and that take full advantage of opportunities to accelerate destruction of the stockpile. The committee notes that the plan, which was required to be submitted with the President's budget for fiscal year 2006, is overdue. The committee directs that the plan be provided expeditiously.

The committee believes that, due to the international legal obligations the United States has assumed pursuant to the CWC, senior administration officials at the Department of Defense, the National Security Council, the Department of State, and the Office of Management and Budget must give this matter increased attention now, while there is still time to make the adjustments necessary to put the program back on track. In particular, this means ensuring that the President's future years budget requests include sufficient funding to accomplish the mission of destroying the chemical weapons stockpile safely and on schedule to meet the treaty timelines. The Congress has made clear its willingness to consider requests for increased funding necessary to meet this goal. At the same time, the committee expects the Department of Defense to improve management and oversight of the program.

Finally, the committee notes that the support of local communities where the destruction activities are being, or will be, undertaken is essential to the Department of Defense's ability to achieve the 100% destruction of the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile by 2012. Therefore, the committee urges the Department to make every effort to consult with and take into account the views of local communities when making significant programmatic decisions that might impact those communities.

### **Army**

#### **Advanced combat helmet with modular integrated communications headset**

The budget request included \$1.9 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for land forces operations support, including \$750,000 for the advanced combat helmet with the modular integrated communications headset. The committee notes that the utility of the advanced combat helmet with modular integrated communications headset has been demonstrated under combat conditions and enhances the personal protection of the individual sol-



dier. The Army has completed approximately 50 percent of the approved acquisition object of the advanced combat helmet with modular integrated communications. The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million in OMA for the advanced combat helmet with modular integrated communications headset.

### **Army training**

The budget request included \$758.8M in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for training support systems. The committee notes that the Army is making every effort to maximize training at homestation prior to deployment in support of contingency operations. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$90.8 million in OMA for training support systems.

Army officials note that the conversion to a brigade-based force while preparing for deployment in support of contingency operations has presented a number of challenges to training units in ensuring deployment preparedness. The Army has acted to ensure training readiness by capitalizing on resources available at both the combat training centers (CTCs) and homestations. In fiscal year 2005, for example, the Army increased the number of rotations at the CTCs by 20 percent and increased the size of each rotation by 30 percent.

The committee notes, however, that the increases in rotations at the CTCs have had secondary effects. National Training Center instructors, for example, noted a decrease in the proficiency level of Third Infantry Division companies and platoons during their rotation, which the instructors attributed to limited training time at homestation. Two brigades of the 101st Air Assault Division, were required to advance their combat training schedules by 4 and 6 months, causing turbulence to planned homestation training in preparation for a CTC rotation. Officials at the Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC) noted that the time staff was able to dedicate to planning and preparing final training events for Army units at JRTC had decreased by nearly 50 percent. The newly-formed brigade of the 10th Mountain Division garrisoned at Fort Polk is limited from fully using training ranges at Fort Polk because of the increase in the number of visiting units using the ranges for JRTC rotations.

The second approach to unit training implemented by the Army in 2005 was to complete unit training at homestation. In February 2005, the First Brigade Combat Team (1BCT) of the 82nd Airborne Division completed unit training at their homestation, Fort Bragg. As a result, the 1BCT was able to spend more time preparing for final training events and preparing equipment for deployment. The unit also was able to reapply approximately \$10 million, the cost to transport equipment to a combat training center, to high priority brigade requirements. Army leadership stated that the final training event at Fort Bragg equaled, and in many cases exceeded, the training experience at a CTC.

The committee understands the challenges to unit training that the Army is addressing, including the impact of accommodating both implementation of a brigade-based organization and preparation for deployment. The committee believes that the Army will be better prepared to address these challenges if the following actions

are taken. First, as addressed elsewhere in this report, the Army should develop and implement a training strategy for the brigade-based organization. Second, the Army should continue to fully maximize the limited amount of time and other resources available to units preparing for deployment, converting to brigade-based organization, or both, by completing training events at homestation to the maximum extent possible.

To increase the availability of resources at homestation, the committee recommends an increase of \$90.8 for training operations and training enablers, as follows: \$73.7 for homestation range operations; \$7.7 million for the virtual combat convoy trainer; \$3.9 million for the battle command training capability; \$3.0 million for cognitive air defense simulators; \$1.0 million for grenade range improvements; and, \$1.5 million for range fiber optic local area network (LAN) installation.

### **Corrosion prevention and control**

The budget request included \$615.1 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for land forces systems readiness and \$416.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), for field logistics support. The committee supports the efforts of the Army and the Marine Corps to sustain their robust and comprehensive corrosion control programs. The committee also notes the work of the Marine Corps to assemble and deploy Corrosion Assessment Teams (CAT) and to implement the advanced vapor corrosion inhibitor delivery system (AAD-VCI). To date, the CATs, for example, have assessed, classified, and documented more than 23,000 pieces of ground combat equipment in five corrosion condition categories. The committee continues to support the efforts of both services to address corrosion in their vehicles and other equipment. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million in OMA and \$9.3 million in OMMC to support corrosion prevention, including \$4.8 million for Marine Corps CATs; \$2.0 million for Marine Corps corrosion prevention and control programs; and \$2.5 million for AAD-VCI.

The committee believes that each of the military services may benefit from a review of the corrosion mitigation programs implemented by other military services. The committee notes, for example, that the Army National Guard has mitigated corrosion and subsequently achieved significant cost savings through the Controlled Humidity Preservation Program (CHP). The CHP is a tiered approach to corrosion prevention and is used for several weapon systems, including combat vehicles and missile systems. Army National Guard officials report investment returns ranging from four-to-one to as high as eleven-to-one on the various weapon systems. The committee believes that corrosion prevention and control programs with demonstrated utility, such as the CHP, could offer similar benefits for the other services. The committee urges the Department of Defense's senior designated official for corrosion policy to ensure that the services coordinate their prevention and control programs to avoid duplication of effort.

### **Facility sustainment, restoration, and modernization for the Army**

The budget request included \$1,825.5 million in Operations and Maintenance, Army (OMA), Operating Forces, for Facility Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization (FSRM). This account is used by the Army to fund critical maintenance, repairs, and renovations of military facilities and infrastructure. The amount in the budget request equates to 92 percent of the total fiscal year 2006 FSRM requirement for the Army, 3 percent less than the budget goal established by the Department of Defense for this account.

On April 5, 2005, the Government Accountability Office released an issue paper entitled "Budget Justification Review: Operations and Maintenance Trends" that reviewed the Army's execution of the FSRM account. Their analysis concluded that an average of 29 percent of the funds authorized by Congress in fiscal year 2003 and 2004 for this account were not obligated for their intended purpose, but rather transferred to other operations and maintenance accounts.

The Army announced a goal on March 22, 2005, to obligate funds for FSRM at 90 percent of validated requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$33.8 million in OMA to meet the Army's goal of funding 90 percent of the requirements for the FSRM account. The committee directs the Army to request funding for the FSRM account in future year budgets at an amount intended to be obligated for the purpose authorized by Congress, and to discontinue the practice of transferring FSRM funding to other operations and maintenance accounts.

### **Quadruple specialty containers**

The budget request included \$248.2 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for strategic mobilization. The committee notes that the Army deploys quadruple specialty containers (QUADCONS) at key power projection platforms for early deploying units. This equipment has been particularly well used in support of ongoing contingency operations. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in OMA for QUADCONS.

### **Department of Defense foreign language training**

The budget request included \$1.0 million for the Defense Language Institute in Operations and Maintenance, Army (OMA), specifically for satellite communications language training activities (SCOLA).

SCOLA is a unique satellite-based language training activity that provides television programming in a variety of languages from around the world. Language students and seasoned linguists have found this augmentation of their normal language training to be very helpful. 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 information on demand. The development of these capabilities will make SCOLA training assistance

much more widely available, but requires additional investment. The committee is concerned that even after three years of encouragement from the Congress, and in an operational environment where the value of language training is of great importance to the nation, the Department of Defense has not fully funded the innovative language training concepts that can help sustain and significantly improve the skills of military and civilian linguists in the Department.

The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in OMA, for the Defense Language Institute, for funding of SCOLA related training activities.

#### **Army civilian intern program**

The budget request included \$154.2 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for civilian education and training, including funding for the Army civilian intern program. The committee notes that the requested level of funding for the intern program represents an increase of \$51.7 million over the fiscal year 2005 level. The committee believes that the Army has failed to provide justification for this increase. The committee recommends a decrease of \$51.7 million in OMA for the intern program.

#### **Unattended ground sensors**

The budget request included \$919.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for Security Programs, including \$1.7 million for unattended ground sensors (UGS). The committee notes that the Army is fielding a new UGS as a quick reaction capability in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom for area and force protection. The UGS will serve as an intrusion detection system, as well as provide target classification, target recognition, target identification, and target dynamics, enhancing the security of U.S. ground forces and their ability to rapidly engage threat forces. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in OMA, for UGS.

#### **Information assurance vulnerability alert cell**

The budget request included \$389.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for logistics support activities. The committee notes the importance of employing Army logistics systems, such as the Standard Army Management Information System, with security safeguards. The Information Assurance Vulnerability Alert (IAVA) Cell is designed to provide such safeguards, including information security analysis and response capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in OMA for the IAVA Cell.

#### **Aviation and missile life cycle management pilot program**

The budget request included \$606.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for administration activities. The committee notes the utility of electronic business (e-business) portals in weapon systems product life cycle management. The program manager (PM) for Aviation Systems has successfully used the Army Aviation Fleet Logistics Management e-business portal for such purposes. The committee understands that extending life cycle management technologies to the end-user may further enhance management efficiencies. The committee notes that a complete as-

assessment of the utility of extending life cycle management to the end-user has yet to be completed. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in OMA to extend life cycle management capabilities from PM Aviation Systems to the end-user and directs that these funds be used to conduct a pilot program only.

In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to conduct a study on the effectiveness of the pilot program in supporting the goals of life cycle management for PM Aviation Systems. The committee directs the Secretary to report the results of the study to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2006.

#### **Army excess carryover**

The Army's working capital fund budget request included \$3.1 billion in new orders and \$1.0 billion in calculated depot maintenance carryover—the dollar value of depot maintenance work that has been ordered, but not yet completed at the end of a fiscal year. In June 2004, the Department of Defense's Comptroller provided the services new written guidance concerning calculation of carryover. The previous guidance was that a service could "carryover" no more than the equivalent of 3 months of workload from one fiscal year to the next. The new methodology for calculating carryover, in which the Government Accountability Office (GAO) participated, includes an analytically-based carryover standard based on actual expenditures. While the new method is more analytically sound, the committee is concerned with the Army's execution of the methodology.

The Army continues to manage to an operation and maintenance expenditure rate 5 to 10 percentage points lower than the other services, allowing them to carryover significantly more workload at the end of a fiscal year. The committee recommends that, upon the completion of an ongoing study by the GAO on this discrepancy, the Department provide the services amended guidance concerning carryover calculations.

The committee also recommends that the Department use one rate for all of the services.

The committee is concerned that the Army's use of a different rate is not an effective cash management technique. By allocating funds to workload that will not be executable in fiscal year 2006, the lower rate restricts the Department from better using funds for more immediate, higher priority matters.

The committee recommends a decrease of \$94.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army, to reflect funds in the Army Working Capital Fund that cannot be expended in fiscal year 2006 due to the Army's excess depot maintenance carryover.

#### **Audits of Department of Defense financial statements**

The budget request included \$200.0 million in the service's operation and maintenance accounts for the audits of defense financial statements. The Government Accountability Office testified on April 13, 2005, before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services that spending on audits before the Department has financial management sys-

tems in place to support such audits is not the best use of limited resources. The committee expects that the auditors hired by the Department of Defense Inspector General in fiscal year 2005 for audits of defense financial statements will be used in fiscal year 2006 for other auditing and investigation purposes. The committee recommends a reduction of \$200.0 million to the service's operation and maintenance accounts, as follows:

- Operation and Maintenance, Army—\$70.0 million;
- Operation and Maintenance, Navy—\$65.0 million; and
- Operation and Maintenance, Air Force—\$65.0 million.

#### **Civilian personnel pay in excess of requirements**

The budget request included \$53.5 billion for civilian personnel pay in fiscal year 2006. Based on an analysis of the services' end strength data for civilian personnel as of April 29, 2005, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) projects that the Army and Navy/Marine Corps' civilian personnel costs are overstated for fiscal year 2006 by \$189.0 million. The committee recommends reducing the operation and maintenance accounts by \$189.0 million, as follows:

- Army—\$17.0 million; and
- Navy/Marine Corps—\$172.0 million.

#### **Defense Information System Network**

The committee understands that the Defense Information System Network (DISN)—the Department of Defense's backbone for providing data, video, and voice services—will establish a new pricing structure in fiscal year 2006 for billing the individual services for usage. While supportive of the proposed simplified structure, the committee is concerned about the conflicting and contradictory budget justification materials in DISN that accompanied the President's budget submission. As initially briefed to the committee, the simplified structure entails a decentralization of funds from the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) to the individual services. In turn, the services then pay a "subscription fee" for DISN usage. However, budget justification materials provided to the committee from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, DISA, and the individual services do not lay out this reallocation in any trackable, logical manner. The committee recommends reducing the Department's operation and maintenance accounts by \$95.0 million, as follows:

- Operation and Maintenance, Army—\$25.0 million;
- Operation and Maintenance, Navy—\$25.0 million;
- Operation and Maintenance, Air Force—\$25.0 million; and
- Operation and Maintenance, Defense Information System Agency—\$20.0 million.

#### **Working capital funds**

The budget request included \$3.1 billion in discretionary spending for defense working capital funds. These working capital funds serve a vital role in providing financial transaction flexibility for critical defense customer support activities. When working capital funds produce an annual net operating result involving a surplus—revenues exceeding expenses—consideration should be given to ad-

justing customer rates in future years. Working capital funds that do not appropriately return surplus funds to the supported departments, commands, and agencies through rate-change mechanisms artificially inflate the cost of support and deprive the supported units of limited resources. In many cases, the global war on terrorism has created increased work flow in and out of working capital funds annually over scheduled peacetime projections.

In previous years, the committee has urged the Department of Defense to anticipate the increased workload being experienced within the working capital funds and to budget accordingly. While some agencies and services have begun to take these additional revenue and expenses into account, the Army, Air Force, and Defense Information System Agency (DISA) still are not doing so. Consequently, end of year positive operating balances and excess cash balances continue to grow for these working capital funds.

The current projections of net operating result for fiscal year 2006 for the Army, Air Force, and DISA are based, in part, on artificially low revenue estimates. As higher revenues are realized, the working capital funds will continue to maintain large, positive operating balances and excess cash balances. To ensure proper management of the funds, the committee recommends reducing excess balances within these working capital fund accounts by \$252.9 million, as follows: Army, \$124.7 million; Air Force, \$85.5 million; and DISA, \$42.7 million.

## **Navy**

### **NULKA decoy cartridge**

The budget request included \$588.4 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), for ship operational support and training. The committee notes the Navy requirement to recertify Mark-234 NULKA electronic decoys every 3 years. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.7 million in OMN for NULKA maintenance and recertification.

### **Stainless steel sanitary spaces**

The budget request included \$4.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), for ship depot maintenance. The committee notes that the Stainless Steel Sanitary Space (S4) is being installed on ships during repair or overhaul periods. The S4 consists of corrosion prevention materials and coatings, which reduce maintenance requirements and increase quality of life for ships' company. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.5 million in OMN to sustain the S4 installation rate.

### **Manufacturing Technical Assistance and Production Program**

The budget request included \$298.1 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), for combat communications, including funding for Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command (SPAWAR) activities. The committee notes that the Manufacturing Technical Assistance and Production Program (MTAPP) continues to be a key program for integration of small businesses into the

military supply chain. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in OMN for SPAWAR MTAPP.

#### **Electric start system**

The budget request included \$173.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), for equipment maintenance. The committee notes that performance models have demonstrated that improved reliability and lower maintenance costs could be achieved with electric start technology. Electric start system technology is now available for installation on marine gas turbine engines, including power plants on Ticonderoga-class cruisers and Arleigh Burke-class destroyers. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million in OMN for electric start system upgrades.

#### **Marine gas turbine photonic sensors**

The budget request included \$173.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), for equipment maintenance. The committee understands that more accurate monitoring of gas turbine plant performance and operating parameters is an important element of the Navy's Conditioned Based Maintenance (CBM) program. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in OMN for marine gas turbine photonic sensors in support of the CBM program.

#### **Mark-45 gun system overhauls**

The budget request included \$473.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), for weapons maintenance, including funding for the overhaul of Mark-45 (Mk-45) gun systems. The committee notes that the Mk-45 continues to be the Navy's primary battery on cruisers and destroyers. The committee recommends an increase of \$16.0 million in OMN for Mk-45 gun system overhauls.

#### **Facility sustainment, restoration, and modernization for the Navy**

The budget request included \$1,345.0 million in Operations and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), Operating Forces, for Facility Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization (FSRM). This account is used by the Navy to fund critical maintenance, repairs and renovations of military facilities and infrastructure. The amount in the budget request equates to 95 percent of the total fiscal year 2006 FSRM requirement for the Navy, which meets the budget goal established by the Department of Defense for this account.

On April 5, 2005, the Government Accountability Office released an issue paper entitled "Budget Justification Review: Operations and Maintenance Trends" that reviewed the Navy's execution of the FSRM account. Their analysis concluded that 23 percent of the funds authorized by Congress in fiscal year 2004 for this account were not obligated for their intended purpose, but transferred to other operations and maintenance accounts.

The committee recommends a decrease of \$26.2 million in OMN to reflect the anticipated obligation amount in fiscal year 2006. Furthermore, the committee directs the Department of the Navy to request funding for the FSRM account in future year budgets at an amount intended to be obligated for the purpose authorized by Con-



gress, and to discontinue the practice of transferring FSRM funding to other operations and maintenance accounts.

### **Marine Corps**

#### **Acclimate high performance undergarments**

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), for acclimate high performance undergarments. The committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps continues to support the initiative to make improvements in form, fit, and function of Marine clothing and accessories. Acclimate high performance undergarments allow Marines to adapt to all environments using one type of undergarment system. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million in OMMC for acclimate high performance undergarments.

#### **Combat casualty care equipment upgrades**

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), for combat casualty care equipment upgrades. The committee notes that the Marine Corps assesses combat casualty care equipment upgrades as high military value and has an identified shortfall of 458 units against the approved acquisition object (AAO). The committee recommends an increase of \$5.2 million in OMMC for combat casualty care equipment upgrades to fulfill the AAO.

#### **Family of mountain cold weather clothing and equipment**

The budget request included \$7.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), for the family of mountain cold weather clothing and equipment. Additional funding for the family of mountain cold weather clothing and equipment has been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list, including the All Purpose Environmental Clothing System (APECS). The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million in OMMC for APECS.

#### **Portable tent lighting**

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), for portable tent lighting. The committee notes that Marine Corps portable tent lighting is electro-magnetic interference hardened to prevent compromising peripheral electronics and computers. Additional funding for portable tent lighting has been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in OMMC for portable tent lighting.

#### **Ultra-light Camouflage Net System**

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), for the Ultra-light Camouflage Net System (ULCANS). The committee notes that ULCANS greatly enhances the ability of combat troops and support units to conceal military target signatures of weapons, vehicles, and semi-permanent positions in situations where natural cover or concealment may be absent or inadequate. Additional funding for ULCANS has

been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million in OMMC for ULCANS.

#### **Supplemental communications and electrical utility support to U.S. Marine Corps Network Operations Center**

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, to extend and improve base information technology and electric infrastructure to meet requirements of the network operations center currently under construction and other facilities at the U.S. Marine Corps Base at Quantico, Virginia. There is a requirement for \$2.1 million to complete construction of the Marine Corps network operations center that begun last year. Without this additional funding, the Marine Corps communications and warfighting capabilities will be degraded.

The committee recommends an increase in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, of \$2.1 million to extend and improve base information technology and electrical infrastructure to meet requirements of the network operations center and other facilities.

### **Air Force**

#### **Bomber deployable phase maintenance kits**

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), for B-52 or B-1 bomber deployable phase maintenance kits. The committee notes that the global war on terrorism has increased the requirement for Air Force aircraft, including bombers, to operate from forward operating locations. Additional funding for B-52 and B-1 bomber deployable phase maintenance kits has been identified on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force unfunded priorities list in order to increase bomber availability in theater. The committee recommends an increase of \$86.0 million in OMAF for bomber deployable phase maintenance kits, as follows: \$34.0 million for B-1 aircraft and \$52.0 million for B-52 aircraft.

#### **Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator**

The budget request included \$3.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), for the development of a preliminary design and risk assessment of a navigation, guidance, and control unit for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP), and for an assessment of the integration and requirements of such a unit for carriage on the B-2 bomber. The committee notes that the evaluation of RNEP feasibility by the Department of Energy is not scheduled to be completed prior to 2007. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$3.5 million in OMAF.

#### **Joint protection enterprise network**

The budget request included no funding in the Operations and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) account for the joint protection enterprise network (JPEN). The Department of Defense requires standardized and timely submission of Threat and Local Observation Notices (TALON) and Suspicious Activity Reports (SAR) across components and commands. The Commander, U.S. Northern Com-

mand, has identified funding shortfalls for the operations and maintenance of JPEN, which provides this capability. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.6 million in OMAF to address this funding shortfall and to support system upgrades, enhanced functionality, and expanded information sharing capabilities for JPEN.

#### **Joint task force north**

The budget request included \$4.5 million in the Operations and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) account for Joint Task Force North (JTF-N). In September 2004, Commander, U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM), assigned JTF-N a full homeland defense and civil support mission. This new mission transforms JTF-N into an operational, proactive, transnational threat-focused organization driven by actionable intelligence. The Commander, NORTHCOM, has identified funding shortfalls for the operation of the task force. The task force must maintain operational readiness and participation in efforts such as the recently concluded 3 month, multiagency Operation Winter Freeze border security project. The successful operation took place on the northeast border during a period of heightened security. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in OMAF to support basic operational requirements; equipment and personnel for the JTF-N; and to continue projects focused on proactive situational awareness, decision superiority, theater security cooperation, and other initiatives required under the new homeland defense and civil support mission.

#### **Mobile consolidated command center**

The budget request included \$14.9 million in the Operations and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) account for the mobile consolidated command center (MCCC). The MCCC is a rapidly deployable, vehicle-based command and control center designed to provide commanders with tactical warning, military force direction, and consequence management during periods of heightened security alerts or increased national readiness levels. The Commander, U.S. Northern Command, has identified funding shortfalls for the operations and maintenance of MCCC.

The committee recommends an increase of \$6.2 million in OMAF to address this shortfall and to fully sustain and support the operation of the MCCC. Uninterrupted operation of the MCCC would ensure the availability of continuous communication links to the military chain of command in a crisis and would allow for prolonged independent operation as necessary.

#### **Mobility Air Force depot maintenance**

The budget request included \$2.5 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), for depot maintenance programs, including \$287.8 million for KC-135 depot maintenance and \$87.5 million for C-130 depot maintenance. The KC-135 and C-130 are venerable, combat-tested aircraft. Manned with talented, dedicated mobility Air Force crews, these aircraft continue to demonstrate their essential contributions to the global war on terrorism. Additional funding for KC-135 depot maintenance and for C-130 depot maintenance has been identified on the Chief of Staff of the Air

Force unfunded priorities list. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$96.6 million in OMAF, including \$59.0 million for KC-135 depot maintenance and \$37.6 million for C-130 depot maintenance funding to address immediate safety of flight issues and to sustain the long-term readiness of mobility air forces.

The committee is concerned with the level of funding provided for KC-135 depot maintenance, given the results of previous Air Force studies, ongoing efforts to mitigate corrosion, and continuing challenges related to the future force structure of tanker aircraft. The Tanker Requirement Study for Fiscal Year 2005, supported by the KC-135 Economic Service Life study, concluded that the Air Force should apply additional resources for KC-135 depot maintenance in order to increase depot throughput and to maximize available operational aircraft. The committee finds, however, that the budget request included funding for only 47 percent of the requirement for KC-135 air frame maintenance and only 58 percent of the total depot maintenance requirement for KC-135 aircraft. The committee, therefore, recommends additional funding for KC-135 depot maintenance to maintain a viable depot maintenance program and address continuing challenges.

The committee notes that recent changes to the C-130J acquisition program and the discovery of advanced fatigue in the center wing box of the current inventory of C-130 aircraft present challenges to the readiness of the C-130 fleet. Program changes and advanced wing fatigue were not anticipated when the C-130 depot maintenance program for fiscal year 2006 was prepared. The committee notes that as a result of center wing box fatigue, the Air Force has grounded 30 aircraft and has imposed restrictions on an additional 60 aircraft. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase in depot maintenance funding to address immediate C-130 center wing box safety of flight issues and to ensure the availability of mission capable aircraft to support intra-theater, tactical air lift operational requirements.

The committee notes that this additional funding is one part of an overall initiative by the committee to provide additional funding for KC-135 and C-130 readiness.

#### **Homeland Security/Homeland Defense Education Consortium**

The budget request included no funding in the Operations and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) account to continue the U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM) Homeland Security/Homeland Defense Education Consortium (HSDEC). The committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in OMAF to enable NORTHCOM to continue and expand HSDEC. As homeland security and homeland defense roles and missions are further defined, it is important that educational curriculums designed to train personnel in these areas adhere to standards, and that the Department of Defense, through NORTHCOM, participates in establishing the criteria for such standards. An expanded program would increase the role of NORTHCOM in setting education and research priorities and would further training, information sharing, and targeted projects, particularly in cyber and biodefense.

## **Defense-Wide**

### **Counseling and assistance to military families**

The budget request included \$42.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for non-medical counseling and \$179.0 million for family assistance centers across all military departments. Recent studies, including the National Military Family Association's "Serving the Home Front" analysis and the Army Family Action Plan, show significantly increased demand for assistance to families due to the changing nature of military service since September 11, 2001.

The committee recommends an increase of \$30.0 million in OMDW for increased assistance to military families, including non-medical, preventive mental health counseling, including assistance to families of the Guard and Reserve. The committee expects the increased funding to support non-medical counseling services available through the Department of Defense's Military One-Source program, which provides up to six face-to-face counseling visits for individual and family needs, both in the continental United States and overseas. The committee further directs that additional funds be applied to reducing the shortfall of funding for family assistance centers serving the Army National Guard, Air Force National Guard Wings, Air Force Reserve, and Army Reserve.

### **Increased support for child care for military families**

The budget request included a total of \$440.0 million for child care services for all military services, including \$174.0 for the Army; \$95.0 for Navy; \$151.0 for Air Force; and \$20.0 for the Marine Corps. The committee believes that additional funds are needed to meet the documented requirement for more than 38,000 additional child care spaces for military families. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has an ongoing deficiency in the availability of child care services, which has increased significantly in the past two years and which adds a substantial burden to the families of deployed military members.

The committee recommends an increase of \$40.0 million in Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for child care services for military families, including the families of mobilized Guard and Reserve members.

The committee intends that the increased funding will be used for the following purposes:

- (1) construction of temporary facilities at military installations with high deployment rates that are experiencing an increase in births, based on authority provided elsewhere in this report. This new authority would increase the threshold for use of minor military construction authority for unspecified minor construction projects to construct child development centers; and
- (2) support for public-private partnerships to provide incentives for providers on and off military installations to offer support to military families.

The committee acknowledges that the demand for child care services exceeds availability both in the continental United States

and overseas, and is a top quality of life concern among military personnel.

### **Funding for Office of Economic Adjustment**

The budget request included \$30.0 million in Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), Administration and Service-wide Activities, for the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA). The committee recommends additional funding of \$60 million in OMDW to allow the OEA to provide planning assistance to local communities affected by the closure or realignment of military installations resulting from the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) round.

The OEA provides comprehensive planning and organizational assistance to communities, regions, and States adversely impacted by BRAC. Civilian reuse of a former military installation is often the single most important opportunity for an affected community to overcome the specific impacts of a closure or realignment, while building upon a community's strengths and opportunities. OEA anticipates start-up obligations that will average \$1.0 million per community grant in fiscal year 2006 for local staff to coordinate the community's response and to develop realistic reuse plans and community strategies. OEA grants will also be used to establish physical and environmental baseline conditions, to study market-feasible reuses, and to plan for potential zoning actions and public improvements.

### **Capital security cost sharing**

The budget request included \$61.3 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for capital security cost sharing. The committee recommends a decrease of \$61.3 million for capital security cost sharing.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends a provision that would permit funds appropriated to the Department of Defense to be transferred to the Department of State as payment for a fee charged by the Department of State for maintenance, upgrade, or construction of U.S. diplomatic facilities, only to the extent that the amount charged in any given year exceeds the total amount of unreimbursed costs incurred by the Department of Defense during that year in providing goods and services to the Department of State. The committee anticipates that in fiscal year 2006 the Department of Defense will provide unreimbursed goods and services to the Department of State valued in excess of \$61.3 million; therefore, the Department of Defense will not need the money included in the budget request for the capital security cost sharing program.

### **Information assurance scholarship program**

The budget request included \$5.5 million in Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for the information assurance scholarship program. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in OMDW for this program. The Department of Defense requires experts in the areas of information security, assurance, and architecture. Increased funding for these scholarships

will allow the Department to educate and train additional students in fiscal year 2006.

The committee's commitment to ensuring an adequate and skilled workforce to support the Department's complex information assurance and security challenges led to the creation of this scholarship program in the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-398). The committee continues to strongly support the program and commends the Department for successful recruitment of quality educational institutions and perspective students to participate in this important endeavor.

#### **Increased funding for conservation buffer zones**

The budget request included \$20.0 million in Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for implementation of conservation buffer zones around military facilities under the Department of Defense's Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative. The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million to accelerate the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative.

The committee believes that limiting the development or use of property that would be incompatible with the mission of an installation, and preserving habitat that is compatible with environmental requirements and which may also serve to eliminate or relieve current or anticipated environmental restrictions on the use of military installations, should be a high priority for the Department. The Department should pursue opportunities to avoid encroachment by urban growth and development through partnership agreements with eligible entities. The committee directs that in allocating the funding provided for the Department's Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative, the Department should give priority to projects that have been characterized by the Army as benefitting high priority training sites and identified as having the greatest potential to reduce or prevent encroachment through the implementation of a compatible use buffer zone, such as projects that are part of the Army's Compatible Use Buffer Program at the following locations: Fort Campbell, KY; Fort Carson, CO; Fort A. P. Hill, VA; Fort Hood, TX; Fort Sill, OK and Camp Ripley, MN.

#### **Citizen-Soldier Support Program**

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for the Citizen-Soldier Support Program. The committee is aware that the Citizen-Soldier Support Program is improving and augmenting family readiness programs for families of the Reserve and Guard. This program is providing expert assistance to reserve families in remote areas in which military installations and the services these installations offer do not exist. The committee believes that there is an ongoing need for such assistance to military families.

The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in OMDW to expand services provided by the Citizen-Soldier Support Program.

### **Parents as Teachers**

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for the Parents as Teachers program. The committee believes that additional funding is needed to expand a program that provides assistance to military families through providing instructional assistance to parents of pre-school children.

The committee authorizes the increase in order to initiate a demonstration program at up to five military installations, to be identified in conjunction with the Department of Defense, at which there is a large concentration of military families experiencing high deployment rates and large numbers of children from birth to five years of age. The committee acknowledges that the Parents as Teachers program has been successfully supporting military families under nondefense sponsorship at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri; Fort Leavenworth, Kansas; Fort Riley, Kansas; and Fort Hood, Texas; and expects that funding would support continued operation of these highly successful programs as well.

The committee believes that the Parents as Teachers program can provide a valuable service to military families, based on voluntary participation, through providing instructional assistance to parents of pre-school children. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in OMDW for the Parents as Teachers program.

### **Military to civilian conversions**

The budget request included \$1.4 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA); Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN); Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC); Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF); and Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for conversion of 6,434 military positions to 11,573 civilian positions during fiscal year 2006. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not provided adequate information on the funding requirements and execution data for military to civilian conversions.

According to an April 29, 2005, analysis by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Office of the Secretary of Defense and service budget officials acknowledge that they are unable to provide a clear methodology to calculate the Department's budget cost estimates for replacing military positions with civilians in fiscal year 2006. According to the GAO analysis, Department officials also acknowledged that the services have not determined the federal civilian employee and contractor mix for these conversions. The GAO analysis stated: "Without determining this mix, DoD can not be certain whether it accurately estimated its need for staffing resources and the funds to pay for such resources in its fiscal year 2006 budget."

The committee concurs with this assessment regarding the lack of clarity on the budget requirements for achieving conversion of military billets to civilians or contractors. The committee believes that military-to-civilian conversions should be reviewed and validated by the Secretary of Defense to ensure that such requirements are formulated in a consistent manner; that there is an availability of qualified civilian employees; and that the mix of Department ci-



vilians and contractors is more clearly understood. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$285.0 million for military to civilian conversions, as follows:

- Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA)—\$90.0 million;
- Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN)—\$90.0 million;
- Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF)—\$90.0 million; and
- Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW)—\$15.0 million.

### **Army Reserve**

#### **Army Reserve components cold weather clothing**

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve (OMAR), or Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG), for the Extended Cold Weather Clothing System (ECWCS). According to Reserve component officials, the ECWCS program is critical to unit mission and training requirements in all regions and in all deployments. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for the ECWCS, as follows: \$2.0 million in OMAR and \$2.0 million in OMARNG.

### **Air Force Reserve**

#### **Air Force Reserve mobility Air Force depot maintenance**

The budget request included \$377.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (OMAFR), for mobility Air Force (MAF) depot maintenance programs, including \$74.0 million for KC-135 depot maintenance and \$96.6 million for C-130 depot maintenance. The committee recommends an increase of \$58.0 million in OMAFR for Air Force Reserve MAF depot maintenance, as follows: \$53.7 million for KC-135 depot maintenance, \$4.3 million for C-130 depot maintenance, including inspection and repair of the center wing box.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee notes that this additional funding is one part of an overall initiative to address immediate safety of flight issues and to sustain the long-term readiness of mobility air forces.

### **Army National Guard**

#### **Communicator Automated Emergency Notification System**

The budget request included no funding for the Communicator Automated Emergency Notification System (CAENS). The committee notes that the CAEN, a component of the Emergency Mass Notification System, provides timely and effective notification of emergencies to soldiers supporting contingency operations within the homeland and at deployed locations worldwide. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million in OMARNG for CAENS.

#### **Virtual battlefield system one**

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG), for the virtual battlefield system one (VBS1). The committee notes that VSB1 is specifically designed to meet the training objectives of small infantry unit

operations. The committee understands that the Army National Guard initiated fielding of the VSB1 in response to an urgent training requirement in support of deploying units. VSB1 is currently part of the predeployment training package at many Army National Guard mobilization sites. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million in OMARNG for VBS1.

**Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear and High Yield Explosive Enhanced Response Force Package Teams**

The budget request included no funding for National Guard Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear and High Yield Explosive (CBRNE) Enhanced Response Force Package (NG CERFP) teams. The committee recommends an increase of \$19.8 million for this program. Of that amount, the committee recommends an increase of \$9.5 million to establish five additional NG CERFP teams, and an increase of \$10.3 million to provide sustainment funding for the 12 existing NG CERFP teams.

The committee directs that the \$9.5 million for the five additional NG CERFP teams be allocated as follows: Operations and Maintenance, Army National Guard, \$4.0 million; Operations and Maintenance, Air National Guard, \$2.3 million; National Guard Personnel, Army, \$1.6 million; and Military Personnel, Air National Guard, \$1.6 million.

The committee directs that the \$10.3 million for sustainment for the 12 existing NG CERFPs be allocated as follows: Operations and Maintenance, Army National Guard, \$1.8 million; Operations and Maintenance, Air National Guard, \$1.1 million; National Guard Personnel, Army, \$3.7 million; and Military Personnel, Air National Guard, \$3.7 million.

The NG CERFP pilot program was initiated in fiscal year 2004 and has proven to be a valuable asset for federal and state authorities. Twelve NG CERFP teams were funded through fiscal year 2005 as a proof of concept demonstration. These NG CERFP teams are capable of performing mass decontamination and triage/emergency medical treatment, and locating and extracting victims from an incident "hot zone." The NG CERFP teams provide follow-on forces in support of the National Guard's Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams (WMD-CSTs), whose mission is to support civil authorities at a domestic CBRNE incident site by identifying CBRNE agents/substances, assessing current and projected consequences, and advising on response measures. The NG CERFP teams deploy subsequently, within 4–24 hours after a disaster, to provide additional capabilities in support of civil or military authorities in conducting consequence management operations.

The original 12 CERFP teams are located in each of the 10 Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regions, with two additional teams placed to cover larger geographic areas. Continued funding for the 12 original NG CERFP teams will ensure that they are available to assist local authorities in major disasters. These existing teams would also benefit from the purchase of additional equipment including medical supplies, extraction equipment, and special outfits with ancillary assemblies for hot zones. The committee believes that the five additional teams will provide en-

hanced capabilities for response to a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear attack or event.

### **Air National Guard**

#### **Air National Guard mobility Air Force depot maintenance**

The budget request included \$612.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (OMANG), for mobility Air Force (MAF) depot maintenance programs, including \$221.7 million for KC-135 depot maintenance and \$93.7 million for C-130 depot maintenance. The committee recommends an increase of \$45.5 million in OMANG for Air Force National Guard MAF depot maintenance, as follows: \$35.8 million for KC-135 depot maintenance and \$9.7 million for C-130 depot maintenance.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee notes that this additional funding is one part of an overall initiative to address immediate safety of flight issues and to sustain the long-term readiness of mobility air forces.

### **Transfer Accounts**

#### **Funding for Formerly Used Defense Sites**

The budget request included \$221.9 million for cleanup of Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS). The committee notes that the budgeted amount is below the level authorized and appropriated for this program in fiscal year 2005, even though the scope and challenges of FUDS cleanup remain substantial. The committee recommends an increase of \$40.0 million for FUDS cleanup. The committee expects the Department of Defense to demonstrate its commitment to FUDS cleanup by increasing the amount of funding budgeted for this effort in the outyears.

### **ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST**

#### **Defense Information System Network Access Transport Services**

The committee notes that the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) is in the process of acquiring additional network access to connect remote Department of Defense locations to terrestrial networks that are part of a component of the Global Information Grid (GIG), known as the GIG Bandwidth Expansion (GIG-BE). This will provide the Department with a high speed fiber optic network that will greatly enhance network centric operations.

The committee is concerned that DISA is moving forward with an acquisition plan to acquire this connectivity through a Defense Information System Network Access Transport Services (DATS) contract without a complete analysis of the costs and capabilities associated with all possible alternative strategies. In a briefing to the committee by DISA personnel, they reported that the underlying assumptions behind the analysis of alternatives (AoA)—accomplished internally by DISA, of whether to purchase or lease fiber optic connectivity, did not include cost as a factor. The committee also understands that DISA has not solicited sufficient input from industry. The committee understands that the Office of the Secretary of Defense for Program Analysis and Evaluation, an

independent analysis group within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, has voiced concerns about the DISA-planned approach for over a year. The committee directs the Congressional Budget Office to undertake a review of the AoA and underlying assumptions being prepared by DISA and report its findings to the committee by March 1, 2006.

**Test to improve the quality of agricultural produce available in commissary stores**

The committee is aware that the Defense Commissary Agency has initiated a test program to improve the quality of agricultural produce, particularly fruits and vegetables available to patrons of military commissary stores. The test employs web-based ordering techniques and is designed to reduce average times for the receipt of produce and to improve administrative processing. The test also affords greater opportunities for small businesses to become providers to commissary stores.

The committee believes that the adoption of modern business practices such as these will improve the quality of produce available at commissary stores, and encourages the Department of Defense to move forward to implement such best practices throughout the commissary system. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2006, on its progress in implementation of improved business practices designed to result in better quality produce at Department Commissary stores.

## 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 2006, as shown below:

	Fiscal year—		
	2005 authorization	2006 request	2006 recommendation
Army .....	502,400	482,400	522,400
Navy .....	365,900	352,700	352,700
Marine Corps .....	178,000	175,000	178,000
Air Force .....	359,700	357,400	357,400

The Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) authorized active duty end strength for the Army at 502,400 and 178,000 for the Marine Corps. Additional authority was also provided in section 403 of that Act to increase active duty end strength for the Army by up to 30,000 and increase Marine Corps active duty end strength by up to 9,000 above the fiscal year 2004 authorized levels of 482,400 and 175,000, respectively, during fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

The committee notes that the Army and the Marine Corps continue to provide substantial forces in support of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, and that the Reserve components comprise approximately 40 percent of the troops in theater. The Army is simultaneously engaged in major organizational changes intended to increase combat power and flexibility by creating more modular units of deployment at the combat brigade level, and is also working to rebalance critical skills and units between the active and Reserve component forces.

Because of these continuing demands, the Army currently estimates that its active duty end strength for fiscal year 2006 will be 522,400. The Marine Corps believes that its active duty end strength for fiscal year 2005 will be about 178,000. The Commandant of the Marine Corps has testified before the Committee on Armed Services that an increase in end strength is not required for fiscal year 2006.

The committee believes that achieving an active duty end strength above 522,400 in fiscal year 2006 would be difficult for the Army given the challenges the Army faces in recruiting and retention. The committee also believes that broad use of stop-loss authority to meet higher end strength requirements would have negative impacts on recruiting, retention, and the public's perception of military service. The committee believes the Army should make every effort to reduce the number of personnel retained under stop-

loss authority, consistent with maximum combat unit cohesion and readiness.

For the reasons set forth above, the committee recommends an active duty end strength for the Army at 522,400 and 178,000 for the Marine Corps for fiscal year 2006. This reflects an increase of 20,000 from the authorized level for the Army for fiscal year 2005 and an increase of 40,000 from the requested level for fiscal year 2006. The recommended level for the Marine Corps is equal to the authorized level in fiscal year 2005 and is an increase of 3,000 from the requested level for fiscal year 2006. The committee has recommended funding to support these higher end strength levels in title XIV of this Act. The recommended active duty end strength for the Navy is decreased by 13,200 and the recommended active duty end strength for the Air Force is decreased by 2,300, as requested.

#### **Revision of permanent active duty end strength minimum levels (sec. 402)**

The committee recommends a provision that would establish minimum active duty end strengths for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force as of September 30, 2006, as shown below. These minimum end strengths reflect the committee recommendations in section 401 of this report. The minimum end strength requirements reflect an increase of 20,000 for the Army and a decrease of 13,200 for the Navy and 2,300 for the Air Force. The minimum end strength requirement for the Marine Corps remains equal to the level established for fiscal year 2005.

	Fiscal year—	
	2005 authorization	2006 recommendation
Army .....	502,400	522,400
Navy .....	365,900	352,700
Marine Corps .....	178,000	178,000
Air Force .....	359,700	357,400

### **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 2006, as shown below:

	Fiscal year—		
	2005 authorization	2006 request	2006 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States .....	350,000	350,000	350,000
The Army Reserve .....	205,000	205,000	205,000
The Naval Reserve .....	83,400	73,100	73,100
The Marine Corps Reserve .....	39,600	39,600	39,600
The Air National Guard of the United States .....	106,800	106,800	106,800
The Air Force Reserve .....	76,100	74,000	74,000
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 2006, as shown below:

	Fiscal year—		
	2005 request	2006 recommendation	2006 authorization
The Army National Guard of the United States .....	26,602	27,345	27,396
The Army Reserve .....	14,970	15,270	15,270
The Naval Reserve .....	14,152	13,392	13,392
The Marine Corps Reserve .....	2,261	2,261	2,261
The Air National Guard of the United States .....	12,253	13,089	13,123
The Air Force Reserve .....	1,900	2,290	2,290

The committee recommends increases of 794 in the Army National Guard, 300 in the Army Reserve, 870 in the Air National Guard, and 390 in the Air Force Reserve. The committee supports increases in full-time support manning needed to increase readiness, particularly in view of the major role played by the Reserve and National Guard in ongoing operations in the global war on terrorism.

In addition to the budget request, the recommended end strengths include: 51 active duty members of the Army National Guard and 34 active duty members of the Air National Guard for sustainment of the 12 existing and creation of five additional National Guard Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear and High Yield Explosive (CBRNE) Enhanced Response Force Package teams. The committee also recommends a decrease of 760 in the Naval Reserve consistent with reductions in both active Navy and Naval Reserve end strength.

The committee recommends an end strength for the Marine Corps Reserve equal to the fiscal year 2005 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 2006, as shown below:

	Fiscal year—		
	2005 authorization	2006 request	2006 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States .....	25,076	25,563	25,563
The Army Reserve .....	7,299	7,649	7,649
The Air National Guard of the United States .....	22,956	22,971	22,971
The Air Force Reserve .....	9,954	9,852	9,852

**Fiscal year 2006 limitations on non-dual status technicians (sec. 414)**

The committee recommends a provision that would establish numerical limits on the number of non-dual status technicians who

may be employed in the Department of Defense as of September 30, 2006, as shown below:

	Fiscal year—		
	2005 authorization	2006 request	2006 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States .....	1,600	1,600	1,600
The Army Reserve .....	795	695	695
The Air National Guard of the United States .....	350	350	350
The Air Force Reserve .....	90	90	90

### Subtitle C—Authorizations of Appropriations

#### Authorization of appropriations for military personnel (sec. 421)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of \$109.2 billion for military personnel for fiscal year 2006, an increase of \$236.9 million above the budget request. This includes: (1) \$220.0 million for increases in Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance and death gratuity levels; (2) \$10.6 million for increases in Army and Air National Guard full-time support personnel to sustain the existing 12 and create five additional National Guard Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear and High Yield Explosive Enhanced Response Force Package teams; (3) \$6.0 million for continued payment throughout a period of hospitalization of special pay for duty subject to hostile fire or imminent danger; and (4) \$0.3 million for additional personnel costs related to the exclusion of general and flag officers on terminal leave from grade limits.

#### Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 422)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$58.3 million to be appropriated for fiscal year 2006 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

The committee is concerned that there are a number of complaints from residents of the Armed Forces Retirement Home that generally revolve around changes made in medical care, and that greater focus should be placed on these concerns.

The committee directs that the annual Performance and Accountability Report of the Armed Forces Retirement Home will include, in this and in all subsequent fiscal years, a report on the quality and access to health care for all residents of the home, and any changes in the level and type of care provided in each location. The report will describe the level and scope of services provided to all residents and will also include the results of independent accreditation surveys conducted by the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations.

Additionally, to further communication between residents and management and to ensure that the voices of residents are heard, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an annual survey of resident satisfaction. The survey will be developed with the involvement of the resident advisory committees and major functional committees, and will include questions relating to satisfaction with health care, facilities, and support services. All residents shall be invited to participate in the annual survey. The



survey format shall be consistent over time in order to reveal trends and indicators in satisfaction. The result and outcome of each annual resident survey will be reported in the Armed Forces Retirement Home's Performance and Accountability Report beginning in fiscal year 2007 and every year thereafter.

The committee expects that other resident suggestions will also be considered by the management of the home, including frequent meetings with residents and resident advisory councils, new resident questionnaires, as well as surveys of residents who chose to leave the Armed Forces Retirement Home for any reason.



## **TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY**

### **Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy**

#### **Exclusion of general and flag officers on leave pending separation or retirement from computation of active duty officers for general and flag officer distribution and strength limitations (sec. 501)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 525 and 526 of title 10, United States Code, to exclude from consideration in determining the distribution limitations and the total number of general or flag officers of an armed force on active duty, officers in the grade of brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half) or above who are on leave pending separation, retirement, or release from active duty. This provision would only be applicable during the 60-day period beginning on the date of the commencement of leave of such officer. The committee believes that officers in general and flag officer grades who have commenced terminal leave should not be counted against existing limits on total numbers of officers. The committee expects that this provision would effectively reduce the incidence and duration of frocking of general and flag officers, and provide assistance to the services in filling general and flag officer billets.

#### **Expansion of joint duty assignments for Reserve component general and flag officers (sec. 502)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 526(b)(2)(A) of title 10, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 11 the number of Reserve general or flag officer positions that may be assigned on the staffs of the commanders of the unified and specified combatant commanders. The provision would also authorize the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to assign Reserve general or flag officers under section 526(b)(2)(A) to the Joint Staff.

The committee believes that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has effectively assigned Reserve component general and flag officers under this authority, and that an additional position on the Joint Staff is needed to assist in performing missions related to homeland defense, anti-terrorism, force protection, and military assistance to civil authorities.

#### **Deadline for receipt by promotion selection boards of correspondence from eligible officers (sec. 503)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 614 and 14106 of title 10, United States Code, to specify that officers eligible for consideration by a promotion selection board may send a written communication to the board, to arrive not later than the date before the board convenes.

Existing law provides that officers eligible for consideration may send written communications, to arrive not later than the date the promotion selection board convenes. This creates the potential that selection boards will have reviewed, briefed, and acted upon the record of an officer on the first day of board proceedings before written communications have been received. The committee believes this change will ensure greater efficiency in promotion selection board procedures, and that an effective date of March 1, 2006, will provide sufficient time for the services to issue appropriate notice to officers eligible for promotion.

**Furnishing to promotion selection boards of adverse information on officers eligible for promotion to certain senior grades (sec. 504)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 615 of title 10, United States Code, to require that substantiated adverse information be provided to promotion selection boards considering Active and Reserve component officers for promotion to the grade of lieutenant colonel, or commander in the case of the Navy, or above. Under current law, the decision to provide promotion selection boards with substantiated adverse findings and conclusions from officially documented investigations or inquiries is subject to the discretion of the service secretaries, and unless previously made part of the official record such information is not routinely presented. The committee believes that promotion selection boards responsible for selecting the “best qualified” future senior leaders of the military services should evaluate such information and should be provided with adverse documentation as part of their deliberative process.

**Grades of the Judge Advocates General (sec. 505)**

The committee recommends a provision that would raise the statutory grades of the Judge Advocates General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to lieutenant general or vice admiral, as appropriate. These three officers would be in addition to the numbers that would otherwise be permitted for their Armed Forces for officers serving on active duty in grades above major general or rear admiral, as the case may be.

The greatly increased operations tempo of the Armed Forces has resulted in an increase in the need for legal advice from uniformed judge advocates in such areas as operational law, international law, the law governing occupied territory, the Geneva Conventions, and related matters. In addition, the system of military justice, administered by the Judge Advocates General, has taken on increased importance. This provision recognizes these developments and the vital importance of the duties of these officers in today’s Armed Forces.

**Temporary extension of authority to reduce minimum length of commissioned service for voluntary retirement as an officer (sec. 506)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 3911, 6323, and 8911 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize reduction in the amount of time from 10 to 8 years that a

regular or Reserve officer who has prior enlisted service must serve as a commissioned officer in order to retire as a commissioned officer. The committee believes that lowering the amount of active service to 8 years would encourage more highly qualified petty officers and non-commissioned officers to consider applying for a commission. The committee also views this change as assisting in force shaping by enabling a limited number of officers, primarily in overmanned officer communities, to voluntarily choose retirement in the highest grade achieved. This reduction from 10 to 8 years was in effect from 1990 through 2001 and, under this provision, would remain in effect from the date of enactment of this Act through December 31, 2008.

**Modification of strength in grade limitations applicable to Reserve flag officers in active status (sec. 507)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 12004 of title 10, United States Code, to reduce by four the number of required Naval Reserve flag officers in medical designators and by one the number of flag officers in the Supply Corps and to increase by five the number of Naval Reserve line officers.

The committee recognizes that additional Reserve flag officers in line and restricted line specialties are needed to meet operational requirements. The committee continues to view the allocation of line and staff corps Naval Reserve flag officers in section 12004 as a valuable means of ensuring sound officer community management and effective integration of the Active and Reserve components of the Navy.

**Uniform authority for deferment of separation of Reserve general and flag officers for age (sec. 508)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 14512 of title 10, United States Code, to make uniform among each of the services the conditions under which the authority to defer retirement until age 64 of up to 10 reserve flag or general officers per service may be exercised. Under existing law, the Army and Air Force are limited to exercising this authority in the case of officers occupying certain billets. The committee believes removing this condition for the Army and Air Force will afford necessary flexibility in retaining key Army and Air Force senior Reserve officers possessing essential experience and skills.

**Subtitle B—Enlisted Personnel Policy**

**Uniform citizenship or residency requirements for enlistment in the Armed Forces (sec. 521)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 504 of title 10, United States Code, to codify and uniformly apply existing practices of the military services regarding eligibility of individuals who are not citizens of the United States to enlist into the Armed Forces.

### **Subtitle C—Reserve component Personnel Matters**

#### **Requirements for physical examinations and medical and dental readiness for members of the Selected Reserve not on active duty (sec. 531)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require an annual physical examination for members of the Selected Reserve. The provision would also require an annual report to the secretary concerned which documents the medical and dental readiness of the Reserve member to perform military duties.

The committee is concerned that there are continuing reports of Reserve members who are unable to deploy as a result of disqualifying physical or dental conditions. When this occurs, it erodes the readiness of units to perform their military mission. The committee recognizes that the requirement for an annual physical examination is more frequent than the existing five-year requirement. However, the committee believes that rigorous discipline to ensure medical and dental readiness is essential. Drilling members of the Reserve and National Guard are not seen by military physicians as frequently as their Active-Duty counterparts and thus will benefit from an annual physical examination.

#### **Repeal of limitation on amount of financial assistance under Reserve Officers' Training Corps scholarship program (sec. 532)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2107 and 2107a of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the service secretaries to pay the costs of room and board for Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) cadets who are receiving scholarships when those costs exceed the cumulative cost of tuition, fees, books, and laboratory expenses. This provision offers additional flexibility to managers of ROTC programs in meeting the specific financial needs of participating students, and will assist the Army in achieving a planned 15 percent increase in Senior ROTC participation.

#### **Procedures for suspending financial assistance and subsistence allowance for senior ROTC cadets and midshipmen of the basis of health-related conditions (sec. 533)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2107 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Secretary of Defense prescribe policies and procedures to ensure fairness and medically based decision making prior to suspension of financial assistance for senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) cadets and midshipmen under section 2107 of title 10, United States Code, and monthly subsistence allowance under section 209 of title 37, United States Code.

While the practices of each of the services regarding medical leaves of absence for cadets and midshipmen on ROTC scholarship have varied, each of the services and the Defense Finance and Accounting Service must incorporate and adhere to essential administrative due process before suspending or terminating ROTC scholarships following health-related incidents. As noted in the statement of managers accompanying section 555 of the Ronald W.

Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375), the committee expects the services to promptly implement uniform procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for medical leaves of absence that will ensure medical officer evaluation under a prescribed standard of review prior to involuntary suspension of ROTC benefits for medical reasons.

**Increase in maximum number of Army Reserve and Army National Guard cadets under Reserve Officers' Training Corps (sec. 534)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2107a of title 10, United States Code, to double the number of Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) cadets who would be authorized to perform their obligated service in the Army Reserve and Army National Guard. This provision would encourage more members of the Army Reserve and National Guard to enter ROTC while attending college, and assist in meeting the need for additional company grade officers in the Army Reserve and Army National Guard.

**Modification of educational assistance for Reserves supporting contingency and other operations (sec. 535)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 16163 of title 10, United States Code, pertaining to educational assistance for Reserves supporting contingency and other operations. The change would clarify that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs would prescribe the form and manner of an eligible member's election among multiple educational benefits. The Department of Veterans Affairs administers the educational programs and the eligible members' claims for assistance.

The committee also recommends a modification of section 16165 of title 10, United States Code, that would allow a member of the Selected Reserve, who incurs a short break (not to exceed 90 days) from service in the Selected Reserve, to continue to be eligible to receive educational assistance under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, if that member continues to serve in the Ready Reserve. This would allow members who desire to shift Reserve components or to transfer to a new unit the opportunity to do so without jeopardizing their educational benefit under this section. This would also allow a person who has separated from the Selected Reserve to remain eligible for this benefit if they rejoin the Selected Reserve within the time indicated, provided the individual remains in the Ready Reserve during the break in Selected Reserve service.

**Repeal of limitation on authority to redesignate the Naval Reserve as the Navy Reserve (sec. 536)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 517(a) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375) to eliminate the requirement that implementation of the Secretary of the Navy's decision to redesignate the Naval Reserve not take place before the date that is 180 days after the date on which the Secretary submits

recommended conforming legislation. On April 29, 2005, the President approved the redesignation of the U. S. Naval Reserve as the U. S. Navy Reserve. The committee supports prompt implementation of this change, and directs the Secretary of the Navy to comply with the requirement to submit conforming legislation no later than August 1, 2005.

**Performance by Reserve component personnel of operational test and evaluation and training relating to new equipment (sec. 537)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to carry out a pilot program through September 2010 to evaluate the feasibility and advisability of utilizing members of the Reserve components of the Army, rather than contractor personnel, to perform test, evaluation, and new equipment training, and related activities. Under this authority, up to \$10.0 million, in any fiscal year of funds available to the Army for multiyear purposes in appropriations for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation and for procurement, may be transferred to a Reserve component military personnel account in the amounts necessary to reimburse that account for the costs of military pay and allowances of reservists participating in this program.

Relying on soldiers to perform developmental testing could prove beneficial in providing soldier feedback earlier in the development cycle, enabling program managers to identify potential problems and required engineering changes sooner, reducing cost increases and delays, and providing soldiers with hands-on experience in new and emerging systems.

Use of multiyear Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation funds and procurement funds to reimburse the pay, allowances, and expenses of Reserve component members could prove to be a practical and efficient means to achieve the benefits of soldier involvement in testing and evaluation functions.

**Subtitle D—Military Justice and Related Matters**

**Modification of periods of prosecution by courts-martial for murder, rape, and child abuse (sec. 551)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 43 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (10 U.S.C. 843) to: (1) clarify that all murders are included in the class of offenses that has an unlimited statute of limitations; (2) include rape in that class of offenses; and (3) modify the statute of limitations for child abuse offenses.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) amended article 43 to provide that certain enumerated child abuse offenses could be tried by court-martial if sworn charges and specifications were received before the child attained the age of 25 years. The analogous federal statute of limitations, section 3283 of title 18, United States Code, simply provides that the limitation is equal to the life of the child.

This provision would conform the limitation in article 43 to the federal statute, with one modification. It has been argued that the intent of Congress to lengthen the limitation in section 3283 would



be undercut in cases where the child died early, whether as a result of the abuse or not. In order to avoid this problem, the committee recommends a provision that would set the limitation at the life of the victim or five years after the offense, whichever is greater.

Finally, the provision would include kidnapping and certain aggravated offenses under title 18 of the United States Code in the category of child abuse offenses to which the extended statute of limitations would apply.

#### **Establishment of offense of stalking (sec. 552)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice (chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code) to establish stalking as a separate offense under the code. Stalking is presently punishable under article 134 of the code (10 U.S.C. 934), if the government can prove conduct amounting to stalking, as well as proving that the conduct was prejudicial to good order and discipline. The offense may also be punished under article 93 of the code (10 U.S.C. 893) if the victim is subject to the orders of the accused. The provision would authorize prosecution of stalking within the compass of a single punitive article of the code, without the necessity of proving prejudice to good order and discipline under article 134 and without the subordination required by article 93. Every State and the District of Columbia has enacted some form of stalking legislation.

The provision is patterned after the Model Antistalking Code for the States developed by the National Criminal Justice Association for the Department of Justice. Approximately half the States have enacted statutes based in whole or in part on this model code. The provision would require a course of conduct, including repeatedly maintaining visual or physical proximity to the victim; and threatening or otherwise placing the victim or the victim's immediate family in reasonable fear of death or bodily harm, including but not limited to sexual assault.

#### **Clarification of authority of military legal assistance counsel (sec. 553)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1044 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that judge advocates or civilian attorneys who are authorized to provide military legal assistance to military personnel and their dependents may do so without regard to the licensing requirements of the State in which the assistance is rendered.

While legal assistance has been provided under service regulations for decades, and was explicitly authorized in section 1044 of title 10 in 1984, questions have been raised by some as to whether attorneys providing such assistance outside the States in which they are licensed are engaging in the unauthorized practice of law. This provision would codify the long-accepted practice with respect to the provision of legal assistance.

**Administrative censures of members of the Armed Forces  
(sec. 554)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense and the service secretaries to issue administrative censures in writing to members of the Armed Forces. An administrative censure is a statement of adverse opinion or criticism with respect to the conduct or performance of duty by a military member. Such administrative censures would be final when issued. Under controlling regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense, such censures could be made part of the member's official record and, if this option is exercised, should be subject to notice to the member with the right of rebuttal. The issuance of an administrative censure by the Secretary of Defense and the service secretaries would not be subject to appeal.

The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments possess inherent authority separate from, but fully consistent with Article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, to administratively censure members of the Armed Forces. The Department of the Navy, by regulation in its Manual of the Judge Advocate General, has long articulated the authority of the Secretary of the Navy to administratively censure members. Nonetheless, the committee believes that a specific grant of this authority to the Secretary of Defense and the service secretaries with a requirement for the Secretary of Defense to issue controlling regulations will provide a uniform standard throughout the Department of Defense and provide an important means for civilian leaders to ensure accountability.

**Reports by officers and senior enlisted personnel of matters  
relating to violations or alleged violations of criminal  
law (sec. 555)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations by January 1, 2006, that would require active duty and reserve officers and senior non-commissioned officers and petty officers above the grade of E-6 to report to appropriate military authority their arrest, investigation, charging, detention, adjudication, conviction, or any other legal finding of culpability for offenses other than minor traffic violations.

Imposing a duty to report such involvement, at the earliest possible time after its occurrence, would avoid situations in which information material to an officer's or senior enlisted member's duties and assignments is concealed and individual and unit readiness may be adversely affected. Additionally, the services must be informed of information that is potentially relevant to adjudications of security clearances and determinations of administrative and statutory selection boards. The committee trusts that members covered by this provision generally adhere to this standard as a matter of personal integrity and responsibility; however, the committee believes that the duty to report this information in a timely manner should be unequivocally stated in regulations in order to ensure compliance.

This provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe procedures to ensure that information relating to the inci-

dents described above is timely forwarded to the parent service of the officer or senior enlisted member involved in order to avoid instances in which incidents committed on one service's installations are not reported to the parent service of the officer or senior enlisted member.

#### **Subtitle E—Military Service Academies**

##### **Authority to retain permanent military professors at the Naval Academy after more than 30 years of service (sec. 561)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy, upon recommendation from the Superintendent of the Naval Academy and concurrence with the Chief of Naval Operations, to continue on active duty permanent military professors at the Naval Academy beyond the normal statutory retirement for years of service for their grade. Permanent military professors in the grade of O-5, who are retained on active duty beyond 28 years of service, would remain eligible for promotion to the grade of O-6.

The committee believes that the Secretary of the Navy should have authority to retain certain exceptional permanent military professors at the Naval Academy on active duty beyond their statutory retirement, similar to the authority that the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force currently possess with regard to permanent professors at their respective academies. The committee also believes that permanent military professors in the grade of O-5, who are retained beyond 28 years of service, should remain eligible for promotion to the grade of O-6.

Permanent military professors on active duty at the Naval Academy are highly educated and represent a significant investment in a valuable and highly sought after resource. The Secretary of the Navy should have the authority to retain exceptional permanent military professors who have extensive college-level teaching experience, a doctorate, and military experience, who will benefit the mission of the Naval Academy.

#### **Subtitle F—Administrative Matters**

##### **Clarification of leave accrual for members assigned to a deployable ship or mobile unit or other duty (sec. 571)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 701 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify and expand eligibility for members assigned to a deployable ship, mobile unit, or other designated duty to retain accumulated leave at the end of a fiscal year. The committee intends by this provision that military members who serve on extended operational deployments and perform arduous duty in support of the global war on terrorism, and who are impeded in their ability to take annual leave, should be permitted to accrue up to 120 days of leave. Limitation on conversion of military medical and dental billets to civilian positions (sec. 572)

**Limitation on conversion of military medical and dental billets to civilian positions (sec. 572)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit conversion of any military medical or dental billet to a civilian position until 90 days after the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that: (1) conversion does not lead to an increase in civilian health care costs; (2) the conversion has been subjected to review in light of joint medical and dental requirements of the uniformed services; and (3) market surveys conducted in areas affected by such conversion suggest that there are available qualified civilian providers to replace military medical and dental personnel.

The committee is concerned that no credible plan exists for conversion of military medical and dental billets to civilian positions across the military health care system. It has been reported that one service, for example, is converting military medical assets for which there are shortfalls in another service. Additionally, the committee has learned that, in some areas affected by military to civilian conversions, civilian markets have not been able to respond to military requirements for civilian health and dental providers, largely due to salary disparities.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not considered all of the factors, including joint warfighting requirements and civilian compensation that are necessary to effect a rational reshaping of active duty and reserve military billets in the medical and dental fields. The committee is concerned that the failure of the Department to meet the requirement contained in section 595 of the statement of managers accompanying the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375), which required the Secretary to report no later than 90 days following enactment on the plans of each military department for military and dental military-to-civilian conversions, is further evidence of the absence of a comprehensive and rational plan.

**Subtitle G—Defense Dependents Education Matters**

**Expansion of authorized enrollment in Department of Defense dependents schools overseas (sec. 581)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide tuition-free enrollment in Department of Defense dependents schools overseas for the children of full-time, locally-hired U.S. citizens. It is the committee's intent that this authority be utilized in an equitable manner in any overseas location based on the requirements of the combatant commander.

**Assistance to local educational agencies with significant enrollment increases in military dependent students due to troop relocations, creation of new units, and realignments under BRAC (sec. 582)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$15.0 million annually in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide activities, for fiscal years 2006, 2007, and 2008 for special as-

sistance to local educational agencies that experience an increase in student dependents of service members and Department of Defense civilian employees as a result of global rebasing, the creation or activation of new military units, or base realignment and closures. The program would assist local education agencies that experience an increase of 250 or more military and Department of Defense civilian dependent students to make necessary infrastructure adjustments in a timely manner.

**Assistance to local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 583)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$30.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide activities, for continuation of the Department of Defense's assistance program to local educational agencies that benefit dependents of service members and Department civilian employees.

**Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 584)**

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 program to local educational agencies that benefit dependents with severe disabilities.

**Subtitle H—Other Matters**

**Policy and procedures on casualty assistance to survivors of military decedents (sec. 591)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense by January 1, 2006, to develop and promulgate a comprehensive policy on the provision of casualty assistance to survivors and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who die during their military service.

The policy shall include elements that the committee believes should, to the maximum extent possible, reflect uniform casualty assistance procedures and practices to be employed by the services, including: (1) initial notification of death to primary and secondary next of kin and any subsequent notifications; (2) transportation and disposition of remains of military decedents; (3) qualifications, assignment, training, duties, supervision, and accountability for the performance of casualty assistance responsibilities; (4) the relief or transfer of casualty assistance officers, including notifications to survivors and next of kin of the reassignment to other duties; (5) centralized case management procedures for casualty assistance by each military department; (6) the provision of personalized information on benefits available to survivors; (7) the provision of financial counseling; (8) a process for registering and responding to complaints; (9) liaison with the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Social Security Administration in order to ensure prompt resolution

of issues; and (10) data collection and surveys aimed at ensuring the needs of survivors are identified and, whenever possible, addressed.

The committee recognizes that the military services place great importance on casualty notification and assistance and that personnel assigned casualty assistance duty have provided timely, sensitive, and responsive service to survivors of military decedents in the vast majority of cases. Testimony received in hearings conducted by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate in February 2005 established, however, that the complexity of federal benefit programs and the duration of the period in which survivors require assistance demand a uniform policy and coordinated efforts by the services, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and other federal agencies responsible for providing assistance to survivors and next of kin of military personnel killed while serving their nation.

**Modification and enhancement of mission and authorities of the Naval Postgraduate School (sec. 592)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 7041 of title 10, United States Code, to modify the mission of the Naval Postgraduate School to include professional education and a combat-related focus to the purposes of education at the institution.

The committee believes that the mission of the Naval Postgraduate School should include a greater emphasis on advanced instruction and professional and technical education to enhance combat effectiveness in support of national security, rather than merely advanced instruction and technical education of commissioned officers "in their practical and theoretical duties" as reflected in the existing mission statement in section 7041 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee also recommends a modification of section 7045 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of the Navy to permit eligible enlisted members of the Armed Forces to receive instruction from the Naval Postgraduate School in certificate programs and courses required for the performance of their duties.

The committee believes that highly qualified and carefully screened enlisted personnel may also benefit from instruction at the Naval Postgraduate School in graduate level, nondegree certificate programs and courses required for the performance of their duties. To the extent that the existing facility and faculty at the Naval Postgraduate School can be utilized to provide such education, this authority represents an efficient use of educational resources.

**Expansion and enhancement of authority to present recognition items for recruitment and retention purposes (sec. 593)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the procurement and award of recognition items to Active Duty and Reserve military personnel, family members, and certain other individuals under prescribed conditions.

Section 520 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) authorized through December 31, 2005, the award of recognition items, such as coins, medals, trophies, badges, flags, posters, paintings, or other similar items to members of the Army Reserve, Army National Guard, and Air National Guard. The committee believes that this authority has proven valuable during time of war in enabling commands to appropriately express appreciation for the dedicated service and sacrifices of individual members, family members, and others who have served and supported the Armed Forces, and that this authority should be extended to all Active and Reserve components through December 31, 2007. The committee expects the implementing regulations to include reasonable limitations to prevent excessive expenditures of funds under this authority.

**Requirement for regulations on policies and procedures on personal commercial solicitations on Department of Defense installations (sec. 594)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense, not later than January 1, 2006, to prescribe regulations, or modify existing regulations, relating to commercial solicitation including the sale of life insurance and securities, on Department of Defense installations.

The committee notes that the Department has been attempting for over two years to revise Department of Defense Directive 1344.7 entitled “Personal Commercial Solicitation on DOD Installations,” which is set forth in part 43 of title 32 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The proposed policy, which was published in the Federal Register of April 19, 2005, represents a substantial improvement over the current directive policy by establishing specific prohibitions and procedures aimed at preventing abusive sales tactics by commercial agents. For example, the proposed policy would: (1) require reporting of violations to higher headquarters and direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to maintain and make available to installation commanders the current master file of all individual agents, dealers, and companies who have their privileges withdrawn at any Department installation; (2) permit insurers to solicit on Department installations only if they are licensed under the insurance laws of the State in which the installation is located; (3) prohibit Department personnel from representing any insurer or acting as an agent of an insurer in any official or business capacity with or without compensation; (4) prohibit the use of an agent as a participant in any service-sponsored education or orientation program; and (5) set limits on advertising and solicitation of personal contact information in connection with commercial sponsorship of Department morale, welfare, and recreation programs or events.

The committee believes that the repeal of previous provisions relating to the Department commercial solicitation policy in previous authorization and appropriations acts is necessary to allow the Department to implement changes at the earliest possible time with the objective of promoting the welfare of Department personnel as consumers and in order to prevent abuses of service members by private commercial interests.

### **Federal assistance for State programs under the National Guard Youth Challenge program (sec. 595)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 509(d) of title 32, United States Code, to phase in over 3 years a change in the federal to state matching funds ratio for the National Guard Youth Challenge program. The provision would increase the amount of federal funds that may be provided in fiscal year 2006 to not more than 65 percent of a State program's operating costs; 70 percent in fiscal year 2007; and 75 percent in fiscal year 2008 and each subsequent fiscal year. The provision would also authorize an additional \$15.0 million in Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for the National Guard Youth Challenge program.

### **Items of Special Interest**

#### **Air Force future total force planning**

In section 587 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375), the committee directed a report by the Air Force describing the manner in which current blended wings are functioning and the current and future plans of the Air Force to implement the blended wing concept.

The Air Force's report focused on the experience of the Air Force's only blended wing, the 116th Air Control Wing located at Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, which operates the E-8C Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System. The Air Force concluded that the 116th Air Control Wing had achieved a significant number of operational successes since its inception in 2002. Most significantly the Wing deployed successfully in support of Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom, with personnel days deployed totaling 132,674. The unit conducted 292 combat sorties over 3,130 hours with a 96 percent mission effective rate.

The success of the 116th Air Control Wing is a tribute to the tenacity and dedication of its assigned personnel and their leaders. However, this success was achieved despite numerous organizational, administrative, legal, and cultural barriers to true integration of Active Duty and Air National Guard units. The Air Force concluded that the challenges of operating a blended wing are substantial enough that future "blending" is not advisable in the current legal environment and that, until the necessary changes are in place, reliance should instead be placed on "associate" models with units that share the weapon systems of an equipped unit and perform the same mission. Even some of these models, however, are constrained by legislative and fiscal law limitations.

The committee supports the Air Force commitment to full integration of the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard with its active forces, and urges the Air Force to continue to refine the various models of integration to maximize readiness, training, and enhanced mission capability. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to promptly work towards addressing the issues identified in the Air Force report that present barriers to essential Active and Reserve component integration and expects to be advised of the rel-



evant statutory issues pursuant to making this integration successful.

**Opportunity for general or flag officer review of involuntary administrative separation of victims of sexual assault and protection against reprisals for victim advocates**

The committee recommends that the Department of Defense consider, as part of its implementation of policies on sexual assault, a requirement for victims of sexual assault who are being involuntarily separated from active-duty service to be afforded, on a voluntary basis, an opportunity for a general or flag officer review of their case. The committee believes that providing an option to victims of sexual assault for general or flag officer interview and review could be a valuable safeguard on the ultimate disposition of such cases within the military departments, especially as newly developed policies and programs on sexual assault are being implemented.

The committee also recommends that the Department consider what additional actions, if any, could be taken to ensure timely and adequate protection against reprisal directed at victim advocates, to include protection for military members, Department civilian employees, Department contractors, and volunteers.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2006, on the Department's review of these matters and what actions it considers necessary to address them.

**Premium conversion/flexible spending account options for service members**

The committee is concerned that uniformed service members do not have access to premium conversion and flexible spending account options that allow pre-tax payment of health and dental insurance premiums and out-of-pocket health care expenses for family member health care needs. The committee is also concerned that uniformed service members do not have access to flexible spending account options that can be used to purchase child care services. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2006, on a plan to evaluate and implement these programs for uniformed service members, including identification of any administrative or statutory barriers to achieving their implementation.

The committee believes that active-duty members and Selected Reserve members should be able to use premium conversion to pay dental insurance premiums, and Selected Reserve personnel should be able to use it to pay TRICARE Reserve Select premiums authorized by the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375). The committee believes that members should also have access to flexible spending accounts for the purpose of paying for child care services. The committee recognizes that Active-Duty and Reserve family members can incur out-of-pocket expenses related to dependent care, pharmacy copays, TRICARE Standard deductibles and copays, dental care deductibles and copays, expenses for eyeglasses and contact lenses, premium payments for dental and medical care, and child care.

**Western Governors University**

Western Governors University (WGU), a competency-based institution of higher learning, offers a fully accredited baccalaureate degree based on a direct assessment of student learning, rather than on an accumulation of credit hours. WGU, created by 19 Governors from America's Western States, was included in the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (Public Law 105-244), which made federal financial assistance available to qualified students. WGU currently has four educational projects with the Department of Defense supporting the Air War College, Junior ROTC, Special Operations Command, and Air Force Community Colleges at Maxwell Air Force Base.

The committee commends the Department and WGU for partnering to provide educational opportunities for military personnel, and encourages the Department and WGU to explore additional opportunities to expand educational opportunities for service members.

## **TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS**

### **Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances**

#### **Eligibility for additional pay of permanent military professors at United States Naval Academy with over 36 years of service (sec. 601)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 203 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of additional pay in the amount of \$250 a month to permanent military professors at the Naval Academy who have over 36 years of service. This additional pay is already authorized for permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy and the Air Force Academy.

#### **Enhanced authority for agency contributions for members of the Armed Forces participating in the Thrift Savings Plan (sec. 602)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 211(d) of title 37, United States Code, to authorize service secretaries to make matching contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund pursuant to an agreement with an enlisted member covering the duration of the member's initial enlistment.

The committee believes that expanding the authority of the services to match savings contributions of first term enlistees would encourage habits of financial responsibility among the most junior military personnel. A matching contributions program could also provide an effective recruiting incentive for young men and women who are considering service in the Armed Forces and would be tested through a limited pilot program authorized elsewhere in this Act.

#### **Permanent authority for supplemental subsistence allowance for low-income members with dependents (sec. 603)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 402a of title 37, United States Code, to make permanent the authority to pay the supplemental subsistence allowance for low-income members with dependents. The availability of this allowance enables increases of up to \$500 per month in the basic allowance for subsistence for junior enlisted members who would otherwise qualify to receive food stamps under state-administered programs. Since implementation of this allowance on May 1, 2001, the number of military members who have qualified for food stamps has significantly declined. The committee believes this program should be made permanent in order to continue to assist in meeting the financial needs of junior enlisted personnel and their families.

**Modification of pay considered as saved pay upon appointment of an enlisted member as an officer (sec. 604)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 907 of title 37, United States Code, with respect to “saved pay,” or the stabilization of pay and allowances that an enlisted member or warrant officer in the grade of W-4 may receive after accepting an appointment as a commissioned officer. The provision would update and add to the list of special and incentive pays and allowances that should be considered in determining the amount of pay and allowances of a grade formerly held by an officer who continues to perform the duties creating the eligibility for such pay and allowances and may be entitled to saved pay treatment.

**Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays**

**One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for Reserve forces (sec. 611)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for one year the authority to pay the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high priority units in the Selected Reserve, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus, and the prior service enlistment bonus. Additionally, the provision would authorize payment under section 308g(h) of title 37, United States Code, of the non-prior service enlistment bonus in elements of the Ready Reserve other than the Selected Reserve. The committee notes that the Selected Reserve enlistment bonus and the Selected Reserve affiliation bonus authorized under sections 308c(e) and 308e(e) of title 10, United States Code, respectively, have been amended and renewed by other provisions of this Act.

**One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for certain health care professionals (sec. 612)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for one year the authority to pay the nurse officer candidate accession bonus, 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, and to repay education loans for certain Selected Reserve health professionals.

**One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for one 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.

**One-year extension of other bonus and special pay authorities (sec. 614)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for one year the authority to pay the aviation officer retention bonus, assignment incentive pay, the reenlistment bonus for active mem-

bers, the enlistment bonus for active members, the retention bonus for members with critical military skills, and the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills.

**Payment and repayment of assignment incentive pay (sec. 615)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 307a of title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of assignment incentive pay in a lump sum or in installments pursuant to the terms of a written agreement. The committee believes that the ability of the services to offer lump sum or installment payments of assignment incentive pay, in addition to existing authority for monthly payments, would offer greater flexibility and, in many cases, enhance the attractiveness of this incentive. In all cases in which lump sum or installment payments of assignment pay are authorized, the provision would require that a written agreement be executed.

**Increase in amount of selective reenlistment bonus for certain senior supervisory nuclear qualified enlisted personnel (sec. 616)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 308 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of up to \$75,000 to an enlisted member of the naval service who has completed at least 10, but not more than 14, years of active duty, is currently qualified for duty in connection with the supervision, operation, and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants, and is qualified in a military skill designated as critical by the Secretary of Defense. The committee believes that authorization of this increase in the amount of the selective reenlistment bonus for designated nuclear qualified enlisted personnel above the current limit of \$60,000 is necessary to address shortages and improve retention of this class of highly trained and experienced personnel.

**Consolidation and modification of bonuses for affiliation or enlistment in the Selected Reserve (sec. 617)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 308c and repeal section 308e of title 37, United States Code, in order to consolidate these provisions and authorize an enhanced affiliation bonus in an amount not to exceed \$10,000 for service in the Selected Reserve.

In section 618 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375), the conferees authorized an increase in the maximum amount of the Selected Reserve enlistment bonus under section 308c to \$10,000. This enlistment bonus assists the Reserve components in meeting their non-prior service recruiting objectives. The committee believes that an identical bonus authority is needed to provide an incentive to members who are separating from active duty, and who may have a continuing military service obligation, to affiliate with the Selective Reserve.

The current affiliation bonus under section 308e of title 37, United States Code, is inadequate to encourage members with active-duty experience to affiliate with the Selected Reserve with no

break in service upon completion of their active-duty obligation. Because of their military training and experience, these individuals should be given every reasonable incentive to continue serving in the Selected Reserve.

**Expansion and enhancement of special pay for enlisted members of the Selected Reserve assigned to certain high priority units (sec. 618)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 308d of title 37, United States Code, to increase the amount of special pay that may be awarded to members of the Selected Reserve assigned to certain high priority units from \$10 to \$50 for each regular period of instruction or period of appropriate duty. The committee believes that increasing this special pay will assist in improving manning, including company grade officer shortages, in high priority units of the Selected Reserve.

**Retention incentive bonus for members of the Selected Reserve qualified in a critical military skill or specialty (sec. 619)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize a retention incentive bonus for members of the Selected Reserve qualified in a critical military skill or specialty. This bonus would offer an effective retention incentive for individuals possessing key specialties and qualifications in the Selected Reserve, and would be structured along the lines of the critical skills retention bonus offered to active-duty personnel under section 323 of title 37, United States Code.

**Termination of limitation on duration of payment of imminent danger special pay during hospitalization (sec. 620)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 310 of title 37, United States Code, to extend the period during which a member who is hospitalized as a result of injuries or wounds incurred as a result of hostile action may continue to receive special pay for duty subject to hostile fire or imminent danger. Under current law, continuation of such special pay is limited to three months. The committee believes that eligible members should receive special pay for the duration of their hospitalization.

**Authority for retroactive payment of imminent danger special pay (sec. 621)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 310 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to determine the date from which members assigned to duty in an area in which the members were subject to the threat of physical harm or imminent danger are eligible to receive this special pay. This provision would preclude the need for legislation authorizing back pay as a consequence of delays within the Department of Defense in determining the eligibility of members for special pay under section 310. The most recent example of such legislation was included in section 620 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136).

**Authority to pay foreign language proficiency pay to members on active duty as a bonus (sec. 622)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 316 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of foreign language proficiency pay to members on active duty as a lump sum bonus. In section 620 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) the amount of foreign language proficiency pay was increased from \$300 to \$1,000 per month. The ability to offer a lump sum bonus under certain conditions, in an amount not to exceed \$12,000, would serve to enhance the effectiveness of this incentive for members skilled in foreign languages to continue serving on active duty.

**Incentive bonus for transfer between the Armed Forces (sec. 623)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize payment of an incentive bonus not to exceed \$2,500 to military members of the Active and Reserve components who transfer from the regular or Reserve component of one service to the regular or Reserve component of another service.

The committee notes that the Navy and Air Force intend to significantly reduce the size of their Active and Reserve components in anticipation of force structural changes. At the same time, the Army and Marine Corps are experiencing recruiting challenges and, in some areas, shortfalls. The committee believes that the experience and skills accrued by military members, combined with their possessing required qualifications and continuing motivation to serve, should be tapped whenever possible to meet recruiting needs. While so called “blue to green” programs to date have experienced some success, the committee believes this bonus has the potential to encourage more individuals to accept the challenges inherent in such changes in service.

**Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances**

**Transportation of family members in connection with the repatriation of service members or civilian employees held captive (sec. 631)**

The committee recommends a provision that amends chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, and chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, to authorize travel and per diem allowances for up to three family members of military personnel or federal civilian employees who have been held captive, as determined by the secretary concerned, and who are being repatriated to a site inside or outside the United States. This provision ensures that family members of repatriated service personnel and civilian employees are able to travel to the location of their loved ones upon their return to U.S. control.

### **Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits**

#### **Enhancement of death gratuity and life insurance benefits for deaths from combat-related causes or causes incurred in combat operations or areas (sec. 641)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 75 of title 10, United States Code, effective October 1, 2005, to increase the amount of the death gratuity payable under sections 1475 through 1478 from \$12,000 to \$100,000 under certain conditions. Payment in the amount of \$100,000 to survivors would be authorized in the case of a death of a service member on active duty which resulted from wounds, injuries, or illnesses incurred under the combat-related conditions specified in section 1413a(e)(2) of title 10, United States Code, specifically: (1) as a direct result of armed conflict; (2) while engaged in hazardous service; (3) in the performance of duty under conditions simulating war; or (4) through an instrumentality of war. Additionally, the increased death gratuity of \$100,000 would be payable if the death occurred in an operation or area designated as a combat operation or a combat zone, respectively, by the Secretary of Defense.

The provision would also amend section 1967 of title 38, United States Code, to increase from \$250,000 to \$400,000 the maximum amount of coverage available under the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance (SGLI) program. The provision would also authorize the military services to provide up to \$150,000 in coverage for members who die as a result of wounds, illness, or injury incurred while serving in an operation or area that the Secretary designates as a combat operation or a zone of combat, respectively. The total amount of insurance payable under any circumstances would not exceed \$400,000. In the case of insured members who are married, the provision would require that notice be given to spouses regarding an election by the member to decline coverage under SGLI or to choose coverage in an amount less than the maximum amount of \$400,000. Spouses must also be notified of a redesignation of a beneficiary or beneficiaries by an insured member.

### **Subtitle E—Other Matters**

#### **Payment of expenses of members of the Armed Forces to obtain professional credentials (sec. 651)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize payment to members of the Armed Forces for the costs of obtaining professional credentials, licenses, and certifications. The committee notes that this authority is available to federal civilian employees under section 5757 of title 5, United States Code. The military services increasingly have come to rely on commercially available systems, products, and services with certification standards corresponding to military occupational specialties in order to avoid duplication and costs of training programs. This provision would not extend authority to pay military members for the costs of meeting basic qualifications for entry into specific communities and professions, e.g., bar examinations and licensing of health professionals.



**Pilot program on contributions to Thrift Savings Plan for initial enlistees in the Armed Forces (sec. 652)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to conduct a pilot program in order to assess the extent to which contributions by the Army to the Thrift Savings Plan on behalf of first term enlistees would assist in recruiting non-prior service enlistees and result in establishing habits of financial responsibility. A separate provision in the act authorizes the service secretaries to make matching contributions to the Thrift Savings Fund on behalf of first term enlistees under section 211(d) of title 37, United States Code.

The committee expects the Army to develop a pilot program that will assist in determining the cost and effectiveness of an enhanced "matching funds" Thrift Savings Plan option for first term enlistees. While enlistment bonuses and education benefits have proven utility in encouraging voluntary service, the committee believes that an enhanced Thrift Savings Plan conducted under the provisions of section 211(d) of title 37, United States Code, as revised by another provision of this Act, may assist the Army in meeting recruiting goals. The committee expects the Army to collect data and conduct surveys that will allow a determination as to whether a matching funds Thrift Savings Plan has utility as a recruiting incentive and separately as a means to encourage participation in the Thrift Savings Plan among individuals who otherwise would not participate.



## **TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE**

### **Subtitle A—Benefits Matters**

#### **Clarification of eligibility of Reserve officers for health care pending active duty following issuance of orders to active duty (sec. 701)**

The committee recommends a technical correction to section 1074, title 10, United States Code, that would clarify the intent of that section to ensure that Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) graduates have access to military health benefits while awaiting active-duty status. This correction would ensure that ROTC graduates do not lose their eligibility for health care under section 1074(a), title 10, United States Code, before they report to active duty.

#### **Limitation on deductible and copayment requirements for nursing home residents under the pharmacy benefits program (sec. 702)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit out-of-pocket pharmacy expenses for a beneficiary who is a resident of a nursing home and who is required, by state law, to use nursing home pharmacy services utilizing prepackaged pharmaceuticals, which are not part of the pharmacy network under TRICARE. The committee recognizes that there are a small number of individuals who would require such assistance, and directs the Department of Defense to find the most economical means available to implement this provision for those beneficiaries.

#### **Eligibility of surviving active duty spouses of deceased members for enrollment as dependents in a TRICARE dental plan (sec. 703)**

The committee recommends a provision that would expand eligibility for survivor benefits under the TRICARE dental plan authorized in section 1076a, title 10, United States Code, to include the active duty spouse of a member who dies while on active duty for a period of more than 30 days. The provision would extend eligibility to a surviving spouse who, because he or she was also on active duty for a period of more than 30 days, was ineligible to enroll in the TRICARE dental plan.

#### **Increased period of continued TRICARE Prime coverage of children of members of the uniformed services who die while serving on active duty for a period of more than 30 days (sec. 704)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend health care coverage under TRICARE Prime for the children of an active-duty service member who dies while on active duty for a period of

more than 30 days. The provision would authorize any dependent child of a deceased service member to continue to receive benefits under TRICARE Prime as if the service member parent were still alive, and without annual premiums, until the age of 21, or 23 if enrolled in an educational program. Under current law, the children of members who die while on active duty retain benefits under TRICARE as if the member were still alive for only three years, at which time the active-duty benefit is replaced by a benefit equal to that for retirees, which has a lower priority for access to military treatment facilities and requires an annual enrollment fee for TRICARE Prime. The provision would apply to eligible dependent child survivors of members who have died while on active duty since October 7, 2001.

The committee believes that this provision will ensure that families with surviving children will experience no additional financial hardship or barriers to needed health care services under TRICARE, following the death of an active-duty service member.

#### **Subtitle B—Planning, Programming, and Management**

##### **TRICARE Standard coordinators in TRICARE regional offices (sec. 711)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the designation of a position in each TRICARE Regional Office for the purpose of assisting beneficiaries who use the Standard option under TRICARE in identifying providers who will participate in the TRICARE program.

The committee is concerned that there is insufficient focus within the Department of Defense on assistance to users of TRICARE Standard, as well as outreach to community providers to encourage their participation in the TRICARE program. Moreover, despite statements by the Department that TRICARE contractors have specific mandates to perform this function, none have verified that such is the case. Thus, the committee is concerned that the intent of Congress, clearly expressed in the National Defense Authorization Act of 2004, to ensure improvements in access to TRICARE Standard, has not been fulfilled. The committee continues to receive reports of access problems, which may increase as members of the Selected Reserve, who elect coverage under the *TRICARE Reserve Select* Program, add to the demand for TRICARE Standard providers in areas not served by a military treatment facility.

##### **Report on delivery of health care benefits through military health care system (sec. 712)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the delivery of health care benefits through the military health system. The report would contain an analysis of the organization and costs of delivering health care benefits to current and retired military personnel and their families; an analysis of the costs of ensuring medical readiness; an assessment of the role of health benefits in recruitment and retention of members of the Armed Forces; and an assessment of the Department of Defense's experience in recruitment and retention of military and civilian medical and dental personnel. In

addition, the report would include recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Secretary considers necessary to improve efficiency and quality in the provision of health care benefits and to ensure the sustainability of such benefits into the future.

**Comptroller General report on differential payments to children's hospitals for health care for children dependents under TRICARE (sec. 713)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General to study the effectiveness of the system used by the Department of Defense to make differential payments to children's hospitals for health care services for severely ill or injured dependent children of members of the uniformed services under the TRICARE program. The committee is aware of ongoing reports that children's hospitals are reimbursed for health care services at levels that are less than the costs incurred by those hospitals for providing such services. The committee is concerned that the amount of the differential payment to children's hospitals (one component of payments to children's hospitals) has remained unchanged since its introduction in 1992.

The provision would require a report by the Comptroller General not later than May 1, 2006, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General believes appropriate for modifications of the current system of differential payments to children's hospitals.

**Repeal of requirement for Comptroller General reviews of certain Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs projects on sharing of health care resources (sec. 714)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal certain reporting requirements for the Comptroller General on defense and veterans affairs health resource sharing projects. The intent of the provision is to eliminate detailed reporting on individual sharing projects to allow the Comptroller General to focus on measurement of efforts by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs to institutionalize defense and veterans affairs health resource sharing projects in both health care systems.

**Surveys on TRICARE standard (sec. 715)**

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the survey questions required under section 723(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136) concerning the continued viability of the TRICARE Standard option. The committee is concerned that the surveys carried out by the Department of Defense to date have been unable to gather sufficient information to permit better understanding of the availability of civilian medical providers to participate in the Standard option of the TRICARE program.

The committee believes that this provision would ensure that surveys capture necessary data on whether providers are aware of the TRICARE program, the percentage of their patient populations who receive TRICARE benefits, and whether or not civilian pro-

viders accept patients or new patients under the Medicare program.

**Modification of health care quality information and technology enhancement report requirements (sec. 716)**

The committee recommends a provision that modifies the annual health care quality reporting requirement of the Department of Defense to ensure that it more closely resembles state-of-the-art quality improvement efforts in the civilian sector as well as those developed by other public health agencies. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to undertake a comprehensive review of health care quality programs of the Department's medical programs, to include civilian provider networks, in order to ensure that health care quality is monitored in an aggressive manner that results in health improvements for all eligible beneficiaries, regardless of age.

**Modification of authorities relating to patient care reporting and management system (sec. 717)**

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate the requirement that the Department of Defense Patient Safety Center be located within the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology. In doing so, the committee intends to provide the Secretary of Defense greater flexibility to manage and consolidate patient safety initiatives for the Department.

**Subtitle C—Other Matters**

**Report on adverse health events associated with use of anti-malarial drugs (sec. 731)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of adverse health events that may be associated with the use of anti-malarial drugs, including mefloquine, also known as Lariam. The study would require the participation of epidemiological and clinical researchers outside the Department of Defense. It would also require an assessment of whether, and to what extent, Lariam may be a risk factor contributing to suicides among members of the Armed Forces.

The committee is aware of concerns by service members and their families that the anti-malarial drug Lariam (mefloquine) may have side effects which contribute to serious injury and/or major psychiatric disorders. The committee believes that a study will assist the Department in a more complete understanding of the potential effects of Lariam, if any, on military personnel.

**Pilot projects on early diagnosis and treatment of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and other mental health conditions (sec. 732)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out a minimum of three pilot projects to evaluate the efficacy of various approaches to improving the capability of the military and civilian primary health care systems to provide early diagnosis and treatment of Post Traumatic Stress

Disorder (PTSD) and other mental health conditions experienced by military members returning from combat.

The provision would require one of the pilot projects to be carried out at a military medical facility, which supports a large mobilization and demobilization site in order to evaluate and produce effective diagnostic and treatment approaches for use by primary care providers in the military health system. A second pilot would be carried out at the location of a National Guard or Reserve unit or units located more than 40 miles away from a military installation and whose personnel are served primarily by civilian community health resources. A third pilot would require the use and evaluation of Internet-based automated tools to aid military and civilian health care providers in the diagnosis and treatment of PTSD, as well as web-based tools available to family members to assist them in the identification of the emerging symptoms.

Studies of soldiers returning from Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom have found that major depression, generalized anxiety, or PTSD occurred in as many as 17 percent of returning soldiers. Of those who were found to have a mental disorder, including PTSD, only 23 to 40 percent sought mental health care. Failure to seek appropriate treatment due to fear of the stigma associated with seeking such care, and the failure of the primary health care system to accurately diagnose PTSD puts service members who have been exposed to combat at risk for a worsening syndrome that can lead to severe mental illness, or in extreme cases, suicide.

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its recent issuance of a policy requiring additional mental health follow-up visits from 90 to 180 days after redeployment, but recognizes that more needs to be done to increase the capacity of the primary health care delivery system to identify and treat mild forms of these disorders, such as combat stress or normal depression following separation or reintegration, before these disorders progress to the point of requiring referral of the member for specialty mental health care. In addition, tools are needed to assist family members and military unit members in identifying and seeking appropriate resources for care of a member with emerging PTSD or other mental health disorder. The committee expects the Secretary to leverage emerging information technology to support the pilot projects required by this provision.

### **Items of Special Interest**

#### **Active-duty medical extension**

The committee is pleased that the Army has taken steps, through the Medical Retention Processing program, to eliminate the hardship experienced by injured and ill Reserve component soldiers who have been erroneously removed from active-duty status during a period of extended active duty and have lost pay and benefits. The Comptroller General, in a February 2005 report entitled "Military Pay: Gaps in Pay and Benefits Create Financial Hardships for Injured Army National Guard and Reserve Soldiers", documented cases of Reserve component soldiers who, although entitled to continued pay and health benefits when extended on active

duty for the purpose of receiving medical care, experienced loss of pay and benefits during this crucial time of recovery because their active-duty status was not transmitted to the automated systems, which ensure timely pay and continued eligibility for benefits.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to periodically monitor implementation of the Medical Retention Processing program as a follow-up to its February 2005 report and submit the results of such follow-up to the congressional defense committees.

**Comptroller General study of adequacy of TRICARE reimbursement for obstetrical, gynecological, and pediatric services**

The committee is aware that some doctors and hospitals have declined to participate in the TRICARE program for obstetrical, gynecological, and pediatric services because of claims that reimbursement rates for TRICARE are too low.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to study the adequacy of reimbursements paid for obstetric, gynecological, and pediatric services to civilian providers in the TRICARE system. In carrying out the study, the Comptroller General shall consider:

(1) how TRICARE reimbursement rates for obstetrical, gynecological, and pediatric services are determined; (2) how these reimbursement rates compare to comparable rates paid by national health care plans offered by the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; and (3) the sufficiency of the Department of Defense's authority to modify these rates when necessary to ensure access for military beneficiaries to high quality health care services.

The Comptroller General shall submit a report not later than April 15, 2006, to the congressional defense committees containing the results of the study and any recommendations to improve TRICARE provider participation and satisfaction in providing obstetric, gynecological, and pediatric services.

**Increased awareness for families of TRICARE mental health benefits and the need for appropriate mental health services for families overseas**

The committee is concerned that many military family members, including both active and mobilized National Guard and Reserve families, do not have adequate information about mental health benefits that are authorized under the TRICARE program. In light of evidence of the increased need for mental health services, the committee directs the Department of Defense to initiate, through appropriate command and communications channels, an extensive effort to reach all military families with information about mental health services that are authorized under the TRICARE program and how to access these services through both military and civilian providers. These services include outpatient mental health services, hospitalization for mental illness, substance abuse treatment, and partial hospitalization for therapeutic mental health services.

Additionally, the committee directs the Department to expand appropriate mental health services to family members in overseas locations through existing contracting mechanisms, which provide culturally and language-appropriate services to families of military personnel. The committee understands that military mental health



resources are appropriately being directed in support of active-duty members, both in the field and upon return from deployment, which often leaves families in overseas locations without access to appropriate and needed mental health services.

#### **Specialty health care services referrals and authorizations**

The committee is concerned that TRICARE beneficiaries have experienced problems in accessing specialty health care services as a result of the failure of the Department of Defense to provide automated support for the process of obtaining referral and authorization for specialty health care services, as promised in the transition to new TRICARE contracts. As a result, health care support contractors and military treatment facilities instituted costly manual processes that, although necessary, resulted in delays and long waiting times on health care information telephone lines for beneficiaries.

The committee is aware that efforts are now underway to redesign an automated process for obtaining health care referrals and authorizations. The committee expects senior-level involvement throughout the military health system to ensure its success as rapidly as possible. Further, the committee expects the Department to take advantage of best practices in the private sector in specialty referral management, including its partners— the U.S. Family Health Plans. The committee expects the Department to study successful practices by these plans in specialty referral management to ensure that the new system that is being developed will result in timely referrals and complete and accurate reporting from specialist to primary care provider, with no disruption or inconvenience to the beneficiary.



## TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

### Overview

**Introduction.** One of the committee's most important duties is to provide oversight over the management of the hundreds of billions of dollars that the Department of Defense spends each year on the acquisition of supplies, services, and equipment—everything from office supplies to major weapon systems.

The enactment of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355) and the Clinger-Cohen Act in 1996 (as codified in chapter 113 of title 40, United States Code) signaled a fundamental change in the management of government acquisition programs. These statutes: (1) made it easier for federal agencies to purchase commercial items; (2) streamlined the processes for making small purchases; (3) eliminated the General Services Administration (GSA) as the gatekeeper for all federal information technology purchases; and (4) opened the door to government-wide acquisition contracts and other flexible multiple-award contracting vehicles.

As a result, the Department of Defense and other federal agencies gained new flexibility to purchase their own information technology products, to rapidly access technologies developed in the commercial marketplace, and to focus their attention on the larger acquisitions that account for the vast majority of purchasing dollars. These changes, coupled with the procurement “holiday” of the 1990's, made it possible for the Department of Defense to save billions of dollars by cutting its acquisition workforce by almost half in a period of just 10 years.

Unfortunately, the increased flexibility provided by acquisition reform has not always been used in the best interest of the Department of Defense and the taxpayer. Over the last five years, a series of audits of Department of Defense contracts by the Department of Defense Inspector General and the Government Accountability Office (GAO) have revealed case after case of inadequate acquisition planning, insufficient competition, overpriced contracts, inappropriate expenditures of funds, and lack of attention to contract management.

As a result, three of the twenty-five high risk areas across the federal government (those areas identified by GAO as most susceptible to fraud, waste, and abuse) are directly related to the Department of Defense acquisition system. These are: weapon systems acquisition; contract management; and the management of inter-agency contracting. Each of these high-risk areas is addressed in more detail below.

The committee has been aware over the last several years of emerging problems in each of these areas and has initiated numerous legislative provisions in an effort to direct the Department of

Defense toward more sound acquisition practices. While this legislation has resulted in some improvement to the Department of Defense's acquisition processes, serious deficiencies remain in each of the high risk areas identified by GAO.

The committee believes that continuing problems in these high risk areas are attributable, in significant part, to inadequate human capital planning and continuing reductions in the defense acquisition workforce. While it was reasonable to reduce the size of the workforce after the enactment of acquisition reform measures in the mid-1990's, these reductions continued even after the procurement holiday of the 1990's came to an end and even after the global war on terrorism brought record levels of procurement expenditures. Moreover, the Department of Defense made these cuts in a haphazard way, without giving consideration to the recruitment, training, and career-building needed to ensure the ongoing vitality of our acquisition organizations.

At the same time, emerging government requirements have brought forward new challenges such as the acquisition of "systems of systems"; the coordination of joint service and multinational acquisition programs such as the Joint Strike Fighter; the management of complex software acquisitions; the negotiation of commercial pricing agreements without access to traditional cost or pricing data; the development of new performance-based service contracts; the oversight of huge time- and-materials contracts; and the management of public-private competitions. Rather than developing new skills and new resources to address these new challenges, the Department of Defense tried to address them with existing resources using an already undermanned legacy acquisition workforce accustomed to staffing traditional defense procurements in the 1980's and early 1990's.

GAO has reported that strategic human capital management remains a high risk area in the federal government because of agencies' "long-standing lack of a consistent strategic approach to marshaling, managing, and maintaining the human capital needed to maximize government performance and ensure its accountability." This problem is particularly acute in the defense acquisition workforce. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics explained at an April 13, 2005, hearing before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services the following:

I believe we are at the point where any further reductions [in the defense acquisition workforce] will adversely impact our ability to successfully execute a growing workload. The numbers are startling. The Defense acquisition workforce has been downsized by roughly half since 1990 while the contract dollars have roughly doubled during the same period. \* \* \*

The Global War on Terrorism and increasing Defense budget places greater demands on acquisition workers ability to support the warfighter. \* \* \* We need to continue to renew and restore the defense acquisition workforce. We need to ensure that we have the right people in the jobs to perform the functions required to support our warfighters. Now more than ever, I believe we need to in-

crease the size of the acquisition workforce to handle the growing workload, especially as retirements increase in the coming years.

In this title, section 832 would address the problems in the defense acquisition workforce by: (1) giving the Secretary of Defense the authority to realign positions in the acquisition workforce to reinvest in higher priority acquisition positions; (2) increasing the overall size of the acquisition workforce by 15 percent; and (3) requiring the Secretary to conduct a strategic assessment and develop a human resources strategic plan for the acquisition workforce.

#### **Department of Defense Weapon Systems Acquisition.**

Twenty years ago, the President's Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense Management (commonly known as the Packard Commission) ushered in an era of acquisition reform with its finding that the Department of Defense's "weapon systems take too long and cost too much to produce." The Packard Commission attributed this problem in large part to unrealistic budgeting, "chronic instability" in funding, overstated requirements, a dilution of accountability for results, duplication of programs, and inadequate testing.

Many of the recommendations of the Packard Commission report have been implemented by Congress and the executive branch. These include the creation of the position of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics; the flattening of the organizational structure for acquisition programs; enhanced developmental and operational testing; utilization of multiyear procurement authority; use of performance requirements in lieu of detailed military specifications; and greater use of commercial items. Congress significantly streamlined the acquisition laws in the 1990s and successive administrations have endeavored to eliminate unneeded federal and Department of Defense acquisition rules and regulations.

Despite these changes, however, nearly 20 years after the release of the Packard Commission report and the enactment of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-433), major weapon systems programs still cost too much and take too long to field.

Why is it that after all of the "acquisition reforms" of the past two decades, the Department of Defense has still not been able to fix the underlying problems with major weapon system acquisition that the Packard Commission identified? The committee believes that one answer can be found in the inability of the Department to address the budget and program stability issues that were identified by the Packard Commission. Funding and requirements instability continue to drive up costs and delays the eventual fielding of new systems. Constant changes in funding and requirements lead to continuous changes in acquisition approaches.

For example, at a recent hearing held by the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services, representatives from the shipbuilding industry testified that the acquisition strategy or procurement profile for the *Virginia*-class submarine program had changed 12 times in 10 years. Other Department of Defense programs have similar track records. The committee believes that the same focus needs to be placed on reforming the defense

budget and requirements processes as has been placed on reforming the contracting process over the last 20 years. For this reason, the committee directs the GAO to review the Department of Defense's budget and requirements processes and assess how these processes can better support program stability in major weapon systems acquisition.

The committee is also concerned that problems with organizational structure, shortfalls in acquisition workforce capabilities, and personnel instability continue to undermine the performance of major weapon systems programs. The committee believes that the Department of Defense should give serious consideration to longer tenures for program managers and to taking the steps needed to address shortfalls in the Department of Defense's systems engineering capability and other critical acquisition capabilities. It is questionable whether the Department of Defense can effectively manage major programs as long as senior officials are changing every 18 months and the Department continues to rely almost exclusively on contractors for technical expertise.

While the Congress cannot legislate good long-term management and stewardship of programs, the committee will continue to focus attention on issues that will contribute to better program management. In this regard, the committee requested the GAO in January 2005 to review the authority and responsibilities of program managers and to revisit the issue of program manager tenure. In addition, section 806 in this title would require the Defense Acquisition University to review the acquisition organization of the military departments and defense agencies and report to Congress on any deficiencies in those organizations.

With regard to the acquisition process, the committee believes that the Packard Commission correctly emphasized the need for technological maturity in the acquisition of major weapon systems. Seven years ago, the committee revisited this issue and asked the GAO to begin a review comparing the Department of Defense approach to incorporating technology into new products to approaches successfully applied in the private sector. GAO found that private industry fields new products faster and more successfully because they make sure that new technologies have been proven in the laboratory before they try to incorporate them into new products. As the Comptroller General explained in his April 13, 2005, testimony:

Problems occur because Department of Defense's weapon programs do not capture early on the requisite knowledge that is needed to efficiently and effectively manage program risks. For example, programs move forward with unrealistic program cost and schedule estimates, lack clearly defined and stable requirements, use immature technologies in launching product development, and fail to solidify design and manufacturing processes at appropriate junctures in development.

Over the past several years, the committee has enacted the following legislative initiatives designed to address these problems.

- Section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107) required the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees

any time the Department decides to incorporate into a major weapon system a technology that is not yet mature.

- Sections 802 and 803 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) authorized the Department of Defense to take advantage of “spiral” development and incremental acquisition techniques, which enable the Department to acquire new systems in phases, as the technology matures.

- Section 804 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 and section 801 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) required the Department of Defense to focus management attention on problems in the development and acquisition of software, which have frequently resulted in cost overruns and schedule delays in the acquisition of major weapon systems.

The committee is also concerned that the Department of Defense has sometimes tried to address acquisition challenges through the use of contracting approaches that are not appropriate to major weapon systems rather than tackle difficult budgetary, requirements, organizational, and personnel issues. For example, a recent series of hearings held by the Subcommittee on AirLand of the Committee on Armed Services have highlighted continuing problems resulting from so called “commercial item strategies” used by the Department of Defense to acquire major weapon systems. While the Department has been able to reduce administrative overhead, commercial item strategies have required foregoing important provisions designed for the protection of the taxpayer in the acquisition of major weapon systems, including the Truth in Negotiations Act (TINA) (10 U.S.C. 2306a) and the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS). Waiving these provisions limits the government’s insight into contractor cost and performance, while doing nothing to overcome the programmatic and technical challenges faced in developing major systems.

Reviews by GAO and the Department of Defense Inspector General have found that the Department of Defense has frequently waived TINA and CAS requirements without a valid legal basis and has failed to conduct adequate price analysis to support price reasonableness in cases where these requirements are waived. In the case of the proposed Air Force tanker lease, the result was a heightened risk of fraud and abuse, which would have significantly increased costs to the taxpayer, had the committee not disapproved the lease proposal. As a result, the Department has recently decided to restructure two other major defense acquisition programs—the Air Force’s C130J aircraft program and the Army’s Future Combat Systems program—to avoid similar risks.

Over the past several years, the committee has enacted the following legislative initiatives designed to address such problems.

- Sections 803 and 808 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) tightened the requirements for commercial pricing of defense items.

- Section 803 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) lim-

ited the use of so called “other transactions” to projects in which either: (1) at least one nontraditional contractor is participating to significant extent; or (2) the contractor agrees to bear at least one-third of the cost of the project.

- Section 817 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 limited the circumstances in which the TINA could be waived and required the Department of Defense to report to Congress on all TINA and CAS waivers granted for major acquisition programs.

- Section 818 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 clarified the applicability of TINA to modifications of commercial items that cost in excess of \$500,000 and 5 percent of the value of the contract.

In this title, sections 844 and 804 would build on this record by: (1) prohibiting “other transactions” in excess of \$100.0 million and ensuring that the Procurement Integrity Act (41 U.S.C. 423) applies to all such transactions; and (2) requiring a specific authorization for the purchase of major weapon systems under procedures established for the procurement of commercial items.

**Department of Defense Contract Management.** Over the last 15 years, the Department of Defense has dramatically increased its reliance on contractor-provided information technology and management support services. By some estimates, the Department now spends more on the acquisition of services than it does on the acquisition of products, including major weapon systems.

The Department’s acquisition structure and organization has not kept pace with this dramatic change in the expenditure of funds. Despite critical reports by GAO and the Department of Defense Inspector General, the Department still has not developed a centralized management structure for the acquisition of services, still has not conducted a comprehensive spending analysis of its services contracts, and still has not provided its acquisition professionals with the training and guidance needed to manage the Department’s service contracts. Rather, the award of services contracts remains dispersed throughout the Department with little management oversight.

As a result, the Department of Defense has yet to make effective use of critical tools, such as performance-based service contracting (PBSC) and competitive awards under multiple-award task order contracts, to ensure that funds are expended in a cost-effective manner. For example, in July 2004, GAO found that Department of Defense personnel waived competition requirements for nearly half of the task orders reviewed. In March 2005, the Comptroller General reported that the Department of Defense failed to conduct adequate oversight for 26 of 90 contracts reviewed. Department of Defense managers told GAO that contract oversight is “not always a top priority” and “is not given the same importance as getting the contract awarded.” GAO found that some oversight personnel “believe they do not have enough time in a normal workday to perform surveillance, a factor that may be influenced by declining personnel levels in Department of Defense functional offices responsible” for contract oversight.

Over the past several years, the committee has enacted the following legislative initiatives designed to address this problem.



- Section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) required the issuance of government-wide guidance on the appropriate use of task order and delivery order contracts.
- Section 821 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 established a preference for PBSC and required the enhanced training of Department of Defense acquisition personnel and the establishment of centers of excellence in services contracting.
- Section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 required the Department to establish a management structure for the procurement of services, a tracking system for services contracts, and an approval requirement for services contracts that do not use PBSC.
- Section 802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 required the Department to achieve savings in its services contracts through the use of spending analyses, PBSC, and competitive award of task orders.
- Section 803 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 strengthened competition requirements for purchases of services through multiple award task order contracts.
- Section 805 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 established performance goals for the Department of Defense's use of PBSC and competitive task orders in its services contracts.

Section 802 of this title would build on this record by requiring each of the military departments to establish a Contract Support Acquisition Center to act as the executive agent for the acquisition of contract services for the military department. An additional Center would be established to act as a clearinghouse for the acquisition of contract services by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the defense agencies.

**Management of Interagency Contracting.** The last decade has seen a proliferation of new types of government-wide contracts and multi-agency contracts. According to GAO, the GSA alone has seen a nearly tenfold increase in interagency contract sales since 1992, pushing its total sales up to \$32 billion in fiscal year 2004. Other agencies, such as the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Interior, and the National Institutes of Health, also sponsor interagency contracts worth billions of dollars a year. The Department of Defense is by far the largest ordering agency under these contracts, accounting for 85 percent of the dollars awarded under one of the largest GSA programs.

These contracts, which permit officials of one agency to make purchases under contracts entered by other agencies, have provided federal agencies rapid access to high-tech commercial products and related services. However, these contracts have created a chaotic marketplace in which federal agencies are being offered similar products under a wide array of contracts, without any easy way of comparing between the products. At the same time, the Department of Defense does not have an adequate system to track such basic information as who is using these contracts, what they are buying, and how much they are paying.

In too many cases, when one agency uses a contract entered by another agency, it appears that neither agency takes responsibility for making sure that procurement rules are followed and good management sense is applied. As a result, the Department of Defense Inspector General, the GSA Inspector General, and others have identified a long series of problems with inter-agency contracts, including lack of acquisition planning, inadequate competition, excessive use of time and materials contracts, improper use of expired funds, inappropriate expenditures, and failure to monitor contractor performance.

In the past several years, the committee has enacted the following legislative initiatives designed to address these problems.

- Section 814 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 required approval by a contracting officer (or other official specifically designated in regulations) for all Department of Defense purchases under task order contracts of other federal agencies.
- Section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 required the issuance of government-wide guidance on the appropriate use of government-wide contracts and an assessment of the ordering and program practices followed by federal agencies in using GSA contracts.
- Section 824 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 required an assessment of Department of Defense purchases of products and services through contracts entered by other federal agencies, including the costs and benefits of such purchases.
- Section 802 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 required a joint review by the Department of Defense Inspector General and the GSA Inspector General of the procedures in place to ensure compliance with applicable requirements of law and regulation in Department of Defense purchases through the GSA client support centers.
- Section 854 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 required the Department of Defense to establish a process for review and approval of all procurements in excess of \$100,000 through contracts entered by other federal agencies.

In this title, sections 801 and 805 would build on this record by requiring that: (1) the Department of Defense Inspector General conduct joint reviews with the Inspector Generals of other relevant agencies of all major interagency contracts used by the Department of Defense, to ensure that appropriate procedures are in place and to ensure compliance with applicable requirements of law and regulation; and (2) the secretary of each military department review and report on service surcharges imposed on Department of Defense purchases by other Department of Defense agencies.

**Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management****Internal controls for procurements on behalf of the Department of Defense (sec. 801)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense Inspector General, in consultation with applicable Inspector's General of nondefense agencies, to determine whether the policies, procedures, and internal controls of nondefense agencies for purchases on behalf of the Department of Defense are adequate to ensure compliance with defense procurement requirements of law and regulation. The provision would allow the Department to continue contracting after March 15, 2006, with any nondefense agency that is making significant progress toward implementing effective policies, procedures, and internal controls. The provision would prohibit contracting with nondefense agencies after March 15, 2007, if a required second Inspector General review determined that the nondefense agency was not compliant with defense procurement requirements. The provision would also authorize the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to continue contracting through a nondefense agency that has failed to implement appropriate policies, procedures, and internal controls, if he determines that it is necessary to do so in the interest of the Department.

**Contract Support Acquisition Centers (sec. 802)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the secretary of each military department to establish a Contract Support Acquisition Center to act as the executive agent for the acquisition of contract services for that military department. The Secretary of Defense would be required to establish an additional Acquisition Center within the Defense Logistics Agency to act as the executive agent for the acquisition of contract services by the defense agencies.

The committee notes that the budget request includes a reduction of \$2.0 billion in funds available for contract support in fiscal year 2006 and a total planned reduction of \$12.0 billion across the Future Years Defense Program. The committee believes that the Department of Defense should be able to achieve a significant portion of these savings through the improved use of contract management tools, without having to cut programs or reduce needed services.

In particular, section 802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107), as amended, establishes an objective for the Department of Defense to achieve efficiencies in procurements of services through the increased use of: (1) performance-based service contracting; (2) competitive procedures for the award of task orders and contracts; and (3) program review, spending analyses, and improved management of services contracts. Similar steps have enabled private sector companies to achieve considerable savings.

Unfortunately, the goals established in section 802 for competition in services contracting and the use of performance-based services contracting have not been met. Moreover, it appears that the Department has yet to undertake the comprehensive program re-

view, spending analyses, and improved management of services contracts envisioned by section 802. The committee notes that a number of civilian agencies (including the Internal Revenue Service, the Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Postal Service) report that they have achieved significant savings through the use of spending analyses and strategic sourcing decisions.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense has been unable to achieve comparable savings, in part, because the decentralized nature of the Department of Defense's services contracting and the absence of any organization dedicated to the acquisition of contract support hamper efforts to perform spending analyses, make strategic sourcing decisions, and institute comprehensive management improvements. The provision would address this problem by creating an organizational hub for the acquisition of contract support services by the military departments and defense agencies.

The provision would also require the Contract Support Acquisition Centers to develop and maintain policies, procedures, and best practices guidelines for contract tracking and oversight. The committee notes that the Department of Defense is currently in the process of developing a business enterprise architecture and transition plan to guide the modernization of its business systems. The committee expects the business systems developed by the Department of Defense to have the capability of tracking basic information about interagency transactions, including the number and dollar value of transactions under each interagency contract vehicle, the status of open transactions, the status of funds under interagency transactions (including appropriation type; appropriation year; and fund balance received, obligated, expended, and available), and the amount of any funds returned or to be returned to the Department of Defense or to the Department of Treasury due to the completion or modification of contracts or the expiration of funds.

**Authority to enter into acquisition and cross-servicing agreements with regional organizations of which the United States is not a member (sec. 803)**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of Defense to enter into acquisition and cross-servicing agreements (ACSA) with regional international organizations of which the United States is not a member. Under current law, the Secretary may enter into ACSAs only with regional organizations of which the United States is a member.

Acquisition agreements and cross-servicing agreements permit the U.S. Armed Forces to obtain specified logistic support from, and to provide similar support to, the other party to the agreement on a reimbursable basis. Originally designed for and limited to North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) nations and organizations, the authority was expanded in 1994 to include certain non-NATO nations and regional organizations of which the United States is a member.

The Department of Defense has requested the expansion of this authority to be used in cases similar to the 2003 events in Liberia. At that time, the U.S. Joint Task Force Liberia was deployed, but

peacekeeping forces were provided by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)— a regional organization of which the United States is not a member. If the United States were permitted to negotiate an ACSA with ECOWAS, the United States could have furnished essential logistic support. Instead, other, less efficient mechanisms had to be worked out in order to support African peacekeeping forces in Liberia.

**Requirement for authorization for procurement of major weapon systems as commercial items (sec. 804)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the purchase of a major weapon system as a commercial item unless such purchase is specifically authorized by Congress.

A recent series of hearings held by the Subcommittee on AirLand of the Committee on Armed Services has highlighted continuing problems resulting from “commercial item strategies” pursued by the Department of Defense over the last decade. Under this approach, the Department has attempted to acquire major weapon systems under streamlined procedures intended for the purchase of commercial items. Such streamlined procedures do not require application of the Truth in Negotiations Act, the Cost Accounting Standards, and other requirements that are otherwise applicable to the acquisition of major weapon systems.

The provision would ensure that acquisition procedures authorized for the acquisition of commercial items are used for true commercial items and not for the purchase of major weapon systems.

**Report on service surcharges for purchases made for military departments through other Department of Defense agencies (sec. 805)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense to review and report on service charges imposed on one component of the Department for purchases made through another component of the Department.

Section 854(d) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) required an annual report on service charges imposed on Department purchases by other federal agencies. The provision recommended by the committee would extend this requirement to service charges internal to the Department.

**Review of defense acquisition structures (sec. 806)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Defense Acquisition University, acting under the direction of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, to review and report on the capabilities and shortfalls of the acquisition organizations of the military departments and defense agencies. The review would place particular emphasis on steps needed to improve joint acquisition and acquisition outcomes.

The review would specifically identify and make recommendations for addressing any gaps, shortfalls, or inadequacies in current acquisition organizations that could make it more difficult for these organizations to provide high-quality systems to the warfighter on a timely and cost-effective basis. The committee is particularly con-

cerned that the military departments appear to have divested much of their system engineering capability over the last 15 years. In addition, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has become excessively reliant upon contracts awarded by other agencies for the acquisition of services and information technology, and does not appear to have developed the appropriate structures and competencies needed to adequately handle these responsibilities.

At an April 14, 2004, hearing of the Subcommittee on AirLand of the Committee on Armed Services, the Acting Secretary of the Air Force testified that his department had gone too far in downsizing its acquisition organization and had removed critical checks and balances from the acquisition process. These problems are not unique to the Air Force. Because the problems in the Air Force acquisition organization appear to be the most severe, the provision would require an interim report on the Air Force acquisition organization not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### **Subtitle B—Defense Industrial Base Matters**

##### **Clarification of exception from Buy American requirements for procurement of perishable food for establishments outside the United States (sec. 811)**

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that the exception from Buy American requirements for procurement of perishable food for establishments outside the United States applies to procurements for an overseas defense facility, even if the procurements are not conducted by such a facility. This clarification is necessary because many food purchases for defense facilities are now made by prime vendors and other contractors, rather than being made by the facilities themselves.

##### **Conditional waiver of domestic source or content requirements for certain countries with reciprocal procurement agreements with the United States (sec. 812)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to annually determine whether a foreign country with a reciprocal defense procurement Memorandum of Understanding or agreement with the United States has qualitatively or quantitatively increased defense exports to China. If it is determined that no qualitative or quantitative increase has occurred in the previous year, the Secretary may on an annual basis waive the application of statutory domestic source requirements and domestic content requirements, provided that: (1) the application of the requirements would impede the reciprocal procurement of defense items under a Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and another country; and (2) the other country does not discriminate against items produced in the United States to a greater degree than the United States discriminates against items produced in that country. The proposed waiver is identical to the standard previously adopted by the Congress for products covered by the domestic content restrictions in section 2534 of title 10, United States Code.

**Consistency with United States obligations under trade agreements (sec. 813)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require that no provision of this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall apply if the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the U.S. Trade Representative, and the Secretary of State, determines that the application of the provision would be inconsistent with international trade agreements of the United States.

**Identification of areas of research and development effort for purposes of the Small Business Innovative Research program (sec. 814)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to use criteria and procedures, updated at least every four years, in the most current version of the three primary science and technology strategic plans to identify areas of research and development for the Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) program. The three strategic plans are: the Joint Warfighting Science and Technology Plan, the Defense Technology Area Plan, and the Basic Research Plan. The provision would ensure participation in the SBIR research topic selection process by the immediate customers of defense research, the program managers, and program executive officers.

The provision would also require the secretaries of the military departments to identify successful SBIR Phase II programs for acceleration into Phase III and rapid transition into programs of record. All programs identified for rapid transition would first require a written certification from the Secretary of Defense that successful completion of the transition is expected to meet high priority military requirements.

The committee notes the importance of ensuring transition of successful SBIR projects into Department of Defense acquisition programs. Acquisition program managers across the Department of Defense should be encouraged to utilize the SBIR program in their planning, budgeting, and requirements process. The Department of Defense should take the steps necessary to improve data collection on transition of SBIR projects into Department of Defense acquisition programs, either directly or through integration into systems by the prime contractors. The committee believes the Department of Defense should encourage the National Research Council's ongoing study of the SBIR program to address the issue of technology transition and, to the extent possible, collect data on the rates of transition success for SBIR Phase II projects.

**Subtitle C—Defense Contractor Matters**

**Requirements for defense contractors relating to certain former Department of Defense officials (sec. 821)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require companies 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 former DOD officials who receive compensation from the contractor.

At an April 14, 2005, hearing of the Subcommittee on AirLand of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia testified that it has been difficult for him to identify potential ethics violations by former Department officials who go to work for defense contractors, because the Department's records in this area are inadequate. An April 2005 report of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) also concluded that monitoring of former Department employees who go to work for defense contractors is limited. The report states:

Neither the Defense Contract Management Agency nor the Defense Contract Audit Agency—the agencies responsible for oversight of defense contractor's operations—had assessed the adequacy of contractors' practices of hiring current and former government employees. An independent review of one of DOD's largest contractors found that the company lacked the management controls needed to ensure an effective ethics program. Instead, the review found that the company relied excessively on employees to self-monitor their compliance with post-government employment restrictions. The review concluded that by relying on self-monitoring, the company increased the risk of non-compliance, due to either employees' willful misconduct or failure to understand complex ethics rules.

The provision should provide a more complete set of records for the Department of Defense, the GAO, and others to use in assessing the extent to which former Department employees who go to work for defense contractors are in compliance with applicable ethics requirements.

#### **Review of certain contractor ethics matters (sec. 822)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Government Ethics (OGE) and the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, to review ethics issues raised by contractor employees performing functions closely associated with inherently governmental functions and other contractor employees performing functions historically performed by government employees in the federal workplace.

On February 8, 2005, the Acting Director of the OGE requested that the Services Acquisition Reform Act (SARA) Advisory Committee conduct an evaluation of "whether contractor employees should be subject to some type of ethics laws, rules or practices designed to prevent conflicts of interest and the appearance of conflicts of interest." The OGE letter explained:

In recent years, executive branch ethics officials—particularly those from Department of Defense agencies and certain civilian agencies—have identified various issues and concerns that are a result of the growing presence of contractors in the Federal workplace. The issues predominantly relate to the fact that, unlike Government employees, contractor personnel are not subject to a comprehensive set of ethics rules, yet they are often performing some of the Government's most sensitive and critical work. This



disparity is true even when contractor personnel are working side-by-side with Government employees in the Federal workplace or on the battlefield, and, for all practical purposes, may appear to the public to be employees. The problem is most likely to occur when contractors perform work that historically was considered a federal function, as well as when contractors perform functions closely associated with inherently governmental functions.

Thus, it has been suggested that current laws, regulations and practices may be inadequate to prevent certain kinds of conflicts and ethics issues on the part of contractors. For example, Government employees are subject to various “post employment” restrictions that prevent them from switching sides and representing clients back to the government on a matter that they worked on in the Government. In contrast, contractor personnel—even those who performed the same or similar work as their Federal counterparts—are not subject to similar restrictions after they complete work on a contract or obtain work with another contractor. In addition, contractor personnel are not uniformly subject to gift rules. For example, a contractor performing an agency’s IT function could accept a free computer at a company-sponsored user conference or meeting, unless such conduct was prohibited by his company’s internal policies.

The committee supports the OGE request that the SARA Advisory Committee should look into these issues. In addition, the committee believes that Congress would benefit from the views of the Secretary, the Director of OGE, and the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy on these issues. The options listed in the legislation for review by the Secretary are the same options proposed in the OGE letter.

#### **Contract fraud risk assessment (sec. 823)**

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a risk assessment team to assess the vulnerability of Department of Defense contracts to fraud, waste, and abuse and require the Secretary of Defense to develop an action plan to address areas of vulnerability identified by the risk assessment team.

Recent contracting scandals in the Department of Defense have lead the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia to establish a Procurement Fraud Working Group to promote early detection and prevention of procurement fraud through the use of law enforcement measures to increase prevention and prosecution of fraud-related cases. The committee strongly supports this effort. However, the committee believes that more proactive measures can be taken by the Department to prevent fraud. A combined approach of active prosecution and proactive Department policies and procedures directed at areas of potential vulnerability should be constructive in deterring improper contracting practices.

### **Subtitle D—Defense Acquisition Workforce Matters**

#### **Availability of funds in Acquisition Workforce Training Fund for defense acquisition workforce improvements (sec. 831)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 37 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. section 433) to allow the defense acquisition workforce to benefit from fees collected under inter-agency contracts.

Section 1412 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) amended section 37 to establish an Acquisition Workforce Training Fund supporting the training of the acquisition workforce. The Department of Defense was excluded from contributing to, or benefitting from, this fund. The provision would delete this exclusion, enabling the defense acquisition workforce to benefit from the enhanced training opportunities made possible by the fund.

#### **Limitation and reinvestment authority relating to reduction of the defense acquisition and support workforce (sec. 832)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require a 15 percent increase in the defense acquisition and support workforce during fiscal years 2006 through 2008. The Secretary of Defense would be given the flexibility under this provision to realign positions in the acquisition workforce to reinvest in higher priority acquisition positions. The provision would also require the Secretary to conduct a strategic assessment and develop a human resources strategic plan for the defense acquisition and support workforce.

#### **Technical amendments relating to defense acquisition workforce improvements (sec. 833)**

The committee recommends a provision that would make minor technical changes to the newly revised Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (DAWIA), chapter 87 of title 10, United States Code, enacted by section 812 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375). These technical changes are necessary to correct inaccuracies in numbering.

The committee notes that DAWIA, as amended by section 812, specifies which military positions should be designated as critical acquisition positions, but gives the Secretary of Defense broad discretion to determine which civilian positions should be so designated. The committee expects the Secretary to use this discretion to ensure parallel treatment of military and civilian acquisition officials by designating civilian positions that have a level of responsibility comparable to the military positions that are designated by statute.

**Subtitle E—Other Matters****Extension of contract goal for small disadvantaged business and certain institutions of higher education (sec. 841)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend section 2323 of title 10, United States Code, for three years. Section 2323 establishes a 5 percent goal for Department of Defense contracting with small disadvantaged businesses and certain institutions of higher education.

**Codification and modification of limitation on modification of military equipment within five years of retirement or disposal (sec. 842)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit annual expenditures greater than \$100,000 to modify an aircraft, weapon, ship, or other item of equipment that will be retired or otherwise disposed of within 5 years after completion of the modification. The secretary of a military department may waive this restriction if the waiver is necessary on the basis of national security, and he so notifies the congressional defense committees in writing. Safety modifications will not require waivers. This provision would codify and modify the requirements of section 8053 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–56) by establishing an annual \$100,000 threshold requirement for congressional notice and departmental waiver.

**Clarification of rapid acquisition authority to respond to combat emergencies (sec. 843)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 806 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) to give the Department of Defense greater flexibility to address combat emergencies. In particular, the provision would: (1) give the Secretary of Defense authority to address deficiencies that have resulted in combat casualties, even if they are not “combat capability deficiencies” and even if they have not resulted in fatalities; (2) permit the Secretary to delegate his authority under the section to the Deputy Secretary of Defense; and (3) clarify that the category of statutes and regulations that may be waived if necessary to prevent combat casualties include domestic source or content restrictions that would inhibit or impede the rapid acquisition of needed equipment.

**Modification of authority to carry out certain prototype projects (sec. 844)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Department of Defense from entering into a transaction (other than a contract, cooperative agreement, or grant) under the authority of section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136, 10 U.S.C. 2371 note) for a prototype project that is expected to cost in excess of \$100.0 million. The provision would require the approval of the senior procurement executive for an agency before this authority may be used to enter into a transaction that is expected to cost in excess of \$20.0 million.

Section 845 was intended to be used for limited prototype projects, particularly those in which the Department seeks to engage nontraditional defense contractors that may be averse to the requirements imposed by a standard Department procurement contract. For this reason, the statement of managers accompanying the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105-261) states:

The conferees continue to believe that the section 845 authority should only be used in the exceptional cases where it can be clearly demonstrated that a normal contract or grant will not allow sufficient access to affordable technologies. The conferees are especially concerned that such authority not be used to circumvent the appropriate management controls in the standard acquisition and budgeting process.

Similarly, section 803 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-348) expressly limited the use of section 845 authority to transactions with companies that typically do not do business with the Department and to transactions in which costs are shared between the Department and the contractor.

The committee does not believe that the \$20.9 billion agreement entered between the Army and the Lead Systems Integrator for the Future Combat Systems program was consistent with the language and intent of these provisions. For this reason, the committee supports the Army's decision to restructure its agreement with the Lead Systems Integrator as a traditional procurement contract.

The provision recommended by the committee would ensure that section 845 authority is used as intended in the future for limited prototype projects, not to circumvent the appropriate management controls in the standard acquisition and budgeting process.

**Extension of certain authorities on contracting with employers of persons with disabilities (sec. 845)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for one year section 853 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375). This provision would ensure the continuation and completion of existing contracts (including any options) awarded under the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46 *et seq.*) and the Randolph-Sheppard Act (20 U.S.C. 107 *et seq.*) programs for the operation of military troop dining facilities, military mess halls, and other similar military dining facilities.

**Items of Special Interest**

**Commercial satellite bandwidth**

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report in December 2003, at the request of the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services, entitled "Satellite Communications: Strategic Approach Needed for DoD's Procurement of Commercial Satellite Bandwidth." Section 803 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375) required the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on the Department's procurement strategy for commercial communications satellite services, and how the Department will address each of the recommendations contained in the GAO report. It is the committee's understanding that the Department's report will be delivered in June 2005.

The committee directs the GAO to review the Department's report to determine the extent to which the recommendations made by GAO have been addressed by the Department and report to the committee on the results of this assessment within 25 days of the release of the Department's report.

### **Defense trade data**

Defense trade impacts several issues of importance to the Department of Defense, including maintaining a healthy supplier base, protecting critical technologies, ensuring access to a secure supply of defense-related items and services, managing technology transfers, and increasing interoperability with allies. A critical element to guide decision-makers on defense trade is access to comprehensive and reliable data. Due to concerns about the potential inadequacy of defense trade data, the committee directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to identify: (1) Defense trade data that is collected and reported by U.S. government agencies; (2) the limitations, if any, of that data; and (3) reasonable conclusions that can be made about current trends in defense trade based on that data.

The committee is also concerned about the adequacy of data on arms sales to China. The European Union's recent proposal to lift its ban on lethal arms sales to China has generated a need for the GAO to update its June 1998 report, "China: Military Imports from the United States and the European Union since the 1989 Embargoes." Accordingly, the committee directs the GAO to report on arms sales to China over the past five years from the United States, European Union member countries, and other major arms exporting countries and determine any quantitative or qualitative trends in these sales.

### **Department of Defense anti-tamper program**

In the Senate Report accompanying S. 1050 (S. Rept. 108-46) to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, the committee asked the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review the Department of Defense's anti-tamper program, which is designed to protect critical U.S. technologies from risk of exploitation if they are exported, stolen, or lost during combat. The GAO reported to the committee in March 2004 and made several recommendations for the Department to improve its anti-tamper program.

The committee has been informed that the Department has made progress in implementing some of GAO's recommendations but has yet to implement others. Specifically, the Department has made progress in: (1) Developing a tool to help program managers identify critical technologies in their systems; (2) creating a technology database to include anti-tamper technologies and lessons learned; (3) sponsoring training for verification teams; (4) funding an inde-

pendent study on anti-tamper techniques and general effectiveness; and (5) creating more robust verification and validation teams to assist programs with anti-tamper implementation and best practices.

The committee understands that the Department has yet to: (1) Implement a newly drafted policy on anti-tamper; (2) develop a central review mechanism for consistent identification of similar critical technologies across programs; and (3) fully establish a business case that determines whether the current organizational structure and resources are adequate to implement anti-tamper protection and, if not, determine what other actions are needed to mitigate the risk of compromising critical technologies.

The committee directs the GAO to update its March 2004 report to the committee and evaluate the actions the Department has taken to date and pursue any necessary follow-up work on the Department's anti-tamper program.

#### **Industrial base issues**

In May 2004, the Department of Defense issued a report entitled: "*Adequacy of U.S. Beryllium Industrial Base to Meet Defense Requirements*", dated May 2004. This report clearly establishes the long-term national security need to ensure a domestic supply of beryllium to meet defense needs. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to include within future years' budgets a level of funding consistent with the report's findings, which will lead to the development of a cooperative public-private partnership in the domestic beryllium industrial base, to include using funding under the Defense Production Act (50 U.S.C. App. section 2061 *et seq.*), or any other means that the Secretary determines as feasible.

The committee also believes that the Department should review whether Defense Production Act funding should be used for (1) a silicon carbide armor manufacturing initiative and (2) supporting efficient and flexible manufacturing for producing current and future small arms weapons.

#### **Implementation of authority to enter energy savings performance contracts**

Section 1090 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375) extended through the end of fiscal year 2006 the authority for the Department of Defense and other federal agencies to enter energy savings performance contracts pursuant to section 802 of the National Energy Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287a).

When properly used, energy savings performance contracts enable the Department and other federal agencies to reduce energy and water consumption through infrastructure upgrades, such as new thermal storage systems, chillers, boilers, and lights, with no out-of-pocket cost at all to the government. In some cases, excess savings from energy improvements can even be used to offset other base operating support expenses.

Section 802 of the National Energy Policy Act provides that an energy savings performance contract is a contract which provides for the contractor to implement energy savings measures in federal facilities "in exchange for a share of any energy savings directly re-

sulting from implementation of such measures during the term of the contract.” The statute further provides that aggregate payments to the contractor “may not exceed the amount that the agency would have paid for utilities without an energy savings performance contract.”

In December 2004, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that on six energy savings performance contracts it reviewed (including three contracts entered by the Department of the Navy), aggregate payments to the contractor exceeded energy cost savings during the term of the contract. In each case, the GAO found that the agencies made significant up-front payments to the contractor and then paid the contractor all or virtually all of the savings resulting from the contract. As a result, the total of the up-front payments and the regular payments during the term of the contract exceeded the amount of the savings.

The committee is concerned by the appearance that the Department and other federal agencies may have routinely violated the requirements of section 802 of the National Energy Policy Act. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to issue guidance to all the Department officials responsible for entering energy savings performance contracts reemphasizing the statutory requirement that the cost of an energy savings performance contract be paid entirely out of the energy savings resulting from the contract.

### **National technology and industrial base considerations**

The committee notes with concern a number of negative trends affecting the ability of the national technology and industrial base to meet the long-term national security challenges facing the United States. Over the past 20 years, the U.S. aerospace industrial base has declined from 75 competing companies to the present “Big Five.” This is mainly a result of consolidations and mergers. More than 700,000 jobs in the aerospace and defense sector have been lost. The average age of defense industry workers is now over 50, while college enrollment in defense and aerospace-related engineering programs continues to decline.

The integration of the commercial and military industrial bases, so called civil-military integration, has not been as successful as many advocates had hoped. While military systems continue to incorporate advanced commercial technology, many commercial systems have often proven difficult to adapt for military uses. Also, military technologies have been slow to develop commercial applications.

The defense industry has found it difficult to use global sales to stabilize defense production. Cumbersome export control processes often overly restrict American companies from selling defense and dual-use products on the international market and discourage international cooperation on new aerospace and defense technologies.

The committee recognizes that private sector manufacturers have a responsibility to investors and shareholders to be profitable and competitive. Industries supporting national defense must compete with other industries in the U.S. economy for investment capital. The Department of Defense should consider reviewing profit poli-

cies to accurately reflect risk and achieve better performance in defense contracting.

The Department of Defense, industry, and the Congress must work together to ensure that the defense industry continues on the path of integration with the commercial sector, remains globally competitive, and attracts new generations of scientists, engineers, and other skilled workers. To that end, the committee urges the Department to work with industry to: (1) Maintain stable federal funding for core production capabilities and the critical Research Development Test and Evaluation infrastructure supporting defense programs; (2) maintain a stable annual science and technology budget at the Department consistent with the 3 percent goal established in legislation, to develop innovative technologies designed to meet future national security threats; (3) work with universities and the defense manufacturing community to develop a plan to train and build a skilled aerospace and defense workforce; (4) provide appropriate incentives to encourage the participation of small businesses and independent entrepreneurs from nondefense sectors in the Defense Industrial Base; (5) eliminate obstacles in the export licensing process that restrict international sales of defense and dual-use products without providing a corresponding national security benefit; (6) facilitate and encourage international joint programs with allies; and (7) promote greater interoperability among both defense and commercial defense systems, domestically and internationally.



## **TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT**

### **Subtitle A—Duties and Functions of Department of Defense Officers and Organizations**

#### **Directors of small business programs (sec. 901)**

The committee recommends a provision that would change the title of the Department of Defense's "Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization" to the "Office of Small Business Programs" to more clearly represent the office's span of authority. The name would not reflect a change in emphasis or support for disadvantaged businesses, but rather would clarify that the Office of Small Business Programs has the full range of authority over many other small business programs that presently are not reflected in the office's title. The new title would capture the overarching nature of the program, which encompasses the small disadvantaged business, service-disabled veteran-owned small business, qualified historically underutilized business zone small business, women-owned small business, and the very small business programs.

#### **Executive agent for acquisition of capabilities to defend the homeland against missiles and other low-altitude air- craft (sec. 902)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish an executive agent in the Department of Defense to manage the acquisition of capabilities necessary to defend the homeland against cruise missiles, unmanned aerial vehicles, and other low-altitude air threats. The provision would require the executive agent to coordinate with the Missile Defense Agency, the Joint Theater Air and Missile Defense Organization, U.S. Northern Command, U.S. Strategic Command, and other appropriate U.S. government agencies to ensure unity of effort and to avoid unnecessary duplication. Additionally, the Secretary is required to submit to the congressional defense committees, no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, a plan for the defense of the United States against cruise missiles, unmanned aerial vehicles, and other low-altitude air threats. The Secretary shall coordinate this plan with other Department plans for the defense of the homeland against short- to medium-range ballistic missiles.

The committee has been concerned about the increasing threat posed by cruise missiles, unmanned aerial vehicles, and other low-altitude threats against the United States. Accordingly, Congress directed the Secretary, in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136), to provide a report on the U.S. military's ability to address these threats. The report entitled "Cruise Missile Defense," submitted to the Congress in September 2004, addressed the challenges cruise missiles and other

low-altitude threats pose to the air defense of the United States and noted that a comprehensive interagency approach was necessary to address the problem. The report further noted that while technology demonstration programs were underway in the Department for homeland airspace surveillance and defense, it would be necessary to establish acquisition programs with appropriate funding to acquire capabilities that were successfully demonstrated.

The committee notes that it is the mission of NORAD, a component of U.S. Northern Command, to defend the United States against cruise missiles and other air threats. NORAD is currently developing a document under the U.S. Joint Staff's Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System to define the family-of-systems capabilities needed to defend the United States against low-altitude air threats. The committee understands, however, that while U.S. NORTHCOM is responsible for the defense of the homeland against these threats, it does not have the authority or funding to acquire needed capabilities.

To enhance efforts to protect the homeland from cruise missiles, unmanned aerial vehicles, and other low-altitude air threats, the committee believes that there should be a single official within the Department responsible for coordinating, integrating, funding, and acquiring the surveillance and interceptor programs necessary for a cohesive defense of the homeland against these threats, and that there should be a plan for such defense. Additionally, these efforts to defend against low-altitude air threats should be coordinated with ongoing Missile Defense Agency efforts to address the short-to medium-range ballistic missile threat to the United States.

### **Subtitle B—Space Activities**

#### **Advisory committee on Department of Defense requirements for space control (Sec. 911)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish an advisory committee on the current and future space control requirements of the United States, including the means of meeting those requirements.

According to U.S. "National Space Policy," last promulgated in September 1996, the United States will develop, operate, and maintain space control capabilities to ensure freedom of action in space and, if directed, deny such freedom of action to adversaries. In March 2005, senior administration officials testified before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services that this remains official U.S. policy. The space control mission area includes three important components: (1) space situational awareness; (2) defensive counterspace operations; and (3) offensive counterspace operations.

The committee recognizes the growing reliance of the United States on space operations for its security. This reliance creates a potential vulnerability should adversaries develop capabilities for interdicting or destroying U.S. space assets or ground support infrastructure. The committee is concerned that given the potential threats to U.S. and allied space operations, the Department of Defense may not be allocating sufficient funding for space control when compared with other military space mission areas. The com-

mittee therefore believes an advisory committee of experts can provide a valuable assessment of current and future space control requirements, to include the adequacy of means for meeting those requirements.

### **Subtitle C—Other Matters**

#### **Acceptance of gifts and donations for Department of Defense regional centers for security studies (sec. 921)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide authority for the Secretary of Defense to accept gifts and donations on behalf of each of the Department of Defense regional centers for security studies. The provision would define the sources from which gifts and donations may be accepted, and criteria for acceptance of such gifts and donations. The provision would also establish an account on the books of the Treasury to be known as the Regional Centers for Security Studies Account into which monetary donations would be credited and made available for expenditure to defray the costs, or enhance the operation, of the regional centers.

This provision would consolidate a set of laws into one provision that would provide uniform and consistent authority for the Secretary to accept gifts and donations on behalf of each of the Department regional centers for security studies.

#### **Operational files of the Defense Intelligence Agency (sec. 922)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, to exempt specifically defined operational files of certain elements of the DIA from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). Judicial review would be available for allegations of improper withholding of material, subject to certain protections for classified material. All exempted operational files would be subject to a 10-year review to determine whether the protected files should be removed from the exempted operational files. This provision would provide DIA with protection of its most sensitive operational files. The committee notes that such protections are currently authorized for the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office, and the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency, under title VII of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 431 et. seq.).

#### **Prohibition on implementation of certain orders and guidance on functions and duties of the General Counsel and the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force (sec. 923)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 to implement or enforce either: (1) the order of the Secretary of the Air Force, dated May 15, 2003, and entitled “Functions and Duties of the General Counsel and the Judge Advocate General;” or (2) any internal operating instruction or memorandum issued by the Gen-

eral Counsel of the Department of the Air Force in reliance upon the Secretary's May 15, 2003, order.

Since the enactment of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-433), the Congress has strongly supported the existence of separate military and civilian staffs in the area of legal services and elsewhere. In section 574 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375), the Congress enacted explicit protection for the ability of the Judge Advocates General to give independent legal advice to the service secretaries and service chiefs, and for the ability of judge advocates to give such advice to commanders. In the statement of managers accompanying that Act, the conferees directed the Secretary of the Air Force to rescind the above order, which violated the principles of the Goldwater-Nichols Act by elevating the General Counsel to a position of supremacy over Air Force legal services. The conferees further directed the General Counsel to rescind any operating instructions or memoranda issued in reliance upon the Secretary's order. Neither of these has been done. Accordingly, the committee recommends the inclusion of the present provision.

## **TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS**

### **Subtitle A—Financial Matters**

#### **Transfer authority (sec. 1001)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the transfer of funds authorized in division A of this Act for unforeseen higher priority needs in accordance with normal reprogramming procedures.

#### **Incorporation of classified annex (sec. 1002)**

The committee recommends a provision that would incorporate the classified annex prepared by the Committee on Armed Services into the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

#### **United States contribution to NATO common-funded budgets in fiscal year 2006 (sec. 1003)**

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 2006, including the use of unexpended balances from prior years.

#### **Reduction in certain authorizations due to savings relating to lower inflation (sec. 1004)**

The Department of Defense assumed an inflation rate of 2.1 percent in its fiscal year 2006 budget submission. However, according to the Senate Budget Committee's report (S.Prt 109–18, p. 10) accompanying the Senate Concurrent Resolution of the Budget for FY 2006 (S.Con.Res. 18), the Congressional Budget Office's estimate of inflation is 0.5 percentage points lower than the administration's estimate for 2006. The savings resulting from lower-than-expected inflation for fiscal year 2006 is \$1.3 billion.

#### **Authorization of supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2005 (sec. 1005)**

This provision would authorize the supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2005 enacted in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109–13, as adopted by the House of Representatives on May 5, 2005 and the Senate on May 10, 2005).

**Increase in fiscal year 2005 transfer authority (sec. 1006)**

The committee recommends a provision that would increase fiscal year 2005 transfer authority from \$3.5 billion to \$6.185 billion for transfers among accounts in division A of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) for unforeseen higher priority needs in accordance with normal reprogramming procedures.

**Monthly disbursement to States of state income tax voluntarily withheld from retired or retained pay (sec. 1007)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1045(a) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the service secretaries, pursuant to an agreement with any State, to disburse state income tax on a monthly, vice quarterly, basis that is collected from the monthly retired or retainer pay of any service member or former service member entitled to such pay who voluntarily requests such withholding.

**Reestablishment of limitation on payment of facilities charges assessed by Department of State (sec. 1008)**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of Defense to offset, on an annual basis, any fees charged to the Department of Defense by the Department of State for the maintenance, upgrade, or construction of U.S. diplomatic facilities by the total amount of the unreimbursed costs incurred by the Department of Defense for providing goods and services to the Department of State during that year.

While the committee recognizes the need to upgrade and construct new diplomatic facilities, the committee opposes the use of the capital cost sharing program as a means of accomplishing this goal. The capital cost sharing program does not take into account the substantial amount of goods and services that the Department of Defense provides to the Department of State at no cost. The committee urges the administration to request sufficient funds in future year budget requests to provide for the costs of upgrading or constructing U.S. diplomatic facilities.

**Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards****Transfer of battleship (sec. 1021)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to strike the U.S.S. *Wisconsin* from the Naval Register, and transfer it by gift or otherwise, provided that the transferee locate the ship in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The provision would also stipulate that any costs associated with the transfer will be borne by the transferee, notwithstanding section 7306b(d) of title 10, United States Code.

The committee notes that the U.S.S. *Wisconsin* is currently berthed in the Commonwealth of Virginia, where it is open to the general public for tours. The committee expects the Secretary to ensure that any group who accepts transfer will use it to promote the traditions of the Navy.

**Conveyance of Navy Drydock, Jacksonville, Florida (sec. 1022)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to Navy Drydock No. AFDM-7 (the Sustain) to Atlantic Marine Property Holding Company, located in Duval County, Florida.

The provision would include the condition that the drydock remain at the facilities of the Atlantic Marine Property Holding Company until September 30, 2010. The provision would also require the Atlantic Marine Property Holding Company to pay an amount determined by the Secretary to be the fair market value of the drydock. The provision would also authorize the Secretary to require any additional terms and conditions determined appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

**Subtitle C—Counterdrug Matters**

**Use of unmanned aerial vehicles for United States border reconnaissance (sec. 1031)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 18 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to use Department of Defense personnel and equipment to conduct aerial reconnaissance within the area of responsibility of the U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM) with unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) in order to conduct certain operations. These operations would be to detect, monitor, and communicate on the movement of air and sea traffic along the U.S. border and on surface traffic that is outside of the geographic boundary of the United States or up to 25 miles inside the border of the United States, if that traffic was detected outside the boundary of the United States.

The provision would specify that the purposes of this aerial reconnaissance would be to detect and monitor suspicious air, sea, and surface traffic; and to communicate information on such traffic to appropriate federal, state, and local law enforcement officials. The provision would make funds available to the Department of Defense for counterdrug activities available for the other activities authorized by this provision.

The provision would stipulate that any limitations and restrictions under chapter 18, title 10, United States Code, would apply with respect to the use of personnel, equipment, and facilities. The provision would define the term “suspicious air, sea, and surface traffic” as that which is suspected of illegal activities, including activities that would constitute a violation of any provision of law in section 374(b)(4)(A) of title 10, United States Code. The provision would define state law enforcement officials as including authorized members of the National Guard, operating under authority of title 32, United States Code. The provision would require an annual report from the Secretary of Defense to the congressional defense committees that would describe the UAV operations conducted under the authority of this provision for the previous year.

The committee understands that the Department of Homeland Security has initiated its own efforts to use UAVs to patrol the borders of the United States. The authorization for the Department of

Defense to engage in similar activities should complement, not replace, these efforts by civil authorities to develop their own aerial reconnaissance capabilities. The committee urges the Department of Defense to provide technical and other assistance to the Department of Homeland Security so that the civil agencies with the primary responsibility for border enforcement will have the robust capabilities necessary to detect, track, investigate, and apprehend illicit cross-border traffic.

At a hearing of the Committee on Armed Services on March 15, 2005, the Commander, NORTHCOM, who is the combatant commander charged with the defense of the continental United States, stated that he would investigate the potential for UAVs to support the homeland security mission along the borders. The authority provided by this provision would enable NORTHCOM to more actively participate in defense of U.S. borders, communicating information to trained military National Guardsman and other law enforcement officials who can actively engage those who might want to render harm to the United States.

**Use of counterdrug funds for certain counterterrorism operations (sec. 1032)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Department of Defense to utilize funds available for drug interdiction and counterdrug activities in fiscal years 2006 and 2007, as well as for the related detection, monitoring, and interdiction of terrorists, terrorism-related activities, and other related transnational threats on the borders and within the territorial waters of the United States. The committee believes that many narcotics trafficking activities are related to the financing of terrorist activities and may also include the illegal infiltration of criminal and terrorist elements into the United States. The committee believes that the Department of Defense can make significant contributions to the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security and related national, regional, and local law enforcement agencies to enhance the security of U.S. borders and territorial waters.

**Support for counterdrug activities through bases of operation and training facilities in Afghanistan (sec. 1033)**

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510), as amended, expressly authorizing the Secretary of Defense to permit the use of U.S. bases of operation or training facilities to facilitate the conduct of counterdrug activities in Afghanistan, including support for counterdrug related Afghan criminal justice activities. The committee understands that an effective Afghan legal structure is an essential aspect of a meaningful Afghan counterdrug strategy and supports the request of the Department of Defense to provide assistance in all aspects of counterdrug activities in Afghanistan, including detection, interdiction, and related criminal justice activities.



### **Subtitle D—Reports and Studies**

#### **Modification of frequency of submittal of Joint Warfighting Science and Technology Plan (sec. 1041)**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of Defense to submit the Joint Warfighting Science and Technology Plan to Congress every two years, rather than annually. The comprehensive plan provides key guidance for development of responsive science and technology priorities and should be written to coincide with the Department of Defense's budgeting process and major decision-making cycle.

#### **Review and assessment of Defense Base Act insurance (sec. 1042)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Office of Management and Budget, the Department of Labor, the Department of State, and the United States Agency for International Development, to review current and future needs, options, and risks associated with Defense Base Act insurance.

Congress enacted the Defense Base Act (DBA), 41 U.S.C. section 1651 et seq., in 1941 to provide workers' compensation to employees of government contractors working at U.S. defense bases overseas. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has reported significant confusion among federal agencies and contractors over the application of DBA requirements in Iraq and other overseas locations.

The Department of Defense recently initiated a one-year pilot contract for a single insurer to provide DBA insurance for all Army Corps of Engineers contractors performing overseas. While this pilot program appears to be a constructive step, the committee believes that further guidance may be required to ensure that DBA requirements are clearly understood and consistently applied in a manner that provides the greatest benefits to the federal government and its contractor employees overseas.

#### **Comptroller General report on corrosion prevention and mitigation programs of the Department of Defense (sec. 1043)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a report on the effectiveness of the corrosion prevention and mitigation programs of the Department of Defense. The report shall include assessments of the following: (1) the Department's November 2004 "Long-Term Strategy to Reduce Corrosion and the Effects of Corrosion on the Military Equipment and Infrastructure of the Department of Defense"; (2) the adequacy of the funding requested in the budget proposal for fiscal year 2006 and the adequacy of the funding programmed in the associated Future Years Defense Program to support that strategy; (3) the adequacy and effectiveness of the Department's organizational structure in implementing that strategy; (4) the progress made to date in establishing common corrosion and corrosion-related metrics, definitions, and procedures throughout the Department; (5) the progress made to date in estab-

lishing a baseline estimate of the scope of the Department's corrosion problem; (6) the extent to which the Department's strategy has been revised to incorporate the recommendations of the October 2004 Defense Science Board report on corrosion control; (7) the implementation of the Department's corrosion prevention and mitigation programs during fiscal year 2006; and (8) the Comptroller General's recommendations for addressing any shortfalls or areas of potential improvement identified in the course of preparing the report. The provision would require the Comptroller General to submit the report to the congressional defense committees not later than April 1, 2007.

Section 1067 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314) required the Comptroller General (1) to monitor the implementation of the Department's long term strategy to reduce corrosion and the effects of corrosion on military equipment and infrastructure and (2) to provide an assessment to Congress on the extent to which that strategy has been implemented. The Comptroller General's assessment was provided to the Congress in June 2004. The committee believes that a follow-on report by the Comptroller General on Defense Department corrosion program management will support the committee's oversight of corrosion awareness and prevention and the role of the Department's Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight in departmental planning, programming, and budgeting. The committee believes that the Department should continue to work on efforts to realize the large potential savings available from the prevention and mitigation of the impact of corrosion. The committee is concerned that the current organizational structure of the Department's corrosion prevention and mitigation program, and the funding requested for that program, may not allow the Department to achieve potential savings in a timely manner.

### **Subtitle E—Technical Amendments**

#### **Technical amendments relating to certain provisions of environmental defense laws (sec. 1051)**

The committee recommends a provision that would make technical and conforming changes to the definition of "military munitions" in section 101 of title 10, United States Code, and to the cross-reference to "unexploded ordnance" in section 2703 of that title.

### **Subtitle F—Military Mail Matters**

#### **Safe delivery of mail in the military mail system (sec. 1061)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to promptly develop and implement a plan to ensure that the mail within the military mail system is safe for delivery. The plan would provide for the screening of all mail within the military mail system in order to detect the presence of biological, chemical or radiological weapons, agents or pathogens, or explosive devices before the mail is delivered to its intended recipients. The provision would require the Secretary to include in the fiscal year 2007 budget request and future years defense plan a de-

scription of the amounts required in each fiscal year to carry out the plan.

The provision would also require the Secretary to submit a report on the plan to the congressional defense committees within 120 days of enactment of this Act. The report would include an assessment of any deficiencies in the military mail system with respect to safety; the plan developed pursuant to this provision; an estimate of the time and resources required to implement the plan; and a description of any delegation within the Department of Defense of responsibility for ensuring that mail within the military mail system is safe for delivery.

The provision would define mail within the military mail system as mail that is posted through the Military Post Offices (including Army Post Offices and Fleet Post Offices), the Department mail centers, military Air Mail Terminals, and military Fleet Mail Centers; any mail or package posted in the United States that is addressed to an unspecified member of the Armed Forces; and any official mail posted by the Department. Mail that has been screened for safety for delivery by the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) is excepted.

The committee believes that the Secretary must elevate the priority of ensuring the safety of the mail within the military mail system. Toward that end, the Department should develop uniform standards, concepts of operation, tactics, techniques, and procedures for screening against biological, chemical or radiological weapons, agents or pathogens, or explosive devices at mail centers. An example of the lack of standards or failure to comply with established standards was illustrated in the events surrounding the March 14, 2005, detection of anthrax in the Pentagon Remote Delivery Facility (RDF) and a later presumed detection of anthrax in a TRICARE mail sorting room. In both cases, established Department protocols were either not followed due to lack of knowledge or were ignored. Events at both the RDF and TRICARE facility highlight the lack of uniform standards and methods for ensuring that the Department mail is safe for delivery. It is apparent that to ensure uniformity and avoid errors, a standardized system must be developed that provides a reasonable level of capability and imposes uniform standards and methods. There are no current Department requirements for mail centers to operate collectively, either locally or regionally, to provide layers of defense to mitigate risk.

The committee recognizes that there is a large number of military mail delivery nodes and mail centers, and that screening every piece of mail entering the system is a challenging task. However, most mail entering the Department system goes through centralized sorting and transfer points at which effective monitoring can and should be implemented. Because the USPS screens mail that it delivers, there is no need for the Department to screen mail heading from the Department into the USPS, or mail received through and already screened by the USPS.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends authorizing an additional \$12.0 million in Procurement and Research, Development, Test and Evaluation funding in fiscal year 2006 for military mail screening system development and demonstration, and pro-

curement of military mail screening equipment and augmented laboratory testing capabilities. The committee recommends these increases to ensure that resources are available to begin implementation of the plan as soon as possible.

**Delivery of mail addressed to any service member (sec. 1062)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out a program through which mail and packages addressed to any American service member would be delivered to deployed members of the Armed Forces overseas. The provision would require the Secretary to designate appropriate overseas addresses to serve as hubs for the receipt of such mail, and would also require that such mail be screened to detect the presence of biological, chemical or radiological weapons, agents or pathogens, or explosive devices before it is delivered to members of the Armed Forces. The provision would require the Secretary to ensure that such mail and packages are widely distributed on an equitable basis, and that information is provided to the public regarding this program.

The committee's intent is to establish a program such as that originally established in 1967. The Department of Defense worked cooperatively to facilitate the delivery of mail addressed to any service member until October 30, 2001, when, in response to the anthrax attack involving U.S. postal offices, mail to unspecified service members was suspended.

The committee believes that the generosity of the American people in supporting American service members overseas should be encouraged by the Department. The committee acknowledges the growth in access to electronic communications and the popularity of such communications with American service members, but believes that there is no substitute for a letter or package from home, especially for a service member who may not otherwise receive such communication.

The committee is mindful of the importance of ensuring the safe delivery of mail in the military mail system. Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary to promptly develop and implement a plan to ensure that all mail within the military mail system, including mail and packages addressed to unspecified members of the Armed Forces, is screened for the presence of biological, chemical or radiological weapons, agents or pathogens, or explosive devices to ensure that it is safe for delivery.

**Subtitle G—Other Matters**

**Policy on role of military medical and behavioral science personnel in interrogation of detainees (sec. 1071)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a uniform policy on the role of military medical and behavioral science personnel in interrogation of persons detained by the Armed Forces. The committee expects that in the development of the policy, the Department of Defense will seek the views of medical and behavioral health experts out-

side of the Department, including medical and behavioral science personnel, physicians, nurses, and psychologists; and scholars in medical ethics—scholars with civilian backgrounds.

The committee is aware that the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs) has directed a policy review of the role of medical personnel in detainee operations, including humane medical treatment of detainees, reporting of alleged abuses, and maintenance of medical records. In addition, the committee is aware that the Surgeon General of the Army has directed an assessment of the role of medical personnel in detainee operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee is concerned that the February 2005 report of Vice Admiral Albert T. Church, III, on Department of Defense detention operations, found that “since neither the Geneva Conventions nor U. S. military medical doctrine specifically address the issue of behavioral science personnel assisting interrogators in developing interrogation strategies, this practice has evolved in an ad hoc manner.” The committee concurs with the need for clarity on the role and status of medical personnel in interrogations, and believes that the Secretary should promptly address this issue.

#### **Clarification of authority to issue security regulations and orders under Internal Security Act of 1950 (sec. 1072)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 21(a) of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 81–831; 50 U.S.C. 797(a)) to authorize delegation of the authority to issue security regulations to civilian or military directors. The statute presently authorizes the Secretary of Defense to issue such regulations, as well as any military commander designated by the Secretary. The growth of defense agencies and field activities in the past 50 years has resulted in more installations and entities being headed by civilians or by military personnel who are not “commanders” in the formal sense. The provision would update the statute to recognize this change in organizational structure and enable the Secretary to designate either military commanders or military or civilian directors, as appropriate, to issue these essential regulations.

### **Items of Special Interest**

#### **Strategic seaports**

In a statement for a hearing of the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services, the Commander, Transportation Command (TRANSCOM), stated that 95 percent of all material for Operation Iraqi Freedom was shipped by sea. This high volume of shipment by sea is consistent with past conflicts. The Mobility Capabilities Study has not yet been received by Congress, but is expected to address the role of TRANSCOM as the distribution process owner for the Department. A vital part of this distribution is the movement of goods and materials to ports of embarkation. The committee is concerned that certain ongoing processes within the Department may change the current requirements at these strategic seaports. The Quadrennial Defense Review could lead to changes in force structure. Both the Integrated Global Presence

and Basing Strategy and the Base Realignment and Closure process could realign where personnel and equipment will be located.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to deliver a report to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2006, that includes an examination of projected requirements for throughput at strategic seaports, and any improvements required for rail facilities and port facilities and any other infrastructure necessary to achieve the required throughput.

## **TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL POLICY**

### **Extension of authority for voluntary separations in reductions in force (sec. 1101)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend until September 30, 2010, the authorities contained in section 3502(f) of title 5, United States Code, which govern the order of retention of civilian personnel in a reduction in force. This extension is necessary as the Department of Defense prepares for 2005 Base Realignment and Closure.

### **Compensatory time off for certain nonappropriated fund employees (sec. 1102)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to grant nonappropriated fund employees time off instead of overtime pay for overtime work, if requested by the employee.

The provision makes available to nonappropriated fund employees the same compensatory time off allowance available to other employees as contained in section 5543 of title 5, United States Code.

### **Extension of authority to pay severance payments in lump sums (sec. 1103)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend until October 1, 2010, the authority contained in section 5595(i)(4) of title 5, United States Code, for the Secretary of Defense or the secretary of the military department concerned to pay the entire amount of an employee's severance pay in one lump sum.

This provision is necessary to support force shaping and as the Department of Defense prepares for 2005 Base Realignment and Closure.

### **Continuation of Federal Employee Health Benefits program eligibility (sec. 1104)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the requirement for the Department of Defense to pay the employer portion of Federal Employee Health Benefit premiums for 18 months for employees involuntarily separated, or voluntarily separated from a surplus position, due to a reduction in force. This extension is necessary as the Department prepares for 2005 Base Realignment and Closure.

**Permanent and enhanced authority for Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation (SMART) defense education program (sec. 1105)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the Science, Mathematics and Research for Transformation (SMART) pilot program that was initiated in the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375). The provision would make the program permanent and would provide additional authorities to the Department of Defense for implementation. Under the provision, the Department could provide fellowship as well as scholarship assistance to individuals pursuing technical degrees critical to national security. The provision would allow the Department to award financial assistance directly to an individual or to an administering entity, reducing the management burden on the Department. The provision would modify Section 1105 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) to permit the Department to hire individuals participating in the program, which would expedite security clearances and other personnel processes.

The provision modifies the service requirement to include post-graduation time served in an interim position for up to two years as part of the individual's payback to the Department. Finally, the provision clarifies commitments of all program participants to repay the Department for financial assistance, if they voluntarily choose to drop out of the program, if they fail to maintain satisfactory academic progress, or if they are dropped from the program due to misconduct.

The committee established the SMART pilot scholarship program in fiscal year 2005 to address growing deficiencies in the numbers and types of scientists and engineers comprising our national security workforce. The committee commends the Department for quickly implementing the pilot program and notes that, in just the first year, hundreds of qualified individuals submitted applications for approximately 30 available scholarships. A permanent SMART program would maintain the committee's original goal of providing targeted educational assistance to individuals seeking a baccalaureate or an advanced degree in science and engineering disciplines deemed critical to national security by the Department.

The committee continues to believe that future U.S. technical dominance relies on a rapid, well-managed infusion of defense science and engineering personnel who are experts in 21st century defense-related critical skills. The committee authorizes the Department's budget request of \$10.3 million for the SMART defense education program for fiscal year 2006, which would more than double the number of scholarships and fellowships available for the next school year.

**Items of Special Interest**

**Comptroller General report on policy concerning Department of Defense civilians deployed in support of contingency operations**

The committee understands that the Department of Defense is increasingly reliant on civilian employees who volunteer to serve in



a theater of operation in support of military contingencies. The committee recognizes that guidelines and procedures have been established by the Department of Defense, applicable to civilians, covering roles, responsibilities, pay, compensation, and support in the event of injury or death. The committee believes that a review of current policy, procedures, and guidelines regarding civilian employees serving in support of contingency operations is warranted.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to conduct a review of Department policies concerning deployment of civilian employees in support of contingency operations. The review should include:

- (1) an examination of compliance by Department of Defense components with department-wide policies on deployment of civilian employees to Iraq and Afghanistan;
- (2) examination of lessons learned from those deployments regarding deployment of Department civilian personnel;
- (3) a comparison of mission, roles, and compensation for Department civilian personnel with those for military personnel; and
- (4) such recommendations as the Comptroller General concludes are appropriate regarding policies and benefits for Department civilian employees serving in support of contingency operations.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to deliver the required review to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2006.



## **TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS**

### **Commanders' Emergency Response Program (sec. 1201)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use up to \$500.0 million in operations and maintenance funding in each of fiscal years 2006 and 2007 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, 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 committee 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 that the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) issued 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 committee notes that the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) required the Secretary to submit a report within 120 days of enactment to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives identifying all provisions of law that, if not waived, would prohibit, restrict, limit, or otherwise constrain implementation of the CERP program in Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee has not yet received that report and directs that it be provided expeditiously.

### **Enhancement and expansion of authority to provide humanitarian and civic assistance (sec. 1202)**

The committee recommends a provision that would expand the current authority of the Secretary of Defense to provide humanitarian and civic assistance in conjunction with military operations to include: (1) an increase to \$10.0 million in funding that may be used to conduct detection and clearance of landmines and other unexploded remnants of war; (2) authority to restore or develop the capacity of the host nation's information and communications infrastructure as necessary to provide basic information and commu-

nications services; and (3) authority to provide training, education, and technical assistance related to medical, dental, and veterinary care that is provided as part of humanitarian and civic assistance.

The provision would acknowledge that restoration or development of basic information and communications capacity should be considered a fundamental element of humanitarian and civic assistance, and that a functioning information and communications infrastructure is vital to the successful conduct of humanitarian missions. The provision would also acknowledge that medical, dental, and veterinary care provided to the host nation can be sustained and enhanced by the provision of related education, training, and technical assistance. Finally, the provision would recognize that the cost of equipment for the detection and clearance of landmines continues to increase, and that funding to support such activities must be periodically adjusted.

**Modification of geographic limitation on payment of personnel expenses under bilateral or regional cooperation programs (sec. 1203)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide flexibility to combatant commanders to pay expenses for personnel from developing countries, even if the personnel are from a developing country that is not located within a combatant commander's area of responsibility.

**Payment of travel expenses of coalition liaison officers (sec. 1204)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1051a, title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to pay the travel expenses of certain foreign military officers assigned to U.S. combatant commands, component commands, or subordinate operational commands, when that travel is directed by the U.S. commander of such command in support of U.S. national interests. Additionally, the provision would extend the authority to provide administrative and fiscal support to coalition liaison officers through fiscal year 2009.

The committee acknowledges that contemporary military operations are almost always conducted in conjunction with allied nations and that foreign military officers increasingly play critical planning and operational roles within U.S. military headquarters. The committee believes that providing reasonable fiscal support to certain foreign military officers to facilitate U.S. and coalition military operations is warranted and appropriate.

## **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 those authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this Act; and authorize the CTR funds to be available for obligation for three fiscal years.

### **Funding allocations (sec. 1302)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$415.5 million, the amount included in 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 2006 funds for a purpose other than the purposes described in each of the CTR program elements; and provide limited authority to exceed the amount authorized for a specific CTR program element.

### **Permanent waiver of restrictions on use of funds for threat reduction in states of the former Soviet Union (sec. 1303)**

The committee recommends a provision that would make permanent the President's authority to waive, on an annual basis, restrictions and eligibility requirements under the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (22 U.S.C. 5952) and section 502 of the Freedom Support Act (22 U.S.C. 5852). The President's current authority to waive these restrictions and requirements will expire on September 30, 2005. This provision would retain the requirements under the previous authority that, for any year in which a waiver is exercised, the President must submit a written certification to Congress that the waiver is important to the national security interests of the United States and a report. The report should explain: why a state does not satisfy the eligibility requirements; why a waiver is in the U.S. national security interests; and what the President's strategy is for promoting the commitment of that state to meeting the eligibility requirements for Cooperative Threat Reduction and Freedom Support Act assistance.

### **Modification of authority to use Cooperative Threat Reduc- tion funds outside the former Soviet Union (sec. 1304)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authority of the Department of Defense to use Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) funds outside the former Soviet Union by changing the existing requirement for a presidential determination and

certification to a requirement for a determination and certification made by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees not later than 15 days before obligating CTR funds pursuant to this authority.

The committee recommends this provision in order to increase the flexibility of the Department of Defense to respond quickly to an urgent new requirement for using CTR funds in an important nonproliferation project or activity outside of the former Soviet Union.

The committee believes that CTR funds should continue to be used primarily for the purpose of reducing weapons of mass destruction and proliferation threats from the states of the former Soviet Union. However, the committee supports the use of CTR funds outside of the former Soviet Union in order to address a specific, unanticipated and urgent threat, such as the recent use of this authority to assist in the destruction of newly discovered chemical weapons stocks in Albania. The committee expects that should a project or activity initiated pursuant to this authority require additional funding in future years, that specific project or activity would be budgeted for and would appear as a separate CTR program element in the President's budget request for future fiscal years.

The committee is supportive of the President's Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) and urges the Department to establish a separate funding line for that purpose, should it be required. The committee does not believe that PSI activities in states outside of the former Soviet Union should be funded with CTR funds as a routine matter.

**Repeal of requirement for annual Comptroller General assessment of annual Department of Defense report on activities and assistance under Cooperative Threat Reduction programs (sec. 1305)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the requirement for the Comptroller General to provide to Congress an assessment of the annual Department of Defense report to Congress on the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs. The committee has been satisfied with the thoroughness of the Department annual reports on the CTR programs over the past several years. The annual assessments from the Comptroller General have confirmed that the Department annual reports have been comprehensive and accurate, and have met the requirements of the legislation mandating their submission to Congress. Therefore, the committee believes there is no reason to maintain the requirement for a Comptroller General assessment of the annual Department reports to Congress on the CTR programs.

## **TITLE XIV—AUTHORIZATION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR IRAQ, AFGHANISTAN, AND THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM**

### **Overview**

The committee recommends a supplemental authorization of \$50.0 billion in funds to be appropriated for fiscal year 2006 to support operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the global war on terrorism. The committee notes that H. Con. Res. 95 of the 109th Congress, establishing the congressional budget for the Government for fiscal year 2006 and setting forth budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005 and 2007 through 2010, included \$50.0 billion for fiscal year 2006 in anticipation of additional needs in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the global war on terrorism. Providing authorization of these funds in advance of need ensures our troops in the field will be given adequate resources to meet ongoing demands of current military operations and any emergent needs of the ongoing global war on terrorism.

### **Summary table of authorization**

The following table summarizes authorizations included in this title for ongoing operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the global war on terrorism for fiscal year 2006.

**Title XIV EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
<b>PROCUREMENT</b>	
<b>Aircraft Procurement, Army</b>	
UH-60 Black Hawk helicopter MEDEVAC Kits (10)	50,000
UH-60 Black Hawk helicopter attrition (2)	20,300
<b>Total Aircraft Procurement, Army</b>	<b>70,300</b>
<b>Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles Procurement, Army</b>	
M-107 .50 caliber sniper rifle	9,300
M249 SAW machine gun mods - RFI	5,800
Medium machine gun modifications - RFI	9,200
Soldier Enhancement Program - RFI	3,500
<b>Total Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles , Army</b>	<b>27,800</b>
<b>Other Procurement, Army</b>	
Up-armored M1151/M1152 HMMWVs or wheeled vehicle add-on armor	120,000
Mounted Battle Command on the Move	30,000
AN/PAQ-4 Aiming Light - Night Vision Equipment	32,100
Target acquisition laser observation night devices	53,400
Thermal Weapon System - Night Vision Equipment	31,600
Lightweight Laser Designation Rangefinders	4,600
<b>Total Other Procurement, Army</b>	<b>271,700</b>



## Title XIV EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
<b>Aircraft Procurement, Navy</b>	
UH-1Y attrition	74,000
UH-1 government furnished equipment	10,800
CH-53E night vision system FLIR kits	9,600
Low Band transmitters for EA-6B Aircraft	16,400
EA-6B Improved Capabilities III	73,000
<b>Total Aircraft Procurement, Navy</b>	<b>183,800</b>
<b>Weapons Procurement, Navy</b>	
Hellfire missiles	122,000
Small arms	36,800
Pioneer UAV engines and avionics	6,700
<b>Total Weapons Procurement, Navy</b>	<b>165,500</b>
<b>Procurement of Ammunition, Navy &amp; Marine Corps</b>	
Dual mode laser guided training bombs	2,000
Small arms and landing party ammunition	16,000
M80/M62 7.62mm cartridge	1,500
.50 caliber linked armor piercing cartridge with tracer	13,000
M430 40mm high explosive dual purpose	30,000
M830A1 120mm high explosive with tracer cartridge	10,000
XM1028 120mm tank cartridge	3,000
M72A7 66mm high explosive rocket	11,000
MK154 non-electric detonator	10,000
M762A1 electric time fuze	2,000
M782 multi-option fuze for artillery	6,000
<b>Total Procurement of Ammunition, Navy &amp; Marine Corps</b>	<b>104,500</b>

**Title XIV EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
<b>Other Procurement, Navy</b>	
EOD equipment for naval coastal warfare units	7,000
Amphibious equipment for naval coastal warfare units	8,300
Expanded outfitting for maritime interdiction operations	4,300
Visit, Board, Search and Seizure Trainer	11,200
<b>Total Other Procurement, Navy</b>	<b>30,800</b>
<b>Procurement, Marine Corps</b>	
Guided MLRS pods for HiMARS	54,400
TPS-59(V3) radar system array rebuild	7,500
Enhanced position location reporting system	17,900
Hardened Engineer Vehicles	9,400
<b>Total Procurement, Marine Corps</b>	<b>89,200</b>
<b>Aircraft Procurement, Air Force</b>	
C-5 aircraft missile warning system upgrade	7,700
C-17 aircraft infrared measures	97,000
<b>Total Aircraft Procurement, Air Force</b>	<b>104,700</b>
<b>Other Procurement, Air Force</b>	
Mobile approach control system	51,900
<b>Total Other Procurement, Air Force</b>	<b>51,900</b>
<b>Total Procurement</b>	<b>1,100,200</b>

## Title XIV EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
<b>OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE</b>	
<b>Operation and Maintenance, Army</b>	
Incremental wartime costs	21,000,735
Army active end strength increase	1,081,640
Body armor	57,400
Army linguistic support /a	[200,000]
<b>Total Operations and Maintenance, Army</b>	<b>22,139,775</b>
<b>Operation and Maintenance, Navy</b>	
Incremental wartime costs	1,911,000
Expanded maritime interdiction ops trng and outfitting	6,200
Small caliber wpns and mounts repair and replacement	24,000
Body armor	3,100
<b>Total Operations and Maintenance, Navy</b>	<b>1,944,300</b>
<b>Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps</b>	
Incremental wartime costs	1,717,800
Marine Corps active end strength increase	31,431
Field medical equipment	19,000
M1A1 tank depot Maintenance	40,000
<b>Total Operations and Maintenance, Marine Corps</b>	<b>1,808,231</b>
<b>Operation and Maintenance, Air Force</b>	
Incremental wartime costs	2,580,655
Body armor	54,900
<b>Total Operations and Maintenance, Air Force</b>	<b>2,635,555</b>

**Title XIV EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<b>Program Title</b>	<b>Senate Authorized</b>
<b>Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide</b>	
Incremental wartime costs	3,348,721
Army active end strength increase	116,000
Marine Corps active end strength increase	5,397
<b>Total Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide</b>	<b>3,470,118</b>
<b>Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve</b>	
Body armor	2,400
<b>Total Operations and Maintenance, Navy Reserve</b>	<b>2,400</b>
<b>Total Operation and Maintenance</b>	<b>32,000,379</b>
<b>OTHER PROGRAMS</b>	
<b>Defense Health Program</b>	
Incremental wartime costs	702,163
Army active end strength increase	258,200
Marine Corps active end strength increase	17,415
<b>Total Defense Health Program</b>	<b>977,778</b>
<b>Total Other Programs</b>	<b>977,778</b>
<b>MILITARY PERSONNEL</b>	
<b>Military Personnel, Army</b>	
Army incremental wartime costs	6,990,123
Army active end strength increase	2,527,520
<b>Total Military Personnel, Army</b>	<b>9,517,643</b>

# **Title XIV EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION**

(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Program Title</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
<b>Military Personnel, Navy</b>	
Navy incremental wartime costs	350,000
<b>Total Military Personnel, Navy</b>	<b>350,000</b>
<b>Military Personnel, Marine Corps</b>	
Marine Corps incremental wartime costs	641,200
Marine Corps active end strength increase	170,571
<b>Total Military Personnel, Marine Corps</b>	<b>811,771</b>
<b>Military Personnel, Air Force</b>	
Air Force incremental wartime costs	916,559
<b>Total Military Personnel, Marine Corps</b>	<b>916,559</b>
<b>Total Military Personnel</b>	<b>11,595,973</b>
<b>Iraq Freedom Fund (IFF)</b>	<b>4,325,670</b>
Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Task Force /a,b	[500,000]
Transfer Authority /a	[2,500,000]
<b>Total</b>	<b>50,000,000</b>

a/ Values in brackets are non-additive

b/ Of the funds available in the IFF and only for the IED Task Force

**Purpose (sec. 1401)**

This section would establish this title as an authorization of appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2006, in addition to the amounts otherwise authorized in this Act \$50.0 billion to be available for activities in support of operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the global war on terrorism.

**Designation as emergency amounts (sec. 1402)**

This section designates the authorization of appropriations in this title as an emergency requirement in accordance with H. Con. Res. 95 of the 109th Congress.

**Army procurement (sec. 1403)**

This section would authorize an additional \$369.8 million for fiscal year 2006 Army procurement.

Of these funds, the committee recommends \$120.0 million be provided to acquire additional up armored high (UAH) mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles, wheeled vehicle add-on armor protection, or M1151/M1152 high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles (HMMWV), if the requirement for such vehicles is identified by a combatant commander and validated by the Secretary of the Army. The committee understands that the M1151/M1152 HMMWV is an improved version of the standard HMMWV. The M1151/M1152 HMMWV has a heavier chassis and improved engine that enable the use of removable add-on armor protection that provides the Army greater flexibility when deploying units. M1151/M1152 provides the same level of protection as an UAH.

Providing armored vehicles to our Armed Forces deployed in contingency operations has been an issue of great concern to this committee for the past two years. While the committee acknowledges that there were problems in rapidly supplying UAH and add-on armor for Army and Marine Corps tactical wheeled vehicles when the insurgency began in Iraq in the fall of 2003, the committee also commends the Department of Defense for taking aggressive steps to satisfy the evolving force protection requirements of U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM).

The Congress also responded quickly to the force protection requirements of CENTCOM. From fiscal year 2003 to fiscal year 2005, the Congress added \$1.9 billion to the President's requests to increase UAH production and almost \$1.6 billion to increase the production of add-on armor protection for tactical wheeled vehicles for the Army and Marine Corps. In the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief Act, 2005 (H.R. 1268, as adopted by the House of Representatives on May 5, 2005 and the Senate on May 10, 2005), the Congress added \$150.0 million for up-armored HMMWVs and \$610.9 million for add-on armor for tactical wheeled vehicles. With this funding, all current CENTCOM UAH and add-on armor requirements will be addressed.

The committee understands that UAH and add-on armor requirements are continuously under review. If the Commander, U.S. CENTCOM should submit an urgent needs statement for additional UAH or add-on armor, the committee believes that the Secretary should have funds immediately available to address that re-

quirement. The committee recommends an increase of \$120.0 million in Other Procurement, Army, to provide the Secretary with the flexibility to immediately address any additional CENTCOM requirements for armored vehicles or add-on armor.

**Navy and Marine Corps procurement (sec. 1404)**

This section would authorize an additional \$573.8 million for fiscal year 2006 Navy and Marine Corps procurement.

**Air Force procurement (sec. 1405)**

This section would authorize an additional \$156.6 million for fiscal year 2006 Air Force procurement.

**Operation and Maintenance (sec. 1406)**

This section would authorize an additional \$32.0 billion for fiscal year 2006 operation and maintenance programs.

Of the additional \$22.1 billion authorized for fiscal year 2006 in Operation and Maintenance, Army, the committee recommends that \$200.0 million may be utilized to obtain linguistic support for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The committee is aware of an urgent need for additional linguistic support to military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Commander, U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), has identified this shortfall in communications with the Department of Defense and in testimony before the committee. The committee urges the Department of the Army to address this urgent requirement of the Commander, CENTCOM.

**Defense Health Program (sec. 1407)**

This section would authorize an additional \$977.8 million to the Defense Health Program for operation and maintenance for fiscal year 2006.

**Military personnel (sec. 1408)**

This section would authorize an additional \$11.6 billion for fiscal year 2006 to the Department of Defense for military personnel. As described elsewhere in this report, some of this funding provides for the additional cost of increased Army and Marine Corps personnel end strength.

**Iraq Freedom Fund (sec. 1409)**

This section would authorize an additional \$4.3 billion for an Iraqi Freedom Fund to be available until expended for activities in support of operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the global war on terrorism. These funds would be available for transfer to other accounts in this title, subject to a 5 day prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

Of the amounts provided in this section, not less than \$500.0 million is dedicated to the support of activities of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Task Force. The funding provided for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Task Force would ensure the rapid development and deployment of intelligence; tactics, techniques and procedures (TTP); training; and the associated procurement of equipment to counter IEDs in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The budget request included no funding for the procurement of Improvised Explosive Device (IED) countermeasures. The committee has closely monitored the efforts of the Department of Defense to provide force protection capabilities to our soldiers and Marines in Iraq and Afghanistan for countering the threat posed by IEDs. In October 2003, the Chief of Staff of the Army directed the formation of an IED task force to orchestrate Army efforts to eliminate IED threats, recommend best available responses, and direct the development and fielding of selected solutions. In June 2004, the Commander, U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) asked the Secretary of Defense for an integrated Department response to the IED threat. On July 12, 2004, the Deputy Secretary of Defense approved the establishment of an Army-led Joint IED Defeat Integrated Process Team (IPT), which was organized around the existing Army IED Task Force, to immediately focus all counter-IED efforts within the Department.

The committee understands that the IPT identifies, prioritizes, and resources materiel and non-materiel solutions to the IED threat in a coordinated response across the services and the Department. The IPT, augmented by Joint Service staff, performs the counter-IED operational mission as the Joint IED Defeat Task Force (TF).

The committee understands that the Joint IED TF has expended much effort and funding to provide electronic countermeasure systems for the protection of U.S. convoys in Iraq and is working to procure thousands of additional jamming devices. The committee also understands that the procurement of current technology must be supplemented by the development of new counter-IED devices and employment of innovative techniques, tactics and procedures. The committee believes that the Joint IED TF should have dedicated funding to facilitate the rapid development of new technology and the rapid deployment of current IED countermeasures.

#### **Transfer authority (sec. 1410)**

This section would provide fiscal year 2006 transfer authority of \$2.5 billion to the Department of Defense for the authorizations contained in this title.

### **Budget Items**

#### **UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters**

The budget request included \$562.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA), for 41 UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters, including \$61.0 million for six UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters lost in Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). The Army has lost 13 UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters since the onset of OIF and OEF. Using October 1, 2004 as a cutoff date, the Army requested \$50.8 million in the fiscal year 2005 supplemental budget for five UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters lost in OIF and OEF. The committee notes that the Army has an unfunded requirement for the replacement of two UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters; therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$20.3 million in APA, for two additional UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters, for a total authorization of \$582.3.



### **UH-60 Black Hawk helicopter modifications**

The budget request included \$33.3 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA), for UH-60 Black Hawk helicopter modifications, but included no funding for HH-60L Black Hawk helicopter Medical Evacuation (MEDEVAC) Medical Equipment Packages (MEP). The Army has a requirement for 336 HH-60L MEDEVAC helicopters, including 156 MEDEVAC helicopters in the Active component and 180 MEDEVAC helicopters in the Reserve component, but only 24 HH-60L MEDEVAC helicopters in the inventory or scheduled for delivery in fiscal year 2005. The committee understands that the Army is using over 300 UH-60A Black Hawk helicopters without MEP kits to perform MEDEVAC missions, of which 75 are currently deployed in support of Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. Given the shortfall in MEDEVAC helicopters and the high operational demand, the committee recommends an increase of \$50.0 million in APA, for 10 additional HH-60L MEP kits, for a total authorization of \$83.3 million.

### **M107 sniper rifle**

The budget request included \$9.7 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV), for the procurement of the M-107 .50 caliber sniper rifle. The M107 sniper rifle provides a man-portable, material destruction capability that enables sniper teams to employ greater destructive force at greater ranges and at a higher rate of fire that exceed the terminal effect capability of the M24 Sniper Weapon System. The Army has an inventory objective of 3,143 M107 sniper weapons but only has 1,300 fielded to soldiers in support of Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. Additional funding for the M107 sniper rifle is on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$9.3 million in WTCV, for 774 additional M107 sniper rifles, for a total authorization of \$19.0 million.

### **Rapid fielding initiative**

The budget request included \$15.4 million in Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles Army (WTCV), to procure ancillary small arms equipment as part of the Rapid Fielding Initiative (RFI), an Army program to respond quickly to individual soldier equipment requirements and to provide soldiers engaged in or preparing for Operation Iraqi Freedom and other operations, with state-of-the-art individual weapons, clothing, and equipment, including radios. Additional funding for this initiative is on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list. The committee continues to support this worthwhile program and remains committed to ensuring that the individual soldier, Active and Reserve, is personally equipped for advantage in combat and contingency operations. The committee recommends an increase of \$18.5 million in WTCV to procure M240B medium machine gun, M249 squad automatic weapon, and Soldier Enhancement Program ancillary equipment, for a total authorization of \$33.9 million for the RFI.

### **Night vision enhancements**

The budget request included \$247.4 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA), for the procurement of night vision enhance-

ments, including \$16.6 million for the AN/PAQ-4 laser aiming light, \$42.9 million for the AN/PVS-6 Mini Eyesafe Laser Infrared Observation Set and the Target Acquisition Laser Observation Night (TALON) device, and \$83.7 million for the night vision thermal weapon sight (TWS). Lessons learned from Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom have shown that night vision equipment increases survivability and lethality of soldiers in combat and has been used for force protection missions, convoy operations, and perimeter security missions. Additional funding for the procurement of AN/PAQ-4 laser aiming lights, TALONs, and TWSs has been identified on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$117.1 million in OPA for the procurement of 40,182 aiming lights, 712 TALONs, and 2,528 TWSs, for a total authorization of \$364.5 million.

#### **Lightweight laser designation rangefinder**

The budget request included \$12.7 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA), for the procurement of the Lightweight Laser Designation Rangefinder (LLDR), a man-portable, modular system designed for day and night, all weather target acquisition. The LLDR meets a critical requirement for precision target location and engagement for artillery fire support teams and is in high demand in Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. Additional funding for LLDR procurement is on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.6 million in OPA for the procurement of 15 additional LLDRs, for a total authorization of \$17.3 million.

#### **Mounted battle command on the move**

The budget request included \$870,000 in Other Procurement, Army (OPA), for the Mounted Battle Command on the Move (MBCOTM) system, which provides a battle command platform for maneuver commanders for echelons from cavalry squadron through unit of employment. The MBTCOM will be hosted on the Bradley Fighting Vehicle, the Stryker Command Vehicle, and the High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV). The MBCOTM will provide commanders with an automated tactical command post for mobile operations, rather than relying on a fixed site command post. The committee understands that the Army intends to field this capability in fiscal year 2006 for units deploying to Operation Iraqi Freedom. Additional funding for MBCOTM procurement has been identified on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$30.0 in OPA for the procurement of 15 MBTCOM systems to be mounted on the HMMWV, for a total authorization of \$30.9 million.

The committee notes that the Marine Corps has a similar initiative for on-the-move communications under the Control On-The-Move Network, Digital Over the Horizon Relay program and encourages the Army-Marine Corps Board to review these programs for cooperative development and efficiencies.

### **UH-1Y helicopters**

The budget request included \$307.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for the procurement of UH-1Y and AH-1Z helicopters. There is no UH-1 manufacturing line to build helicopters to replace UH-1N helicopters lost in Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. However, the Marine Corps does have a program to acquire new-build UH-1Y helicopters as replacement aircraft. The program is currently in low-rate initial production. The Marine Corps needs to replace four aircraft lost during current operations. The committee recommends an increase of \$74.0 million in APN for four additional UH-1Y helicopters.

The Marine Corps needs to procure 18 sets of government furnished equipment (GFE) to retain the UH-1N utility helicopters until new UH-1Y helicopters are procured. Without this funding, the operational force inventory will be reduced by 14 UH-1Ns for 12 months until UH-1Ys can be delivered. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.8 million in APN for UH-1 GFE.

The committee notes that the procurement of UH-1Y helicopters and government furnished equipment are on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends a total authorization of \$392.3 million in APN, for the procurement of UH-1Y and AH-1Z helicopters.

### **EA-6B ICAP III**

The budget request included \$120.6 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for modifications to the EA-6B, including \$52.2 million for the procurement of Improved Capabilities III (ICAP III) systems modifications.

The EA-6B is a high-demand, low-density key enabler for joint combat operations. The ICAP III systems modification removes over 70 aging and unreliable weapons replaceable assemblies (WRAs). The procurement of seven additional EA-6B ICAP III kits meets the Navy's minimum requirement for ICAP III equipped EA-6B aircraft. Procurement of ICAP III is included on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$73.0 million in APN for the procurement of seven additional EA-6B ICAP III kits.

### **Low band transmitters for EA-6B aircraft**

The budget request included \$120.6 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for modifications to the EA-6B aircraft, including \$9.6 million for procurement of low band transmitters. The EA-6B is a high-demand, low-density electronic warfare aircraft that is being heavily used in the global war on terrorism. The low band transmitter gives the EA-6B aircraft expanded jamming capability and is more reliable and maintainable than the current system. The procurement of additional EA-6B aircraft low band transmitters has been included on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$16.4 million in APN for the procurement of 11 EA-6B aircraft low band transmitters to ensure sufficient numbers are available to support critical global war on terrorism missions.

### **CH-53E Helicopter Night Vision Systems**

The budget request included \$14.9 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy, for H-3 helicopter modifications, including \$600,000 for the procurement of CH-53E Helicopter Night Vision System (HNVS) Forward Looking Infrared (FLIR) kits. The committee notes that, currently, the Marine Corps has 71 FLIRs to share among 148 aircraft, with 26 on contract to be delivered in fiscal years 2005 and 2006. Another 51 aircraft have FLIR installation provisions, but do not have FLIR turrets to install. The HNVS FLIR improves the CH-53's ability to operate in night operations in the austere mountainous and desert terrain typical of the U.S. Central Command area of operations. Additional funding for HNVS FLIR procurement for the CH-53 helicopter is on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$9.6 million in APN for the procurement of 16 additional HNVS FLIRs, for a total authorization of \$24.5 million.

### **Hellfire missiles**

The budget request included no funds in Weapons Procurement, Navy (WPN) for the procurement of AGM-114 Hellfire missiles. The Hellfire is a laser-guided missile primarily employed against point targets by Navy and Marine Corps rotary wing aircraft. Total Navy and Marine Corps use of the two variants of Hellfire in the global war on terrorism exceeds 900 missiles. The Navy's intent was to replace its inventory of these missiles with the Joint Common Missile, but this program has recently been terminated by the Department of Defense, and there is a projected inventory shortage of AGM-114 Hellfire missiles for the Marine Corps. Additional funding for Hellfire is included on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$122.0 million in WPN for the procurement of Hellfire missiles.

### **Small arms**

The budget request included \$22.6 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy (WPN) for the initial procurement, modernization, standardization, and stock replenishment of a wide variety of small arms and weapons. Fleet and joint force protection requirements have expanded as a result of the global war on terrorism. Explosive ordnance disposal teams and naval coastal warfare units, in particular, need small arms for their own protection. Additional funding for small arms has been included on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$36.8 million in WPN for the procurement of small arms.

### **Pioneer tactical unmanned aerial vehicle**

The budget request included \$1.9 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy (WPN) for modernization efforts for the Pioneer tactical unmanned aerial vehicle (TUAV). The Pioneer TUAV provides near real-time reconnaissance, surveillance, target acquisition, combat assessment, and battlefield management within line-of-sight of a ground control station. The Pioneer TUAV is being heavily used in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Additional funding for 12 Pioneer engines and avionics, due to its high usage rates, has been re-

quested on the Chief of Naval Operations' and the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.7 million in WPN for the procurement of engines and avionics for the Pioneer TUAV.

#### **Dual mode laser guided training bombs**

The budget request included \$24.6 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC), for dual mode laser guided training bombs. The committee notes that the dual mode laser guided training bomb improves the use of laser guided bombs (LGBs) in combat. The training bomb provides actual hardware for aircrews and tactics development at a reduced cost while maintaining inventories of LGBs. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PANMC for dual mode laser guided training practice bombs.

#### **Small arms and landing party ammunition**

The budget request included \$35.6 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC), for small arms and landing party ammunition. The committee notes that small arms training requirements for force protection, homeland defense, maritime interdiction operations, and security force operations have increased by 50 percent since the commencement of the global war on terrorism. Additional funding for small arms and landing party ammunition has been identified on the Chief of Naval Operations unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$16.0 million in PANMC for small arms and landing party ammunition.

#### **M80/M62 7.62mm cartridge**

The budget request included \$7.9 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC), for the Cartridge M80 7.62mm four-ball cartridge and one tracer M62 linked. According to Marine Corps officials, this munition is currently experiencing an extremely high rate of use in operations in support of the global war on terrorism. Additional funding for the Cartridge M80 7.62mm four-ball cartridge and one tracer M62 linked has been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase in PANMC of \$1.5 million for the M80 7.62mm four-ball cartridge and one tracer M62 linked.

#### **.50 caliber linked armor piercing cartridge with tracer**

The budget request included \$28.0 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC), for the .50 caliber linked armor piercing cartridge with tracer. Additional funding for the .50 caliber linked armor piercing cartridge with tracer has been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list. Marine Corps officials also note that this munition is currently experiencing an extremely high rate of use in support of the global war on terrorism. The committee recommends an increase of \$13.0 million in PANMC for the .50 caliber linked armor piercing cartridge with tracer.

**M430 40mm high explosive dual purpose**

The budget request included \$40.7 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC), for the M430 40mm high explosive dual purpose cartridge. According to Marine Corps officials, this munition is currently experiencing an extremely high rate of use in support of the global war on terrorism. Additional funding for the M430 40mm high explosive dual purpose cartridge has been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$30.0 million in PANMC for the M430 40mm high explosive dual purpose cartridge.

**M830A1 120mm high explosive with tracer cartridge**

The budget request included no funding in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC), for the M830A1 120mm high explosive with tracer cartridge. According to Marine Corps officials, this munition is extremely effective against buildings, bunkers, and light armored vehicles and experienced an extremely high usage rate in Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. Additional funding for the M830A1 120mm high explosive with tracer cartridge has been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list in order to replenish deleted stocks and ensure proper munitions inventory. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PANMC for the M830A1 120mm high explosive with tracer cartridge.

**XM1028 120mm tank cartridge**

The budget request included no funding in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC), for the XM1028 120mm tank cartridge. The committee notes the utility of the XM1028 120mm canister round in improving the M1A1 Main Battle Tank's urban warfare capability, improving its survivability against massed assaulting infantry with hand held anti-tank and automatic weapons. Additional funding for the XM1028 120mm tank cartridge has been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PANMC for the XM1028 120mm tank cartridge in support of the Marine Corps' total munition requirement.

**M72A7 66mm high explosive rocket**

The budget request included no funding in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC), for the M72A7 66mm high explosive rocket. According to Marine Corps officials, this munition was recently identified as an urgent requirement in support of the global war on terrorism. Additional funding for the M72A7 66mm high explosive rocket has been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$11.0 million in PANMC for the M72A7 66mm high explosive rocket.

**MK154 non-electric detonator**

The budget request included no funding in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC), for the MK154 non-

electric detonator. The committee notes that the budget request procures only 4 percent of the approved acquisition objective (AAO) of the MK154 non-electric detonator. The committee believes that constrained procurement of the MK 154 non-electric detonator can be problematic given the usage rates in support of the global war on terrorism. Additional funding for the MK154 non-electric detonator has been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list in order to increase procurement toward the AAO and ensure proper munitions inventory. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PANMC for the MK154 non-electric detonator.

#### **M762A1 electronic time fuze**

The budget request included no funding in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC), for the M762A1 electronic time fuze. The committee notes that the M762A1 is replacing less capable fuzes in the inventory. Additional funding for the M762A1 electronic time fuze has been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PANMC for the M762A1 electronic time fuze.

#### **M782 multi-option fuze for artillery**

The budget request included \$2.2 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC), for the M782 multi-option fuze for artillery. The committee notes that the M782 multi-option fuze for artillery is the replacement for five different types of fuzes in the current Marine Corps inventory. Additional funding for the M782 multi-option fuze for artillery has been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in PANMC for the M782 multi-option fuze for artillery.

#### **Explosive ordnance disposal equipment allowance for naval coastal warfare units**

The budget request included \$28.4 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) for explosive ordnance disposal equipment. Naval coastal warfare (NCW) units are being heavily used in the global war on terrorism, with NCW mobile inshore undersea warfare units providing the security for the oil platforms in much of the U.S. Central Command's area of responsibility. These units have certain explosive ordnance disposal equipment shortages, including cargo trucks, generators, forklifts, and water trailers. Additional funding for this equipment has been requested on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.0 million in OPN for explosive ordnance disposal equipment for naval coastal warfare units.

#### **Amphibious equipment allowance for naval coastal warfare units**

The budget request included \$149.7 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) for amphibious equipment. Naval coastal warfare (NCW) units are being heavily used in the global war on terrorism, with NCW mobile inshore undersea warfare units providing

the security for the oil platforms in much of the U.S. Central Command's area of responsibility. These units have identified shortages of cargo trucks, generators, forklifts, and water trailers. Additional funding for this equipment has been included on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.3 million in OPN for amphibious equipment for naval coastal warfare units.

#### **Equipment and trainer for maritime interdiction operations**

The budget request included \$60.8 million for command support equipment in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN). A key mission for the Navy in the global war on terrorism has been to conduct maritime interdiction operations (MIO), where naval teams visit, board, and search vessels, some of which are non-compliant. Additional funding is required to improve the MIO teams' abilities to protect themselves from terrorist-related threats. Additional funding for the necessary weapons, body armor, helmets, communications gear, breaching and boarding equipment, and medical supplies has been requested on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. The Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list also requests additional funding for a visit, board, search and seizure trainer (VBSST) at the Navy Center for Anti-terrorism. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.3 million in OPN for the procurement of the necessary MIO equipment, and an increase of \$11.2 million in OPN for the procurement of the VBSTT.

#### **High mobility artillery rocket system**

The budget request included \$176.8 million in Procurement, Marine Corps (PMC), for the High Mobility Artillery Rocket System (HIMARS). HIMARS provides Marine forces immediate, precision fires with its 24 hour, all weather long-range precision strike capability. The committee understands that with additional funding the Marine Corps could accelerate the fielding of a guided munitions capability, by procuring Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System (GMLRS) rockets. GMLRS rockets are the tactical munitions for HIMARS. With these rockets, the Marine Corps could accelerate HIMARS fielding within 18 months to support the global war on terrorism, particularly Operation Iraqi Freedom. Additional funding for procurement of GMLRS rockets is on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$54.4 million in PMC, for the procurement of 480 GMLRS rockets, for a total authorization of \$231.2 million.

#### **AN/TPS-59(V3) radar system array rebuild**

The budget request included \$12.2 million in Procurement, Marine Corps (PMC), for radar systems, including \$5.6 million for the rebuild of one AN/TPS-59(V3) radar system array. The AN/TPS-59 radar is a critical low-density item being used extensively in current global war on terror operations. The AN/TPS-59(V)3 radar system is the only long-range, three-dimensional surveillance radar in the Marine Corps inventory. The high ops tempo and harsh environmental conditions of Operation Iraqi Freedom have caused antennas to degrade and require additional maintenance. The Marine Corps requested funding to rebuild one AN/TPS-59(V3) radar in



fiscal year 2005, but the requirement remains unfunded. The committee believes that rebuilding two AN/TPS-59(V3) radars will allow the Marine Corps to maintain the reliability, availability, and maintainability of the radar. Additional funding for the rebuild of one additional AN/TPS-59(V3) is on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.5 million in PMC, for the AN/TPS-59(V3) radar system, for a total authorization of \$19.7 million.

#### **Enhanced position location reporting system**

The budget request included \$29.0 million in Procurement, Marine Corps (PMC), for radio systems, but included no funding for the Enhanced Position Location Reporting System (EPLRS), a tactical data radio which provides the only dedicated source of wireless data connectivity for tactical Marine Corps units above regimental level of command, extending to battalion and company level headquarters. The committee understands that the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) was intended to fill this capability gap, but the committee recently learned that JTRS development will be delayed for 30 months. The committee understands that additional funding would enable the Marine Corps to procure EPLRS radio sets, their associated network management platforms, and the increased requirement for EPLRS radio sets throughout Marine operating forces to support the expanded use of Command and Control On the Move Network Digital Over the Horizon Relay (CONDOR). This item is on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$17.9 million in PMC, for the procurement of 425 EPLRS radio sets, for a total authorization of \$46.9 million.

The committee strongly encourages the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration to immediately waive JTRS compliance for the procurement of EPLRS radios for the Marine Corps. The committee also notes that the Army has a similar initiative for on-the-move communications under the Mounted Battle Command on the Move program and encourages the Army-Marine Corps Board to review these programs for cooperative development and efficiencies.

#### **Explosive ordnance disposal equipment**

The budget request included \$42.6 million in Procurement, Marine Corps (PMC), for explosive ordnance disposal equipment, but included no funding for the hardened engineer vehicle. The Marine Corps has an immediate need for hardened engineer and explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) vehicles with a V-shaped hull designed to withstand both anti-personnel and anti-tank mine blasts and an nuclear, biological and radiological overpressure system. This item is on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$9.4 million in PMC for hardened engineer vehicles, for a total authorization of \$52.0 million.

#### **C-5 aircraft missile warning system upgrade**

The budget request included \$71.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for modifications to the C-5 aircraft, but

included no funding to upgrade the AAR-47 missile warning sets (MWSs) on the aircraft. With the proliferation of man-portable air defense systems, airlift aircraft are vulnerable to the shoulder-launched infrared surface-to-air missiles. The AAR-47 MWS is currently installed on 50 C-5B and one C-5A aircraft. An upgrade is available to this MWS which would provide a new processor, improved system sensors, a new control indicator unit, and a new laser warning detection system. Funding for this upgrade has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.7 million in OPAF to upgrade the AAR-47 MWS on the C-5 aircraft.

#### **C-17 aircraft infrared countermeasures**

The budget request included \$260.8 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (OPAF), for modifications to the C-17 aircraft, including \$84.5 million for the installation of the large aircraft infrared countermeasure system (LAIRCM). This 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 is included on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends funding this increase of \$97.0 million for the procurement of LAIRCM for the C-17 aircraft.

#### **Mobile approach control system**

The budget request included \$16.8 million in Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF), for air traffic control and landing systems, including \$11.8 million for the modification and refurbishment of the mobile approach control system (MACS), but included no funding for the procurement of MACS. MACS is a deployable radar approach control system that provides airspace control and precision approach control capability. The committee is concerned that the Air Force was unable to provide all of the MACS that were requested during Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. Procurement for MACS has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends funding an increase of \$51.9 million in OPAF for the procurement of three mobile approach control systems.

#### **Body armor**

The budget request included \$40.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for body armor, \$3.3 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), for body armor, \$2.2 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), for body armor, but no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), for body armor. Body armor, composed of outer tactical vests, small armor protective inserts, and deltoid armor protection, continues to provide superior personal protection to service members deployed in support of the global war on terrorism. The committee remains committed to ensuring that the individual soldier, sailor, airman, and Marine, Active and Reserve, has the equipment necessary to ensure individual safety and combat lethality across the full spectrum of operations. In addition, the committee believes

that recent technological advances in protective and safety equipment must be delivered to deployed service members as soon as possible.

The committee recommends an increase of \$117.8 million for interceptor body armor or body armor components including: \$57.4 million in OMA for enhanced SAPI plates; \$3.1 million in OMN for interceptor body armor; \$2.4 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve (OMNR), for interceptor body armor; and \$54.9 million in OMAF for deltoid armor protection. The committee expects that the Army will ensure the provision of enhanced SAPI plates to all members of the U.S. Armed Forces and appropriate civilian personnel deployed in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility.

#### **Expanded maritime interdiction operations training and outfitting**

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), for expanded maritime interdiction operations (MIO) training and outfitting. The committee notes that the Navy has an urgent requirement to train and outfit the MIO visit, board, search and seizure (VBSS) teams of 58 ships deploying in support of the global war on terrorism and the Proliferation Security Initiative. Additional funding for expanded MIO training and outfitting has been identified on the Chief of Staff of the Army unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.2 million in OMN for expanded maritime interdiction operations outfitting.

#### **Small caliber weapons and mounts repair and replacement**

The budget request included \$5.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), for the repair or replacement of small caliber weapons and weapon mounts. According to Navy officials, there has been a rapid growth in small caliber weaponry sustainment requirements due to the global war on terrorism. The committee understands that deployments of Naval Coastal Warfare personnel in support of Persian Gulf oil platform security and Naval Construction Force personnel in support of Iraq and Afghanistan infrastructure development has increased small caliber weapons readiness requirements. Additional funding for the repair or replacement of small caliber weapons and weapon mounts has been identified on the Chief of Naval Operations unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$24.0 million in OMN for the repair or replacement of small caliber weaponry and weapon mounts.

#### **Field medical equipment**

The budget request included \$6.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), for field medical equipment. According to Marine Corps officials, current medical inventories, which support operating rooms, aid stations, laboratories, and individual units, have been depleted in the conduct of contingency operations. Additional funding for field medical equipment has been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded prior-

ities list. The committee recommends an increase of \$19.0 million in OMMC for field medical equipment.

**M1A1 tank depot maintenance**

The budget request included \$9.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), for M1A1 tank depot maintenance. Additional funding for the M1A1 tank depot maintenance has been identified on the Commandant of the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list. According to Marine Corps officials, this unfunded priority supports the reset of tanks returning from contingency operations. The committee understands that average usage on tanks deployed in support of contingency operations is 3,000 kilometers per year. This is 10 times the quantity of miles historically executed in support of peacetime training. The committee also notes that the Marine Corps continues to effectively manage depot maintenance programs. The committee recommends an increase of \$40.0 million in OMMC for M1A1 tank depot maintenance.

## **DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS**

### **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 and military construction for the Reserve components, the defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment program. It also provides authorization for the base closure account that funds environmental cleanup and other activities associated with the implementation of 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.

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 included authorization of appropriations for military construction and housing programs totaling \$12,051,611,000. Of this amount, the budget request included authorization of appropriations for \$1,880,466,000 to implement the results of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment round. The amount authorized for appropriation is included in the following table in a line designated Base Realignment & Closure V.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations for military construction and housing programs totaling \$12,051,611,000. The total amount authorized for appropriations reflects this committee's commitment to continue a strong investment in the recapitalization of facilities and infrastructure in the United States, while continuing to invest prudently in overseas installations that are identified in the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy released by the President in September 2004 as enduring installations with firmly defined, long-term operational missions.

**Summary of FY 2006 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<b><u>Military Construction</u></b>	<b><u>President's Budget</u></b>	<b><u>Senate Change</u></b>	<b><u>Senate Authorized</u></b>
Military Construction, Army	1,479,841	124,172	1,604,013
Military Construction, Navy	1,029,249	73,417	1,102,666
Military Construction, Air Force	1,069,640	137,781	1,207,421
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	1,042,730	0	1,042,730
NATO Security Investment Program	206,858	0	206,858
BRAC IV	377,827	0	377,827
BRAC V	1,880,466	-376,000	1,504,466
Military Construction, Army National Guard	327,012	137,668	464,680
Military Construction, Air National Guard	165,256	80,605	245,861
Military Construction, Army Reserve	106,077	15,000	121,077
Military Construction, Navy & MC Reserve	45,226	5,000	50,226
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	<u>79,260</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>79,260</u>
<b>Total Military Construction</b>	<b>7,809,442</b>	<b>197,643</b>	<b>8,007,085</b>
<b><u>Family Housing</u></b>			
Family Housing Construction, Army	549,636	0	549,636
Family Housing Support, Army	812,993	0	812,993
Family Housing Construction, Navy	218,942	3,197	222,139
Family Housing Support, Navy	593,660	0	593,660
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	1,251,108	-108,486	1,142,622
Family Housing Support, Air Force	766,939	0	766,939
Family Housing Support, Defense-Wide	46,391	0	46,391
Family Housing Improvement Fund	<u>2,500</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2,500</u>
<b>Total Family Housing</b>	<b>4,242,169</b>	<b>-105,289</b>	<b>4,136,880</b>
<b>Total Authorization of Appropriations, Military Construction &amp; Family Housing</b>	<b>12,051,611</b>	<b>92,354</b>	<b>12,143,965</b>
<b>Prior Year Rescissions</b>		<b>-92,354</b>	<b>-92,354</b>
<b>Total Military Construction and Family Housing:</b>	<b>12,051,611</b>		<b>12,051,611</b>

**FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Location</u>	<u>Service/Agency</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>FY06 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Auth</u>
Alabama	USMC Reserve		ARNGRC Mobile	Reserve Training Center/Vehicle Maint Facility	7,463	700	8,163
Alabama	Army		Redstone Arsenal	System Software Engineering Annex, Ph 1		20,000	20,000
Alabama	Air Force		Maxwell AFB	SOC Lodging Facility	14,900	0	14,900
Alabama	Air National Guard		Montgomery AP	Replace Composite Operation & Training	9,100	0	9,100
Alaska	Army		Ft Richardson	Railhead Port Facility		4,700	4,700
Alaska	Army		Ft Wainwright	Barracks Complex	33,560	0	33,560
Alaska	Army		Ft Wainwright	Information Systems Facility		5,600	5,600
Alaska	Air Force		Clear AS	Dormitory (100 Room)	20,000	0	20,000
Alaska	Air National Guard		Eielson AFB	Construct Mobility Warehouse		5,900	5,900
Alaska	Air Force		Elmendorf AFB	C-17 Maintenance Complex, Phase 1	54,000	0	54,000
Alaska	Air Force		Elmendorf AFB	C-17 Add/Alter Survival Equipment Shop	820	0	820
Alaska	Air Force		Elmendorf AFB	F-15E Flight Simulator Facility		8,000	8,000
Alaska	Air Force Reserve		Elmendorf AFB	C-17 Convert Hangar for Group HQ	3,100	0	3,100
Arizona	Army		Yuma Proving Ground	Upgrade Wastewater Treatment Plant		8,100	8,100
Arizona	Marine Corps		MCAS Yuma	Rotary Wing Fueling Apron	3,637	0	3,637
Arizona	Air Force		Davis-Monthan AFB	CSAR Squadron Complex	8,600	0	8,600
Arizona	Air Force		Luke AFB	Dormitory (144 Room)	13,000	0	13,000
Arizona	DLA		MCAS Yuma	Rotary Wing Hydrant System	7,300	0	7,300
Arizona	Air Force Reserve		Davis-Monthan AFB	Alter Rescue Squadron Operations Facility	1,500	0	1,500
Arkansas	Air Force		Little Rock AFB	Parallel Taxiway AALZ	2,500	0	2,500
Arkansas	National Guard		Camp Robinson	Regional Training Institute Complex, Ph 1		5,608	5,608
California	Army		Ft Irwin	Land Acquisition, Phase 3	5,000	0	5,000
California	Army		Ft Irwin	Military Operations Urban Terrain, Phase 1	12,000	0	12,000
California	Army		NWS Concord	Upgrade Outload Facilities	3,250	0	3,250
California	Army		NWS Concord	Pier Security Upgrade	8,600	0	8,600
California	Navy		NAF El Centro	Apron & Hangar, Increment 2	18,666	0	18,666
California	Navy		NAS Lemoore	Replace Air Traffic Control Tower	8,480	0	8,480
California	Navy		NAS North Island	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - Shipboard Ashore	13,700	-13,700	0

FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing (Dollars in Thousands)						
<u>Location</u>	<u>Service/Agency</u>		<u>Installation</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>FY06 Senate</u>	
	<u>Program</u>	<u>Request</u>			<u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u>
California	Navy		NAWC China Lake	Advanced Sensor Lab	19,158	19,158
California	Marine Corps		MCAS Camp Pendleton	Flight Line Security Fence	1,400	1,400
California	Marine Corps		MCB Camp Pendleton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	19,620	21,620
California	Marine Corps		MCB Camp Pendleton	Reclamation/Conveyance, Phase I	25,436	29,736
California	Marine Corps		MCB Camp Pendleton	Assault Breacher Vehicle Facility	5,160	5,660
California	Air Force		Beale AFB	Global Hawk Two Bay Maintenance Hangar	14,200	14,200
California	Air Force		Edwards AFB	Repair Mainbase Runway, Phase I	37,000	37,000
California	Air Force		Los Angeles AFB	Civil Engineering Administration Facility	2,500	2,500
California	Air Force		Travis AFB	C-17 Maintenance Training Facility	8,100	8,100
California	Air Force		Travis AFB	C-17 Add/Alter Composite Shop	3,200	3,200
California	Air Force		Travis AFB	C-17 Add/Alter Life Support	1,300	1,300
California	Air Force		Travis AFB	AMOG Global Reach Deployment Center	19,000	19,000
California	Air Force		Travis AFB	Aerospace Ground Equipment Shop	10,900	10,900
California	Air Force		Vandenberg AFB	Fitness Center	16,845	16,845
California	DLA		Def Dist Depot Tracy	Replace General Purpose Warehouse	33,635	33,635
California	SOCOM		Miramar	Replace Storage and Distribution System	23,000	23,000
California	SOCOM		NSWC Coronado	SOF Applied Instruction Facility (NSWC)	4,000	4,000
California	SOCOM		NSWC Coronado	SOF Seal Team Operation/Support Facility	11,000	11,000
California	SOCOM		NSWC Coronado	SOF Training Support Facilities (NSWC)	13,350	13,350
California	National Guard		Camp Luis Obispo	Dining Facility	8,599	8,599
California	National Guard		ANGRC Roseville	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	2,941	2,941
California	Air National Guard		Fresno	ASA-Fresno Alert Crew Quarters	3,000	3,000
California	Army Reserve		Ft Hunter Liggett	Urban Assault Course	1,500	1,500
California	Army Reserve		Ft Hunter Liggett	Shoot House	1,700	1,700
California	TRICARE		Beale AFB	Clinic Addition/Alteration	18,000	18,000
California	TRICARE		NAVHOSP San Diego	Patient Parking Facility	15,000	15,000
Colorado	Army		Ft Carson	Barracks Complex	25,522	25,522
Colorado	Army		Ft Carson	Shoot House (USASOC)	1,250	1,250



**FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Location</u>	<u>Service/Agency</u>		<u>Project Title</u>	<u>FY06</u>		<u>Senate</u>
	<u>Program</u>	<u>Installation</u>		<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Auth</u>
Colorado	Army	Ft Carson	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	28,000	0	28,000
Colorado	Army	Ft Carson	Shoot House	1,250	0	1,250
Colorado	Army	Ft Carson	A/DACG Complex, Phase 1B	14,600	0	14,600
Colorado	Air Force	Air Force Academy	Upgrade Academic Facility, Phase 4A	13,000	0	13,000
Colorado	Air Force	Buckley AFB	Leadership Development Facility	5,500	0	5,500
Colorado	Air Force	Buckley AFB	Add/Alter Communications Complex	10,600	0	10,600
Colorado	Air Force	Buckley AFB	Consolidated Services Facility	4,000	0	4,000
Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	West Gate Force Protection/Access	12,800	0	12,800
Colorado	TRICARE	Peterson AFB	Life Skills Support Center	1,820	0	1,820
Colorado	Air National Guard	Greeley ANG	Space Warning Squadron Support Facility		6,400	6,400
Connecticut	Navy	NSB New London	Crane Maintenance Facility		4,610	4,610
Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	C-17 Alter Facilities for Parts Storage	1,000	0	1,000
Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	Dormitory (144 Room)	13,000	0	13,000
Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	C-17 Flight Simulator Facility	5,000	0	5,000
Delaware	National Guard	New Castle	Army Aviation Support Facility		5,780	5,780
Distr Columbia	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Force Protection Main Gate	4,500	0	4,500
Distr Columbia	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Construct Operations Facility	10,400	0	10,400
Distr Columbia	DIA	Bolling AFB	Install PEPCO Feeder Line	7,900	0	7,900
Florida	Navy	NAS Jacksonville	Helo Hangar Replacement, Increment 1	45,179	0	45,179
Florida	Navy	NAS Pensacola	Water Treatment Facility	8,710	0	8,710
Florida	Navy	NDSTC Panama City	Joint Aquatic Combat Diving Training	9,678	0	9,678
Florida	Navy	NS Mayport	Expand Flight Trainer	2,930	0	2,930
Florida	Navy	NS Mayport	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - Shipboard Ashore	7,820	0	7,820
Florida	Navy	Whiting Field	Replace Control Tower		4,670	4,670
Florida	Air Force	Cape Canaveral	Satellite Processing Operations Support Facility		6,200	6,200
Florida	Air Force	Hurlburt Fld	Weapons Instructor Course Facility	2,540	0	2,540
Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Security Forces Facility	11,200	0	11,200
Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	CENTCOM Joint Intel Center	67,000	0	67,000

FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing (Dollars in Thousands)						
<i>Service/Agency</i>	<i>Program</i>	<i>Installation</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>FY06 Request</i>	<i>Senate Change</i>	<i>Senate Auth</i>
Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	Dormitory (120 Room)	9,000	0	9,000
Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	F/A-22 Add Fuels Maintenance	2,500	0	2,500
Florida	SOCOM	Eglin AFB	SOF Mobility/Ads Facility	12,800	0	12,800
Florida	Air Force Reserve	Patrick AFB	Alter Rescue Squadron Operations Facility	2,090	0	2,090
Georgia	Army	Ft Benning	Shoot House (USASOC)	1,700	0	1,700
Georgia	Army	Ft Benning	Infantry Platoon Battle Course	4,300	0	4,300
Georgia	Army	Ft Benning	Shoot House	1,250	0	1,250
Georgia	Army	Ft Benning	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	20,961	0	20,961
Georgia	Army	Ft Benning	Forensic Lab Addition	3,900	0	3,900
Georgia	Army	Ft Gillem	Modified Record Fire Range		4,550	4,550
Georgia	Army	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	17,814	0	17,814
Georgia	Army	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	Shoot House (USASOC)	1,250	0	1,250
Georgia	Army	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	Urban Assault Course	1,350	0	1,350
Georgia	Army	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	Barracks Complex	37,566	0	37,566
Georgia	Marine Corps	Albany Depot	Construct Vehicle Maint and Preservation Fac		4,000	4,000
Georgia	Navy	NSB Kings Bay	U&SI Waterfront Security Emergency Generator	3,000	0	3,000
Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	Approach Lighting System	2,000	0	2,000
Georgia	NSA	Augusta	Regional Security Operations Center	61,466	0	61,466
Georgia	SOCOM	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	SOF Equipment Maintenance Complex	10,000	0	10,000
Georgia	Air National Guard	Savannah/HH IAP	Replace CRTC Ops, Medical Training Complex	7,200	0	7,200
Georgia	DODEA	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	Construct Elementary School	16,629	0	16,629
Hawaii	Army	Helenano Mil. Res.	Upgrade Drum Road, Phase 2	41,000	0	41,000
Hawaii	Army	Pohakuloa Tng Area	Add to Military Access Road, Ph 4 (DAR)		17,000	17,000
Hawaii	Army	Pohakuloa Tng Area	Tactical Vehicle Wash Facility	9,300	0	9,300
Hawaii	Army	Pohakuloa Tng Area	Battle Area Complex	34,000	0	34,000
Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Barracks Complex, Phase 1	48,000	0	48,000
Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Vehicle Maintenance Facility, Increment 2	24,656	0	24,656
Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Modified Urban Assault Course	5,900	0	5,900

FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing (Dollars in Thousands)						
<i>Service/Agency</i>	<i>Program</i>	<i>Installation</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>FY06 Request</i>	<i>Senate Change</i>	<i>Senate Auth</i>
Hawaii	Navy	NB Pearl Harbor	Pacific Warfighting Center	29,700	0	29,700
Hawaii	Marine Corps	MCAS Kaneohe Bay	Camp Smith Fire Station	5,700	0	5,700
Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Upgrade Electrical Distribution, Phase 3	7,700	7,700	7,700
Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Construct Intelligence Squadron Operation Fac	0	0	5,678
Hawaii	NSA	Kunua	Regional Security Ops Center Replacement	5,678	0	61,466
Hawaii	Air National Guard	Hickam AFB	F-15 Aircraft Rinse Facility	2,500	0	2,500
Hawaii	Air Force Reserve	Hickam AFB	Construct Consolidated Training Facility	6,450	0	6,450
Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Base Operations/Rapcon Facility	9,835	0	9,835
Idaho	National Guard	Gowen Field	Construct Railroad, Phase 1	8,415	8,415	8,415
Illinois	Army	Rock Island Arsenal	Combined Fire/Police Facility	7,400	7,400	7,400
Illinois	Navy	RTC Great Lakes	Upgrade Recruit Training Ctr Infrastructure Incr	32,730	0	32,730
Illinois	Navy	RTC Great Lakes	Recruit Training Center Barracks	38,720	0	38,720
Illinois	Navy	RTC Great Lakes	Replace Drill Hall	16,610	0	16,610
Illinois	Navy	RTC Great Lakes	Recruit Training Center Barracks	33,840	0	33,840
Indiana	Navy	NWCF Crane	Special Weapons Engineering Facility	8,220	8,220	8,220
Indiana	National Guard	Camp Atterbury	Fire Station (ADRS)	2,454	0	2,454
Indiana	Air Force Reserve	Grisson ARB	Radar Approach Control Facility	7,000	0	7,000
Kansas	Army	Ft Leavenworth	Lewis and Clark Instructional Facility, Incr 3	42,642	0	42,642
Kansas	Army	Ft Riley	Construct Alert Holding Area	6,300	6,300	6,300
Kansas	Army	Ft Riley	Deployment Facility Ramp Expansion	5,500	0	5,500
Kansas	Army	Ft Riley	Deployment Support Facility	4,600	4,600	4,600
Kansas	Army	Ft Riley	Digital Multipurpose Training Range	17,500	0	17,500
Kansas	DLA	McConnell AFB	Hydrant Fuel System	15,800	0	15,800
Kansas	Army Reserve	ARC New Century	OMS/AMSA/UNH Storage	6,376	0	6,376
Kentucky	Army	Ft Campbell	Barracks Complex - 52nd Street	49,575	0	49,575
Kentucky	Army	Ft Campbell	Combined Arms Collective Training Fac, Ph 2	10,300	0	10,300
Kentucky	Army	Ft Campbell	Improve Primary Access Control Point	8,300	8,300	8,300
Kentucky	Army	Ft Campbell	Urban Assault Course	1,700	0	1,700

FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing (Dollars in Thousands)						
<i>Service/Agency</i>	<i>Program</i>	<i>Installation</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>FY06 Request</i>	<i>Senate Change</i>	<i>Senate Auth</i>
Kentucky	Army	Ft Campbell	Barracks Complex, Increment 2	24,650	0	24,650
Kentucky	Army	Ft Campbell	Barracks Complex - Glider Rd	43,000	0	43,000
Kentucky	Army	Ft Knox	Upgrade GMD Vehicle Maintenance Facility		8,200	8,200
Kentucky	Army	Ft Knox	Trainee Barracks Complex 1, Increment 2	21,000	0	21,000
Kentucky	SOCOM	Ft Campbell	SOF Company Operation and Supply Facility	7,800	0	7,800
Kentucky	SOCOM	Ft Campbell	SOF Group Operations Complex	30,000	0	30,000
Kentucky	National Guard	W.H.Ford RTC	Construct Training Complex, Phase 6	9,720	0	9,720
Louisiana	Army	Ft Polk	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	28,887	0	28,887
Louisiana	Air Force	Barksdale AFB	Integrated Operations Center		10,800	10,800
Maine	Navy	NSY Portsmouth	Acoustic Test and Calibration Facility		8,100	8,100
Maryland	Navy	NAS Patuxent River	Presidential Helicopter Program Spt Fac, Incr 2	40,700	15,000	55,700
Maryland	Navy	US Naval Academy	Wesley Brown Field House, Increment 1	24,930	0	24,930
Maryland	Navy	NAWC Patuxent River	MMA Aircraft Test Facility	5,800	0	5,800
Maryland	National Guard	Dundalk	Organizational Maintenance Shop		4,912	4,912
Maryland	NSA	Ft Meade	South Campus Mail Facility	4,010	0	4,010
Maryland	NSA	Ft Meade	Classified Material Conversion	12,030	0	12,030
Maryland	NSA	Ft Meade	Construct Generator Plant, Friendship Annex	12,009	0	12,009
Maryland	TRICARE	Ft Detrick	USAMRIID Sterilization Plant	21,200	0	21,200
Maryland	TRICARE	Ft Detrick	Joint Medical Logistics Center	34,000	0	34,000
Maryland	TRICARE	NNMC Bethesda	Academic Program Center/GSN Addition	10,350	0	10,350
Massachusetts	Air Force	Hanscom AFB	Replace BCE Heavy Repair and Grounds Fac		3,900	3,900
Massachusetts	Air Force	Hanscom AFB	Fourth Cliff Erosion Control Stabilization System	10,000	-10,000	0
Massachusetts	National Guard	ANGRC Westfield	Fire Station	2,129	0	2,129
Massachusetts	National Guard	Camp Curtis Guild	Organizational Maintenance Shop (ADRS)	17,136	0	17,136
Massachusetts	National Guard	Camp Edwards	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	2,542	0	2,542
Massachusetts	Air National Guard	Barnes ANGB	Weapons Maintenance/Load Crew Trng Fac		7,100	7,100
Massachusetts	Air Force Reserve	Westover ARB	Munitions Storage and Maintenance	3,000	0	3,000
Michigan	National Guard	Camp Grayling	Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	1,901	0	1,901

FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing (Dollars in Thousands)						
<i>Location</i>	<i>Service/Agency</i>	<i>Program</i>	<i>Installation</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>FY06 Request</i>	<i>Senate Change</i>
Michigan	National Guard		Lansing	US Property Fiscal Office/Readiness Center Ph 1	11,800	Senate Auth
Michigan	Air National Guard		Alpena	CRTC Squadron Operations Center	9,500	11,800
Minnesota	Air National Guard		Duluth	Addition to Fire Station	6,500	9,500
Mississippi	Navy		NAS Meridian	Jet Engine Test Cell	10,450	6,500
Mississippi	Air Force		Keesler AFB	Student Dormitory (300 Room)	30,100	10,450
Mississippi	Air Force		Keesler AFB	Technical Training Facility	17,400	0
Mississippi	Air Force		Columbus AFB	Consolidated Mission Support Group Facility	10,000	0
Mississippi	National Guard		Camp Shelby	Modified Record Fire Range	3,000	0
Mississippi	National Guard		Camp Shelby	CAA Wetlands Crossings, Phase 1	5,263	0
Mississippi	Air National Guard		Gulftort	Replace Munitions Complex, Ph 1	4,500	0
Mississippi	TRICARE		Keesler AFB	Add to/Alter Surgery Suite	14,000	4,500
Missouri	Army		Ft Leonard Wood	Construct Barracks, Phase 1	8,900	0
Missouri	Army		Ft Leonard Wood	Countermine Training Complex, Phase 2	8,100	8,900
Missouri	Air Force		Whiteman AFB	B-2 Conventional Munitions Storage Facility	5,721	0
Missouri	National Guard		Ft Leonard Wood	MK 19 Range	1,878	5,721
Montana	Air Force		Malmstrom AFB	Add/Alter Physical Fitness Center	13,500	1,878
Montana	National Guard		Helena	Army Aviation Support Facility, Phase 2	5,942	13,500
Montana	National Guard		Helena	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	1,324	0
Nebraska	Air Force		Offutt AFB	Repair Runway	19,870	0
Nebraska	Air Force		Offutt AFB	Construct HQ, Air Force Weather Agency	30,410	0
Nebraska	Air Force		Offutt AFB	Construct Child Development Center	12,800	0
Nevada	Air Force		Indian Springs AAF	Predator Operations Facilities	23,314	12,800
Nevada	Air Force		Indian Springs AAF	Predator Training Facilities	8,820	23,314
Nevada	Air Force		Indian Springs AAF	Predator Maintenance and Logistics Complex	19,260	0
Nevada	Air Force		Indian Springs AAF	Predator Munitions Complex	9,330	0
Nevada	Air Force		Nellis AFB	F/A-22 Add/Alter Weapons School	10,240	0
Nevada	Air Force		Nellis AFB	F/A-22 Add/Alter Low Observable Composite	9,330	0
Nevada	Air Force		Nellis AFB	Airfield Fire/Crash Rescue Station	4,800	9,330
Nevada	Air Force		Nellis AFB			4,800

FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing (Dollars in Thousands)						
<i>Service/Agency</i>		<i>Program</i>	<i>Installation</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>FY06 Request</i>	<i>Senate Change</i>
<i>Location</i>						<i>Auth</i>
Nevada	National Guard		Reno-Tahoe	National Guard Intelligence Facility		16,800
Nevada	TRICARE		Nellis AFB	Replace Bio Environmental Engineering Fac	1,700	0
New Hampshire	National Guard		Concord	Joint Forces Headquarters, Phase 2		10,498
New Jersey	Army		Picatinny Arsenal	Construct Fire Station		4,450
New Jersey	Navy		NWS Earle	General Purpose Berthing Pier, Increment 3	54,432	10,000
New Jersey	Air Force		McGuire AFB	Electrical Distribution System	13,185	0
New Jersey	National Guard		NAES Lakethurst	Consolidated Logistics and Training Facility	26,685	0
New Jersey	Army Reserve		Ft Dix	Shoot House/AAR/Breach Facility	1,569	0
New Mexico	Air Force		Holloman AFB	Fire/Crash Rescue Stations		15,000
New Mexico	Air Force		Kirtland AFB	HC-130P Simulator Facility	6,600	0
New Mexico	DLA		Cannon AFB	Replace Fuel Storage and Loading Facility	13,200	0
New York	Army		Ft Drum	Physical Fitness Facility	6,800	0
New York	Army		Ft Drum	Barracks Complex 10300 Block, Increment 1	38,500	0
New York	Army		Ft Drum	Army Supply Plant Pallet Processing Facility	1,850	0
New York	Army		Ft Drum	Airfield Vehicle Support Facility		1,850
New York	Army		USMA West Point	Library and Learning Center, Increment 2	25,470	9,700
New York	Army		USMA West Point	Modified Record Fire Range	4,000	0
New York	National Guard		ANGRC Leeds	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	3,065	0
New York	National Guard		ANGRC Kingston	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	6,039	0
New York	National Guard		ANGRC Latham	Readiness Center (ADRS)	5,580	0
New York	National Guard		ANGRC Rochester	Army Aviation Support Facility	19,944	0
New York	Air National Guard		Stewart IAP	Replace Fire Crash/Rescue Station	10,200	0
New York	Navy Reserve		ANGRC Albany	Joint Reserve Center	19,970	0
New York	Air Force Reserve		Niagara Falls IAP	Visiting Quarters	9,200	0
North Carolina	Army		Ft Bragg	Urban Assault Course	2,100	0
North Carolina	Army		Ft Bragg	Barracks Complex 2nd Brigade, Increment 1	32,000	0
North Carolina	Army		Ft Bragg	Barracks Complex, Increment 2	30,611	0
North Carolina	Army		Ft Bragg	Barracks Complex - Divarty, Increment 1	35,600	0

FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing (Dollars in Thousands)						
<i>Service/Agency</i>		<i>Installation</i>		<i>Project Title</i>		
<i>Location</i>	<i>Program</i>				<i>FY06 Request</i>	<i>Senate Change</i>
						<i>Senate Auth</i>
North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg		Construct Courthouse	4,450	0
North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg		Company Operations Facility	7,300	0
North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg		Barracks Complex - 3D BDE, Increment 1	50,000	0
North Carolina	Navy	MCAS Cherry Point		V22 Rotor Blade Replacement Facility	4,760	0
North Carolina	Navy	MCAS Cherry Point		V22 Gear Box Repair and Test Facility	15,390	0
North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCAS Cherry Point		AICUZ Land Acquisition	1,890	0
North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCAS Cherry Point		High Explosives Magazines	5,107	0
North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCAS New River		Main Gate Security Upgrades	2,530	0
North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCAS New River		Aircraft Fire/Rescue Facility	4,310	4,310
North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCB Camp Lejeune		Enlisted Dining Facility - Courthouse Bay	11,840	0
North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCB Camp Lejeune		Assault Breacher Vehicle Facility	4,040	0
North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCB Camp Lejeune		Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	5,370	1,000
North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCB Camp Lejeune		Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - Camp Johnson	20,340	2,000
North Carolina	DLA	Seymour Johnson AFB		Replace Hydrant Fuel System	18,500	0
North Carolina	SOCOM	Ft Bragg		Resistance Training Complex (JSOC)	2,569	0
North Carolina	SOCOM	Ft Bragg		SOF Training Facility (SWCS)	8,500	0
North Carolina	SOCOM	Ft Bragg		SOF Headquarters Building	3,700	0
North Carolina	National Guard	ANGRC Tarboro		Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	1,154	0
North Carolina	National Guard	Lenoir		Field Maintenance Shop	5,858	5,858
North Carolina	Air National Guard	Charlotte/Douglas IAP		Vehicle Maintenance Complex	3,400	0
North Carolina	DODEA	Ft Bragg		New Elementary /Junior HS Addition	18,075	0
North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB		Security Forces Vehicle Alert Facility	8,700	0
North Dakota	National Guard	Bismarck		WMD Civil Support Facility	3,737	3,737
North Dakota	National Guard	Minot AFB		Field Maintenance Shop	10,950	0
Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB		Add/Alter Intelligence Production Complex	19,670	0
Ohio	National Guard	ARC North Canton		Army Aviation Support Facility	7,923	0
Ohio	National Guard	Mansfield Lahm APT		Fire Station (ADRS)	1,293	0
Ohio	Air National Guard	Camp Perry		Replace Troop Training Quarters	4,700	4,700

FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing (Dollars in Thousands)						
<i>Service/Agency</i>	<i>Program</i>	<i>Installation</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>FY06 Request</i>	<i>Senate Change</i>	<i>Senate Auth</i>
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Alter Maintenance Shops	800	0	800
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Alter Fuel Hydrant System	1,600	0	1,600
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Alter Flight Simulator Facility	800	0	800
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Squadron Operations Facility	5,750	0	5,750
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Airfield Pavements, Phase 2	4,400	0	4,400
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Scheduled Maintenance Hangar	15,300	0	15,300
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Fuel Systems Maintenance Hangar	10,500	0	10,500
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	Railroad Equipment Facility	2,700	0	2,700
Oklahoma	Army	Ft Sill	Construct Airfield Fire Station		3,150	3,150
Oklahoma	Army	Ft Sill	Ammunition Container Facility	5,400	0	5,400
Oklahoma	Army	McAlester AAP	Upgrade Building 3001 Infrastructure, Phase 2	20,000	0	20,000
Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	31st Combat Comm Squadron Ops Complex	11,960	0	11,960
Oklahoma	Air Force	Vance AFB	Enhance Force Protection, phase 1		14,000	14,000
Oregon	Navy Reserve	ARNG Eugene	Reserve Center w/Land	6,132	3,600	9,732
Pennsylvania	Army	Letterkenny Depot	Less-than-Truckload Ammo Shipping Facility		6,300	6,300
Pennsylvania	DLA	New Cumberland Depot	Replace Physical Fitness Facility	6,500	0	6,500
Pennsylvania	National Guard	ANGRC Erie	Readiness Center (SBCT)	11,008	0	11,008
Pennsylvania	National Guard	ANGRC Erie	Field Maintenance Shop (SBCT)	5,136	0	5,136
Pennsylvania	National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Live Fire Shoot House (SBCT)	2,346	0	2,346
Pennsylvania	National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Modified Record Fire Range Upgrade (SBCT)	2,683	0	2,683
Pennsylvania	National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Unit Storage Site (SBCT)	2,961	0	2,961
Pennsylvania	National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	MK 19 40mm (Gren) Machine Gun Range	4,344	0	4,344
Pennsylvania	National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Mission Support Training Facility	4,363	0	4,363
Pennsylvania	National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Sniper Range (SBCT)	2,898	0	2,898
Pennsylvania	National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	UAV Training Facility	2,482	0	2,482
Pennsylvania	National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Urban Assault Course (SBCT)	2,459	0	2,459
Pennsylvania	National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Battalion Training Facility, Phase 1 (SBCT)	22,190	0	22,190
Pennsylvania	National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Infantry Squad Battle Course (SBCT)	2,859	0	2,859



FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing (Dollars in Thousands)					
<i>Service/Agency</i>	<i>Program</i>	<i>Installation</i>	<i>Project Title</i>	<i>FY06 Request</i>	<i>Senate Change</i>
<i>Location</i>					<i>Senate Auth</i>
Pennsylvania	National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	16,706	0
Pennsylvania	National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Multipurpose Machine Gun Range (SBCT)	4,202	0
Pennsylvania	National Guard	Philadelphia	Field Maintenance Shop (SBCT)	6,207	0
Pennsylvania	National Guard	Philadelphia	Readiness Center (SBCT)	11,925	0
Pennsylvania	Army Reserve	ARC Bellefonte	AR Center/OMS/UNH Storage	8,355	0
Pennsylvania	Army Reserve	Erie	AR Center/OMS/UNH Storage	9,367	0
Rhode Island	Navy	NS Newport	Replace Vehicle Bridge	10,620	0
South Carolina	USMC Reserve	Charleston	Marine Corps Reserve Center	6,424	700
South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Add/Alter Fitness Center	2,583	0
South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	USCENTAF Communications Squadron Facility	9,730	0
South Carolina	National Guard	Charleston	Readiness Center	10,298	0
South Carolina	Army Reserve	ARC Greenville	Add/Alter Army Reserve Center	15,524	0
South Carolina	TRICARE	Charleston	Consolidated Medical Clinic	35,000	0
South Carolina	Air Force	Ellsworth AFB	Construct Maintenance Group HQ	8,400	0
South Dakota	National Guard	Nashville	Readiness Center, Phase 2	23,193	0
Tennessee	Air National Guard	Memphis IAP	C-5 Maintenance Hangar and Shops	39,000	0
Tennessee	Air National Guard	Memphis IAP	C-5 Fuel Cell Maintenance Hangar	23,000	0
Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Multipurpose Squad Qual Course-Scout	8,000	0
Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Battalion Command and Control Facilities	6,600	0
Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	21,645	0
Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Fire Station	4,100	0
Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Qualification Training Range	6,093	0
Texas	Army	Ft Sam Houston	Renovate Barracks, Phase 1	7,000	0
Texas	Navy	NAS Kingsville	Airfield Lighting (NALFOG)	6,010	0
Texas	Air Force	Sheppard AFB	T-6 Combs Warehouse	3,000	0
Texas	Air Force	Sheppard AFB	Student Dormitory (300 Room)	33,000	0
Texas	Army Reserve	Grand Prairie	AR Center, Phase 2	5,685	0
Texas	Army Reserve	Ellington Field	Armed Forces Reserve Ctr/BPC/VMF/US, Ph 1	15,000	15,000



**FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Location</u>	<u>Service/Agency</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>FY06 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Auth</u>
Virginia	National Guard		Ft Pickett	MOUT Shoot House (SB)	1,552	0	1,552
Virginia	National Guard		Winchester	Readiness Center		7,619	7,619
Virginia	Navy Reserve		NAS Oceana	C-40 Hangar	2,259	0	2,259
Virginia	TRICARE		Ft Belvoir	Replace Hospital, Phase 2	57,000	0	57,000
Washington	Army		Ft Lewis	Barracks Complex-North Fort, Phase 5	49,949	0	49,949
Washington	Army		Ft Lewis	Barracks Complex	50,000	0	50,000
Washington	Navy		NS Everett	Bachelor Enlisted Qtrs Homeport Ashore, Incr 1	49,950	0	49,950
Washington	Navy		NSB Bangor	Enclose Motor Transfer Facility	2,860	0	2,860
Washington	Navy		NSB Bangor	Waterfront Security Enclave	41,520	0	41,520
Washington	Navy		NSB Bangor	Limited Area Production & Storage Cmplx, Incr	47,095	0	47,095
Washington	Navy		NSB Bangor	Mission Support for SSBN/SSN	15,780	0	15,780
Washington	Air Force		Fairchild AFB	Resistance Training Facility		6,800	6,800
Washington	SOCOM		Ft Lewis	SOF Expand Compound	18,500	0	18,500
Washington	SOCOM		Ft Lewis	SOF Training Facility (SWCS)	4,800	0	4,800
Washington	SOCOM		Ft Lewis	SOF Aviation Battalion Complex	30,000	0	30,000
West Virginia	Air National Guard		Martinsburg ANG	C-5 Jet Fuel Stor, Hydr Sys/Park Apron	20,000	0	20,000
West Virginia	Air National Guard		Martinsburg ANG	C-5 Corrosion Control Hangar	23,000	0	23,000
West Virginia	Air National Guard		Yeager Airport	Upgrade and Extend Runway		17,000	17,000
Wisconsin	National Guard		Camp Williams	Upgrade Force Protection, Relocate Road		6,500	6,500
Wisconsin	Air National Guard		General Mitchell Field	Readiness Center	5,357	0	5,357
Wisconsin	Army Reserve		ARC Wausau	Upgrade Aircraft Maintenance Support Complex		7,000	7,000
Wisconsin	Army Reserve		Ft McCoy	AR Center/OMS/UNH Storage	11,098	0	11,098
Wisconsin	Army Reserve		Ft McCoy	Public Safety Center	5,365	0	5,365
Wisconsin	Army Reserve		Ft McCoy	NCO Academy, Phase 1	15,405	0	15,405
Wisconsin	Army Reserve		Ft McCoy	Modified Record Fire Range	3,038	0	3,038
Wisconsin	Army Reserve		Ft McCoy	Shoot House/AAR/Breach Facility	1,700	0	1,700
Wyoming	National Guard		Casper	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	2,802	0	2,802
Wyoming	Air National Guard		Cheyenne IAP	Composite Airlift Support Center	7,000	0	7,000

FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing (Dollars in Thousands)						
<u>Location</u>	<u>Service/Agency</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>FY06 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u> <u>Auth</u>
<u>Overseas</u>						
Bahrain	TRICARE		SWA	Medical Clinic Addition/Alteration	4,750	0 4,750
Germany	Army		Grafenwoehr	Brigade Complex-Forward Support	40,681	0 40,681
Germany	Army		Grafenwoehr	Shoot House	1,800	0 1,800
Germany	Army		Grafenwoehr	Urban Assault Course	1,600	0 1,600
Germany	Army		Grafenwoehr	Barracks Complex	40,000	0 40,000
Germany	Army		Vilseck	Barracks Complex, Phase 2	13,600	0 13,600
Germany	Air Force		Ramstein AB	Airfield Maintenance Compound	8,600	0 8,600
Germany	Air Force		Ramstein AB	Munitions Maintenance Facility	3,050	0 3,050
Germany	Air Force		Spangdahlem AB	Control Tower	7,100	0 7,100
Germany	Air Force		Spangdahlem AB	Large Vehicle Inspection Station	5,374	0 5,374
Germany	Air Force		Landstuhl	Add to Elementary/Middle School Classroom	5,572	0 5,572
Germany	DODEA		Vilseck	Renovate/Add to Vilseck Elementary School	2,323	0 2,323
Germany	DODEA		Vilseck	Replace Fuel Pipeline	7,089	0 7,089
Greece	DLA		Souda Bay	Improve Alpha/Bravo Wharves, Increment 1	25,584	0 25,584
Guam	Navy		NS Guam	Replace Military Working Dog Facility	3,500	0 3,500
Guam	Air Force		Andersen AFB	AEF FOL Munitions Storage Igloos	15,000	0 15,000
Guam	Air Force		Andersen AFB	Elementary/Middle School Replacement	40,578	0 40,578
Guam	DODEA		NAS Agana	Ammunition Storage Facility	5,254	0 5,254
Italy	Army		Pisa	Air Control Squadron Warehouse	7,800	0 7,800
Italy	Air Force		Aviano AB	Family Support Center	4,010	0 4,010
Italy	Air Force		Aviano AB	Consolidated Support Center Facility	10,850	0 10,850
Korea	Army		Camp Humphreys	Barracks Complex	40,525	-5,000 35,525
Korea	Army		Camp Humphreys	Barracks Complex	45,637	-7,000 38,637
Korea	Army		Camp Humphreys	Barracks Complex	28,000	-3,000 25,000
Korea	Army		Yongpyong	Urban Assault Course	1,450	0 1,450

**FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Location</u>	<u>Service/Agency</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>FY06 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Auth</u>
Korea	Air Force		Kunsan AB	Consolidated Personnel Process/Theater Facility	6,800	0	6,800
Korea	Air Force		Kunsan AB	Dormitory (382 Room)	44,100	-6,712	37,388
Korea	Air Force		Osan AB	Dormitory (156 Room)	21,750	-1,000	20,750
Korea	Air Force		Osan AB	Add/Alter Squadron Operation/AMU Facility	18,969	0	18,969
Korea	DODEA		Taegu	Replace/Add to Taegu Elementary/High School	8,231	0	8,231
Kwajalein	MDA		Kwajalein Atoll	Emergency Services Facility, Meck Island	4,901	0	4,901
Portugal	Air Force		Lajes Field	Fire/Crash Rescue Station	12,000	0	12,000
Puerto Rico	Army Reserve		Camp Santiago	Modified Record Fire Range	2,000	0	2,000
Spain	DODEA		NS Rota	Elementary/High School Multipurpose Bldg	7,963	0	7,963
Turkey	Air Force		Incirlik AB	Consolidated Communications Facility	5,780	0	5,780
United Kingdom	Air Force		RAF Lakenheath	Small Diameter Bomb Maintenance Facility	2,625	0	2,625
United Kingdom	Air Force		RAF Lakenheath	Small Diameter Bomb Storage Igloo and	2,500	0	2,500
United Kingdom	Air Force		RAF Mildenhall	Base Engineer Complex	13,500	0	13,500
United Kingdom	NSA		RAF Menwith Hill Station	Operation/Tech Building	41,697	0	41,697
Worldwide	Navy		Various Worldwide	Wharf Upgrades, Increment 1	39,019	-39,019	0
<u>Unspecified</u>							
Worldwide	Army		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	141,393	1,822	143,215
Worldwide	Army		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design (Host Nation Support)	20,000	0	20,000
Worldwide	Army		Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	20,000	0	20,000
Worldwide	National Guard		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	46,148	7,434	53,582
Worldwide	National Guard		Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,646	1,500	9,146
Worldwide	Army Reserve		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	14,416	0	14,416
Worldwide	Army Reserve		Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,979	0	2,979
Worldwide	Navy		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	18,857	16,830	35,687

FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing (Dollars in Thousands)						
<u>Location</u>	<u>Service/Agency</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>FY06 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>
Worldwide	Navy		Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction		1
Worldwide	Marine Corps		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	10,655	8,165
Worldwide	Navy Reserve		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	1,746	0
Worldwide	USMC Reserve		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	1,232	0
Worldwide	Air Force		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	79,047	4,672
Worldwide	Air Force		Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	15,000	0
Worldwide	Air National Guard		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	12,856	4,005
Worldwide	Air National Guard		Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,000	1,500
Worldwide	Air Force Reserve		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	3,770	0
Worldwide	Air Force Reserve		Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,000	0
Worldwide	DODEA		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	1,096	0
Worldwide	JCS		Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,543	0
Worldwide	NGA		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	24,000	0
Worldwide	MDA		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	3,300	0
Worldwide	Defense Wide		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	26,110	0
Worldwide	Defense Wide		Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,000	0
Worldwide	SOCOM		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	15,575	0
Worldwide	SOCOM		Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,000	0
Worldwide	TRICARE		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	65,000	0
Worldwide	TRICARE		Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,193	0
Worldwide	Defense Wide		Unspecified Worldwide	Energy Conservation Improvement Program	60,000	0
Worldwide	NATO		Unspecified Worldwide	NATO Security Investment Program	206,858	0
Worldwide	Defense Wide		Unspecified Worldwide	Contingency Construction	10,000	0
Worldwide	Army		BRAC, Army	Base Realignment and Closure IV	93,853	0
Worldwide						93,853

**FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Location</u>	<u>Service/Agency</u>		<u>Project Title</u>	<u>FY06</u>		<u>Senate</u>
	<u>Program</u>	<u>Installation</u>		<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Auth</u>
Worldwide	Navy	BRAC, Navy	Base Realignment and Closure IV	142,973	0	142,973
Worldwide	Air Force	BRAC, Air Force	Base Realignment and Closure IV	134,727	0	134,727
Worldwide	DLA	BRAC, Defense	Base Realignment and Closure IV	6,274	0	6,274
Worldwide	Base Closure V	Unspecified Worldwide	2005 Base Realignment and Closure	1,880,466	-376,000	1,504,466
<u>Family Housing</u>						
Alaska	Army	Ft Richardson	Replace Family Housing	49,000	0	49,000
Alaska	Army	Ft Wainwright	Replace Family Housing	42,000	0	42,000
Alaska	Army	Ft Wainwright	Replace Family Housing	49,000	0	49,000
Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Replace Family Housing	37,650	0	37,650
Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Purchase Build/Lease Housing	18,144	0	18,144
Arizona	Army	Ft Huachuca	Replace Family Housing	31,000	0	31,000
Arizona	Army	Yuma PG	Replace Family Housing	11,200	0	11,200
California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Replace Family Housing	59,699	0	59,699
District of	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Replace Family Housing	48,711	-48,711	0
Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 7	40,982	0	40,982
Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 7	56,467	0	56,467
Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	Replace Family Housing	26,917	0	26,917
Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Replace Family Housing	68,971	0	68,971
North Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 9	48,868	0	48,868
North Dakota	Air Force	Grand Forks AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase J	86,706	0	86,706
North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 12	44,548	0	44,548
Oklahoma	Army	Ft Sill	Replace Family Housing	24,000	0	24,000
South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Replace Family Housing	15,935	0	15,935
South Dakota	Air Force	Ellsworth AFB	Replace Family Housing	14,383	0	14,383
Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 6	43,016	0	43,016
Virginia	Army	Ft Lee	Replace Family Housing	19,500	0	19,500

FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing (Dollars in Thousands)						
<u>Location</u>	<u>Service/Agency</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>FY06 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>
Virginia	Army		Ft Monroe	Replace Family Housing	6,000	0
<u>Overseas</u>						
Germany	Air Force		Ramstein AB	Replace Family Housing	62,952	0
Germany	Air Force		Spangdahlem AB	Replace Family Housing	45,385	-45,385
Guam	Navy		NS Guam	North Tipalo Phase I Replacement Construction	40,298	3,197
Turkey	Air Force		Incirlik AB	Replace Family Housing	22,730	0
United Kingdom	Air Force		RAF Lakenheath	Replace Family Housing	48,437	0
<u>Worldwide</u>						
Worldwide	Army		Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	300,400	0
Worldwide	Navy		Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	178,644	0
Worldwide	Air Force		Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	420,203	-11,090
Worldwide	Army		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	17,536	0
Worldwide	Air Force		Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	40,404	-3,300
Worldwide	Defense Wide		Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Improvement Fund	2,500	0
<u>Family Housing</u>						
Worldwide	Army		Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	39,465	0
Worldwide	Army		Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	213,990	0
Worldwide	Army		Unspecified Worldwide	Housing Maintenance	309,123	0
Worldwide	Army		Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	68,188	0
Worldwide	Army		Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	1,345	0

Senate  
Auth  
6,000



FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing (Dollars in Thousands)						
<u>Location</u>	<u>Service/Agency</u>		<u>Installation</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>FY06 Senate</u>	
	<u>Program</u>				<u>Request</u>	<u>Change</u>
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Privatization Support Costs	20,304	0	Senate Auth 20,304
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	28,718	0	28,718
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	131,860	0	131,860
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	20,189	0	20,189
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	143,790	0	143,790
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Housing Maintenance	186,511	0	186,511
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	81,924	0	81,924
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Mortgage Insurance Premium	56	0	56
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Privatization Support Costs	17,928	0	17,928
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	45,421	0	45,421
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	97,841	0	97,841
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Debt Account	1	0	1
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	41,932	0	41,932
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	154,907	0	154,907
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Housing Maintenance	310,479	0	310,479
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	78,090	0	78,090
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	2,407	0	2,407
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Privatization Support Costs	36,437	0	36,437
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	25,740	0	25,740
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	116,946	0	116,946
Worldwide	DIA	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	4,031	0	4,031
Worldwide	DIA	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	30,130	0	30,130
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	40	0	40
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Worldwide	Housing Maintenance	404	0	404

**FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Location</u>	<u>Service/Agency</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Installation</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>FY06 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Auth</u>
Worldwide	DLA		Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	299	0	299
Worldwide	DLA		Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	80	0	80
Worldwide	DLA		Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	427	0	427
Worldwide	NSA		Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	25	0	25
Worldwide	NSA		Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	9,814	0	9,814
Worldwide	NSA		Unspecified Worldwide	Housing Maintenance	1,134	0	1,134
Worldwide	NSA		Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	7	0	7
<b>Total Authorization of Appropriations</b>					12,051,611	92,354	12,143,965
<b>Prior Year Rescissions:</b>						-92,354	-92,354
<b>allocation</b>					12,051,611		12,051,611

**Short title (sec. 2001)**

The committee recommends a provision that would cite Division B of this Act as the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006.



## **TITLE XXI—ARMY**

### **Summary**

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of \$1,480.0 million for military construction and \$1,362.6 million for family housing for the Army in fiscal year 2006. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations for \$1,604.0 million for military construction and \$1,362.6 million for family housing for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommends a decrease of \$15.0 million to the authorization of appropriations for three projects in Korea due to the recent award of similar construction contracts by the Army in Korea at amounts substantially less than appropriated by Congress in previous fiscal years. The committee anticipates that this trend of favorable contract award amounts will continue for the Army in fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommends increasing the authorization of appropriations by \$1.8 million for planning and design to complete design for the projects added by the committee.

### **Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)**

This provision contains the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2006. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

### **Family housing (sec. 2102)**

This provision would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2006. 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)**

This provision would authorize improvements to existing Army family housing units for fiscal year 2006.

### **Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104)**

This provision would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Army's military construction and family housing budget for fiscal year 2006. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount the Army may spend on military construction projects.

### Items of Special Interest

#### Report on permanent facilities for new Army units

On January 30, 2004, the Office of the Secretary of Defense approved a request by the Chief of Staff of the Army to increase the number of active modular Brigade Combat Team Units of Action (BCT(UA)) from 33 to 43 between fiscal years 2004 and 2006. On July 23, 2004, the Army announced the temporary locations for the UA's listed below, and will recommend permanent stations for the units as part of the 2005 round of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC).

[Dollars in millions]

Location	Personnel increase	Cost of temporary facilities
Fort Stewart, Georgia .....	1,700	\$108.0
Fort Campbell, Kentucky .....	3,000	94.7
Fort Drum, New York .....	4,200	188.0
Fort Benning, Georgia .....	3,800	134.5
Fort Hood, Texas .....	5,000	152.8
Fort Polk, Louisiana .....	300	4.8
Fort Lewis, Washington .....	3,900	98.8
Fort Richardson, Alaska .....	2,600	78.4
Fort Bliss, Texas .....	3,800	131.2
Fort Riley, Kansas .....	3,400	138.5
Fort Bragg, North Carolina .....	5,300	152.4
Fort Carson, Colorado .....	3,700	128.5
Total .....	40,700	1,410.6

In order to support the rapid reorganization of combat units, the Secretary of the Army is using emergency authorities pursuant to section 2803, title 10, United States Code, to carry out military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law. The projects install utilities and prepare sites for the purchase and installation of temporary facilities to provide barracks and work areas for the new UAs. The 19,250 families of service members relocated as part of the reorganization are being absorbed within local communities in existing schools and into existing installation support facilities, such as child development centers and medical centers.

The temporary facilities, consisting of modular buildings and trailers, have a design life of five to seven years, depending on local climate. The trailers serving as barracks for permanently assigned military personnel have under-sized sleeping areas and gang latrines that do not meet minimal standards established by the Department of Defense for unaccompanied housing. Because the Army purchased the trailers as equipment items, no maintenance plan has been established, and therefore no funds have been programmed for the sustainment of the trailers.

The committee is concerned that the Army has not included funds to sustain or replace these trailers with permanent facilities in their Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP). Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate by April 1, 2006, a report with the following information:

- (1) an inventory of the temporary facilities installed to meet requirements for the establishment of 10 (BCT(UA));

(2) an estimate of the scope and costs to maintain the temporary facilities through the end of their current use;

(3) a proposed time line to replace the temporary facilities with permanent facilities;

(4) a description and cost estimate for construction of permanent facilities required to replace the temporary facilities;

(5) an assessment by location of the scope and cost to add to or alter existing facilities required to support military personnel and their families;

(6) an assessment of the impact on local communities and actions taken by the Army to address those issues; and

(7) an estimate of the date that the Army will meet the Department goal to eliminate inadequate unaccompanied housing.

In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate by February 15, 2006, on the Department's guidance relating to the procurement and use of temporary facilities to support personnel relocations related to BRAC 2005 and global presence changes.





## **TITLE XXII—NAVY**

### **Summary**

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of \$1,029.2 million for military construction and \$812.6 million for family housing for the Navy in fiscal year 2006. The budget request also included a proposal to use \$92.4 million in prior year unobligated funds authorized for military construction to reduce the request for authorization of appropriation for the Navy in fiscal year 2006. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of \$1,102.7 million for military construction and \$815.8 million for family housing for fiscal year 2006.

The committee believes that the Navy should not use annual budget requests to carry out the reprogramming of unobligated funds from prior years. Therefore, the committee recommends rescinding \$92.3 million as a general reduction from prior year authorization of appropriations for military construction and housing projects for the Navy. The committee further recommends an authorization of appropriations for seven construction projects at their fully authorized amount as shown in the table, FY 2006 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction and Family Housing.

The committee recommends deferring the authorization of appropriations of \$13.7 million to construct a bachelor enlisted quarters at Naval Base Coronado, California under a pilot program authorized by section 2881a of title 10, United States Code, to enter into a public-private venture, until the authority in title 10, United States Code, is amended to authorize a fourth pilot project.

The committee also recommends deferring the authorization of appropriations of \$39.0 million to upgrade wharfs, first increment at world-wide locations, until final basing arrangements negotiated as part of the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy are finalized with the host nation.

The committee recommends increasing the authorization of appropriations by \$4.0 million for planning and design to complete design for the projects added by the committee.

### **Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)**

This section contains the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2006. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

### **Family housing (sec. 2202)**

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2006. 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)**

This section would authorize improvements to existing Navy and Marine Corps family housing units for fiscal year 2006.

**Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)**

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Navy's military construction and family housing budget for fiscal year 2006. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Navy may spend on military construction projects.

**Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2004 project (sec. 2205)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108-136) to increase a project authorization for Naval Weapons Station Earle, New Jersey.

**Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2206)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (division B of Public Law 108-375) to increase project authorizations at an unspecified world-wide location and at Quantico, Virginia.

**Hockmuth Hall, Marine Corps Base Quantico, Virginia**

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of \$2.6 million to construct the first increment of an addition to Hockmuth Hall at Marine Corps Base Quantico, Virginia. The budget request also included authorization for the full requirement of \$14.2 million for the addition to Hockmuth Hall.

Section 2807 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65) expressed a sense of Congress that, in preparing the budget for each fiscal year for military construction for submission to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the President should request an amount of funds for each proposed military construction project that is sufficient to produce a complete and usable facility or a complete and usable improvement to an existing facility. The committee notes that in limited instances, large military construction projects with a total cost exceeding \$50.0 million may be funded in phases consistent with established practices for such projects.

The budget request for the addition to Hockmuth Hall did not comply with congressional intent. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of authorization of appropriations of \$1.4 million to construct the first phase of an addition to Hockmuth Hall, resulting in a complete and useable facility. The committee further directs the Navy to include a request for authorization of appropriations for the full remainder of the military construction requirement for this project in the fiscal year 2007 budget request.

## **TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE**

### **Summary**

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of \$1,069.6 million for military construction and \$2,018.0 million for family housing for the Air Force in fiscal year 2006. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of \$1,207.4 million for military construction and \$1,909.9 million for family housing for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommends deferring authorization of appropriations of \$10.0 million to install an erosion control stabilization system at Fourth Cliff Recreation Annex, Massachusetts, until the Air Force can justify the military requirement.

The committee also recommends deferring the authorization of appropriations of \$45.4 million to construct family housing at Spangdahlem Air Base, Germany, until force structure requirements can be finalized within the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy. The committee also directs the Air Force to reassess their plan to divest 331 adequate housing units at the former Bitburg Air Force Base, Germany, from the Air Force inventory.

The committee further recommends deferring the authorization of appropriations by \$48.7 million to replace family housing and \$11.1 million to improve housing at Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, DC., to allow the Air Force to pursue the replacement of inadequate housing using the alternative authority for the acquisition and improvement of military housing provided in subchapter 4 of chapter 169, title 10, United States Code.

The committee recommends decreasing the authorization of appropriations by \$7.7 million for two projects in Korea due to the recent award of similar construction contracts by the Air Force in Korea at amounts substantially less than appropriated by Congress in previous fiscal years. The committee anticipates that this trend of favorable contract award amounts will continue for the Air Force in fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommends increasing the authorization of appropriations by \$4.7 million for planning and design to complete design for the projects added by the committee.

### **Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)**

This section contains the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2006. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Family housing (sec. 2302)**

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2006. 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)**

This section would authorize improvements to existing Air Force family housing units for fiscal year 2006.

**Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304)**

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Air Force's budget for fiscal year 2006. This section would also provide an overall limit on the amount the Air Force may spend on military construction projects.

**Items of Special Interest****Planning and design, Air Force**

The committee directs that the amount of \$1.6 million, added to the authorization of appropriation for planning and design for the Air Force, be used to complete the design of a headquarters facility for the 70th Intelligence Wing at Fort Meade, Maryland.

## **TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES**

### **Summary**

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of \$1,042.7 million for military construction and \$48.9 million for family housing for defense agencies in fiscal year 2006. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations for \$1,042.7 million for military construction and \$48.9 million for family housing for fiscal year 2006.

The budget request also included authorization of appropriations of \$377.8 million to carry out environmental activities related to the previous rounds of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC), and authorization of appropriations of \$1,880.5 million to initiate the decisions of the 2005 BRAC round.

The budget request included an analysis that, of the \$1,880.5 million for the 2005 BRAC round, \$376.0 million would remain unobligated at the end of fiscal year 2006 and would carry over into fiscal year 2007. The committee is also aware that the budget request was developed at a time when the Department of Defense anticipated reducing the capacity of military installations by 20–25 percent. The Secretary of Defense recently stated that, for the 2005 BRAC round, “the actual number will be less than the lower end of that range.”

Also, documents submitted to support the budget request did not account for savings to be realized from the cancellation of construction projects authorized in previous years. These savings would be available for transfer into the BRAC account in 2006 to augment funds for initial BRAC requirements.

Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$376.0 million to the authorization of appropriations to initiate the decisions of the 2005 BRAC round. The committee also recommends that no funds may be obligated to initiate the decisions of the 2005 BRAC round until 21 days after the Secretary submits a report to the congressional defense committees describing the programs, projects, or activities to be carried out with funds from this account.

### **Authorized defense agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)**

This section contains the list of authorized defense agency construction projects for fiscal year 2006. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

### **Energy conservation projects (sec. 2402)**

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

**Authorization of appropriations, defense agencies (sec. 2403)**

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each defense agency military construction program for fiscal year 2006. This provision also would provide an overall limit on the amount that may be spent on such military construction projects.

## **TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM**

### **Summary**

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriation of \$206.9 million for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2006. The committee recommends an authorization of appropriation of \$206.9 million for fiscal year 2006.

### **Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501)**

This provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this 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)**

This provision would authorize appropriation of \$206.9 million for the United States' contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2006.





## **TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES**

### **Summary**

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of \$722.8 million for military construction in fiscal year 2006 for National Guard and Reserve facilities. The committee recommends authorizations of appropriations for fiscal year 2006 of \$961.2 million to be distributed as follows:

<i>Account</i>	<i>Millions</i>
Army National Guard .....	\$464.7
Air National Guard .....	245.9
Army Reserve .....	121.1
Air Force Reserve .....	79.3
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve .....	50.2
Total .....	961.2

### **Authorized Guard and Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)**

This provision would authorize appropriations for military construction for the National Guard and Reserve by service component for fiscal year 2006. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

#### **Items of Special Interest**

##### **Unspecified minor construction, Army National Guard**

The committee authorizes the Secretary of the Army, using funds authorized for unspecified minor construction for the Army National Guard, to construct an addition and alteration to a readiness center for \$1.5 million at Waterloo, Iowa.

##### **Unspecified minor construction, Air National Guard**

The committee authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force, using funds authorized for unspecified minor construction for the Air National Guard, to construct an addition and alteration to a field maintenance shop for \$1.5 million at Fort Dodge, Iowa.

##### **Planning and design, Army National Guard**

The committee directs that the amount of \$3.0 million, added to the authorization of appropriation for planning and design for the Army National Guard, be used to complete the design of a Joint Armed Services Reserve Center at Naval Air Station Brunswick, Maine.



## **TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS**

### **Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2701)**

This provision would provide that authorizations for military construction projects, repair of real property, land acquisition, family housing projects, contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program, and National Guard and Reserve military construction projects would expire on October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later. This expiration would not apply to authorizations for projects for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funding for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later.

### **Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2003 projects (sec. 2702)**

This section would extend the authorizations for certain fiscal year 2003 military construction projects until October 1, 2006, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2007, whichever is later.

### **Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2002 projects (sec. 2703)**

This section would extend the authorizations for certain fiscal year 2002 military construction projects until October 1, 2006, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2007, whichever is later.

### **Effective date (sec. 2704)**

This provision would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, and XXVI of this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2005, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.



## **TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS**

### **Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes**

#### **Increase in thresholds for unspecified minor military construction projects (sec. 2801)**

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 in this provision were last adjusted.

#### **Modification of cost variation authority (sec. 2802)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, to establish a minimum amount for which the cost of a military construction project or for the construction, improvement, or acquisition of a military family housing project cannot vary. This provision would authorize the secretary concerned to carry out a project of which the cost varies beyond the minimum amount after the secretary concerned notifies the congressional defense committees and waits 21 days before carrying out the project.

#### **Department of Defense housing funds (sec. 2803)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to fund certain acquisitions and improvements of military housing solely through accounts established for that purpose. This provision would also amend section 2884 of title 10, United States Code, to add a requirement for the Secretary to report to the congressional defense committees annually with a summary of the funds obligated from defense housing accounts. This provision would improve the ability of Congress to account for funds obligated to carry out a contract for the acquisition or construction of family housing units using alternative authorities provided under subchapter IV of chapter 169, title 10, United States Code.

**Temporary authority to use minor military construction authority for construction of child development centers (sec. 2804)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a temporary program for the construction of child development centers operated by the Department of Defense. This provision would increase the threshold in section 2805(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to \$7.0 million for unspecified minor construction projects carried out to construct child development centers. This provision would also increase the threshold in section 2805(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to \$8.0 million if the unspecified minor construction project is intended solely to correct a deficiency in a child development center that threatens the life, safety, or health of the occupants. This provision would also increase other thresholds in section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, to ensure continuity of the temporary authority. This provision would provide for the expiration of the authority on September 30, 2007.

This provision would also require the Secretary to establish procedures for the review of each project to be carried out under this section, and to report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2007, with a list and description of the projects carried out under this program, as well as recommendations for extension of the temporary authority.

The committee is concerned that the Department has a deficiency of approximately 38,000 spaces, equating to 167 child development centers, for the care of children of service members between the ages of 6 weeks and 5 years. In many cases, a family must wait 18 months before they can be accommodated at existing centers on military installations, resulting in the use of off-base facilities at a much greater cost and inconvenience for families. This deficiency has increased significantly in the past two years and adds a substantial burden to the families of deployed service members. Aside from housing, access to quality child care offered at military installations has become the top quality of life concern among military personnel.

It is the committee's intent that the authorities provided in this provision would be used to increase the options available to the Department to quickly address the shortfall in child development centers with temporary facilities and to transfer existing funds from other accounts to construct new centers.

**Inapplicability to child development centers of restriction on authority to acquire or construct ancillary supporting facilities (sec. 2805)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2881(b) of title 10, United States Code, to exempt child development centers from the restriction for ancillary facilities authorized to be constructed using the alternative authority for acquisition and improvements of military housing provided in subchapter IV of chapter 169, title 10, United States Code. The committee intends this provision to increase the options available to the Department of Defense to quickly address the shortfall in child development centers by including the construction of permanent facilities

as part of transactions carried out under the alternative authority for acquisition and improvements of military housing.

In order to enhance the quality of life provided to military members and their families, the committee encourages the Department to include the construction and operation of child development centers in all future plans to construct or improve family housing communities.

**Authority to carry out exchanges of facilities including associated utilities, equipment, and furnishings (sec. 2806)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 18240 of title 10, United States Code, to amend the definition of “facility” in section 18240 to include utilities, equipment, and furnishings required to be installed in a facility.

**Increase in number of family housing units in Korea authorized for lease by the Army at maximum amount (sec. 2807)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2828(e)(4) of title 10, United States Code, to increase from 2,400 to 2,800 the number of family housing units the Secretary of the Army may lease in Korea, for which the maximum annual lease cost per unit is \$35,000.

The committee recommends this provision in order to allow the Secretary to provide leased housing units for military personnel and their families that meet the Department of Defense’s guidelines for adequate force protection/anti-terrorism measures in facilities, while supporting the U.S. military force structure and basing plans of the Commander, U.S. Forces, Korea.

**Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration**

**Authority to lease non-excess property of Department of Defense field activities (sec. 2821)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2667a of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lease non-excess property that is under the control of a Department of Defense field activity. This provision would grant field activities the same authorities currently available to defense agencies under section 2667a of title 10, United States Code.

**Modified criteria for agreements to limit encroachments and other constraints on military training, testing and operations (sec. 2822)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 2684a of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that agreements to limit encroachments and other constraints on military training, testing, and operations authorized under that section may include ecologically-related real property and the airspace of a military installation. The provision also requires that agreements initiated after the date of enactment of this Act shall provide for equal sharing of the acquisition costs of such property and interests and that the acquisition costs of any lesser property interest, such as

an easement, may not exceed 70 percent of the appraised value of the land.

The committee believes that the authority created in section 2811 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, and codified at section 2684a of title 10, is a potentially useful tool to create mutually beneficial relationships between the Department, State and local governments, and private organizations by promoting cooperation in maintaining military readiness and meeting environmental goals.

The committee believes that the changes proposed by this provision will strengthen existing law by clarifying that such cooperative conservation agreements may extend to the airspace of the installation and to real estate that conserves species habitat to the Department's benefit, even if that real estate is not directly adjacent to the installation. The committee also believes that the partner entities should, absent circumstances in which the potential impact of encroachment or development on the installation's mission is particularly great, equally share acquisition costs with the Department.

The committee intends to closely monitor implementation of this authority and recommends adding an annual reporting requirement.

### **Subtitle C—Land Conveyances**

#### **Part I—Army Conveyances**

##### **Land conveyance, Helena, Montana (sec. 2841)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey by quitclaim deed to the Helena Indian Alliance, a parcel of property consisting of approximately 3 acres located at the Sheridan Hall Army Reserve Center, Helena, Montana for the purpose of supporting Native American health care, mental health counseling, and the operation of an educational training center. This provision would also require the Secretary to seek reimbursement from the Helena Indian Alliance for costs related to the conveyance.

##### **Land conveyance, Army Reserve center, Bothell, Washington (sec. 2842)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, to the Snohomish County Fire Protection District #10 a parcel of property consisting of approximately 1 acre located at the Army Reserve Center, Bothell, Washington for the purpose of permitting the fire district to operate a fire station on the property.

This provision would authorize the Secretary to include a reversionary clause in the terms of the conveyance, in the event the property conveyed was not used in accordance with the purpose stated in the authorization. This provision would also authorize the Secretary to seek reimbursement from the fire district for costs related to the conveyance.



## **Part II—Air Force Conveyances**

### **Acquisition of build-to-lease family housing at Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska (sec. 2861)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force, if determined to be in the best economic interest of the Air Force, to purchase the entire interest in a family housing project consisting of 300 units at Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, which is being leased from a private entity by the Secretary under section 801 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1984 (Public Law 98–115). The Secretary would be authorized to provide consideration for the project at an amount not to exceed fair market value, as determined by the Secretary.

The authorization provided by this provision is similar to the authorization provided to the Secretary to purchase 366 family housing units at Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska under section 2804 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261). The Air Force requires the family housing units to be obtained by both purchases to meet the total housing requirement for Eielson Air Force Base.

## **Subtitle D—Other Matters**

### **Reorganization and technical improvement of codified laws applicable to real property of the Department of Defense (sec. 2881)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2663 and 2664 of title 10, United States Code, to consolidate and clarify authorities available for real property administration. This provision would also repeal sections 2672, 2672a, and 2676 of title 10, United States Code, that would be superceded as a result of the consolidations. This provision would also amend section 2661 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the application of the section to the Pentagon Reservation.

### **Report on application of force protection and anti-terrorism standards to leased facilities (sec. 2882)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than May 1, 2006, on the application of Department of Defense anti-terrorism/force protection (AT/FP) standards to all facilities leased by the Department of Defense, or leased by the General Services Administration (GSA) on the Department's behalf, that house more than 11 personnel in service to, or employed by the Department. The report would include:

- (1) a description of all facilities;
- (2) a threat and vulnerability assessment;
- (3) a description of actions to mitigate risk; and
- (4) a description and cost estimate of the actions to be carried out to meet force protection/anti-terrorism standards.

The committee is committed to ensuring that AT/FP standards applied to defense installations to protect military personnel should also be applied to leased facilities. The standards, set forth in Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 4–010–01, “DOD Minimum AT Stand-

ards for Buildings,” were established in October 2003 to provide a prescriptive set of design conditions in which all leased facilities were to be in full compliance by October 2009. No facilities currently leased by the Department or GSA, most of which are in highly urban areas, meet the AT/FP standards. Yet, as of this date, the Department has not released a plan or investment strategy required to achieve the goal.

The committee encourages the Department to work with leased facility owners to seek options in the management and upgrade of existing leased facilities that could mitigate risk to an acceptable level, while saving the Department the costs of the relocation of personnel.

**Construction at Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico, for Reserve components (sec. 2883)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1507(b)(2) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) to remove the restriction on construction of facilities for Reserve component or non-appropriated fund projects.

**Authority to use Papago Park Military Reservation, Arizona, for general military purposes (sec. 2884)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1 of the Act of April 7, 1930 (46 Stat. 142, chapter 107) to change the designation of land reserved for the State of Arizona. The Act of April 7, 1930, abolished the Papago Saguaro National Monument and reserved specific land for military purposes for use by the National Guard of the State of Arizona as a rifle range. This provision would designate the use of specific land as a military installation known as the Papago Park Military Reservation, thereby allowing the State of Arizona to incorporate other military requirements on the specific land.

**One-year extension of Department of Defense laboratory revitalization program (sec. 2885)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend by one year the authorization provided by section 2891 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (division B of Public Law 108–375) for the Secretary of Defense to carry out a program for the revitalization of laboratories operated by the Department of Defense. This provision would provide for the expiration of the authority on September 30, 2006.

Initial authorization for this program was provided under section 2892 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104–106). The authority for the program was extended and amended under section 2871 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (division B of Public Law 105–261) and resumed under section 2891 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (division B of Public Law 108–375).

The committee intends the extension of the revitalization program for defense laboratories to allow the Secretary of Defense to use the increased thresholds in section 2805 of title 10, United

States Code, to address unique revitalization requirements for defense laboratories which typically cost more than the revitalization of comparative-sized military facilities.

**Sense of Congress on establishment of Bakers Creek memorial (sec. 2886)**

The committee recommends a provision that would describe the circumstances surrounding the crash at Bakers Creek, Australia, of a U.S. B-17C aircraft transporting 6 crew members and 35 servicemen from Mackay, Australia, to Port Moresby, New Guinea, on June 14, 1943, and that would express the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of the Army may establish an appropriate marker, at a site to be chosen at the discretion of the Secretary, to commemorate the event and the military members who died in that tragedy.

**Items of Special Interest**

**Report on host nation agreements for overseas installations**

The President released the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy (IGPBS) in August, 2004. Within the strategy a series of world-wide military installations, designated as forward operating sites and cooperative security locations, were identified as having an “enduring presence” to support both the permanent presence of U.S. military personnel and rotating units for training and regional operations. The Department of Defense provided a report to Congress on March 3, 2005, which provided an overview by location of the broad purpose, planned capability, estimates of U.S. military population, and general facility requirements needed by fiscal year 2011. The report noted that “requirements may change as discussions and negotiations with host nations mature and individual investment strategies are finalized.”

The Departments of Defense and State are now in the process of negotiating formal agreements with host nations to implement the strategy. The agreements will establish the status of U.S. forces, funding responsibilities, burden-sharing arrangements, and basing plans to include the number of U.S. military personnel to be stationed in the host country. Many of the sites will require a substantial investment of funds for new construction and infrastructure, either to be funded by the host nation, or by the United States, to meet the intent of the strategy.

To ensure a wise use of taxpayer dollars, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure host nation agreements for the status of forces, funding responsibilities, and basing plans are secured before including authorization of funds for military construction projects in future President’s budget requests or in future supplemental appropriations requests. In addition, the Secretary shall ensure that burden-sharing arrangements are pursued with host nations in order to minimize the impact on Department of Defense’s budgets for the support of mutual national security interests.

The committee also directs the Secretary to establish installation development master plans that will cover all facility and infrastructure requirements, total estimated costs, and anticipated funding

sources before expending funds for new construction and replacement of expeditionary facilities. These plans would serve as essential guides to ensure that priorities are developed with comprehensive designs that guide prudent investment decisions, and that preclude the waste of funds on facilities that do not address long-term military requirements. These base development master plans, and particularly the extent of permanent facilities for exclusive use by U.S. forces, must be established in close cooperation with host nations to avoid planning conflicts and to be able to address mutual requirements.

The committee directs the Secretary to submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate not later than April 15, 2006, a report that includes the following information for overseas locations:

- (1) a description and status of all host nation agreements established, or in negotiation, for each installation identified in the IGPBS as a forward operating site or cooperative security locations that will have an enduring presence of U.S. military personnel;
- (2) a description of the base development master plan for each site or location to include a specific list of facility improvement or construction projects and costs to complete all known requirements to support the estimated U.S. military population; and
- (3) an estimate by site or location of the annual cost to operate and sustain the installation.

#### **Training facilities for military operations in urban terrain**

In the Senate report accompanying S.2514 (S. Rept. 107-151), the committee required a report by the Secretary of Defense that would establish the requirements within the Department of Defense for facilities that support training for military operations in urban terrain (MOUT).

The committee is aware that the Department study requested by the committee is ongoing. At the same time, requirements for new MOUT training capabilities, driven by lessons learned during Operation Iraqi Freedom, are increasing within each service. The services will continue to address MOUT requirements and expend resources independently with minimal coordination and cooperation until a comprehensive joint MOUT training plan and investment strategy are approved and implemented within the Department.

The committee is concerned that a critical opportunity to develop capabilities for joint training in urban operations is not effectively being pursued within the Department. Therefore, the committee directs the Department to complete the required study by November 1, 2005, and to establish a requirements baseline against which the capabilities within each service and across the Department can be measured. The committee expects the results of the study to be incorporated into fiscal year 2007 budget decisions.

#### **Relocation of Reserve component military units at Lambert International Airport, St. Louis, Missouri**

The committee is aware of current negotiations between the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Navy, and the City of

St. Louis Airport Authority to support expansion of Lambert International Airport in St. Louis by relocating Reserve component military installations at the airport. The committee is concerned that the current location of the 131st Air National Guard Fighter Wing and a Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center (NMCRC) may impede safe operations of a new runway being constructed at the airport and the installation of navigational equipment required by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for the new runway.

Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy to complete negotiations with the airport authority that will result in an agreement to relocate the 131st Fighter Wing and the NMCRC at the expense of the airport authority before the new airport runway is completed in June 2006. The agreement should also address the issue of FAA access to the military installations prior to the completion of the relocation of the military units in order to install Instrument Landing System equipment, obstruction lights, and power cables for the new runway 29 CAT III approach.



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

### **TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**

#### **Overview**

Title XXXI authorizes appropriations for atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy (DOE) for fiscal year 2006, 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, which include National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA); defense environmental management; other defense activities; and defense nuclear waste disposal.

The budget request for atomic energy defense activities at DOE totaled \$16.4 billion, a 1.4 percent decrease below the fiscal year 2005 appropriated level. Of the total amount requested, \$9.4 billion is for NNSA, of which \$6.6 billion is for weapons activities, \$1.6 billion is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, \$786.0 million is for naval reactors, and \$343.9 million is for the Office of the Administrator; \$6.0 billion is for defense environmental management, of which \$5.2 billion is for defense site acceleration completion, and \$831.3 million is for defense environmental services; \$636.0 million is for other defense activities; \$351.4 million is for defense nuclear waste disposal; and \$12.0 million is for energy supply.

The committee recommends \$16.4 billion for atomic energy defense activities at DOE, the amount of the budget request. Of the amounts authorized for the NNSA, \$6.6 billion is for weapons activities, a decrease of \$39.8 million below the budget request; \$1.6 billion is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, the amount of the budget request; \$786.0 million is for naval reactors, the amount of the budget request; and \$343.9 million is for the Office of the Administrator, the amount of the budget request. The committee recommends \$6.2 billion for the defense environmental management activities, an increase of \$174.4 million above the budget request. Of the amounts authorized for defense environmental management, \$5.3 billion is for defense site acceleration completion, an increase of \$152.1 million above the budget request; and \$853.6 million is for defense environmental services, an increase of \$22.3 million above the budget request. The committee recommends \$563.4 million for other defense activities, a reduction of \$72.6 million below the budget request. The committee recommends \$301.4 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, a re-

duction of \$50.0 million below the budget request. The committee recommends no funds for energy supply, a reduction of \$12.0 million.

The following table summarizes the budget request and the authorizations:



**Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

**ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)**

<b>Department of Energy</b>			
Energy Supply	12,000	-12,000	
National nuclear security administration:			
Weapons activities			
Operation and maintenance	6,063,690	-50,414	6,013,276
Construction	566,443	10,600	577,043
<b>Total, Weapons activities</b>	<b>6,630,133</b>	<b>-39,814</b>	<b>6,590,319</b>
Defense nuclear nonproliferation			
Operation and maintenance	1,269,674		1,269,674
Construction	367,565		367,565
<b>Total, Defense nuclear nonproliferation</b>	<b>1,637,239</b>		<b>1,637,239</b>
Naval reactors			
Operation and maintenance	769,100		769,100
Construction	16,900		16,900
<b>Total, Naval reactors</b>	<b>786,000</b>		<b>786,000</b>
Office of the administrator	343,869		343,869
<b>Total, National nuclear security administration</b>	<b>9,397,241</b>	<b>-39,814</b>	<b>9,357,427</b>

**Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

Environmental and other defense activities:			
Defense site acceleration completion	5,183,713	152,136	5,335,849
Defense environmental services	831,331	22,253	853,584
Other defense activities	635,998	-72,575	563,423
Defense nuclear waste disposal	351,447	-50,000	301,447
<b>Total, Environmental &amp; other defense activities</b>	<b>7,002,489</b>	<b>51,814</b>	<b>7,054,303</b>
<b>Total, Department of Energy</b>	<b>16,411,730</b>		<b>16,411,730</b>
<b>OTHER ACTIVITIES (Discretionary)</b>			
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	22,032		22,032
Corps of Engineers - Civil Works	140,000		140,000
<b>Total, Other Activities Discretionary</b>	<b>162,032</b>		<b>162,032</b>
<b>Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053) Discretionary</b>	<b>16,573,762</b>		<b>16,573,762</b>

**Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<b>Energy Supply</b>	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
	12,000	-12,000	
<b>Weapons Activities</b>			
<b>Directed stockpile work (DSW)</b>			
Life Extension Program			
B61 Life Extension Program	50,810		50,810
W76 Life Extension Program	162,268		162,268
W80 Life Extension Program	135,240		135,240
W87 Life Extension Program			
Total, Life Extension Program	348,318		348,318
Stockpile systems			
B61 Stockpile systems	66,050		66,050
W62 Stockpile systems	8,967		8,967
W76 Stockpile systems	63,538		63,538
W78 Stockpile systems	32,632		32,632
W80 Stockpile systems	26,315		26,315
B83 Stockpile systems	26,391		26,391
W84 Stockpile systems	4,402		4,402
W87 Stockpile systems	50,678		50,678
W88 Stockpile systems	32,831		32,831
Total, Stockpile systems	311,804		311,804
Retired warheads stockpile systems	35,245		35,245

**Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Stockpile services			
Production support	267,246		267,246
Research & development support	66,753		66,753
Research & development certification and safety	211,727		211,727
Management, technology, and production	166,587		166,587
Advanced concepts			
Reliable replacement warhead	9,351		9,351
Robust nuclear earth penetrator	4,000		4,000
Total, Stockpile services	725,664		725,664
<b>Total, Directed stockpile work</b>	<b>1,421,031</b>		<b>1,421,031</b>
<b>Campaigns</b>			
<b>Science campaign</b>			
Primary assessment technologies	45,179		45,179
Dynamic materials properties	80,894		80,894
Advanced radiography	49,520		49,520
Secondary assessment technologies	61,332		61,332
Test readiness	25,000		25,000
<b>Total, Science campaign</b>	<b>261,925</b>		<b>261,925</b>
<b>Engineering campaign</b>			
Enhanced surety	29,845		29,845
Weapon systems engineering assessment technology	24,040		24,040
Nuclear survivability and effects	9,386		9,386
Enhanced surveillance	96,207		96,207

# **Department of Energy National Security Programs**

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Engineering campaign construction activities			
Operations and maintenance / Other project costs (OPC)	4,714		4,714
01-D-108 Microsystem and engineering science			
applications (MESA), SNL, Albuquerque, NM	65,564		65,564
Total, Engineering campaign construction activities	70,278		70,278
<b>Total, Engineering campaign</b>	<b>229,756</b>		<b>229,756</b>
<b>Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign</b>			
Operation and maintenance			
Ignition	75,615		75,615
Support of other stockpile programs	9,872		9,872
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics, and experiment support	43,008		43,008
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	10,111		10,111
University grants / Other ICF support	9,946		9,946
Facility operations and target production	54,623		54,623
Inertial fusion technology			
NIF demonstration program	112,330		112,330
High-energy Petawatt laser development	3,000		3,000
Total, Operation and maintenance	318,505		318,505
Construction			
96-D-111 National ignition facility (NIF),			
LLNL, Livermore, CA	141,913		141,913
<b>Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign</b>	<b>460,418</b>		<b>460,418</b>

# **Department of Energy National Security Programs**

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
<b>Advanced simulation and computing campaign</b>			
Operation and maintenance			
Advanced applications development	137,580		137,580
Verification and validation	50,015		50,015
Physics and material models	67,745		67,745
Problem solving environment (PSE)	39,464		39,464
Distance computing (DisCom)	15,852		15,852
Pathforward	7,442		7,442
Data and visualization sciences (D&VS)	58,959		58,959
Physical infrastructure & platforms	99,220		99,220
Computational systems	59,921		59,921
Simulation support	59,759		59,759
Advanced architectures	2,977		2,977
University partnerships	44,095		44,095
1 Program/3 labs b	17,801		17,801
Total, Operation and maintenance	660,830		660,830
Construction			
00-D-103 Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA			
<b>Total, Advanced simulation and computing</b>	<b>660,830</b>		<b>660,830</b>
<b>Pit manufacturing and certification campaign</b>			
W88 Pit manufacturing	120,926		120,926
W88 Pit certification	61,895		61,895
Pit Manufacturing capability	23,071		23,071

# **Department of Energy National Security Programs**

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>EY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Modern pit facility	7,686		7,686
Pit campaign support activities at NTS	35,182		35,182
<b>Pit manufacturing and certification campaign</b>	<b>248,760</b>		<b>248,760</b>
<b>Readiness campaign</b>			
Stockpile readiness	31,400		31,400
High explosive readiness / Assembly campaign	17,097		17,097
Nonnuclear readiness	28,630		28,630
Tritium readiness	62,694		62,694
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	24,894		24,894
Advanced design and production technologies	54,040		54,040
<b>Total, Readiness campaign</b>	<b>218,755</b>		<b>218,755</b>
<b>Total, Campaigns</b>	<b>2,080,444</b>		<b>2,080,444</b>
<b>Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)</b>			
<b>Operation and maintenance</b>		57,975	1,218,758
Operation of facilities	1,160,783		105,738
Program readiness	105,738		6,619
Special projects	6,619		72,730
Material recycle and recovery	72,730		17,247
Containers	17,247		25,222
Storage	25,222		57,975
<b>RTBF Operation and maintenance</b>	<b>1,388,339</b>	<b>57,975</b>	<b>1,446,314</b>

# **Department of Energy National Security Programs**

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
<b>RTBF Construction</b>			
06-D-140 Project engineering design (PED) various locations	14,113	5,000	19,113
06-D-402 NTS replace fire stations 1 & 2 Nevada Test Site, NV	8,284		8,284
06-D-403 Tritium facility modernization Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA	2,600		2,600
06-D-404 Building B-3 remediation, restoration, and upgrade, Nevada Test Site, NV	16,000		16,000
05-D-140 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations	5,000		5,000
05-D-401 Building 12-64 production bays upgrades Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	11,000	5,600	16,600
05-D-402 Beryllium capability(BEC) project, Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN	7,700		7,700
04-D-103 Project engineering and design, (PED) various locations	2,000		2,000



**Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy research facility replacement, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	55,000		55,000
04-D-126 Building 12-44 production cells upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX			
04-D-128 TA-18 Criticality Experiments Facility Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	13,000		13,000
03-D-102 National security sciences building Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM			
03-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations	29,000		29,000
01-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations	9,000		9,000
01-D-124 HEU materials facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	70,350		70,350
<b>Total, Construction</b>	<b>243,047</b>	<b>10,600</b>	<b>253,647</b>
<b>Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities</b>	<b>1,631,386</b>	<b>68,575</b>	<b>1,699,961</b>

# **Department of Energy National Security Programs**

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
<b>Secure transportation asset</b>			
Operations and equipment	143,766	4,000	147,766
Program direction	68,334		68,334
<b>Total, Secure transportation asset</b>	<b>212,100</b>	<b>4,000</b>	<b>216,100</b>
<b>Nuclear weapons incident response</b>			
Emergency response	101,682		101,682
Emergency management	6,615		6,615
Operations support	10,499		10,499
<b>Total, Nuclear weapons incident response</b>	<b>118,796</b>		<b>118,796</b>
<b>Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program (FIRP)</b>			
Operation and maintenance	233,484	30,000	263,484
Construction			
06-D-160 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	5,811		5,811
06-D-601 Electrical distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	4,000		4,000
06-D-602 Gas main and distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	3,700		3,700

# **Department of Energy National Security Programs**

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
06-D-603 Steam plant life extension project (SLEP), Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN	729		729
05-D-160 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program project engineering and design (PED), various locations	10,644		10,644
05-D-601 Compressed air upgrades project (CAUP), Y-12, National security complex, Oak Ridge, TN	9,741		9,741
05-D-602 Power grid infrastructure upgrade (PGIU), Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	8,500		8,500
05-D-603 New master substation (NMSU), TA I and IV, Sandia National Laboratory, Albuquerque, NM	6,900		6,900
04-D-203 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program (FIRP), project engineering and design (PED), various locations			
Total, Construction	50,025		50,025
<b>Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program</b>	<b>283,509</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>313,509</b>

**Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Change</u>	<u>Senate</u> <u>Authorized</u>
<b>Environmental projects and operations</b>			
Environmental projects and operations program	156,504	-156,504	
Program direction	17,885	-17,885	
<b>Total, Environmental projects and operations</b>	<b>174,389</b>	<b>-174,389</b>	
<b>Safeguards and security</b>			
Operation and maintenance	699,478	32,000	731,478
<b>Construction</b>			
05-D-170 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	41,000		41,000
05-D-701 Security perimeter project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	41,000		41,000
<b>Total, Construction</b>			
Offset for S&S work for others	-32,000		-32,000
<b>Total, Safeguards and security</b>	<b>708,478</b>	<b>32,000</b>	<b>740,478</b>
<b>Total, Weapons Activities</b>	<b>6,630,133</b>	<b>-39,814</b>	<b>6,590,319</b>
<b>Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation</b>			
<b>Nonproliferation and verification R&amp;D</b>			
Operation and maintenance	267,218	86,000	353,218

# Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Construction			
06-D-180 06-01 Project engineering and design (PED), National Security Laboratory, various locations	5,000		5,000
<b>Total, Nonproliferation &amp; verification R&amp;D</b>	<b>272,218</b>	<b>86,000</b>	<b>358,218</b>
Nonproliferation and international security	80,173		80,173
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	343,435	20,000	363,435
Global initiatives for proliferation prevention	37,890		37,890
HEU transparency implementation	20,483		20,483
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	132,000	80,000	212,000
<b>Fissile materials disposition</b>			
U S surplus materials disposition			
Operation and maintenance	226,500		226,500
Construction			
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC	24,000		24,000

**Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	338,565		338,565
Total, Construction	<b>362,565</b>		<b>362,565</b>
US surplus material disposition, TOA	<b>589,065</b>		<b>589,065</b>
Russian surplus materials disposition	64,000		64,000
Reduction due to delay in program		-200,000	-200,000
<b>Total, Fissile materials disposition</b>	<b>653,065</b>	<b>-200,000</b>	<b>453,065</b>
Global threat reduction initiative	97,975	14,000	111,975
<b>Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation</b>	<b>1,637,239</b>		<b>1,637,239</b>
<b>Naval Reactors</b>			
<b>Naval reactors development</b>			
Operation and maintenance	738,800		738,800
Construction			
06-D-901 Central office building 2, Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory, West Mifflin, PA	7,000		7,000
05-N-900 Materials development facility building, Schenectady, NY	9,900		9,900

**Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID			
Total, Construction	16,900		16,900
<b>Total, Naval reactors development</b>	<b>755,700</b>		<b>755,700</b>
Program direction	30,300		30,300
<b>Total, Naval Reactors</b>	<b>786,000</b>		<b>786,000</b>
<b>Office of the Administrator</b>			
Office of the administrator	350,765		350,765
Use of prior year balances	-6,896		-6,896
<b>Total, Office of the Administrator</b>	<b>343,869</b>		<b>343,869</b>
<b>Defense Site Acceleration Completion</b> (was Defense Facilities Closure Projects)			
<b>2006 Accelerated completions</b>			
Operation and maintenance	1,016,508	30,495	1,047,003
<b>2012 Accelerated completions</b>			
Operation and maintenance	1,293,046	41,727	1,334,773
Construction			
06-D-401 Sodium bearing waste treatment project, Idaho National Laboratory, Idaho Falls, ID	15,000		15,000

**Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
04-D-414 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	9,200		9,200
01-D-416 Waste treatment and immobilization plant, Richland, WA	625,893		625,893
Total, Construction	650,093		650,093
<b>Total, 2012 Accelerated completions</b>	<b>1,943,139</b>	<b>41,727</b>	<b>1,984,866</b>
<b>2035 Accelerated completions</b>			
Operation and maintenance	1,826,642	79,914	1,906,556
Construction			
05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	70,000		70,000
04-D-408 Glass waste storage building #2, Savannah River, Aiken, SC	6,975		6,975
03-D-403 Immobilized HLW interim storage facility, Richland, WA	7,495		7,495



# **Department of Energy National Security Programs**

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
03-D-414 Project engineering and design (PED), Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River, Aiken, SC Total, Construction	4,342 88,812		4,342 88,812
<b>Total, 2035 Accelerated completions</b>	<b>1,915,454</b>	<b>79,914</b>	<b>1,995,368</b>
Safeguards and security	287,223		287,223
Technology development and deployment	21,389		21,389
<b>Total, Defense Site Acceleration Completion</b>	<b>5,183,713</b>	<b>152,136</b>	<b>5,335,849</b>
<b>Defense Environmental Services</b> (was Defense Environmental Management Privatization)			
Community and regulatory support	62,032	4,368	66,400
Federal contribution to the uranium enrichment	451,000		451,000
Non-closure environmental activities Operation and maintenance	87,368		87,368
Program direction	230,931	17,885	248,816
<b>Total, Defense Environmental Services</b>	<b>831,331</b>	<b>22,253</b>	<b>853,584</b>

**Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<b>Other Defense Activities</b>			
<b>Office of security and safety performance assurance</b>			
Nuclear safeguards and security	176,878	15,000	191,878
Security investigations	48,725		48,725
Program direction	75,492		75,492
<b>Total, Security and safety performance assurance</b>	<b>301,095</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>316,095</b>
<b>Environment, safety and health</b>			
Environment, safety and health (defense)	56,483		56,483
Program direction	20,546		20,546
<b>Total, Environment, safety and health</b>	<b>77,029</b>		<b>77,029</b>
<b>Office of Legacy Management</b>			
Legacy management	31,421		31,421
Program direction	13,655		13,655
<b>Total, Office of Legacy Management</b>	<b>45,076</b>		<b>45,076</b>
<b>Nuclear energy</b>			
Infrastructure			
Idaho facilities management			17,762
INL infrastructure O&M	17,762		75,008
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	75,008		92,770
<b>Total, Infrastructure</b>	<b>92,770</b>		<b>92,770</b>

# Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	<u>FY2006 Request</u>	<u>Senate Change</u>	<u>Senate Authorized</u>
Spent nuclear fuel management Program direction	31,103		31,103
<b>Total, Nuclear energy</b>	<b>123,873</b>		<b>123,873</b>
Defense related administrative support Office of hearings and appeals	87,575	-87,575	
<b>Subtotal, Other defense activities</b>	<b>639,001</b>	<b>-72,575</b>	<b>566,426</b>
<b>Adjustments</b>			
Use of prior year balances	-3,003		-3,003
Less security charge for reimbursable work (NE)	-3,003		-3,003
<b>Total, Adjustments</b>	<b>635,998</b>	<b>-72,575</b>	<b>563,423</b>
<b>Total, Other Defense Activities</b>			
<b>Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal</b>	<b>351,447</b>	<b>-50,000</b>	<b>301,447</b>
Defense nuclear waste disposal			
<b>Total, Department of Energy</b>	<b>16,411,730</b>		<b>16,411,730</b>
<b>Other Activities (Discretionary)</b>			
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	22,032		22,032
Corps of Engineers - Civil Works	140,000		140,000
<b>Total, Other Activities Discretionary</b>	<b>162,032</b>		<b>162,032</b>
<b>Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053) (Discretionary)</b>	<b>16,573,762</b>		<b>16,573,762</b>

## **Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations**

### **National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of \$9.4 billion for the Department of Energy (DOE) in fiscal year 2006 for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to carry out programs necessary to national security.

#### **Weapons activities**

The committee recommends \$6.6 billion for weapons activities, a \$39.8 million reduction below the amount requested in fiscal year 2006. The committee authorizes the following activities: \$1.4 billion for directed stockpile work; \$2.1 billion for campaigns; \$1.7 billion for readiness in the technical base; \$216.1 million for secure transportation asset; \$740.5 million for safeguards and security; and \$313.5 million for facilities and infrastructure. The budget request included \$174.4 million for environmental projects and operations. The committee recommends no funds for these activities within the NNSA.

#### **Directed stockpile work**

The committee recommends \$1.4 billion for directed stockpile work, 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. This account also includes fabrication and assembly of weapons components, feasibility studies, weapons dismantlement and disposal, training, and support equipment.

#### **Campaigns**

The committee recommends \$2.1 billion for campaigns, the amount of the budget request. The campaigns focus on science and engineering efforts involving the three weapons laboratories, the Nevada Test Site, and the weapons plants. Each campaign is focused on a specific activity to support and maintain the nuclear stockpile without underground nuclear weapons testing. These efforts maintain and enhance the safety, security, and reliability of the existing stockpile. The campaigns are divided into three major categories: science campaigns, readiness campaigns, and engineering campaigns.

#### **Readiness in the technical base**

The committee recommends \$1.7 billion in readiness in the technical base and facilities (RTBF), a \$68.6 million increase above the budget request. This account funds facilities and infrastructure in the weapons complex to ensure the operational readiness of the complex and includes construction funding for new facilities.

The \$68.6 million increase in RTBF should be used to limit any additional deferred maintenance. This amount includes \$20.0 million for fire safety and air handling systems, capital equipment upgrades, and infrastructure improvements at the Kansas City Plant, which plays a critical role in the warhead life extension programs by producing and supporting the non-nuclear components of nu-

clear warheads. Additionally, this amount includes \$12.0 million to accelerate design of the Uranium Processing Facility at the Y-12 National Security Complex of which \$5.0 million is included in project 06-D-140 and \$25.6 million for operations of facilities for maintenance projects, equipment replacements, and the upgrade of production bays at the Pantex Plant of which \$5.6 million is included in project 05-D-401.

#### **Secure transportation asset**

The committee recommends \$216.1 million for the secure transportation asset, a \$4.0 million increase above the budget request. The secure transportation asset is responsible for transportation of nuclear weapons, weapons materials and components, and other materials requiring safe and secure transport.

The committee notes that demand for secure transportation assets has continued to grow in recent years as sites have identified special nuclear material (SNM) excess to program needs and consolidated the storage of these materials in fewer locations. These actions can improve the security posture of DOE sites. The committee encourages DOE to continue to identify opportunities and accelerate the consolidation of SNM storage at its sites, where appropriate.

#### **Safeguards and security**

The committee recommends \$740.5 million for weapons safeguards and security, a \$32.0 million increase above the budget request. This amount includes \$20.0 million for security upgrades at the Y-12 National Security Complex and \$12.0 million for security upgrades at the Pantex Plant.

The committee notes that DOE has increased the amount of funding for safeguards and security in the Future Years Nuclear Security Program (FYNSP) in response to the concern raised by the committee last year; however, the committee remains concerned about the pace of DOE efforts to respond to current postulated threats. Further, DOE has not responded aggressively to this committee's direction from last year to invest in force multiplying construction and technologies to help increase security capabilities. The committee has recommended additional funds within the Office of Security and Safety Performance Assessment to accelerate the demonstration and deployment of security technology at DOE nuclear sites.

#### **Facilities and infrastructure**

The committee recommends \$313.5 million for the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (FIRP), a \$30.0 million increase above the budget request and the same as the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2005. The additional funding provided should be used to complete projects on the approved FIRP integrated project list, including deferred maintenance on heating, ventilating and air conditioning systems at the Y-12 National Security Complex and at Sandia National Laboratories; deferred maintenance and electrical system deficiencies at the Pantex Plant and at Los Alamos National Laboratory; and for electrical substation equipment at the Nevada Test Site.

The FIRP program will sunset in the year 2011. The FYNSP provided with the budget request projects a 30 percent reduction in FIRP funding below the fiscal year 2005 FYNSP. The committee does not expect that DOE can meet the FIRP program objective of elimination of certain deferred maintenance under the new FYNSP. The committee directs DOE to reevaluate FIRP funding and to submit with the fiscal year 2007 budget request a FYNSP sufficient to meet program goals by the program sunset date.

### **Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program**

The committee recommends \$1.6 billion for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program, the amount of the budget request. The 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: \$358.2 million for nonproliferation and verification research and development, an increase of \$86.0 million above the budget request; \$80.2 million for nonproliferation and international security; \$363.4 million for international nuclear materials protection and cooperation, an increase of \$20.0 million above the budget request; \$37.9 million for global initiatives for proliferation prevention; \$20.5 million for highly-enriched uranium transparency implementation; \$212.0 million for elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production, an increase of \$80.0 million above the budget request; \$453.1 million for fissile materials disposition, a decrease of \$200.0 million below the budget request; and \$112.0 million for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, an increase of \$14.0 million above the budget request.

The committee notes that continued delays in the commencement of construction activities under the fissile materials disposition program make it unlikely that the DOE will be able to fully obligate the budget request for that program in fiscal year 2006. The committee remains concerned by the delays in the fissile materials disposition program, as well as in several other cooperative nonproliferation programs with Russia, as a result of a dispute between the United States and Russia over what liability standards should apply to the work under the programs. Continued delays in the fissile materials disposition program have significant domestic, as well as international, ramifications because work at the U.S. MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility is being delayed to ensure parallelism with the Russian program. The committee fully supports the goals of the MOX program and urges the administration to give this matter sustained high-level attention with the aim of resolving the dispute as quickly as possible so that reasonable liability standards are established that will be protective of U.S. interests and will allow the program to proceed. However, the committee does not support the use of program funds for site preparation or equipment procurement for the Russian MOX facility until an agreement on liability has been reached.

The committee believes that the nonproliferation and verification research and development program is supporting valuable basic and applied research in radiation detection that would benefit from the additional resources the committee recommends authorizing for this program. The committee notes the creation of the Domestic

Nuclear Detection Office in the Department of Homeland Security and underscores the importance of properly coordinating the work of that office with the long-standing efforts and technical expertise resident in the DOE in this critical area. The committee further understands that the DOE will retain responsibility for the implementation of international nonproliferation programs involving the deployment of radiation detection equipment overseas.

The committee recommends authorizing additional resources for the elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program to accelerate the construction of a fossil-fuel power plant at Zheleznogorsk in order to meet the goal of shutting down the Zheleznogorsk plutonium-producing nuclear reactor by 2011.

The committee recommends authorizing additional resources for the international nuclear materials protection and cooperation program to accelerate security upgrades at Russian Strategic Rocket Forces sites, at Russian 12th Main Directorate sites as they become available for safety upgrades, and to accelerate the installation of equipment at additional Megaports.

The committee recommends authorizing additional resources for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative to accelerate the conversion of domestic research reactors so that they are fueled with low-enriched uranium-fuel rather than highly-enriched uranium-fuel, which poses a higher proliferation risk.

#### **Naval Reactors**

The committee recommends \$786.0 million for Naval Reactors, the amount of the budget request.

#### **Office of Administrator**

The committee recommends \$343.9 million for program direction for the NNSA, the amount of the budget request. This account includes program direction funding for all elements of NNSA, except for the Naval Reactors Program and the Secure Transportation Asset.

#### **Environmental Projects and Operations**

The budget request included \$174.4 million for environmental projects and operations. The committee recommends no funds for these activities within the NNSA. Congress established the NNSA under title 32 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) to separate the defense activities of DOE from its other disparate missions such as energy research, operation of the federal power marketing administrations, and cleanup of the Cold War environmental legacy. The environmental management program exists for the express purpose of addressing the Cold War environmental legacy at DOE sites. Under the Act, the Secretary of Energy may transfer any environmental remediation and waste management activity at NNSA nuclear weapons production facilities or at NNSA national security laboratories from the NNSA to another element of DOE. In providing this authority, Congress recognized the possibility that DOE may encounter the need to migrate a particular facility, program, or activity out of the NNSA should it evolve principally into an environmental cleanup activity. This provision allows such activity only to be transferred

out of the NNSA. In proposing the transfer of environmental management activities into the NNSA, the budget request does not comply with the Act. The committee has authorized the activities requested under environmental projects and operations within defense environmental management, where they are currently conducted and where they appropriately reside.

### **Reliable replacement warhead**

The committee recommends \$9.4 million to continue the reliable replacement warhead (RRW), the amount of the budget request. The committee understands from the testimony of the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) that the goals of this program are: (1) to increase the security and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile; (2) to develop replacement components for nuclear warheads that can be more easily manufactured with more readily available and more environmentally benign materials; (3) to develop replacements that can be introduced into the stockpile with assured high confidence regarding their effect on warhead safety and reliability; (4) to develop these replacements on a schedule that would reduce the possibility that the United States would ever be faced with the need to conduct a nuclear test in order to diagnose or remedy a reliability problem in the current stockpile; (5) to reduce infrastructure costs needed to support the stockpile, while increasing the responsiveness of that infrastructure; and (6) to increase confidence in the stockpile to a level such that significant, additional reductions in numbers of non-deployed “hedge” warheads can be made.

The committee supports these goals and this modest investment in feasibility studies, as described in the NNSA testimony before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services, with the goal of substantially increasing the safety, security, and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile and with the ultimate objective of achieving the smallest stockpile consistent with our nation’s security. The Administrator of the NNSA shall submit to the congressional defense committees, no later than February 6, 2006, a report describing the activities undertaken or planned for any RRW funding in fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007.

### **Robust nuclear earth penetrator**

The committee recommends \$4.0 million for the robust nuclear earth penetrator (RNEP), the amount of the budget request. Funding is provided to prepare and execute the sled track impact test at Sandia National Laboratories on the feasibility of case hardening and target penetration. The committee has received testimony from the Secretary of Defense and the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, on the continued proliferation of hard and deeply buried targets and the resulting military utility of completing the RNEP feasibility study.

The committee notes that section 3117 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136) prohibits the Secretary of Energy from commencing the engineering development phase (Phase 6.3) of the nuclear weapons development process, or any subsequent phase, of a robust nuclear earth pene-



trator unless specifically authorized by Congress. The funding requested is for Phase 6.2 feasibility study only.

The committee has not included the \$4.5 million requested within the Air Force budget for the development of logistics, integration, and hardware requirements for carriage of the RNEP on the B-2 aircraft. The committee does not believe that these activities are necessary to evaluate the feasibility of RNEP.

#### **Defense environmental management (sec. 3102)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of \$6.2 billion for the Department of Energy (DOE) in fiscal year 2006 for environmental management (EM) activities, a \$174.4 million increase above the budget request. This amount includes \$174.4 million for the activities proposed to be funded as environmental projects and operations within the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The National Defense Authorization Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-65), which established the NNSA, did not grant the Secretary of Energy authority to transfer environmental remediation and waste management activities into the NNSA. The committee does not support the transfer into the NNSA of legacy environmental liabilities from weapons production during the Cold War. The defense environmental management program exists to accomplish the express purpose of addressing this legacy.

#### **Defense site acceleration completion**

The committee recommends \$5.3 billion for defense site acceleration completion, an increase of \$152.1 million above the budget request. The committee authorizes the following activities: \$1.0 billion for 2006 accelerated completions, an increase of \$30.5 million above the budget request; \$2.0 billion for 2012 accelerated completions, an increase of \$41.7 million above the budget request; \$2.0 billion for 2035 accelerated completions, an increase of \$79.9 million above the budget request; \$287.2 million for safeguards and security, the amount of the budget request; and \$21.4 million for technology development and deployment, the amount of the budget request. The committee does not support the requested transfer of environmental management activities into the NNSA, and has provided authorization for these activities in the accelerated completion accounts under which they are currently funded.

The committee is concerned with the pace at which sites under the EM program are adopting the measures necessary to come into compliance with the new design basis threat. The committee encourages DOE to evaluate promptly all EM sites currently storing nuclear materials excess to mission needs and to execute plans to move excess materials to consolidated, more highly secure storage locations.

#### **Defense environmental services**

The committee recommends \$853.6 million for defense environmental services, an increase of \$22.3 million above the budget request. The committee authorizes the following activities: \$87.4 million for non-closure environmental activities, the amount of the budget request; \$66.4 million for community and regulatory support, an increase of \$4.4 million above the budget request; \$451.0

million for the federal contribution to the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund, the amount of the budget request; and \$248.8 million for program direction, an increase of \$17.9 million above the budget request. The committee does not support the requested transfer of environmental management activities into the NNSA, and has provided authorization for these activities in the environmental services accounts under which they are currently funded.

#### **Other defense activities (sec. 3103)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$563.4 million for the Department of Energy (DOE) for other defense activities, \$72.6 million below the budget request.

#### **Security and Safety Performance Assurance**

The committee recommends \$316.1 million for security and safety performance assurance, an increase of \$15.0 million above the budget request. This increase provides an additional \$15.0 million for security technology deployment to mitigate security weaknesses, to evaluate how technology may be used to reduce security costs, and to adapt technology for physical security applications where current technologies are inadequate to meet DOE requirements. The committee encourages DOE to use a portion of these additional funds for the demonstration and field testing of promising security technologies.

The committee notes that security costs have increased rapidly as DOE implements needed security upgrades to protect its facilities against the design basis threat issued by DOE in 2004. The committee is concerned that DOE is relying disproportionately on increasing the number of armed security personnel at each site to defeat the new threats. The committee encourages DOE to adopt state-of-the-art approaches to guard those targets at greatest risk, including the use of technology and innovative deployment strategies for protective forces.

The Office of Security and Safety Performance Assurance has conducted site assistance visits to review security strategies at each DOE site. The committee urges DOE to develop a set of effective and cost-efficient strategies for protecting against the new design basis threat based on these site visits and to promulgate these strategies as security guidance throughout the DOE.

#### **Environment, Safety and Health**

The committee recommends \$77.0 million for environment, safety and health, the amount of the budget request.

#### **Office of Legacy Management**

The committee recommends \$45.1 million for the Office of Legacy Management, the amount of the budget request.

#### **Nuclear Energy**

The committee recommends \$123.9 million for nuclear energy, the amount of the budget request.

### **Defense Related Administrative Support**

The budget request included \$87.6 million for national security programs administrative support. The committee recommends no funds for these activities. The committee views these administrative support activities as inherently part of the nondefense activities. The committee does not support the use of Atomic Energy Defense funds for nondefense activities.

### **Office of Hearings and Appeals**

The committee recommends \$4.4 million for the Office of Hearings and Appeals, the amount of the budget request.

### **Energy security and assurance**

The budget request included \$12.0 million for energy security and assurance and program direction within the Office of Electric Transmission and Distribution. The Department of Energy continues to request funds for efforts to secure the civilian electricity distribution system as an Atomic Energy Defense activity. The committee does not support this categorization. These responsibilities constitute a coordinated function between the Departments of Energy and Homeland Security related to the civilian energy infrastructure. The committee recommends no funds for these activities. The committee does not support using Atomic Energy Defense funds for nondefense activities.

### **Defense nuclear waste disposal (sec. 3104)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$301.4 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, a decrease of \$50.0 million below the budget request but \$72.3 million above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2005. The committee notes that the budget request for defense nuclear waste disposal increased by 270 percent between the fiscal year 2005 and fiscal year 2006 budget requests. Given the long duration of the development period for the geologic repository, the committee encourages the Department of Energy to reduce the volatility of the funding amount requested for defense nuclear waste disposal from year to year.

## **Subtitle B—Other Matters**

### **Report on compliance with design basis threat (sec. 3105)**

The committee recommends a provision that requires the Secretary of Energy, not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing plans for upgrading the security posture of the Department of Energy (DOE) and National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) in response to the design basis threat (DBT) issued by the Secretary of Energy in October 2004. The report shall include implementation plans and funding required to achieve compliance with the design basis threat by September 30, 2007, at DOE and NNSA sites, which contain nuclear weapons or special nuclear material. The report shall also include an evaluation of technologies and force deployment strategies to improve security efficiency and effectiveness against threats postulated in the DBT.

The committee is concerned with the pace of security enhancements at DOE and NNSA sites in the face of threats assessed by the intelligence community since the attacks of September 11, 2001. While both DOE and NNSA have undertaken commendable near-term efforts to hire additional security personnel and reinforce operational security, longer-term efforts to harden facilities physically and to apply security technology have lagged. The Secretary of Energy testified before the committee that full protection against the DBT will not be achieved before 2008. The committee encourages DOE to accelerate the achievement of compliance at those sites containing assets of gravest concern—nuclear weapons and special nuclear material.

**Cost estimate for Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant project, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (sec. 3106)**

The committee is aware of significant design changes being made at the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) at the Hanford site near Richland, Washington, due in part to increased understanding of seismic criteria for the facility. The committee is concerned that the approach to this project—one where design and construction take place concurrently—may lead to significant cost escalation. Prior to the most recent design changes, the total estimated project cost for the WTP was approximately \$6.0 billion.

The committee understands that the Department of Energy has tasked the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to update its prior cost estimate of the WTP. The committee directs that this effort by the Corps of Engineers be expanded to include the development of a full independent cost estimate of the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant project. The committee directs that the independent cost estimate shall include the total cost to complete the project and annual funding required to complete the project, enumerated by year. The independent cost estimate shall include the total and annual costs to complete the project for a project completion date in each of the following years: 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015. The Secretary of Energy shall provide this new cost estimate to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2006.

**Report on international border security programs (sec. 3107)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Secretaries of Defense, State and, as appropriate, Homeland Security, to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 120 days after enactment of this Act on the management of border security programs in the countries of the former Soviet Union and in other countries. The report would include: (1) a description of the roles and responsibilities of each U.S. department and agency in international border security programs; (2) a description of the interactions and coordination among U.S. departments and agencies that are conducting international border security programs; (3) a description of the mechanisms that exist to ensure coordination, avoid duplication, and pro-

vide a means to resolve conflicts or problems that might arise in the implementation of international border security programs; (4) a discussion of whether there is existing interagency guidance that addresses the roles, interactions, and dispute resolution mechanisms for departments and agencies of the U.S. government that are conducting international border security programs, and the adequacy of such guidance if it exists; and (5) recommendations to improve the coordination and effectiveness of international border security programs.

The committee notes that a January 2005 report of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) entitled “Weapons of Mass Destruction: Nonproliferation Needs Better Integration” identified a strong need for government-wide guidance to delineate the roles, interactions, and responsibilities of agencies—in particular, the Departments of Energy, Defense, and State—in managing international border security programs.

The committee further notes that a March 2005 GAO report entitled “Preventing Nuclear Smuggling: DOE has made limited progress in installing radiation detection equipment at highest priority foreign seaports” recommends that the Department of Energy (DOE) develop a comprehensive long-term plan for the Megaports program that would identify criteria for deciding how many and which lower priority ports to complete if DOE continues to have difficulties initiating work at its highest priority ports, and that DOE reevaluate the per port cost estimates and adjust long-term cost projections as necessary. The committee understands that DOE has revised its port priority model and has begun work on the comprehensive plan recommended by the GAO. The Megaports program, the largest border security program of the Department of Energy, is a key program to be included in the report required by this provision.

### **Items of Special Interest**

#### **National security implications of the Rare Isotope Accelerator**

The committee is aware that the Rare Isotope Accelerator (RIA) is a high priority civilian science facility under study by the Department of Energy Office of Science. The committee understands that RIA would allow precise measurements of nuclear physics phenomena through the development of beams of isotopes that are 10 to 100 times more powerful than those available today and in many cases not available at all. The committee believes such research into the fundamental structure of matter may have possible utility in the analysis of nuclear weapons physics.

The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to report to the congressional defense committees no later than 90 days after enactment of this Act on the potential utility, if any, of data from the RIA on issues concerning national security and on any duplication between the potential capability of the RIA and any capabilities being developed with atomic energy defense funds.

**Role of the Kansas City Plant**

The committee is aware that the Kansas City Plant continues to play an important role in the nuclear weapons activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The mission of the Kansas City Plant is the procurement, production, and life-cycle support of the non-nuclear components of nuclear warheads. To perform this mission, the Kansas City Plant provides precision manufacturing, packaging of specialty mechanisms and microelectronics, specialty materials, and leading-edge technologies like high speed optical electronic telemetry systems. The Kansas City Plant provides an array of mission essential products and services in one secure environment, and continues to receive outstanding performance ratings from NNSA in the fulfillment of its award fee contract.

**TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY  
BOARD**

**Authorization (sec. 3201)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$22.0 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, the amount of the budget request.





## **TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE**

### **Revisions to required receipt objectives for previously authorized disposals from the National Defense Stockpile (sec. 3301)**

The committee recommends a provision that would revise authorizations for disposal of current inventories of excess and obsolete material in the National Defense Stockpile.

## **LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

### **Departmental Recommendations**

By letter dated April 7, 2005, the General Counsel of the Department of Defense forwarded to the President of the Senate proposed legislation “To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes.” The transmittal letter and proposed legislation were officially referred as Executive Communication 1578 to the Committee on Armed Services on April 7, 2005.

Executive Communication 1578 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.

There were no rollcall votes on amendments to the bill.

### **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 2006.

### **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.

