AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

**Calendar No. 185**

110TH CONGRESS
*1st Session*

SENATE

REPORT
110–77

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

## REPORT

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1547]

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

JUNE 5, 2007.—Ordered to be printed

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Calendar No. 185

110TH CONGRESS
*1st Session*

SENATE

REPORT
110–77

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

## REPORT

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1547]

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

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
## UNITED STATES SENATE

JUNE 5, 2007.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

35–737 WASHINGTON : 2007

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(110th Congress, 1st Session)

CARL LEVIN, Michigan, *Chairman*

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

RICHARD D. DEBOBES, *Staff Director*
MICHAEL V. KOSTIW, *Republican Staff Director*

# CONTENTS


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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

Page

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

**Calendar No. 185**

110TH CONGRESS *1st Session* | SENATE | REPORT 110–77

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

JUNE 5, 2007.—Ordered to be printed

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

## REPORT

[To accompany S. 1547]

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

## PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would:

(1) authorize appropriations for (a) procurement, (b) research, development, test and evaluation, (c) operation and maintenance and the revolving and management funds of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2008;

(2) authorize the personnel end strengths for each military active duty component of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2008;

(3) authorize the personnel end strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2008;

(4) impose certain reporting requirements;

(5) impose certain limitations with regard to specific procurement and research, development, test and evaluation actions and manpower strengths; provide certain additional legislative authority, and make certain changes to existing law;

(6) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2008; and

(7) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2008.

**Committee overview and recommendations**

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

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

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

(1) Provide fair compensation and first rate health care, and improve the quality of life of the men and women in the armed forces (active duty, National Guard, and reserves) and their families.

(2) Provide our service men and women with the resources, training, technology, equipment (especially force protection), and authorities they need to participate in combat and stability operations, particularly in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(3) Reduce our Nation's strategic risk by starting and, if possible, accelerating the restoration of the readiness of the military services to conduct the full range of their assigned missions.

(4) Improve the efficiency of Department of Defense (DOD) programs and activities, and apply the savings toward high priority programs.

(5) Improve the ability of the armed forces to meet nontraditional threats, including terrorism and weapons of mass destruction.

(6) Promote the transformation of the armed forces to meet the threats of the 21st Century.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

• Approved the Army funding request for the Patriot PAC–3 program, including the "Pure Fleet" initiative, and added $75.0 million to procure 25 additional PAC–3 missiles.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The committee addressed strategic systems as follows:

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

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

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

In the area of science and technology, the committee:

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

cle armor and to preserve the domestic defense industrial base;

- Over $70.0 million in research and technologies to enhance the force protection of deployed units, including advanced materials for vehicle and body armor, active protection systems that shoot down incoming rocket propelled grenades, and sniper detection systems;
- Nearly $75.0 million for advanced energy and power technologies, including programs to develop fuel cells, hybrid engines, and biofuels for military systems;
- Nearly $65.0 million for defense related research performed at our Nation's universities, which develops next generation military capabilities, while training tomorrow's scientists and engineers; and
- Nearly $50.0 million for research on combat casualty care and military medical technologies, including work to address blast injuries and brain trauma.

- Authorized a provision that would expand the nanotechnology research and development efforts of the Department of Defense, to include enhanced efforts in nanomanufacturing and the incorporation of nanotechnologies into defense systems.
- Authorized a provision that would require the development of a strategic plan for defense manufacturing technology development to ensure that the defense industrial base has the most advanced manufacturing processes available to support the production of defense systems at the lowest cost possible, while being responsive to surge production demands driven by military needs.
- Authorized a provision to revitalize defense laboratories by providing more flexibility in funding construction projects and other infrastructure investment to ensure that these laboratories remain world class technical institutions to support the engineering and technical needs of operational forces.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the area of counterdrug activities, the committee:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Explanation of funding summary**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| | Authorization Request | Senate Authorization | BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION FY 2008 Request | Senate Change to Request | Senate Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **DIVISION A** | | | | | |
| **Title I -- PROCUREMENT** | | | | | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | 4,179,848 | 5,229,175 | 4,179,848 | 1,049,327 | 5,229,175 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | 1,645,485 | 2,178,102 | 1,645,485 | 532,617 | 2,178,102 |
| Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army | 3,089,998 | 7,546,684 | 3,089,998 | 4,456,686 | 7,546,684 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Army | 2,190,576 | 2,228,976 | 2,190,576 | 38,400 | 2,228,976 |
| Other Procurement, Army | 12,647,099 | 15,013,155 | 12,647,099 | 2,366,056 | 15,013,155 |
| Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund | 500,000 | | 500,000 | -500,000 | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy | 12,747,767 | 13,475,107 | 12,747,767 | 727,340 | 13,475,107 |
| Weapons Procurement, Navy | 3,084,387 | 3,078,387 | 3,084,387 | -6,000 | 3,078,387 |
| Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy | 13,656,120 | 13,605,638 | 13,656,120 | -50,482 | 13,605,638 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps | 760,484 | 926,597 | 760,484 | 166,113 | 926,597 |
| Other Procurement, Navy | 5,470,412 | 5,432,412 | 5,470,412 | -38,000 | 5,432,412 |
| Procurement, Marine Corps | 2,999,057 | 2,699,057 | 2,999,057 | -300,000 | 2,699,057 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Air Force | 12,393,270 | 12,593,813 | 12,393,270 | 200,543 | 12,593,813 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force | 868,917 | 868,917 | 868,917 | | 868,917 |
| Missile Procurement, Air Force | 5,131,002 | 5,166,002 | 5,131,002 | 35,000 | 5,166,002 |
| Other Procurement, Air Force | 15,421,162 | 16,312,962 | 15,421,162 | 891,800 | 16,312,962 |
| Procurement, Defense-Wide | 3,318,834 | 3,385,970 | 3,318,834 | 67,136 | 3,385,970 |
| Rapid Acquisition Fund | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction | 1,455,724 | | 1,455,724 | -1,455,724 | |
| Defense Production Act Purchases | | | 18,592 | | 18,592 |
| **Total PROCUREMENT** | **101,660,142** | **109,840,954** | **101,678,734** | **8,180,812** | **109,859,546** |
| **Title II -- RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION** | | | | | |
| RDT&E, Army | 10,589,604 | 11,268,904 | 10,604,604 | 679,300 | 11,283,904 |
| RDT&E, Navy | 17,075,536 | 16,296,395 | 17,075,536 | -779,141 | 16,296,395 |
| RDT&E, Air Force | 26,711,940 | 25,581,989 | 26,711,940 | -1,129,951 | 25,581,989 |
| RDT&E, Defense-Wide | 20,559,850 | 21,331,475 | 20,559,850 | 771,625 | 21,331,475 |
| Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense | 180,264 | 180,264 | 180,264 | | 180,264 |
| **Total RESEARCH, DEV, TEST & EVALUATION** | **75,117,194** | **74,659,027** | **75,132,194** | **-458,167** | **74,674,027** |

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

| | Authorization Request | Senate Authorization | BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION FY 2008 Request | Senate Change to Request | Senate Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Title III -- OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE** | | | | | |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army | 28,924,973 | 29,725,273 | 28,924,973 | 800,300 | 29,725,273 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy | 33,334,690 | 33,307,690 | 33,334,690 | -27,000 | 33,307,690 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps | 4,961,393 | 4,998,493 | 4,961,393 | 37,100 | 4,998,493 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force | 33,655,633 | 32,967,215 | 33,655,633 | -688,418 | 32,967,215 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide | 22,574,278 | 22,397,153 | 22,574,278 | -177,125 | 22,397,153 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve | 2,508,062 | 2,512,062 | 2,508,062 | 4,000 | 2,512,062 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve | 1,186,883 | 1,186,883 | 1,186,883 | | 1,186,883 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve | 208,637 | 208,637 | 208,637 | | 208,637 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve | 2,692,077 | 2,821,817 | 2,692,077 | 129,740 | 2,821,817 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard | 5,840,209 | 5,861,409 | 5,840,209 | 21,200 | 5,861,409 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard | 5,041,965 | 5,469,368 | 5,041,965 | 427,403 | 5,469,368 |
| US Court of Appeals, Armed Forces | 11,971 | 11,971 | 11,971 | | 11,971 |
| Environmental Restoration, Army | 434,879 | 434,879 | 434,879 | | 434,879 |
| Environmental Restoration, Navy | 300,591 | 300,591 | 300,591 | | 300,591 |
| Environmental Restoration, Air Force | 458,428 | 458,428 | 458,428 | | 458,428 |
| Environmental Restoration, Defense-wide | 12,751 | 12,751 | 12,751 | | 12,751 |
| Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sit | 250,249 | 270,249 | 250,249 | 20,000 | 270,249 |
| Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction | 348,048 | 448,048 | 348,048 | 100,000 | 448,048 |
| Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster & Civic Aid | 103,300 | 63,300 | 103,300 | -40,000 | 63,300 |
| Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| Scorekeeping Adjustments | | | | | |
| Disposal of DoD Real Property | | | 18,000 | | 18,000 |
| Lease of DoD Real Property | | | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| DoD Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery | | | 1,000 | | 1,000 |
| **Total OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE** | **142,854,017** | **143,461,217** | **142,885,017** | **607,200** | **143,492,217** |

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

| | Authorization Request | Senate Authorization | BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION FY 2008 Request | Senate Change to Request | Senate Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Title IV -- MILITARY PERSONNEL** | | | | | |
| Military Personnel, Army | | 34,952,762 | 31,623,865 | 3,328,897 | 34,952,762 |
| Military Personnel, Navy | | 23,300,841 | 23,305,233 | -4,392 | 23,300,841 |
| Military Personnel, Marine Corps | | 11,065,542 | 10,278,031 | 787,511 | 11,065,542 |
| Military Personnel, Air Force | | 24,091,993 | 24,097,354 | -5,361 | 24,091,993 |
| Military Personnel, Army Reserve | | 3,701,197 | 3,734,620 | -33,423 | 3,701,197 |
| Military Personnel, Navy Reserve | | 1,766,408 | 1,797,685 | -31,277 | 1,766,408 |
| Military Personnel, Marine Corps Reserve | | 593,961 | 594,872 | -911 | 593,961 |
| Military Personnel, Air Force Reserve | | 1,356,618 | 1,370,479 | -13,861 | 1,356,618 |
| Military Personnel, Army National Guard | | 5,914,979 | 5,959,149 | -44,170 | 5,914,979 |
| Military Personnel, Air National Guard | | 2,607,456 | 2,642,410 | -34,954 | 2,607,456 |
| Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Accruals | | | 10,876,204 | | 10,876,204 |
| Mandatory Spending Current Law | | | 2,640,500 | | 2,640,500 |
| **Total MILITARY PERSONNEL** | **105,403,698** | **109,351,757** | **118,920,402** | **3,948,059** | **122,868,461** |
| | | | | | |
| **Title X -- GENERAL PROVISIONS** | | | | | |
| Section 1007: Foreign Currency Fluctuations | | | | | |
| **Total GENERAL PROVISIONS** | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **Title XIV -- OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS** | | | | | |
| **Subtitle A -- Military Programs** | | | | | |
| Defense Working Capital Funds | 102,446 | 102,446 | 102,446 | | 102,446 |
| Defense Commissary Working Capital Fund | 1,250,300 | 1,250,300 | 1,250,300 | | 1,250,300 |
| Defense Coalition Support Fund | 22,000 | | 22,000 | -22,000 | |
| National Defense Sealift Fund | 1,079,094 | 1,044,194 | 1,079,094 | -34,900 | 1,044,194 |
| Defense Health Program | 22,541,124 | 22,543,124 | 22,541,124 | 2,000 | 22,543,124 |
| Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction | | 1,491,724 | | 1,491,724 | 1,491,724 |
| Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense | 936,822 | 959,322 | 936,822 | 22,500 | 959,322 |
| Office of the Inspector General | 214,995 | 224,995 | 215,995 | 10,000 | 225,995 |
| Inflation savings (Section 1407) | | -1,627,000 | | -1,627,000 | -1,627,000 |
| **Subtitle B -- National Defense Stockpile** | | | | | |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| | Authorization Request | Senate Authorization | BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION FY 2008 Request | Senate Change to Request | Senate Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Title XXIX - War-Related Military Construction** | | | | | |
| Military Construction, Army | 738,850 | 752,650 | 738,850 | 13,800 | 752,650 |
| Military Construction, Navy | 157,305 | | 157,305 | -157,305 | |
| Family Housing Construction, Navy & Marine Corps | 11,766 | | 11,766 | -11,766 | |
| **Subtotal War-Related Military Construction** | **907,921** | **752,650** | **907,921** | **-155,271** | **752,650** |
| **TOTAL DIVISION B** | **22,073,103** | **22,534,022** | **22,073,103** | **460,919** | **22,534,022** |
| Other Discretionary Programs | | | 52,000 | | 52,000 |
| Mandatory Programs | | | -686,000 | | -686,000 |
| **TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)** | **613,739,347** | **613,259,267** | **626,687,643** | **-480,080** | **626,207,563** |
| **DIVISION C** | | | | | |
| Energy Supply and Conservation | 5,860 | | 5,860 | -5,860 | |
| **National Nuclear Security Administration** | | | | | |
| Weapons Activities | 6,511,312 | 6,472,172 | 6,511,312 | -39,140 | 6,472,172 |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation | 1,672,646 | 1,809,646 | 1,672,646 | 137,000 | 1,809,646 |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (Emergency funding) | 50,000 | | 50,000 | -50,000 | |
| Naval Reactors | 808,219 | 808,219 | 808,219 | | 808,219 |
| Office of the Administrator | 394,656 | 399,656 | 394,656 | 5,000 | 399,656 |
| IAEA Fuel Bank | | 50,000 | | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| **Total National Nuclear Security Adminstration** | **9,436,833** | **9,539,693** | **9,436,833** | **102,860** | **9,539,693** |
| Defense Environmental Cleanup | 5,363,905 | 5,410,905 | 5,363,905 | 47,000 | 5,410,905 |
| Other Defense Activities | 763,974 | 663,074 | 763,974 | -100,900 | 663,074 |
| Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal | 292,046 | 242,046 | 292,046 | -50,000 | 242,046 |
| **Total DOE/NNSA Discretionary Authorizations** | **15,862,618** | **15,855,718** | **15,862,618** | **-6,900** | **15,855,718** |

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

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

# DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

## TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

### Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

#### Explanation of tables

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

#### Rapid Acquisition Fund (sec. 105)

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

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

| Title I -- PROCUREMENT | Authorization Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | 4,179,848 | 1,049,327 | 5,229,175 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | 1,645,485 | 532,617 | 2,178,102 |
| Procurement of W&TCV, Army | 3,089,998 | 4,456,686 | 7,546,684 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Army | 2,190,576 | 38,400 | 2,228,976 |
| Other Procurement, Army | 12,647,099 | 2,366,056 | 15,013,155 |
| Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund | 500,000 | -500,000 | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy | 12,747,767 | 727,340 | 13,475,107 |
| Weapons Procurement, Navy | 3,084,387 | -6,000 | 3,078,387 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps | 760,484 | 166,113 | 926,597 |
| Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy | 13,656,120 | -50,482 | 13,605,638 |
| Other Procurement, Navy | 5,470,412 | -38,000 | 5,432,412 |
| Procurement, Marine Corps | 2,999,057 | -300,000 | 2,699,057 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Air Force | 12,393,270 | 200,543 | 12,593,813 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force | 868,917 | | 868,917 |
| Missile Procurement, Air Force | 5,131,002 | 35,000 | 5,166,002 |
| Other Procurement, Air Force | 15,421,162 | 891,800 | 16,312,962 |
| Procurement, Defense-Wide | 3,318,834 | 67,136 | 3,385,970 |
| National Guard and Reserve Equipment Rapid Acquisition Fund | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| TOTAL PROCUREMENT | 100,204,418 | 9,636,536 | 109,840,954 |

## Subtitle B—Army Programs

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Aircraft Procurement, Army** | | | | | | |
| | **Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| | **Fixed Wing** | | | | | | |
| 1 | UTILITY F/W CARGO AIRCRAFT | | 157,043 | | -157,043 | | |
| | Transfer fixed-wing intra-theater logistics mission to USAF | | | | [-157,043] | | |
| 2 | UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| | **Rotary Wing** | | | | | | |
| 3 | ARMED RECONNAISSANCE HELICOPTER | | 468,259 | | -131,000 | | 337,259 |
| | Transfer to Kiowa Warrior (APA 19) | | | | [-31,000] | | |
| | Transfer to PE 64220A (RDA 77) | | | | [-100,000] | | |
| 4 | HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH) | | 230,491 | | | | 230,491 |
| 5 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | 42 | 773,799 | | 552,430 | 42 | 1,326,229 |
| 5 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | -185,098 | | | | -185,098 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [182,050] | | |
| | Transfer from Title XV | | | | [370,380] | | |
| 6 | UH-60 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 116,745 | | | | 116,745 |
| 7 | CH-47 HELICOPTER | 6 | 157,908 | | 6,000 | 6 | 163,908 |
| | CH-47 - annual contract | | | | [6,000] | | |
| 8 | CH-47 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 32,982 | | | | 32,982 |
| | **Modification of Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| 9 | GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA) | | 149,062 | | | | 149,062 |
| 10 | ARL MODS (TIARA) | | 52,298 | | | | 52,298 |
| 11 | AH-64 MODS | | 689,628 | | | | 689,628 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 24 | ASE INFRARED CM | | 365,472 | | | | 365,472 |
| | **Other Support** | | | | | | |
| 25 | AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL | | | | | | |
| 26 | AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 5,065 | | | | 5,065 |
| 27 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | | 80,221 | | | | 80,221 |
| 28 | AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS | | 42,727 | | 7,000 | | 49,727 |
| | Aircraft wireless intercom system (AWIS) | | | | [5,000] | | |
| | Air Warrior primary survival gear carrier (PSGC) | | | | [2,000] | | |
| 29 | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | | 95,203 | | | | 95,203 |
| 30 | INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | | 2,377 | | | | 2,377 |
| 31 | LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET | | 2,376 | | | | 2,376 |
| | **Total - Aircraft Procurement, Army** | | **4,179,848** | | **1,049,327** | | **5,229,175** |
| | **Missile Procurement, Army** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Surface-to-air Missile System** | | | | | | |
| 1 | OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT | | 243,251 | | -243,251 | | |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [-243,251] | | |
| 2 | PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY | 108 | 472,907 | 25 | 75,000 | 133 | 547,907 |
| | Patriot PAC-3 missiles | | | [25] | [75,000] | | |
| 3 | SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYSTEM SUMMARY | | | | | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Air-to-surface Missile System** | | | | | | |
| 4 | HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY | | 46,000 | | | | 46,000 |
| | **Anti-tank/Assault Missile System** | | | | | | |
| 5 | JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY | 385 | 103,799 | | 76,914 | 385 | 180,713 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [76,914] | | |
| 6 | TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY | 2,255 | 110,593 | | | 2,255 | 110,593 |
| 6 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | -22,700 | | | | -22,700 |
| 7 | TOW-2 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | | | | | |
| 8 | GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS) | 1,482 | 225,282 | | | 1,482 | 225,282 |
| 9 | MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR) | 3,492 | 22,585 | | | 3,492 | 22,585 |
| 10 | MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS | | | | | | |
| 11 | HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (HIMARS | 57 | 235,865 | | | 57 | 235,865 |
| 12 | ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM | | | | | | |
| | **Modification of Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Modifications** | | | | | | |
| 13 | PATRIOT MODS | | 67,479 | | 502,514 | | 569,993 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [502,514] | | |
| 14 | JAVELIN MISSILE MODS | | | | | | |
| 15 | ITAS/TOW MODS | | 92,330 | | 121,440 | | 213,770 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [121,440] | | |
| 16 | MLRS MODS | | 5,578 | | | | 5,578 |
| 17 | HIMARS MODIFICATIONS | | 10,541 | | | | 10,541 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Spares and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| 18 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 23,643 | | | | 23,643 |
| | **Support Equipment and Facilities** | | | | | | |
| 19 | AIR DEFENSE TARGETS | | 4,268 | | | | 4,268 |
| 20 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES) | | 10 | | | | 10 |
| 21 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT | | 4,054 | | | | 4,054 |
| 22 | CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | | | | | |
| | **Total - Missile Procurement Army** | | **1,645,485** | | **532,617** | | **2,178,102** |
| | **Procurement of Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| | **Tracked Combat Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 1 | ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD | | | | | | |
| 2 | BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT | | 140,314 | 481 | 1,402,500 | 481 | 1,542,814 |
| | Transfer from Title XV | | | | [1,402,500] | | |
| 3 | BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD) | | 4,684 | | | | 4,684 |
| 4 | ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES | | | | | | |
| 5 | STRYKER VEHICLE | 127 | 1,038,984 | 263 | 1,060,875 | 390 | 2,099,859 |
| | Transfer from Title XV | | | | [402,775] | | |
| | Additional Stryker vehicles | | | | [658,100] | | |
| 6 | FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEMS (FCS) | | 79,483 | | | | 79,483 |
| 7 | FCS SPIN OUTS | | 20,123 | | | | 20,123 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Modification of Tracked Combat Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 8 | CARRIER, MOD | | | 317 | 132,220 | 317 | 132,220 |
| | Transfer from Title XV | | | | [132,220] | | |
| 9 | FIST VEHICLE (MOD) | | | 56 | 165,400 | 56 | 165,400 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [35,400] | | |
| | Transfer from Title XV | | | | [130,000] | | |
| 10 | BFVS SERIES (MOD) | | 37,611 | | | | 37,611 |
| 11 | HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD) | | 36,924 | | | | 36,924 |
| 12 | FAASV PIP TO FLEET | | | | | | |
| 13 | IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD) | 12 | 36,826 | 134 | 398,000 | 146 | 434,826 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [95,700] | | |
| | Transfer from Title XV | | | | [277,400] | | |
| | Hercules Recapitalization | | | | [24,900] | | |
| 14 | HEAVY ASSAULT BRIDGE (HAB) SYS (MOD) | | | | | | |
| 15 | ARMORED BREACHER VEHICLE | | 41,500 | | | | 41,500 |
| 16 | ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD) | | | | | | |
| 17 | JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE | | 12,927 | | | | 12,927 |
| 18 | M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD) | | 588,979 | | | | 588,979 |
| 19 | SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2 | 18 | 52,928 | -18 | -52,928 | | |
| | M1A2 SEP requirements already funded | | | | [-52,928] | | |
| 19A | ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM (M1A2 SEP) (GA0750) | | | 235 | 1,303,100 | 235 | 1,303,100 |
| | Transfer from Title XV | | | | [1,303,100] | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Support Equipment and Facilities** | | | | | | |
| 20 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV) | | | | | | |
| 21 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV) | | 7,760 | | | | 7,760 |
| | **Weapons and Other Combat Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 22 | HOWITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM, M119 | 53 | 48,902 | 57 | 52,800 | 110 | 101,702 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [52,800] | | |
| 23 | INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY | | 331,729 | | -331,729 | | |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [-331,729] | | |
| 24 | M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62MM) | 2,308 | 37,096 | | 27,389 | 2,308 | 64,485 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [7,989] | | |
| | M240 medium machine gun (7.62 mm) | | | | [19,400] | | |
| 25 | MACHINE GUN, CAL .50 M2 ROLL | | 19,000 | | 13,317 | | 32,317 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [13,317] | | |
| 26 | M249 SAW MACHINE GUN (5.56MM) | 8,382 | 35,335 | | 9,241 | 8,382 | 44,576 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [9,241] | | |
| 27 | MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN (40MM) | 970 | 21,000 | | 15,448 | 970 | 36,448 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [15,448] | | |
| 28 | MORTAR SYSTEMS | 313 | 4,320 | | 4,704 | 313 | 9,024 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [4,704] | | |
| 29 | M16 RIFLE | | | | | | |
| 30 | M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE | | 417 | | | | 417 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 44 | M119 MODIFICATIONS | | 1,794 | | | | 1,794 |
| 45 | M16 RIFLE MODS | | 3,900 | | 188 | | 4,088 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [188] | | |
| 46 | MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | | 2,791 | | | | 2,791 |
| | **Support Equipment and Facilities** | | | | | | |
| 47 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | | | | 1,262 | | 1,262 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [1,262] | | |
| 48 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV) | | 6,466 | | | | 6,466 |
| 49 | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | | 3,189 | | 12,000 | | 15,189 |
| | Arsenal Support Program Initiative (ASPI) | | | | [12,000] | | |
| 50 | SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG) | | 5,424 | | | | 5,424 |
| 51 | CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | | | | | |
| | **Spares** | | | | | | |
| 52 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV) | | | | | | |
| | **Total - Procurement of WTCV, Army** | | **3,089,998** | | **4,456,686** | | **7,546,684** |
| | **Procurement of Ammunition, Army** | | | | | | |
| | **Ammunition** | | | | | | |
| | **Small/Medium Caliber Ammunition** | | | | | | |
| 1 | CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES | | 189,179 | | | | 189,179 |
| 2 | CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES | | 68,045 | | | | 68,045 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES | | 4,527 | | | | 4,527 |
| 4 | CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES | | 179,466 | | | | 179,466 |
| 5 | CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES | | | | | | |
| 6 | CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES | | 29,243 | | | | 29,243 |
| 7 | CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES | | 21,759 | | | | 21,759 |
| 8 | CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES | | 208,504 | | | | 208,504 |
| | **Mortar Ammunition** | | | | | | |
| 9 | 60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | | 6,495 | | | | 6,495 |
| 10 | 81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES | | 53,798 | | | | 53,798 |
| 11 | CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ALL TYPES | | 111,594 | | | | 111,594 |
| | **Tank Ammunition** | | | | | | |
| 12 | CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES | | 14,338 | | | | 14,338 |
| 13 | CTG, TANK, 120MM, ALL TYPES | | 180,400 | | | | 180,400 |
| | **Artillery Ammunition** | | | | | | |
| 14 | CTG, ARTY, 75MM: ALL TYPES | | 2,699 | | | | 2,699 |
| 15 | CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES | | 41,965 | | | | 41,965 |
| 16 | CTG, ARTY, 155MM, ALL TYPES | | 88,049 | | | | 88,049 |
| 17 | PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982 | | 28,781 | | | | 28,781 |
| 18 | MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T | | 60,076 | | | | 60,076 |
| | **Artillery Fuzes** | | | | | | |
| 19 | ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES | | 4,251 | | | | 4,251 |
| | **Mines** | | | | | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Ammunition Production Base Support** | | | | | | |
| | **Production Base Support** | | | | | | |
| 36 | PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | | 143,708 | | 20,400 | | 164,108 |
| | AAP solvent recovery system | | | | [7,200] | | |
| | Acid containment and storage system | | | | [13,200] | | |
| 37 | LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | | 3,436 | | | | 3,436 |
| 38 | MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES | | 5,418 | | | | 5,418 |
| 39 | CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL | | 135,256 | | | | 135,256 |
| 40 | ARMS INITIATIVE | | 2,944 | | | | 2,944 |
| | **Re-Estimate of Guaranteed Loan** | | | | | | |
| 41 | RE-ESTIMATE OF GUAR LOAN | | | | | | |
| | **Interest on Re-Estimate** | | | | | | |
| 42 | INTEREST ON RE-ESTIMATE | | | | | | |
| | **Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Army** | | **2,190,576** | | **38,400** | | **2,228,976** |
| | **Other Procurement, Army** | | | | | | |
| | **Tactical and Support Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| | **Tactical Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 1 | TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS | | 57,053 | | 9,631 | | 66,684 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [9,631] | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED | | 6,100 | | 171 | | 6,271 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [171] | | |
| 3 | SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS | | 2,185 | | | | 2,185 |
| 4 | HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV) | | 596,627 | | 389,782 | | 986,409 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [389,782] | | |
| 5 | FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV) | | 828,403 | | 1,024,349 | | 1,852,752 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [1,024,349] | | |
| 6 | FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMEN | | 36,011 | | | | 36,011 |
| 7 | FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV) | | 483,023 | | 80,641 | | 563,664 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [80,641] | | |
| 8 | ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV) | | 155,124 | | 428,186 | | 583,310 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [126,288] | | |
| | Transfer from Title XV | | | | [301,898] | | |
| 9 | MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY | | 199,100 | | | | 199,100 |
| 10 | TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916 | | 83,897 | | | | 83,897 |
| 11 | HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV P | | 197,499 | | | | 197,499 |
| 12 | LINE HAUL ESP | | 1,925,867 | | -1,925,867 | | |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [-1,925,867] | | |
| 13 | HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM | | | | | | |
| 14 | MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP | | 32,725 | | | | 32,725 |
| 15 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH) | | | | | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL | | 898 | | 34 | | 932 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [34] | | |
| | **Non-tactical Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 17 | HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN | | 600 | | | | 600 |
| 18 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | | 310 | | | | 310 |
| 19 | NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER | | 3,437 | | | | 3,437 |
| | **Communications and Electronics Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Comm-Joint Communications** | | | | | | |
| 20 | COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM | | 4,228 | | | | 4,228 |
| 21 | JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM) | | 2,071 | | | | 2,071 |
| | **Comm-Satellite Communications** | | | | | | |
| 22 | SECOMP-I | | | | | | |
| 23 | DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS | | 87,772 | | 37,600 | | 125,372 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [37,600] | | |
| 24 | SHF TERM | | 8,790 | | 5,174 | | 13,964 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [5,174] | | |
| 25 | SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE) | | 812 | | | | 812 |
| 26 | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE) | | 86,877 | | 10,413 | | 97,290 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [10,413] | | |
| 27 | SMART-T (SPACE) | | 50,412 | | | | 50,412 |
| 28 | SCAMP (SPACE) | | 1,300 | | | | 1,300 |
| 29 | GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS | | 33,447 | | 2,250 | | 35,697 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 64 | DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (MIP) | | 34,604 | | 4,250 | | 38,854 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [4,250] | | |
| 65 | DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA) | | | | | | |
| 66 | TACTICAL EXPLOITATION SYSTEM (MIP) | | | | | | |
| 67 | DCGS-A (MIP) | | 114,842 | | 32,788 | | 147,630 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [32,788] | | |
| 68 | JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS) | | | | | | |
| 69 | TROJAN (MIP) | | 13,418 | | | | 13,418 |
| 70 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP) | | 2,351 | | | | 2,351 |
| 71 | CI HUMINT INFO MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CHIMS) | | 26,310 | | 276 | | 26,586 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [276] | | |
| 72 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MIP) | | 17,903 | | 5,519 | | 23,422 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [5,519] | | |
| | **Elect Equip-Electronic Warfare (EW)** | | | | | | |
| 73 | LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR | | 43,893 | | 5,304 | | 49,197 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [5,304] | | |
| 74 | COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY | | 11,900 | | | | 11,900 |
| 75 | CI MODERNIZATION (MIP) | | 1,278 | | | | 1,278 |
| | **Elect Equip-Tactical Surv. (TAC SURV)** | | | | | | |
| 76 | SENTINEL MODS | | 20,885 | | | | 20,885 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 77 | NIGHT VISION DEVICES | | 278,641 | | 180,102 | | 458,743 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [147,102] | | |
| | Fill unfunded requirement for night vision devices | | | | [33,000] | | |
| 78 | LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE | | 129,951 | | 29,538 | | 159,489 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [29,538] | | |
| 79 | NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT | | 230,607 | | 102,417 | | 333,024 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [102,417] | | |
| 80 | RADIATION MONITORING SYSTEMS | | 3,518 | | | | 3,518 |
| 81 | ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP | | | | 300 | | 300 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [300] | | |
| 82 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MMS) | | | | | | |
| 83 | ENHANCED PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SE | | 7,572 | | | | 7,572 |
| 84 | PROFILER | | 8,000 | | 2,800 | | 10,800 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [2,800] | | |
| 85 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS) | | 41,480 | | | | 41,480 |
| 86 | FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2) | | 175,975 | | 74,160 | | 250,135 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [74,160] | | |
| 87 | LIGHTWEIGHT LSR DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD) | | 93,986 | | 43,400 | | 137,386 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [43,400] | | |
| 88 | COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32 | | | | 1,001 | | 1,001 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [1,001] | | |
| 89 | MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM | | 14,000 | | | | 14,000 |
| 90 | INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - MIP | | | | | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 91 | ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM | | | | | | |
| | **Elect Equip-Tactical C2 Systems** | | | | | | |
| 92 | TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS | | 393,883 | | | | 393,883 |
| 93 | FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY | | 40,626 | | 6,676 | | 47,302 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [6,676] | | |
| 94 | BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM | | 32,935 | | 828 | | 33,763 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [828] | | |
| 95 | FAAD C2 | | 9,000 | | | | 9,000 |
| 96 | AIR & MSL DEF PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (AMD) | | 19,611 | | 20,751 | | 40,362 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [20,751] | | |
| 97 | KNIGHT FAMILY | | 68,280 | | 26,000 | | 94,280 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [26,000] | | |
| 98 | LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS) | | 2,070 | | | | 2,070 |
| 99 | AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY | | 71,034 | | | | 71,034 |
| 100 | TC AIMS II | | 29,037 | | 362 | | 29,399 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [362] | | |
| 101 | JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JNMS) | | 10,745 | | | | 10,745 |
| 102 | TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER | | 9,215 | | 1,053 | | 10,268 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [1,053] | | |
| 103 | DATA PRODUCTS | | 36,142 | | | | 36,142 |
| 104 | MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS) | | 120,767 | | 1,722 | | 122,489 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [1,722] | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 105 | SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE) | | 53,563 | | 96,042 | | 149,605 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [96,042] | | |
| 106 | MOUNTED BATTLE COMMAND ON THE MOVE | | 42,000 | | | | 42,000 |
| | **Elect Equip - Automation** | | | | | | |
| 107 | GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM | | 39,353 | | | | 39,353 |
| 108 | ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION | | 11,389 | | | | 11,389 |
| 109 | AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP | | 120,732 | | | | 120,732 |
| 110 | CSS COMMUNICATIONS | | 32,955 | | 2,680 | | 35,635 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [2,680] | | |
| 111 | RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS) | | 30,427 | | | | 30,427 |
| | **Elect Equip-Audio Visual Sys (A/V)** | | | | | | |
| 112 | AFRTS | | 964 | | | | 964 |
| 113 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V) | | 6,306 | | | | 6,306 |
| 114 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT) | | 3,358 | | 3,760 | | 7,118 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [3,760] | | |
| | **Elect Equip-Mods Tactical Sys/Eq** | | | | | | |
| 115 | WEAPONIZATION OF UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM | | 15,207 | | | | 15,207 |
| | **Elect Equip-Support** | | | | | | |
| 116 | ITEMS UNDER $5M (SSE) | | 14,430 | | | | 14,430 |
| 117 | PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E) | | 508 | | | | 508 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Other Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Chemical Defensive Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 118 | RADIAC SET AN/PDR 77() | | 1,500 | | 39 | | 1,539 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [39] | | |
| 119 | RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM NUCLEAR - BIOLOGICAL | | 316 | | | | 316 |
| 120 | CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION | | 46,294 | | 13,532 | | 59,826 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [13,532] | | |
| 121 | SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM) | | 7,700 | | 1,379 | | 9,079 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [1,379] | | |
| | **Bridging Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 122 | TACTICAL BRIDGING | | 50,443 | | | | 50,443 |
| 123 | TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON | | 74,785 | | | | 74,785 |
| | **Engineer (Non-construction) Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 124 | HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS- | | 45,218 | | 3,945 | | 49,163 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [3,945] | | |
| 125 | KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING | | 334,068 | | -334,068 | | |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [-334,068] | | |
| 126 | GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM | | 63,016 | | | | 63,016 |
| 127 | ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS) | | | | | | |
| 128 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD | | 33,283 | | 25,000 | | 58,283 |
| | Additional EOD equipment | | | | [25,000] | | |
| 129 | ITEMS< $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT | | 3,562 | | | | 3,562 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 153 | MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING | | 4,219 | | | | 4,219 |
| 154 | LOADERS | | 18,842 | | 1,044 | | 19,886 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [1,044] | | |
| 155 | HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR | | 3,371 | | 560 | | 3,931 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [560] | | |
| 156 | TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED | | 6,000 | | 2,189 | | 8,189 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [2,189] | | |
| 157 | CRANES | | | | | | |
| 158 | HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) FOS | | 37,800 | | 2,287 | | 40,087 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [2,287] | | |
| 159 | CONST EQUIP ESP | | 42,984 | | | | 42,984 |
| 160 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP) | | 11,484 | | 338 | | 11,822 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [338] | | |
| | **Rail Float Containerization Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 161 | LOGISTIC SUPPORT VESSEL (LSV) | | | | | | |
| 162 | JOINT HIGH SPEED VEHICLE (JHSV) | | 210,000 | | | | 210,000 |
| 163 | HARBORMASTER COMMAND AND CONTROL CENTER | | 18,237 | | | | 18,237 |
| 164 | CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS | | | | | | |
| 165 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL) | | 4,300 | | | | 4,300 |
| | **Generators** | | | | | | |
| 166 | GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP | | 92,863 | | 18,612 | | 111,475 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [18,612] | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Stryker Mobile Gun System (sec. 113)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Budget Items—Army

### Armed reconnaissance helicopter

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

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

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

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

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

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

**CH–47 Chinook helicopter**

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

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

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

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

**Enhanced electronic digital engine control unit**

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

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

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

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

**Aircraft survivability equipment infrared countermeasures**

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

**Aircrew integrated systems**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Patriot Advanced Capability–3**

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

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

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

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

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

**Stryker Vehicle**

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

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

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

**Improved recovery vehicle**

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

**System enhancement program: SEP M1A2**

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

**M240 medium machine gun**

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

**Arsenal support program initiative**

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

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

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

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

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

**Grenades**

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

**Ammunition outloading test bed**

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

**Ammunition plant solvent recovery system**

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

**Acid containment and storage system**

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

**Single channel ground and airborne radio system family**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Information systems**

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

**Installation information infrastructure modernization program**

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

**Explosive ordnance disposal equipment**

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

**Land warrior**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Recon and navigation system**

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

**Army combat training centers**

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

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

**Urban training technologies**

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

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

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

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

**Laser collective combat training system**

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

**Call for fire trainer**

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

## Subtitle C—Navy Programs

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Aircraft Procurement, Navy** | | | | | | |
| | **Combat Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| 1 | AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP) | | 3,016 | | | | 3,016 |
| 2 | EA-18G | 18 | 1,307,303 | | | 18 | 1,307,303 |
| 2 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | -39,593 | | | | -39,593 |
| 3 | EA-18G ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 51,117 | | | | 51,117 |
| 4 | F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) | 24 | 2,112,973 | 12 | 713,540 | 36 | 2,826,513 |
| 4 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | -55,824 | | | | -55,824 |
| | Transfer from Title XV | | | | [713,540] | | |
| 5 | F/A-18E/F ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 46,817 | | | | 46,817 |
| 6 | JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER | 6 | 1,112,564 | | | 6 | 1,112,564 |
| 7 | JSF ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 119,598 | | | | 119,598 |
| 8 | V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) | 21 | 1,847,877 | | | 21 | 1,847,877 |
| 8 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | -89,216 | | | | -89,216 |
| 9 | V-22 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 200,690 | | | | 200,690 |
| 10 | UH-1Y/AH-1Z | 20 | 518,475 | | | 20 | 518,475 |
| 11 | MH-60S (MYP) | 18 | 509,763 | | | 18 | 509,763 |
| 11 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | -86,223 | | | | -86,223 |
| 12 | MH-60S ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 80,037 | | | | 80,037 |
| 13 | MH-60R | 27 | 958,816 | | | 27 | 958,816 |
| 13 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | -114,095 | | | | -114,095 |
| 14 | MH-60R ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 152,841 | | | | 152,841 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP) | | | | | | |
| 15 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | | | | | |
| 16 | E-2C ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 57,275 | | | | 57,275 |
| | **Airlift Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| 17 | C-40A | | | | | | |
| | **Trainer Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| 18 | T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK | | 32,523 | | | | 32,523 |
| 19 | JPATS | 44 | 295,272 | | | 44 | 295,272 |
| | **Other Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| 20 | KC-130J | 4 | 268,096 | | | 4 | 268,096 |
| 20 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | -45,553 | | | | -45,553 |
| 21 | KC-130J ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 33,900 | | | | 33,900 |
| 22 | F-5 | | | | | | |
| 23 | VTUAV | 3 | 37,687 | | | 3 | 37,687 |
| 24 | OTHER SUPPORT AIRCRAFT | | | | | | |
| | **Modification of Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| 25 | EA-6 SERIES | | 30,602 | | | | 30,602 |
| 26 | AV-8 SERIES | | 37,549 | | | | 37,549 |
| 27 | ADVERSARY | | 3,523 | | | | 3,523 |
| 28 | F-18 SERIES | | 441,883 | | | | 441,883 |
| 29 | H-46 SERIES | | 22,125 | | 2,000 | | 24,125 |
| | Upgrade H-46 communications equipment | | | | [2,000] | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30 | AH-1W SERIES | | 7,404 | | | | 7,404 |
| 31 | H-53 SERIES | | 48,145 | | 2,900 | | 51,045 |
| | Integrated mechanical diagnostics health monitoring | | | | [2,900] | | |
| 32 | SH-60 SERIES | | 58,609 | | | | 58,609 |
| 33 | H-1 SERIES | | 6,489 | | | | 6,489 |
| 34 | EP-3 SERIES | | 46,862 | | | | 46,862 |
| 35 | P-3 SERIES | | 262,563 | | 8,900 | | 271,463 |
| | Equipment for integrated P-3C tactical picture | | | | [8,900] | | |
| 36 | S-3 SERIES | | 470 | | | | 470 |
| 37 | E-2 SERIES | | 11,047 | | | | 11,047 |
| 38 | TRAINER A/C SERIES | | 20,227 | | | | 20,227 |
| 39 | C-2A | | 32,420 | | | | 32,420 |
| 40 | C-130 SERIES | | 1,208 | | | | 1,208 |
| 41 | FEWSG | | 651 | | | | 651 |
| 42 | CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES | | 20,903 | | | | 20,903 |
| 43 | E-6 SERIES | | 126,185 | | | | 126,185 |
| 44 | EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES | | 55,823 | | | | 55,823 |
| 45 | SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT | | 13,707 | | | | 13,707 |
| 46 | T-45 SERIES | | 57,157 | | | | 57,157 |
| 47 | POWER PLANT CHANGES | | 22,454 | | | | 22,454 |
| 48 | JPATS SERIES | | 9,872 | | | | 9,872 |
| 49 | AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS | | 8,389 | | | | 8,389 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 50 | COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT | | 65,774 | | | | 65,774 |
| 51 | COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES | | 148,785 | | | | 148,785 |
| 52 | COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM | | 6,454 | | | | 6,454 |
| 53 | ID SYSTEMS | | 10,283 | | | | 10,283 |
| 54 | V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY | | 68,377 | | | | 68,377 |
| | **Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| 55 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 1,158,051 | | | | 1,158,051 |
| | **Aircraft Support Equipment and Facilities** | | | | | | |
| 56 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | | 470,795 | | | | 470,795 |
| 57 | AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | | 10,812 | | | | 10,812 |
| 58 | WAR CONSUMABLES | | 65,369 | | | | 65,369 |
| 59 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | | 20,630 | | | | 20,630 |
| 60 | SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 58,315 | | | | 58,315 |
| 61 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | | 1,719 | | | | 1,719 |
| 62 | JUDGMENT FUND | | | | | | |
| 63 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | | | | | |
| | **Total - Aircraft Procurement, Navy** | | **12,747,767** | | **727,340** | | **13,475,107** |
| | **Weapons Procurement, Navy** | | | | | | |
| | **Ballistic Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Modification of Missiles** | | | | | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | TRIDENT II MODS | 12 | 1,087,801 | | -36,000 | 12 | 1,051,801 |
| | Conventional Trident missile modifications | | | | [-36,000] | | |
| | **Support Equipment and Facilities** | | | | | | |
| 2 | MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | | 3,486 | | | | 3,486 |
| | **Other Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Strategic Missiles** | | | | | | |
| 3 | TOMAHAWK | 394 | 383,075 | | | 394 | 383,075 |
| | **Tactical Missiles** | | | | | | |
| 4 | AMRAAM | 79 | 87,460 | | | 79 | 87,460 |
| 5 | SIDEWINDER | 184 | 54,891 | | | 184 | 54,891 |
| 6 | JSOW | 421 | 131,324 | | | 421 | 131,324 |
| 7 | SLAM-ER | | | | | | |
| 8 | STANDARD MISSILE | 75 | 159,667 | | | 75 | 159,667 |
| 9 | RAM | 90 | 79,540 | | | 90 | 79,540 |
| 10 | HELLFIRE | 439 | 45,736 | | | 439 | 45,736 |
| 11 | AERIAL TARGETS | | 66,311 | | | | 66,311 |
| 12 | DRONES AND DECOYS | | | | | | |
| 13 | OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT | | 9,279 | | | | 9,279 |
| | **Modification of Missiles** | | | | | | |
| 14 | ESSM | 85 | 83,275 | | | 85 | 83,275 |
| 15 | HARM MODS | | 41,302 | | | | 41,302 |
| 16 | STANDARD MISSILES MODS | | | | | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Support Equipment and Facilities** | | | | | | |
| 17 | WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | | 3,675 | | 30,000 | | 33,675 |
| | *Allegany Ballistics Laboratory facilities modernization* | | | | [30,000] | | |
| 18 | FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON | | 215,834 | | | | 215,834 |
| | **Ordnance Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 19 | ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 41,697 | | | | 41,697 |
| | **Torpedoes and Related Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Torpedoes and Related Equip.** | | | | | | |
| 20 | SSTD | | 13 | | | | 13 |
| 21 | ASW TARGETS | | 10,158 | | | | 10,158 |
| | **Mod of Torpedoes and Related Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 22 | MK-46 TORPEDO MODS | 133 | 83,902 | | | 133 | 83,902 |
| 23 | MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS | | 63,754 | | | | 63,754 |
| 24 | QUICKSTRIKE MINE | | 3,236 | | | | 3,236 |
| | **Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 25 | TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 35,919 | | | | 35,919 |
| 26 | ASW RANGE SUPPORT | | 9,496 | | | | 9,496 |
| | **Destination Transportation** | | | | | | |
| 27 | FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION | | 3,395 | | | | 3,395 |
| | **Other Weapons** | | | | | | |
| | **Guns and Gun Mounts** | | | | | | |
| 28 | SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | | 14,233 | | | | 14,233 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Modification of Guns and Gun Mounts** | | | | | | |
| 29 | CIWS MODS | | 182,314 | | | | 182,314 |
| 30 | COAST GUARD WEAPONS | | 20,516 | | | | 20,516 |
| 31 | GUN MOUNT MODS | | 8,365 | | | | 8,365 |
| 32 | PIONEER | | | | | | |
| 33 | CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS | | 23,561 | | | | 23,561 |
| 34 | AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS | | 6,566 | | | | 6,566 |
| | **Other** | | | | | | |
| 35 | MARINE CORPS TACTIAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM | | 90,259 | | | | 90,259 |
| 36 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | | | | | |
| | **Spares and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| 37 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 34,347 | | | | 34,347 |
| | **Total - Weapons Procurement, Navy** | | **3,084,387** | | **-6,000** | | **3,078,387** |
| | **Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps** | | | | | | |
| | **Proc Ammo, Navy** | | | | | | |
| | **Navy Ammunition** | | | | | | |
| 1 | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | | 113,493 | | | | 113,493 |
| 2 | JDAM | 1,145 | 33,633 | | | 1,145 | 33,633 |
| 3 | AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | | 30,323 | | | | 30,323 |
| 4 | MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION | | 12,651 | | | | 12,651 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | PRACTICE BOMBS | | 36,339 | | | | 36,339 |
| 6 | CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES | | 44,255 | | | | 44,255 |
| 7 | AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS | | | | | | |
| 8 | AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES | | 78,546 | | | | 78,546 |
| 9 | JATOS | | 4,774 | | | | 4,774 |
| 10 | 5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION | | 26,619 | | | | 26,619 |
| 11 | INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION | | 11,211 | | | | 11,211 |
| 12 | OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION | | 21,696 | | | | 21,696 |
| 13 | SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO | | 45,375 | | | | 45,375 |
| 14 | PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION | | 11,041 | | | | 11,041 |
| 15 | AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 3,229 | | | | 3,229 |
| | **Proc Ammo, MC** | | | | | | |
| | **Marine Corps Ammunition** | | | | | | |
| 16 | SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION | | 37,116 | | 92,494 | | 129,610 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [92,494] | | |
| 17 | MC GROUND FORCES AUGMENTATION | | 69,375 | | -69,375 | | |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [-69,375] | | |
| 18 | 5.56 MM, ALL TYPES | | | | | | |
| 19 | 7.62 MM, ALL TYPES | | | | | | |
| 20 | LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES | | 19 | | 8,827 | | 8,846 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [8,827] | | |
| 21 | .50 CALIBER | | | | | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | SSN ERO | | | | | | |
| 8 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | | | | | |
| 9 | SSBN ERO | 1 | 222,887 | | | 1 | 222,887 |
| 9 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | -35,235 | | | | -35,235 |
| 10 | SSBN ERO ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 42,744 | | | | 42,744 |
| 11 | DDG 1000 | | 2,802,637 | | | | 2,802,637 |
| 11 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | | | | | |
| 12 | DDG-1000 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 150,886 | | | | 150,886 |
| 13 | DDG-51 | | 78,078 | | -30,000 | | 48,078 |
| | Program close-out costs funded ahead of need | | | | [-30,000] | | |
| 14 | DDG MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | | | | | | |
| 15 | LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP | 3 | 910,482 | -2 | -430,482 | 1 | 480,000 |
| | Reflect delays & cost growth in the LCS program | | | | [-430,482] | | |
| | **Amphibious Ships** | | | | | | |
| 16 | LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP | | | | | | |
| 17 | LPD-17 | 1 | 1,698,825 | | | 1 | 1,698,825 |
| 17 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | -299,903 | | | | -299,903 |
| 18 | LPD-17 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | | | | | |
| 19 | LHA REPLACEMENT | | 1,377,414 | | | | 1,377,414 |
| 19 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | | | | | |
| 20 | LHA ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | | | | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Small Boats** | | | | | | |
| 24 | STANDARD BOATS | | 30,236 | | | | 30,236 |
| | **Training Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 25 | OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT | | 9,239 | | | | 9,239 |
| | **Production Facilities and Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 26 | OPERATING FORCES IPE | | 50,335 | | | | 50,335 |
| | **Other Ship Support** | | | | | | |
| 27 | NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS | | 70,101 | | | | 70,101 |
| 28 | LCS MODULES | | 80,324 | | -65,000 | | 15,324 |
| | Defer module funding to reflect delay in LCS program | | | | [-65,000] | | |
| | **Drug Interdiction Support** | | | | | | |
| 29 | DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| | ***Communications and Electronics Equipment*** | | | | | | |
| | **Ship Radars** | | | | | | |
| 30 | RADAR SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| | **Ship Sonars** | | | | | | |
| 31 | SPQ-9B RADAR | | 14,480 | | 6,000 | | 20,480 |
| | Additional radar for backfitting on Navy surface vessels | | | | [6,000] | | |
| 32 | AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM | 1 | 25,423 | | | 1 | 25,423 |
| 33 | SSN ACOUSTICS | | 319,981 | | | | 319,981 |
| 34 | UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 14,929 | | | | 14,929 |
| 35 | SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS | | 13,357 | | | | 13,357 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Shipboard Communications** | | | | | | |
| 73 | SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS | | 185 | | | | 185 |
| 74 | PORTABLE RADIOS | | | | | | |
| 75 | SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION | | 301,868 | | | | 301,868 |
| 76 | COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M | | 36,753 | | | | 36,753 |
| 77 | SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT | | 4,169 | | | | 4,169 |
| 78 | SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT | | 86,551 | | | | 86,551 |
| | **Satellite Communications** | | | | | | |
| 79 | SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | | 74,677 | | | | 74,677 |
| | **Shore Communications** | | | | | | |
| 80 | JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT | | 2,643 | | | | 2,643 |
| 81 | ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS | | 1,179 | | | | 1,179 |
| 82 | JEDMICS | | | | | | |
| 83 | NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS | | 10,672 | | | | 10,672 |
| | **Cryptographic Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 84 | INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) | | 107,609 | | | | 107,609 |
| | **Cryptologic Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 85 | CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP | | 16,067 | | | | 16,067 |
| | **Other Electronic Support** | | | | | | |
| 86 | COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT | | 27,298 | | | | 27,298 |
| | **Drug Interdiction Support** | | | | | | |
| 87 | OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT | | | | | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Aviation Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Sonobuoys** | | | | | | |
| 88 | SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES | | 67,373 | | 15,000 | | 82,373 |
| | Additional procurement to improve training & readiness | | | | [15,000] | | |
| | **Aircraft Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 89 | WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 58,155 | | 8,000 | | 66,155 |
| | Multi-spectral threat emitter system (MTES) | | | | [8,000] | | |
| 90 | EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS | | 8,281 | | | | 8,281 |
| 91 | AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT | | 12,897 | | | | 12,897 |
| 92 | AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT | | 38,863 | | | | 38,863 |
| 93 | METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT | | 12,248 | | | | 12,248 |
| 94 | OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT | | 1,507 | | | | 1,507 |
| 95 | AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT | | 12,750 | | | | 12,750 |
| 96 | AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES | | 79,536 | | | | 79,536 |
| 97 | LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT | | 31,811 | | | | 31,811 |
| 98 | OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 11,638 | | | | 11,638 |
| | **Ordnance Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Ship Gun System Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 99 | NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM | 2 | 1,382 | | | 2 | 1,382 |
| 100 | GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT | | 5,567 | | | | 5,567 |
| | **Ship Missile System Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 101 | HARPOON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | | | | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 102 | NATO SEASPARROW | | 28,765 | | | | 28,765 |
| 103 | RAM GMLS | | 3,990 | | | | 3,990 |
| 104 | SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM | | 31,642 | | | | 31,642 |
| 105 | AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 93,783 | | | | 93,783 |
| 106 | TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 53,966 | | | | 53,966 |
| 107 | VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS | | 6,840 | | | | 6,840 |
| | **FBM Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 108 | STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP | | 150,918 | | -13,000 | | 137,918 |
| | Conventional Trident missile program | | | | [-13,000] | | |
| | **ASW Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 109 | SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS | | 114,205 | | | | 114,205 |
| 110 | SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 5,191 | | | | 5,191 |
| 111 | SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 3,490 | | | | 3,490 |
| 112 | ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 8,935 | | | | 8,935 |
| | **Other Ordnance Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 113 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP | | 38,462 | | | | 38,462 |
| 114 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 3,422 | | | | 3,422 |
| | **Other Expendable Ordnance** | | | | | | |
| 115 | ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM | | 42,450 | | 6,000 | | 48,450 |
| | NULKA decoy procurement | | | | [6,000] | | |
| 116 | SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS | | 9,950 | | | | 9,950 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 29 | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 28,902 | | 120,751 | | 149,653 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [120,751] | | |
| | **Other Comm/Elec Equipment (Non-tel)** | | | | | | |
| 30 | NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT | | 8,991 | | 33,553 | | 42,544 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [33,553] | | |
| | **Other Support (Non-tel)** | | | | | | |
| 31 | COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES | | 75,101 | | 22,147 | | 97,248 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [22,147] | | |
| 32 | COMMAND POST SYSTEMS | | 20,535 | | 11,044 | | 31,579 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [11,044] | | |
| 33 | RADIO SYSTEMS | | 61,148 | | 118,670 | | 179,818 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [118,670] | | |
| 34 | COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS | | 27,019 | | 76,593 | | 103,612 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [76,593] | | |
| 35 | COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT | | 20,090 | | 2,303 | | 22,393 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [2,303] | | |
| | **Support Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| | **Administrative Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 36 | COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES | | 1,070 | | | | 1,070 |
| 37 | COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES | | 13,366 | | | | 13,366 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 58 | FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT | | 8,585 | | 79,406 | | 87,991 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [79,406] | | |
| 59 | FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV) | | 2,472 | | | | 2,472 |
| 60 | BRIDGE BOATS | | | | 43,903 | | 43,903 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [43,903] | | |
| 61 | RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN | | 1,109 | | 21,982 | | 23,091 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [21,982] | | |
| | **Other Support** | | | | | | |
| 62 | MODIFICATION KITS | | | | | | |
| 63 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 6,508 | | 16,455 | | 22,963 |
| | Grow the Force Transfer | | | | [16,455] | | |
| | **Spares and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| 64 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 12,794 | | | | 12,794 |
| | **Total - Procurement, Marine Corps** | | **2,999,057** | | **-300,000** | | **2,699,057** |

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

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

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

## Budget Items—Navy

### H–46 modifications

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

### H–53 modifications

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

### P–3 modifications

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

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

**Weapons industrial facilities**

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

**Ship Self Defense System for carrier replacement program**

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

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

***Virginia* class submarine advance procurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) increasing the length of deployments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**DDG–51 program completion costs**

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

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

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

**Littoral combat ship**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In summary:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Outfitting and post-delivery**

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

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

**LCS modules**

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

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

**SPQ–9B radar**

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

**Sonobuoys**

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

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

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

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

**Weapons range support equipment**

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

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

**NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system**

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

**Submarine training device modifications**

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

## Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Aircraft Procurement, Air Force** | | | | | | |
| | **Combat Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| | **Tactical Forces** | | | | | | |
| 1 | F-35 | 6 | 1,391,824 | | | 6 | 1,391,824 |
| 1 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | -93,657 | | | | -93,657 |
| 2 | F-25 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 123,539 | | | | 123,539 |
| 3 | F-22A | 20 | 3,737,976 | | | 20 | 3,737,976 |
| 3 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | -585,263 | | | | -585,263 |
| 4 | F-22 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 426,666 | | | | 426,666 |
| 5 | F-15E | | | | | | |
| 5 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | | | | | |
| | **Airlift Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| | **Tactical Airlift** | | | | | | |
| 6 | C-17A (MYP) | | 260,601 | | | | 260,601 |
| 6 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | | | | | |
| 7 | C-17 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | | | | | |
| | **Other Airlift** | | | | | | |
| 8 | C-130J | 9 | 799,658 | | | 9 | 799,658 |
| 8 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | -113,589 | | | | -113,589 |
| 9 | C-130J ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | | | | | |
| 10 | HC-130 RECAP | | 9,990 | | | | 9,990 |
| 11 | MC-130 RECAP | | 65,742 | | | | 65,742 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 73 | F-15 | | 5,615 | | | | 5,615 |
| 74 | F-16 | | 19,454 | | | | 19,454 |
| 75 | OTHER AIRCRAFT | | 101,896 | | | | 101,896 |
| | **Industrial Preparedness** | | | | | | |
| 76 | INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS | | 23,942 | | | | 23,942 |
| | **War Consumables** | | | | | | |
| 77 | WAR CONSUMABLES | | 86,707 | | | | 86,707 |
| | **Other Production Charges** | | | | | | |
| 78 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | | 683,080 | | 49,500 | | 732,580 |
| | LITENING advanced targeting pods | | | | [49,500] | | |
| 79 | DEPOT MODERNIZATION | | | | | | |
| | **Classified Pgms** | | | | | | |
| 80 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 81 | CLASSIFIED ACTIVITIES | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 82 | SPECIAL PROGRAMS | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| | **Other Production Charges SOF** | | | | | | |
| 83 | CANCELLED ACCT ADJUSTMENTS | | | | | | |
| | **DARP** | | | | | | |
| 84 | DARP | | 27,881 | | | | 27,881 |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 8,348 | | | | 8,348 |
| | **Total - Aircraft Procurement, Air Force** | | **12,393,270** | | **200,543** | | **12,593,813** |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Weapons** | | | | | | |
| | **Small Arms** | | | | | | |
| 15 | SMALL ARMS | | 3,652 | | | | 3,652 |
| | **Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force** | | **868,917** | | | **3,817** | **868,917** |
| | **Missile Procurement, Air Force** | | | | | | |
| | **Ballistic Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Missile Replacement Equipment-Ballistic** | | | | | | |
| 1 | MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC | | 26,446 | | | | 26,446 |
| | **Other Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Tactical** | | | | | | |
| 2 | JASSM | 210 | 201,125 | -47 | -40,000 | 163 | 161,125 |
| | Reduce ramp-up to reflect testing difficulties | | | | [-40,000] | | |
| 3 | SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X) | 172 | 52,690 | | | 172 | 52,690 |
| 4 | AMRAAM | 206 | 224,577 | | | 206 | 224,577 |
| 5 | PREDITOR HELLFIRE MISSILE | 662 | 65,143 | | | 662 | 65,143 |
| 6 | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB | 1,395 | 95,297 | | | 1,395 | 95,297 |
| | **Industrial Facilities** | | | | | | |
| 7 | INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION | | 2,382 | | | | 2,382 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Modification of In-service Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Class IV** | | | | | | |
| 8 | ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE | | 31 | | | | 31 |
| 9 | MM III MODIFICATIONS | | 505,395 | | | | 505,395 |
| 10 | AGM-65D MAVERICK | | 252 | | | | 252 |
| 11 | AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE | | 10,111 | | | | 10,111 |
| | **Spares and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| | **Missiles and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| 12 | INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | | 46,675 | | | | 46,675 |
| | **Other Support** | | | | | | |
| | **Space Programs** | | | | | | |
| 13 | ADVANCED EHF | | 744 | | 125,000 | | 125,744 |
| 13 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | | | | | |
| | Advance procurement for additional satellite (AEHF 4) | | | | [125,000] | | |
| 14 | WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE) | 1 | 375,682 | | | 1 | 375,682 |
| 14 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | -50,499 | | | | -50,499 |
| 15 | WIDEBAND ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | | | | | |
| 16 | SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC) | | 18,242 | | | | 18,242 |
| 17 | GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) | | 200,161 | | | | 200,161 |
| 17 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | | | | | |
| 18 | GPS SPACE ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 10,100 | | | | 10,100 |
| 19 | DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE) | | 127,350 | | | | 127,350 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE) | | | | | | |
| 21 | TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS(SPACE) | | 36,457 | | | | 36,457 |
| 22 | EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE) | 5 | 1,166,591 | | | | 1,166,591 |
| 23 | MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE) | | 117,740 | | | | 117,740 |
| 24 | SBIR HIGH ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY) | | 479,000 | | | | 479,000 |
| | **Special Programs** | | | | | | |
| 25 | DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM | | 184,314 | | | | 184,314 |
| 26 | SPECIAL PROGRAMS | | [ ] | | [-50,000] | | [ ] |
| 27 | SPECIAL ACTIVITIES | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 28 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 29 | SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS | | 148,581 | | | | 148,581 |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 1,086,415 | | -50,000 | | 1,036,415 |
| | **Total - Missile Procurement, Air Force** | | **5,131,002** | | **35,000** | | **5,166,002** |
| | **Other Procurement, Air Force** | | | | | | |
| | **Vehicular Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Passenger Carrying Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 1 | ARMORED VEHICLE | | | | | | |
| 2 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | | 19,254 | | | | 19,254 |
| | **Cargo and Utility Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 3 | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE | | 32,737 | | | | 32,737 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 67 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 27,935 | | | | 27,935 |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 12,269,562 | | 853,700 | | 13,123,262 |
| | **Total - Other Procurement, Air Force** | | **15,421,162** | | **891,800** | | **16,312,962** |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Budget Items—Air Force

### B–2 bomber

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

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

**B–52 bomber aircraft**

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

**Large aircraft infrared countermeasures system**

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

**C–135 global air traffic management**

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

**Advanced targeting pod**

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

**Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile**

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

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

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

**Advanced Extremely High Frequency satellite**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Joint threat emitter**

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

**Space-Based Infrared Satellite system mission control station backup**

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

**Self-deploying infrared streamer**

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

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

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Procurement, Defense-Wide** | | | | | | |
| | **Major Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Major Equipment, OSD/WHS** | | | | | | |
| 1 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD | | 98,063 | | | | 98,063 |
| | **Major Equipment, NSA** | | | | | | |
| 2 | INTEL SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPS | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 3 | CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM | | [ ] | | [12,336] | | [ ] |
| 4 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) | | 8,145 | | | | 8,145 |
| 5 | DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PGM | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 6 | COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE | | | | | | |
| 7 | TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| | **Major Equipment, WHS** | | | | | | |
| 8 | WHS MOTOR VEHICLES | 1 | 175 | | | 1 | 175 |
| 9 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS | | 22,393 | | | | 22,393 |
| | **Major Equipment, DISA** | | | | | | |
| 10 | INTERDICTION SUPPORT | | | | | | |
| 11 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY | | 45,564 | | | | 45,564 |
| 12 | DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM | | | | | | |
| 13 | GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | | 10,779 | | | | 10,779 |
| 14 | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | | 2,596 | | | | 2,596 |
| 15 | TELEPORT PROGRAM | | 39,082 | | | | 39,082 |
| 16 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 127,177 | | | | 127,177 |
| 17 | NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES) | | 10,836 | | | | 10,836 |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 63 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 3,651 | | | | 3,651 |
| 64 | SPECIAL PROGRAMS | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 65 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | | 10,612 | | | | 10,612 |
| 66 | MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS | | 70,014 | | | | 70,014 |
| 67 | COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS | | 20,000 | | | | 20,000 |
| 68 | MILCON COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT | | 12,500 | | | | 12,500 |
| 69 | UNMANNED VEHICLES | | 37,107 | | | | 37,107 |
| 70 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAM (GDIP) | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 71 | SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT | | 6,973 | | | | 6,973 |
| 72 | DRUG INTERDICTION | | | | | | |
| 73 | MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT | | 17,644 | | | | 17,644 |
| 74 | SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS | | 366,024 | | | | 366,024 |
| 75 | PSYOP EQUIPMENT | | 76,198 | | | | 76,198 |
| | **Chemical/Biological Defense** | | | | | | |
| | **CBDP** | | | | | | |
| 76 | INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION | | 86,418 | | | | 86,418 |
| 77 | INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION | | 127,537 | | | | 127,537 |
| 78 | DECONTAMINATION | | 28,639 | | 14,000 | | 42,639 |
| | M291 skin decontamination kit | | | | [14,000] | | |
| 79 | JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM | | 55,991 | | | | 55,991 |
| 80 | COLLECTIVE PROTECTION | | 38,857 | | 1,500 | | 40,357 |
| | Collectively protected deployable medical systems | | | | [1,500] | | |

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

## Budget Items—Defense-wide

### Defense Information Systems Network enhancement

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

### CV–22 procurement

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

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

### M291 skin decontamination kit

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

### Collectively protected deployable medical system

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

### Automatic chemical agent detector and alarm

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

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

**Improved chemical agent monitor**

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

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

**Joint biological point detection system**

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

## Items of Special Interest

**C–5 Reliability Enhancement Re-engining Program**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**MQ–1C Predator/Warrior**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Mine resistant ambush protected vehicle reporting requirement**

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

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

**Navy harbor tugs**

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

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

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

**LPD–17 amphibious transport dock**

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

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

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

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

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

**Shipboard personal locator beacon**

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

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

**Strike fighter gap**

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

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

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

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

## Explanation of tables

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

## NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

## Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

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

### Advanced Sensor Applications Program (sec. 211)

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

### Active protection systems (sec. 212)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Subtitle D—Other Matters

### Modification of notice and wait requirement for obligation of funds for the foreign comparative test program (sec. 251)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Budget Items

### Army

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0305204A | 175 | TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES | 97,947 | 30,000 | 127,947 |
| | | Constant Hawk | | [30,000] | |
| 0305206A | 176 | AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | [ ] | | [ ] |
| 0305208A | 177 | DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS | [ ] | | [ ] |
| 0702239A | 178 | AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 1,024 | | 1,024 |
| 0708045A | 179 | END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES | 66,869 | | 66,869 |
| 1001018A | 180 | NATO JOINT STARS | | | |
| | 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 147,162 | -10,000 | 137,162 |
| | | **Total, RDT&E Army** | **10,589,604** | **679,300** | **11,268,904** |

**Army basic research**

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

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

**University research initiatives**

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

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

**Army university research centers**

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

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

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

**Army materials research**

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

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

**Electronics and space research**

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

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

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

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

**Materials for insensitive munitions**

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

**Sniper detection systems**

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

**Army vehicle research**

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

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

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

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

**Recoil mitigation technologies**

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

**Unmanned ground vehicle weaponization**

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

**Army electronics research**

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

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

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

**Standoff explosives detection technologies**

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

**Force protection materials research**

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

**Unmanned air systems**

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

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

**Army medical research**

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

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

**Guided airdrop systems**

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

**Army medical technologies**

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

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

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

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

vanced technologies to support telesurgery applications in battlefield environments.

**Dengue infection research**

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

**Lightweight cannon recoil technologies**

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

**Combat vehicle armor technologies**

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

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

tem "may be based on 'best of breed' solutions developed within multiple programs."

**Unmanned ground vehicle initiative**

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

**Combat vehicle energy and power technologies**

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

**Combat vehicle reliability and readiness technologies**

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

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

**Leadership training simulators**

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

**Fuel cells for military applications**

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

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

**Counter rocket, artillery, and mortar radar technologies**

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

**Language translation technologies**

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

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

**Radiation hardening initiative**

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

**Active protection systems development and integration**

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

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

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

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

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

**Undersea chemical weapons assessment program**

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

**Warfighter information network—tactical**

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

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

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

**Future medical shelter systems**

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

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

**Nickel boron metal coating technology for crew served weapons**

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

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

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

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

**Integrated broadcast service**

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

**Family of heavy tactical vehicles**

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

**Light Tactical Wheeled Vehicles**

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

**Future combat systems**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Combat identification**

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

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

**High energy laser systems test facility**

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

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

**HIMARS modular launcher communications system**

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

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

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

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

**Combat vehicle improvement programs**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Helicopter autonomous landing system**

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

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

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

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

**Joint tactical ground station**

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

## Navy

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0604215N | 85 | STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT | 106,242 | | 106,242 |
| 0604216N | 86 | MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT | 78,151 | | 78,151 |
| 0604218N | 87 | AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING | 5,162 | | 5,162 |
| 0604221N | 88 | P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM | 8,621 | | 8,621 |
| 0604230N | 89 | WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM | 2,911 | | 2,911 |
| 0604231N | 90 | TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM | 86,921 | | 86,921 |
| 0604234N | 91 | ADVANCED HAWKEYE | 808,993 | | 808,993 |
| 0604245N | 92 | H-1 UPGRADES | 3,608 | | 3,608 |
| 0604261N | 93 | ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS | 18,325 | | 18,325 |
| 0604262N | 94 | V-22A | 117,997 | | 117,997 |
| 0604264N | 95 | AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 24,267 | | 24,267 |
| 0604269N | 96 | EA-18 | 272,699 | | 272,699 |
| 0604270N | 97 | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 41,064 | | 41,064 |
| 0604273N | 98 | VH-71A EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT | 270,971 | | 270,971 |
| 0604280N | 99 | JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM - NAVY (JTRS-NAVY) | 853,676 | | 853,676 |
| 0604300N | 100 | SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING | 621,544 | 15,000 | 636,544 |
| | | Permanent magnet motor system | | [9,000] | |
| | | Advanced wireless encryption module | | [6,000] | |
| 0604307N | 101 | SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING | 142,810 | | 142,810 |
| 0604311N | 102 | LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION | 4,300 | | 4,300 |
| 0604329N | 103 | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB) | 9,832 | | 9,832 |

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

**Navy science and technology educational outreach**

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

**Infrared materials research**

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

**Undersea perimeter security technologies**

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

**Navy energy and power technologies**

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

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

**Composites research for special operations craft**

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

**Situational awareness processing technologies**

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

**Navy electronics research**

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

**Undersea sensor arrays**

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

**Tactical unmanned air vehicles**

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

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

**Free electron laser research**

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

**Force protection advanced technology**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Ground sensor networks

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

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

**Navy sensor arrays**

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

**Shipboard system component development**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Surface vessel torpedo tubes**

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

**Advanced submarine system development**

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

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

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

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

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

**Next generation shipboard monitoring**

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

**Expeditionary fighting vehicle**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Joint light tactical vehicle**

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

**Optical interconnect**

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

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

**Tactical aircraft direct infrared countermeasures development**

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

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

**Conventional Trident modification**

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

**Permanent magnet motor**

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

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

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

**Wireless encryption technology**

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

**Improved towed array handler**

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

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

**Combat information center conversion**

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

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

**Submarine electronic chart updates**

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

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

**Next generation Phalanx**

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

**NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system**

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

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

(1) an improved payload that would provide radio frequency coverage of more than one band of the spectrum to deal with anti-ship missiles;

(2) better countermeasures techniques for advanced anti-ship cruise missiles with advanced seekers;

(3) an improved guidance and propulsion system to allow more precise positioning of the decoy during operations;

(4) increased duty cycle; and

(5) additional systems engineering and software support.

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

**Navy medical research**

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

**Joint Strike Fighter research and development**

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

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

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

**Navy support of the reliable replacement warhead**

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

**Linear accelerator**

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

**Structural life tracking**

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

**Ultrasonic consolidation technology**

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

**Anti-sniper infrared targeting system**

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

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

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

**Satellite communications (space)**

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

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

**Internet protocol version 6**

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

**Navy manufacturing research**

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

**National Shipbuilding Research Program—Advanced Shipbuilding Enterprise**

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

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

## Air Force

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0605502F | 108 | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH | | | |
| 0605712F | 109 | INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION | 30,203 | | 30,203 |
| 0605807F | 110 | TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 737,558 | | 737,558 |
| 0605860F | 111 | ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE) | 15,145 | 13,700 | 28,845 |
| | | BMRST | | [13,700] | |
| 0605864F | 112 | SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP) | 47,430 | | 47,430 |
| 0605976F | 113 | FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION - TEST ANI | 59,131 | | 59,131 |
| 0605978F | 114 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT - TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPOI | 30,865 | | 30,865 |
| 0804731F | 115 | GENERAL SKILL TRAINING | | | |
| 0909999F | 116 | FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | | |
| 1001004F | 117 | INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES | 4,041 | | 4,041 |
| | | **Operational Systems Development** | | | |
| 0605024F | 118 | ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY | 10,930 | | 10,930 |
| 0605798F | 119 | ANALYSIS SUPPORT GROUP | [ ] | | [ ] |
| 0101113F | 120 | B-52 SQUADRONS | 41,916 | | 41,916 |
| 0101120F | 121 | ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE | | | |
| 0101122F | 122 | AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM) | 4,672 | | 4,672 |
| 0101313F | 123 | STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM - USSTRATCOM | 20,340 | | 20,340 |
| 0101314F | 124 | NIGHT FIST - USSTRATCOM | 5,296 | | 5,296 |
| 0101815F | 125 | ADVANCED STRATEGIC PROGRAMS | [ ] | | [ ] |
| 0102326F | 126 | REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNI2 | 23,495 | | 23,495 |

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0208161F | 165 | SPECIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM | 760,312 | 150,000 | 910,312 |
| | | Special evaluation system | | [150,000] | |
| 0301310F | 166 | NATIONAL AIR INTELLIGENCE CENTER | [ ] | | [ ] |
| 0301314F | 167 | COBRA BALL | [ ] | | [ ] |
| 0301315F | 168 | MISSILE AND SPACE TECHNICAL COLLECTION | [ ] | [1,500] | [ ] |
| | | Classified program | | [1.500] | |
| 0301324F | 169 | FOREST GREEN | [ ] | | [ ] |
| 0301386F | 170 | GDIP COLLECTION MANAGEMENT | [ ] | | [ ] |
| 0302015F | 171 | E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC) | 19,529 | | 19,529 |
| 0303112F | 172 | AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS (AIRCOM) | 2,022 | | 2,022 |
| 0303131F | 173 | MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETV | 103,846 | | 103,846 |
| 0303140F | 174 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 229,657 | | 229,657 |
| 0303141F | 175 | GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | 10,631 | | 10,631 |
| 0303150F | 176 | GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 3,397 | | 3,397 |
| 0303158F | 177 | JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2) | 5,841 | | 5,841 |
| 0303601F | 178 | MILSATCOM TERMINALS | 388,491 | | 388,491 |
| 0304111F | 179 | SPECIAL ACTIVITIES | [ ] | [64,100] | [ ] |
| | | Classified program | | [20,000] | |
| | | Classified program | | [44,100] | |
| 0304260F | 180 | AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE | 139,627 | | 139,627 |

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

**Air Force basic research**

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

**Carbon fiber research**

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

**Optical components for air vehicles**

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

**Scramjet technologies**

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

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

**Network centric collaboration technologies**

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

**Air Force seismic research for nuclear test monitoring**

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

**Acoustic shields for rocket payloads**

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

**Cyber attack mitigation**

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

**Aerospace metals research**

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

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

**Deployable fuel cell processors**

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

**Aerospace titanium research**

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

**Thin film amorphous solar arrays**

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

**High integrity global positioning system**

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

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

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

**Optical interconnects for battlefield communications**

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

**Space control technology**

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

**Space radar technology study**

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

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

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

**Common aero vehicle**

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

**Operationally responsive space**

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

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

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

**Combat search and rescue replacement vehicle**

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

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

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

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

**Rapid attack identification detection and reporting system**

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

**Space control test capability**

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

**Space situation awareness systems**

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

**Space fence**

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

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

**Joint space intelligent decision support**

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

**Space-Based Infrared Satellite System High GEO**

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

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

**Alternate infrared satellite system**

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

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

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

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

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

**Ballistic missile range safety technology**

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

**MQ–9 Reaper**

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

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

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

**Predator trainer upgrade**

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

**Joint surveillance target attack radar system research and development**

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

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

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

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

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

**Weather service research and development**

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

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

**Classified program**

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

**Global Positioning System user equipment**

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

**MQ–1 Predator signals intelligence direction finding**

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

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

**Network-centric collaborative targeting**

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

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

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

**National Security Space Office**

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

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

**Space situational awareness operations**

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

**C–130 deicing system**

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

**KC–135 tanker replacement**

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

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

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

**Combat casualty management system**

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

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

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

**Laser processing of materials**

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

## Defense-wide

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0603121D8Z | 27 | SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT | 32,669 | | 32,669 |
| 0603122D8Z | 28 | COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT | 76,276 | 2,000 | 78,276 |
| | | Arabic language analysis systems | | [2,000] | |
| 0603160BR | 29 | COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES - PROLIFERATION PF | 213,240 | | 213,240 |
| 0603175C | 30 | BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY | 118,569 | 4,000 | 122,569 |
| | | Directly printed electronic components | | [4,000] | |
| 0603225D8Z | 31 | JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 23,488 | | 23,488 |
| 0603286E | 32 | ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS | 86,385 | | 86,385 |
| 0603287E | 33 | SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY | 224,551 | | 224,551 |
| 0603384BP | 34 | CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANC | 232,302 | 8,000 | 240,302 |
| | | Semiconducting metal oxide sensors | | [2,000] | |
| | | Improved CBR filters | | [2,000] | |
| | | Raman chemical ID system | | [4,000] | |
| 0603618D8Z | 35 | JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY | 9,219 | | 9,219 |
| 0603648D8Z | 36 | JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS | 194,352 | | 194,352 |
| 0603662D8Z | 37 | NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| 0603665D8Z | 38 | BIOMETRICS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY | 8,000 | 4,000 | 12,000 |
| | | Standoff biometrics technology | | [4,000] | |
| 0603670D8Z | 39 | HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCE | 9,000 | | 9,000 |

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0307207G | 225 | AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) | [ ] | | [ ] |
| 0708011S | 226 | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | 20,114 | 42,000 | 62,114 |
| | | Manufacturing supply chain research | | [3,000] | |
| | | Castings research | | [2,000] | |
| | | Military high pressure packaging program | | [4,000] | |
| | | Defense fuel cell manufacturing | | [3,000] | |
| | | Industrial base innovation fund | | [30,000] | |
| 0708012S | 227 | LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 2,846 | | 2,846 |
| 0902298J | 228 | MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS) | 3,210 | | 3,210 |
| 1001018D8Z | 229 | NATO JOINT STARS | 41,466 | | 41,466 |
| 1130435BB | 230 | STORM | 27,107 | | 27,107 |
| 1160279BB | 231 | SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH/SMALL BUS TECH | | | |
| 1160403BB | 232 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS AVIATION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVI | 60,750 | | 60,750 |
| 1160404BB | 233 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT | 42,262 | | 42,262 |
| 1160405BB | 234 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPM | 35,783 | | 35,783 |
| 1160408BB | 235 | SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS | 53,418 | | 53,418 |
| 1160421BB | 236 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS CV-22 DEVELOPMENT | 23,473 | | 23,473 |
| 1160425BB | 237 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS AIRCRAFT DEFENSIVE SYSTEMS | 5,195 | | 5,195 |
| 1160426BB | 238 | OPERATIONS ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS) D | 20,292 | | 20,292 |
| 1160427BB | 239 | MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS (MTPS) | 6,405 | | 6,405 |
| 1160428BB | 240 | UNMANNED VEHICLES (UV) | 1,500 | | 1,500 |

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1160429BB | 241 | MC-130J SOF TANKER RECAPITALIZATION | 12,701 | | 12,701 |
| | 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 3,483,300 | 608,725 | 4,092,025 |
| | | Transfer to PE 63714D8Z (RDDW 70) | | [-20,000] | |
| | | Other classified adjustments | | [628,725] | |
| | | **Total, RDT&E Defense-Wide** | **20,559,850** | **771,625** | **21,331,475** |

# Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE** | | | |
| | | **RDT&E Management Support** | | | |
| 0605118D8Z | 1 | OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION | | | |
| 0605118OTE | 2 | OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION | 48,627 | | 48,627 |
| 0605131D8Z | 3 | LIVE FIRE TESTING | | | |
| 0605131OTE | 4 | LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION | 11,133 | | 11,133 |
| 0605804D8Z | 5 | DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION | | | |
| 0605814OTE | 6 | OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES | 120,504 | | 120,504 |
| | | **Total, Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense** | **180,264** | | **180,264** |
| | | **TOTAL RDT&E** | **75,117,194** | **-458,167** | **74,669,027** |

**Semiconductor focus center research program**

The budget request included no funding in PE 61111D8Z for Government/Industry Cosponsorship of University Research (GICUR) in semiconductor technology. This is despite the fact that in the January 2007 report to Congress entitled "Response to Findings and Recommendations of the Defense Science Board Task Force on High Performance Microchip Supply," the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics indicated that the GICUR program "is a shared commitment between industry and the Department to sponsor next generation semiconductor electronics research," which "capitalizes on university-based research, education, and training in technologies of strategic importance to national defense and also to industry." The committee recommends an additional $5.0 million in PE 61111D8Z for the semiconductor focus center research program. The committee directs that the Director of Defense Research and Engineering ensures that this funding is combined with an adequate cost-sharing investment from industry partners, and is executed in coordination with similar authorized funding requested in PE 61101E.

Further, the committee directs the Director of Defense Research and Engineering to comply with the recommendation of the Defense Science Board Task Force on High Performance Microchip Supply to develop an ". . . estimate of Department of Defense 5- and 10-year future microelectronics needs (including processes and design methods)" as well as to "collect and organize known and projected technology requirements." This estimate shall be delivered to the congressional defense committees no later than October 1, 2008.

**Superstructural particle evaluation**

The budget request included $72.0 million in PE 61384BP for chemical and biological defense basic research. This basic research improves the understanding of the scientific processes for protecting against chemical and biological agents. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 61384BP to continue work in superstructural particle evaluation and characterization with targeted reaction analysis. This program shows potential as an enabling technology for other efforts in the chemical and biological defense area.

**Medical free electron laser**

The budget request included no funding for the Medical Free Electron Laser (MFEL) program. The Department of Defense describes the program as developing "advanced, medical laser-based technology applications focusing on rapid diagnosis and treatment of battlefield medical problems," while addressing "military mission and unique medical challenges on the battlefield." The Department further noted that "most laser-based medical procedures used in surgery . . . for Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom casualties have a research base and lineage" from the MFEL program. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $8.0 million in PE 62227D8Z for the continuation of competitive research awards under the MFEL program. Further, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategic plan

for the continuation of militarily relevant medical laser research, technology development, and technology transition to operational users, and to deliver that plan to the congressional defense committees along with the fiscal year 2009 budget request.

**Chemical and biological infrared detector**

The budget request included $305.3 million in PE 62384BP for chemical and biological defense applied research, but did not include any funds to develop miniaturized infrared detection technology. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62384BP to continue development and miniaturization of an advanced infrared detection system for chemical and biological agents. The objective is to demonstrate a functional prototype that operates at high speed and sensitivity with minimal false alarm rates. This technology may provide an end product with significantly lower logistical burden than other technologies.

**Chemical and biological protective textile fabric**

The budget request included $305.3 million in PE 62384BP for chemical and biological defense applied research, but included no funds for research and development of protective fabrics based on advanced molecular matrices. The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 62384BP for development of novel textile fabrics for protection against exposure to chemical and biological warfare agents. The committee notes that development of novel protective fabric concepts is currently a major thrust of the Department of Defense Chemical and Biological Defense Program, and this research could lead to important contributions in future protective fabric development.

**Verification and validation of chemical agent persistence models**

The budget request included $305.3 million in PE 62384BP for chemical and biological defense applied research, but included no funding for the verification and validation of chemical agent persistence models. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 62384BP, to complete verification and validation of chemical agent persistence models to help ensure U.S. forces are capable of operating effectively in a chemically contaminated environment.

The committee notes that the agent fate program is a joint service program that focuses on the acquisition of chemical warfare agent data and the development of models from that data. The continuation of the agent fate effort to validate and verify chemical agent persistence models meets a Defense Technology Objective, and will help U.S. military forces protect themselves and their equipment in a chemically contaminated environment.

**Blast mitigation and protection**

The budget request included $182.4 million in PE 62718BR for technologies to defeat weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 62718BR for blast mitigation and protection analysis and software development to improve the Vulnerability Assessment and Protection Op-

tion analytic tool used by the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to predict the effects of explosive blasts on buildings, and to design mitigation and protection options for military facilities. Terrorist attacks using high explosives have become more sophisticated and powerful. This requires improved analytic and predictive capabilities for external and internal blast effects, identification of critical vulnerabilities, and designing protective measures against blast.

**Comprehensive national incident management system**

The budget request included $182.4 million in PE 62718BR for technologies to defeat weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62718BR for the Comprehensive National Incident Management system being developed by the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) to improve national capabilities to analyze potential catastrophic events such as pandemic influenza and terrorist attacks using weapons of mass destruction. This technology has the potential to significantly improve the ability of the Department of Defense to analyze and plan for such catastrophic events, including its ability to provide support to civil authorities for consequence management of such events.

**Advanced technologies for special operations**

The budget request included $21.3 million in PE 1160401BB, $2.4 million in PE 1160407BB, and $29.9 million in PE 1160402BB for science and technology efforts to support the development of special operations capabilities. The committee notes that United States Special Operations Command (SOCOM) has highlighted "tagging, tracking, and locating" as a key technology challenge and plans to invest $17.6 million in the fiscal year 2008 budget in related research. The committee recommends an additional $2.5 million in PE 1160401BB for the development of multi-sensor data fusion systems to enhance detection and discrimination of targets hidden in foliage.

Special Operations Command has also highlighted the development of "alternative and advanced lightweight power sources" as a priority technology challenge. Consistent with that assessment, and with efforts in the SOCOM Small Business Innovative Research program, the committee recommends an additional $2.0 million in PE 1160402BB for research on systems to produce mobile electric power from a variety of fuels. Further, the committee recommends an additional $3.0 million in PE 1160402BB for the development of portable fuel cell systems for battlefield communications equipment. Special Operations Command has identified the development of systems that can reduce signatures across the spectrum without mission impact to enhance clandestine operations capability as a major technology challenge. To support efforts to address this challenge, the committee recommends an additional $3.0 million in PE 1160402BB to reduce antenna signatures and improve performance on airborne platforms. To support SOCOM's urgent need to enable precision fires in urban terrain and other operational settings, the committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 1160402BB for development of standoff precision guided munitions.

**Directly printed electronic components**

The budget request included $118.6 million in PE 63175C for ballistic missile defense technology development. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63175C for development of directly printed electronic components for missile defense applications. Such components could have increased performance, greater reliability, and smaller size than currently available technology.

**Semi-conducting metal oxide sensors**

The budget request included $232.3 million in PE 63384BP for chemical and biological defense advanced technology. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63384BP to develop miniaturized semi-conducting metal oxide sensor array technology for chemical warfare agents and toxic industrial chemicals. This technology effort meets the Department of Defense Chemical and Biological Defense Program objective to develop small, integrated chemical vapor sensors by targeting permissive exposure levels.

**Improved chemical, biological, and radiological filters**

The budget request included $232.3 million in PE 63384BP for chemical and biological defense advanced technology development, but included no funds for developing improved chemical, biological, and radiological (CBR) filtration capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63384BP for design, engineering, and prototyping of improved CBR filters. Improved filters would fill a requirement for enhanced collective protection capability against a wider spectrum of threat agents. Such filters would be multi-use and multi-platform configurable, for use in buildings, ships, and shelters.

**Raman chemical identification system**

The budget request included $232.2 million in PE 63384BP for chemical and biological defense advanced technology development, but included no funding to develop a miniaturized Raman chemical agent identification system. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63384BP for development of a handheld Raman chemical identification system that is smaller and more reliable than existing systems, in order to improve the ability of U.S. forces to rapidly identify unknown chemical agents and substances.

**Biometrics technologies**

The budget request included $8.0 million in PE 63665D8Z for biometrics science and technology. The 2007 "Report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on Defense Biometrics" highlighted the need for improvements in the ability to perform biometric identification at standoff ranges, and recommended support of research efforts into "extended-range human biometric identifiability and tracking." Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $4.0 million for the development of systems to perform clandestine identification of moving subjects at variable distances.

**Manufacturing technologies**

The budget request included $10.0 million in PE 63680D8Z for defense-wide manufacturing science and technology programs. The committee commends the Department of Defense for understanding the need to advance manufacturing technologies to support the defense industrial base, improve the performance of defense systems, and reduce life cycle costs. In title II, subtitle D of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), the committee established the high performance defense manufacturing technology research and development program with a goal to identify and transition advanced manufacturing processes and technologies whose utilization would create significant productivity and efficiency gains in the defense manufacturing base. The committee notes that this legislation has been endorsed by the Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force on the Manufacturing Technology Program. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63680D8Z to continue activities under this program, including development of test beds and prototypes of advanced manufacturing technologies, diffusion of advanced manufacturing processes throughout the industrial base, and the development of technology roadmaps to ensure that the Department can access required manufacturing and technology capabilities in critical defense technologies.

The committee notes that the DSB recommended an increased investment in research on "disruptive" manufacturing technologies, which can radically alter traditional manufacturing processes and change the industrial base. These types of innovations would allow the Department to gain easier access to affordable low-volume, state-of-the-art production capabilities, as is often needed in the acquisition of defense unique technologies of low density, high demand systems. The DSB indicated that investments in areas such as nanomanufacturing and flexible manufacturing processes would be of high value to the Department. To support these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63680D8Z for longer-term research into disruptive manufacturing techniques.

**Printed circuit board technologies**

The budget request included $18.7 million in PE 63712S for generic logistics research and development technology demonstrations. The committee notes that the National Research Council Committee on Manufacturing Trends in Printed Circuit Technology recommended that the Department of Defense "should ensure access to new printed circuit board (PrCB) technology by expanding its role in fostering new PrCB design and manufacturing technology." In support of that recommendation the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million for the development of emerging critical interconnect and printed circuit board technology.

**Energy efficiency technologies**

The budget request included $18.7 million in PE 63712S for generic logistics research and development (R&D) technology demonstrations. The committee is aware of a growing number of studies from organizations including the JASONs technical study

group, the Defense Science Board, and the Energy Security Task Force that highlight the need for the Department of Defense to closely examine its energy use and technologies for improving energy efficiency. The use of energy efficient technologies by the Department can result in cost savings, enhanced operational performance, and reduce dependence on foreign oil. The committee also notes that the Marine Corps submitted an urgent request for renewable energy systems to be deployed in Iraq. Finally, the committee notes that Executive Order 13423 calls on federal agencies to increase their use of renewable energy for power, and for federal fleets to increase their consumption of non-petroleum-based fuels by 10 percent annually.

The committee supports efforts by the Department to invest in energy efficient and alternative energy technologies. To support these efforts the committee recommends increases of $10.0 million to continue the Vehicle Fuel Cell Program established in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), $6.0 million for research on solid hydrogen storage materials and systems appropriate for military applications, $3.0 million for research on the production and use of biofuels for military operations, and $3.0 million for the development of deployable microgrid systems that can utilize a variety of energy sources to produce installation and vehicle power.

**Unmanned air vehicle batteries**

The budget request included $18.7 million in PE 63712S for generic logistics technology demonstrations. The committee has strongly endorsed the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) for a growing number of military missions. The committee notes that one limiting factor in the use of UAVs on the battlefield is the limited power available on the platforms, which can limit both UAV flight range as well as the specific missions of each platform. In order to address this issue, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for research on advanced battery technologies for UAVs.

**Water remediation research**

The budget request included $68.9 million in PE 63716D8Z for the strategic environmental research program. The committee understands that the Department of Defense has identified a large number of active and formerly used defense sites with issues of groundwater contamination. Many of these sites will require environmental remediation. To support those efforts, the committee recommends an additional $2.5 million for water remediation research.

**High performance computing modeling and simulation**

The budget request included $187.6 million in PE 63755D8Z for the high performance computing modernization program. The committee notes that one of the Army's major future force technology areas is advanced simulation technologies. These technologies are being developed to provide increasingly realistic training and mission rehearsal environments to support military operations and acquisition efforts. In order to support those efforts, the committee

recommends an increase of $2.0 million for high performance computing modeling and simulation research.

**Small craft common operating picture technology**

The budget request included $109.5 million in PE 63826D8Z for quick reaction special projects. The committee notes that the Navy's assymetric and irregular warfare science and technology focus area has a specific technical objective of improving riverine surveillance capabilities, through the development of a "common and persistent maritime picture on and below the surface and shore." To support those efforts, the committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million for the development of technology to provide a common tactical operating picture to riverine craft.

**Active protection systems comparative testing**

The budget request included $109.5 million in PE 63826D8Z for quick reaction special projects. The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million for the comparative testing of foreign and domestic active protection systems as required elsewhere in this report. The committee further recommends an increase of $1.0 million for the assessment of current and future active protection systems as described elsewhere in this report.

**Joint warfare experimentation**

The budget request included $112.0 million in PE 63828D8Z for joint experimentation. The committee notes that Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) is playing the lead role in the development of joint operational concepts and in the development of joint experiments and wargames to test new operational concepts, capabilities, and technologies. The committee notes that JFCOM is conducting experiments to understand how multiple federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, should interact with each other and state and local entities in carrying out homeland defense missions. To support these efforts the committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million for wargaming and experimentation to simulate terrorist attacks against domestic military facilities. The committee also is supportive of JFCOM efforts to enhance Department language and cultural awareness capabilities and recommends an increase of $3.2 million to continue the development of cultural and societal modeling and simulation tools. The committee also commends JFCOM efforts in the development of urban operations concepts and capabilities and recommends an increase of $1.5 million to fund the JFCOM unfunded requirement for the development of a joint urban fires prototype.

**Range readiness analyses**

The budget request included $62.9 million in PE 63941D8Z for test and evaluation science and technology. The committee notes that the "Annual Report of the Test Resource Management Center" highlighted the fact that Department of Defense test facilities and ranges need to be protected against diminution in mission capability as an unintended consequence of environmental laws and encroachment. The committee recommends an additional $1.0 million

for analysis of issues that may affect military mission readiness and test activities on and between installations and ranges.

**Terminal High Altitude Area Defense**

The budget request included $858.3 million in PE 63881C for the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system. The committee recommends an increase of $105.0 million in PE 63881C, of which $40.0 million is to begin development of the Evolved THAAD Interceptor, $40.0 million is to increase the missile production rate to four per month, and $25.0 million is to conduct additional flight testing of the THAAD system.

The THAAD system is expected to have significant capability to defend against short-, medium-, and intermediate-range ballistic missiles, including potential Iranian missiles that could be launched at Europe. With evolutionary upgrades to the THAAD interceptor, the system would increase significantly its defensive area and its capability, to include the possibility of defending against some intercontinental ballistic missiles. The additional funding recommended would permit the Evolved THAAD Interceptor upgrade to begin development so that it could be tested and demonstrated on an accelerated schedule. This is not intended to interfere with the existing THAAD program of record.

The committee notes that the THAAD system is designed to have nine launchers per fire unit, but that initially the system will have only three launchers per fire unit, with eight interceptors per launcher. The Commander of the Joint Force Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense told the committee in April 2007 that recent analyses indicate a need to nearly double the number of planned THAAD interceptors, currently 96. The committee believes that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) should plan and budget for a significantly larger number of THAAD interceptors to meet the needs of regional combatant commanders, as well as for a robust flight test program. The additional funding recommended to increase the interceptor production rate would permit production at rates that better meet the needs of combatant commanders.

The committee is disappointed that the MDA eliminated three flight tests from the THAAD testing program for budget reasons and because of difficulty delivering targets on time. This reduction is contrary to the direction provided by Congress last year for the Department of Defense to place priority on the development, testing, fielding, and improvement of effective, near-term ballistic missile defense systems, specifically including the THAAD system.

The testing reduction adds risk to the THAAD program, and increases the number of critical factors that must be accomplished in individual tests. It also eliminates two near-term flight tests. The additional funding recommended by the committee is intended to restore a THAAD flight test to reduce risk and allow a more measured pace of demonstrating critical factors in each test.

The committee is disappointed that the THAAD flight test program has suffered from target failures and target delivery delays, despite the availability to MDA of considerable sums of money for the targets program. The committee urges MDA to improve its performance on supplying reliable targets to the THAAD program and other element and system flight tests.

**Arrow missile defense program**

The budget request included $73.6 million in PE 63881C for the Israeli Arrow missile defense program, including $55.0 million for the Arrow System Improvement program, and $12.4 million for co-production of the Arrow interceptor missile. The committee recommends an increase of $35.0 million in PE 63881C for the Arrow missile defense program, including $25.0 million for increased co-production of the Arrow interceptor missile, and $10.0 million for the United States and Israel to conduct a detailed analysis of the potential for the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system to serve as a follow-on to the Arrow system to provide an upper tier defense of Israel against longer-range and more advanced ballistic missiles armed with unconventional warheads.

The Arrow co-production program provides a means to increase the near-term inventory of operational Arrow interceptors. The Arrow system provides defense of Israel and defense of U.S. forces deployed in the region, thus allowing U.S. freedom of action in future contingencies. The Arrow system is designed to be interoperable with deployed U.S. missile defense assets.

The committee notes that the THAAD system is planned to have the capability to defend an area the size of Israel against regional ballistic missiles that could leak through Israel's improved Arrow weapon system. The committee believes that Israel should consider seriously the option of purchasing the THAAD system, rather than beginning a development program for a new upper tier interceptor system that would replicate the capabilities of THAAD. The committee urges the Department of Defense to assist in this effort.

**Short-range ballistic missile defense**

The budget request included $962.6 million in PE 63881C for terminal-phase missile defense efforts, of which $7.0 million is for short-range ballistic missile defense (SRBMD) research and development cooperation between the United States and Israel on the Israeli "David's Sling" weapon system. The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in PE 63881C for acceleration of the SRBMD development effort.

The short-range missile and rocket attacks by Hezbollah against Israel in the summer of 2006 reinforced the importance of developing affordable and effective short-range ballistic missile defense capabilities. The Missile Defense Agency wants to ensure that the technology developed for the David's Sling weapon system can be fully interoperable with the U.S. Ballistic Missile Defense system. The program seeks to produce an interceptor missile costing $350,000, which is less than 15 percent of the cost of a Patriot missile.

This program development objective is on an accelerated schedule to allow rapid demonstration and fielding of an initial capability by Israel starting as early as 2009.

**Ground-based midcourse defense in Europe**

The budget request included $2.5 billion in PE 63882C for midcourse ballistic missile defense, including $85.0 million for construction of facilities in Europe for the proposed deployment of Ground-based Interceptors in Poland and a midcourse X-band

radar in the Czech Republic. As noted elsewhere in this report, the committee believes this proposed deployment request is premature. The committee recommends a reduction of $85.0 million in PE 63882C, the entire amount for site activation and construction activities for the proposed European deployment.

Should the international agreements be reached before or during fiscal year 2008, the Department of Defense could then seek a reprogramming request to fund site activation and construction activities.

**Airborne Laser**

The budget request included $548.8 million in PE 63883C for the Airborne Laser boost-phase missile defense technology demonstration program. The committee recommends a reduction of $200.0 million to PE 63883C for the Airborne Laser. The committee notes that the Airborne Laser (ABL) program has had a history of schedule delays and cost overruns since its inception in 1996. The Department of Defense previously told Congress that the system would be available for an emergency capability in 2003. The current schedule has delayed the first demonstration shoot-down flight test until 2009 and, if all the technology worked as hoped, the system would likely not be operational until 2018, or later.

The committee has concerns about the many technical challenges still facing the Airborne Laser program, as well as its operational constraints and very considerable cost. For example, the ABL demonstration program is expected to cost $5.0 billion dollars to get through the first demonstration of the proof of principle in a shoot-down flight test in 2009. Even if that flight test were to work, it would not demonstrate that the system could be made operationally effective. And it is unclear that the system would be affordable. The Congressional Budget Office has provided an initial estimate that an operational ABL system of 7 aircraft could cost as much as $36.0 billion.

Although the MDA says that the ABL program is a knowledge-based program, it did not meet all its knowledge points in 2006 before moving forward to the next knowledge point. This indicates too high a degree of technical risk, and an undue effort to meet a schedule for the flight test demonstration, rather than demonstrating all necessary knowledge point steps before proceeding to the next step.

The committee notes that near-term capabilities to defend against existing threats are a higher priority than far-term, high risk technology demonstrations. The committee urges the Department to consider restructuring the ABL program as a technology demonstrator.

**Real-time non-specific viral agent detector**

The budget request included $57.2 million in PE 63884BP for chemical and biological defense advanced component development and prototypes, but included no funds for development of a mobile non-specific viral agent detector. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63884BP for development of a mobile real-time non-specific viral agent detector that would improve current capabilities. The committee notes that this effort would pro-

vide a significant upgrade to the current Joint Biological Agent Identification and Diagnostic system (JBAIDS). This technology, which would add the capability to detect infectious diseases, would be useful both for forward-deployed forces and for domestic consequence management missions.

**Ballistic missile defense reductions**

The budget request included $482.0 million in PE 63890C for Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) systems Core; and $323.3 million in PE 63891C for Missile Defense Agency (MDA) Special Programs. The committee recommends a decrease of $50.0 million in PE 63890C for BMD systems Core; and a decrease of $150.0 million in PE 63891C for MDA Special Programs to partially offset the additional funding needed for the Patriot PAC–3, Aegis BMD, and THAAD programs, described elsewhere in this report. The committee notes that the proposed funding reductions are for projects that are of lower priority than the near-term capabilities provided by these three near-term programs, which meet the needs of combatant commanders to defend against existing short-range and medium-range missile threats to forward-deployed U.S. forces.

**Aegis ballistic missile defense**

The budget request included nearly $1.1 billion in PE 63892C, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) system, including the Standard Missile–3 (SM–3) interceptor. The committee recommends an increase of $75.0 million in PE 63892C for the Aegis BMD system, of which $20.0 million is for increasing the SM–3 interceptor production rate to four per month; $45.0 million is for long lead production of an additional 15 SM–3 interceptors; and $10.0 million is for accelerating the development of the Aegis BMD Signal Processor (BSP) and Open Architecture software for the Aegis weapon system.

The committee notes that the Aegis BMD system, and its SM–3 interceptor, is deployed today and provides an important missile defense capability against short- and medium-range missiles deployed widely in theaters where U.S. forces are forward deployed. The system is planned for significant capability improvements in the future.

The Missile Defense Agency (MDA) increased the planned funding for SM–3 missiles in fiscal year 2008 to fund missiles it had previously cut for budget reasons. Currently MDA plans to procure only some 147 SM–3 missiles of all Block I varieties. The Commander, Joint Forces Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense (JFCC–IMD) testified in April 2007 that recent analyses indicate a need to nearly double the number of planned SM–3 interceptors. The committee urges MDA to plan and budget for increased numbers of SM–3 interceptors to meet the needs of regional combatant commanders, as indicated by the Commander, JFCC–IMD.

**Space tracking and surveillance system**

The budget request included $331.5 million in PE 63893C for the Space Tracking and Surveillance System (STSS). The committee

recommends a reduction of $55.0 million in PE 63893C for STSS, the amount requested for product development of the follow-on satellites that will not be deployed until 2016. The committee notes that the STSS program is preparing to deploy two experimental STSS satellites to learn how the system works, and what changes or improvements are needed for the operational system. It is premature to plan to spend funds on developing the follow-on operational satellites before the Missile Defense Agency knows how the experimental satellites work, and what changes are needed in the follow-on satellites.

**Space test-bed**

The budget request included $27.7 million in PE 63895C for Ballistic Missile Defense system space programs, including $10.0 million for a new "space test-bed." The committee recommends a decrease of $10.0 million in PE 63895C, the entire amount requested for the space test-bed.

The committee notes that the space test-bed is intended to be the initial step toward deploying space-based interceptors. There is no threat that justifies such a deployment, and therefore no justification to create such a test-bed. There are, however, numerous real missile threats for which near-term missile defense capabilities are needed, as Congress made clear in section 223 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). The committee believes it is more appropriate to support funding for those effective, near-term systems that meet current combatant commander needs against existing threats.

**Surface-to-air missile threat simulators**

The budget request included $133.8 million in PE 64940D8Z for central test and evaluation investment development. The committee notes the need to develop simulators for the large variety of threats that may face warfighters in the future. The fiscal year 2006 annual report of the Director of the Test Resource Management Center identified digital modeling and simulation of targets and threats as a test and evaluation gap. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $4.0 million for the development of surface-to-air missile hardware simulators.

**Prompt global strike**

The budget request included a total of $175.4 million for the Conventional Trident Modification (CTM), with $126.4 million in hard and deeply buried target defeat systems, PE 64327N; $36.0 million in Trident II modifications, Weapons Procurement, Navy (WPN) line 1; and $13.0 million in strategic systems missile equipment, Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) line 108. The budget request also included $32.8 million for the Common Aero Vehicle, PE 64856F.

The committee believes that a coordinated look at a variety of kinetic non-nuclear concepts is necessary to address the feasibility of a prompt global strike (PGS) capability and to review, in a coordinated fashion, technologies that would be common to such a capacity, including thermal protection, guidance navigation, and control issues. The committee recommends that the funds identified above be transferred to technical studies, support, and analysis, PE

65104D8Z, to be used to establish an integrated PGS research program. Requirements for the program should be provided by the United States Strategic Command as informed by the ongoing analysis of alternatives for PGS and the PGS technology roadmap.

In addition to the research areas mentioned above, research should include advanced propulsion, payload delivery and dispensing mechanisms, weapon system command and control, and advanced non-nuclear, kinetic, and other enabling capabilities.

The committee is aware of several potential options for non-nuclear prompt global strike, including the Army's advanced hypersonic weapon technology demonstrator program, which is included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priority list in the amount of $41.7 million. The committee recommends that of the funds provided for PGS, $41.7 million be provided to begin sounding rocket and flight vehicle tests, and to support booster development for the Army's advanced hypersonic weapon.

Other service program elements, including PE 63216F, aerospace propulsion and power technology, also include research and development areas that could be applied to the PGS mission. Included in the propulsion research and development efforts is the versatile, affordable advanced turbine engine high speed turbine engine demonstrator (HiSTED). The budget request included $2.5 million for this effort. The committee recommends an additional $10.0 million to allow the PGS effort to coordinate research and development activities with the Air Force HiSTED project.

The committee continues to believe that it is essential to maintain a bright line between legacy nuclear capabilities and any future PGS capability, and therefore recommends no funds for the CTM or other similar capability that could raise any nuclear ambiguity issues. The committee believes that PGS should be clearly and unambiguously non-nuclear.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Commander of the Strategic Command, to submit a research plan for PGS for fiscal year 2008, including a funding plan, prior to initiating any PGS research.

**Information systems security program technology development**

The budget request included $394.3 million in PE 33140G for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) for the Information Systems Security program at the National Security Agency (NSA). The committee is concerned that the NSA information assurance program does not have a dedicated program for developing a technology base for future requirements for advanced products like high-speed encrypters for space and terrestrial applications.

Multiple Department of Defense and national intelligence major acquisition programs have been adversely affected by delays in the development of security features. These delays are in part the result of NSA security technology lagging behind the constant, rapid advance of communications technology.

The committee believes it is unwise for a critical mission area such as this to receive no tech base funding, especially in the current era when the communications technology that must be protected is growing relentlessly.

Accordingly, the committee directs the establishment of an anticipatory technology development program for advanced information assurance capabilities. The committee recommends an authorization of $30.0 million for this purpose.

The committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Network and Information Integration to develop a technology development plan that describes key challenges, critical capabilities, and technical goals for information assurance over the future-years defense program. This plan must delineate how the Department intends to structure the anticipatory development program, and to utilize commercial expertise and investments. This plan, as well as a spending plan for fiscal year 2008, must be submitted to the congressional defense committees prior to obligation and expenditure of authorized funds.

**Software assurance education and research**

The budget request included $394.3 million for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) in PE 33140G for the Information Systems Security program (ISSP), but no funds for the development and integration of secure software design practices in curricula of higher education institutions that teach computer science and software engineering.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million for this purpose at one of the institutions designated as a national Center of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education by the National Security Agency.

**Defense Logistics Agency manufacturing research**

The budget request included $20.1 million in PE 78011S for industrial preparedness programs of the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA). The committee notes that efforts to adopt fuel cell technology by the military are inhibited by cost barriers. The reduction of fuel cell cost is a specific technical goal of the Department of Defense's Energy and Power Technology Initiative. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $3.0 million for the improvement of manufacturing processes to reduce the cost of fuel cells for use in military applications. The committee directs that these activities will be undertaken in coordination with the efforts of the Joint Defense Manufacturing Technology Panel. The DLA has indicated that a disproportionate share of equipment backorders are due to an unavailability of critical cast parts. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million to develop systems to accelerate the manufacturing and procurement of high priority castings. Further, the committee notes that the DLA has set an objective to improve supply chain performance through a number of improvements including supply chain integration. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for continued improvements in supply chain integration and accelerating response times to equipment backorders. Finally, the committee notes that DLA and the Army have a need for shelf stable combat rations, especially items sensitive to heat, such as produce and eggs, and recommends an increase of $4.0 million for development of equipment to improve processing of rations to enhance their produceability, quality, and shelf life.

### Manufacturing processes to support surge requirements

The budget request included $20.1 million in PE 78011S for Defense Logistics Agency manufacturing technology programs. The committee notes that this is part of the overall Department of Defense manufacturing technology program which has total funding of $193.3 million in the budget request. The committee notes that the 2006 Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force on the Manufacturing Technology Program called for increased funding levels for the program over a 5-year period to a level of "one percent of the RDT&E budget," to align the Department with the level of manufacturing technology investments in the early 1980s. The committee notes that 1 percent of the requested RDT&E budget in fiscal year 2008 would be approximately $750.0 million.

The committee recommends that the Department seriously consider implementing the DSB recommendations for increased manufacturing research funding and has recommended a series of investments throughout this bill to support the ramp up in this important area.

As part of that effort the committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million in PE 78011S for the establishment of an industrial base innovation fund. The committee directs that these funds be executed in coordination with the Joint Defense Manufacturing Technology Panel and the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Industrial Policy to ensure that investments are made to develop manufacturing processes and technologies to support both long-term and short-term needs of the Department. The committee has noted that the surge production requirements of current operations have stressed the industrial base and lead to intolerable wait times for the delivery of some much needed materiel to the battlefield. The committee believes that this recommended increased investment should be used to begin the development of advanced manufacturing technologies that can reduce the time required to produce high demand items during surges in military operations.

## Items of Special Interest

### Adaptive optics

The committee notes that adaptive optics are an important enabling technology for a wide variety of military applications, including laser weapons and space surveillance systems. The committee is concerned that the domestic research and industrial base may not be able to meet the innovation and production demands of the Department of Defense in the future. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a report not later than September 1, 2008, analyzing and recommending a multiyear funding requirement and a set of technical challenges for research to maintain a viable domestic manufacturing base for adaptive optics that can support the meeting of military requirements.

### Advanced cruise missile threats

The committee is concerned about the limited effort that the Navy is undertaking in developing test resources that can adequately simulate emerging advanced cruise missile threats to Navy platforms. The committee is aware that the lack of this test capa-

bility has been raised specifically by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation as potentially impacting the operational testing of a number of major Navy acquisition programs. The committee also notes that the Deputy Secretary of Defense is currently reviewing Navy plans to address this shortfall.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, jointly with the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation and the Director of the Test Resource Management Center to report on plans to develop test resources to adequately test naval assets against advanced cruise missile threats. The report should include a classified analysis of the current and projected future threat, required funding and schedule for the development and acquisition of relevant test resources, and impacts on test schedules and adequacy of testing for specific relevant Navy systems. Further, the Secretary of the Navy shall provide the committee with a report containing an assessment of international advanced cruise missile capabilities relative to the United States' capabilities and the feasibility, cost, and schedule for developing similar capabilities for the Navy. The committee directs that these two reports shall be delivered to the congressional defense committees no later than April 15, 2008.

**Analyses of the Air Force test and evaluation proposals**

The committee notes that both the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–289) and the statement of managers accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) expressed concern over proposed realignments and closures of Air Force test and evaluation facilities. In response to these concerns, the Air Force has delivered an analysis of one such proposal to Congress, and has undertaken a second overall assessment of Air Force test and evaluation activities.

The committee continues to monitor this situation and the iterations of Air Force proposals and strategies to appropriately resource critical test and evaluation functions within a constrained budget. The committee has been concerned in the past with the preservation of a robust test and evaluation capability, leading to establishment of the Test Resource Management Center in the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), to provide oversight over proposed budgets and expenditures for the Major Range and Test Facility Base and to be cognizant of other test and evaluation facilities and resources.

In order to ensure that any reductions in test and evaluation workforce or capabilities are only undertaken after comprehensive and careful analyses of the costs, benefits, and impacts of such decisions on the Department of Defense, the committee directs the Air Force to provide planned actions, criteria used to determine acceptable risk, and supporting data to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Director of the Test Resource Management Center. The committee directs the Director of the Test Resource Management Center to review and analyze existing and ongoing test and evaluation studies being conducted by the Air Force after their completion and to submit a report that provides the committee with any appropriate conclusions and recommendations on the studies, findings, or planned actions

that affect the capabilities and capacity of the Major Range and Test Facility Base. The committee directs that this report shall be delivered to the congressional defense committees as soon as practicable after the completion of the Air Force studies, and that no implementation of proposed plans be initiated before 60 days after receipt of the Director of the Test Resource Management Center's report by Congress.

**Director of Operational Test and Evaluation workforce study**

The committee notes that the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation plays a critical role in determining that weapons systems are operationally effective. The Director's efforts help ensure that acquisition programs deliver systems that provide deployed forces with battlefield superiority. The committee notes that the duties of the office of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation have expanded into areas such as information assurance, force protection, and non-lethal weapons, while continuing the extensive oversight and reporting functions required by statute and regulation. The committee is concerned that the office may not have the workforce required to perform its assigned duties.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to undertake a comprehensive review and analysis of his workforce requirements and report back to the congressional defense committees no later than April 1, 2008. The report shall include an assessment of projected future workforce requirements, resources required to meet those requirements, and recommendations on additional personnel hiring and retention authorities that would support the Director in the conduct of his required duties.

**Ground/air task-oriented radar**

The budget request included $104.4 million in PE 26313M to develop a multi-function radar that would replace five existing single-purpose Marine Corps radar systems used for air defense surveillance and weapons engagement, counter-battery fire, and air traffic control.

The committee is aware that the Marine Corps requirements specified for this system resulted in selection of an S-band radar, and that the first of the four planned increments of the ground/air task-oriented radar (G/ATOR) program includes weapon cueing. S-band radar can do many tasks well, but it is not optimal for weapons engagement. Furthermore, the Marine Corps has terminated its planned weapons engagement system, the Complementary Low-Altitude Weapons System based on the Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missile.

The committee is concerned that the Department of the Navy has embarked on the development of a new radar system which may be poorly suited for the system's primary functions. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to conduct an independent assessment and submit a report to the congressional defense committees, with the fiscal year 2009 budget request, on the Marine Corps acquisition of the G/ATOR system. The report shall address: (1) the Marine Corps requirement for weapons engagement, and verify that the planned S-band radar design will support

that requirement; (2) an assessment of the phasing for planned increments, recognizing that the Marine Corps does not yet have a defined weapons engagement requirement (other than cueing of terminal weapons such as Stinger); and (3) an examination of the technical and program management resources needed to effectively execute this complex state-of-the-art development program.

**National Security Agency acquisition management**

The National Security Agency (NSA) has experienced significant problems over the last decade in transforming itself from the Cold War era to operate effectively in today's global information environment. The Congress and the executive branch concluded that poor acquisition management was a major cause of the NSA's relative lack of success, and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) prohibited the delegation of Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) to the NSA Director and designated the ongoing transformation program, TRAILBLAZER, as a major defense acquisition program (MDAP).

The Congress intended this action to cause the Senior Acquisition Executives (SAEs) in the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) to take vigorous action to improve the Agency's acquisition management capabilities, and to enforce acquisition discipline and accountability through process controls and milestone reviews.

Although some progress is evident, the TRAILBLAZER program was essentially abandoned, and its successor has significant problems. One of the most serious problems is that the NSA chose to structure the TURBULENCE architecture, a major element of its new Transformation 3.0 activity, as a series of loosely connected projects, not one of which met the threshold for designation as a major systems acquisition. This decision, while permitting the NSA to avoid external acquisition oversight, exacerbated the Agency's weaknesses in systems engineering and systems integration. The Department and the ODNI have tolerated this situation for almost 1.5 years.

The committee directs that TURBULENCE be designated as a major systems acquisition requiring milestone review and approval, and formal oversight, by the DOD and DNI MDAs. In addition, the committee directs that the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation exercise oversight over all major elements of the Agency's Transformation 3.0 architecture, including TURBULENCE and the remaining activities under TRAILBLAZER.

The committee supports the Agency's recent decision to create the position of Chief Technology Officer (CTO), whose responsibilities will include ensuring that all the major elements of the Transformation 3.0 effort are integrated at the enterprise level. The committee is concerned, however, that the Agency still lacks the skills necessary to manage a systems engineering and integration challenge of this size and complexity.

The committee directs that the TURBULENCE program may not proceed to Milestone B without a certification to the congressional defense and intelligence committees from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)), and the Deputy Director of National Intelligence for Acquisition

(DDNI(A)), that: (1) the program managers for TURBULENCE and TRAILBLAZER are qualified and have the authority and resources necessary to carry out effective program management; and (2) the CTO has the authorities, personnel, funding, and plans necessary to effectively integrate the Agency's Transformation 3.0 activities.

**Open Architecture**

The Navy has made considerable investments over the past several years in an effort to transition development of surface ship systems to an open business model, commonly referred to as Open Architecture (OA). OA systems are characterized by modular design, public access to design specifications, software reuse, common interface standards, and seamless interoperability between system hardware and software applications. By rejecting proprietary and closed solutions, OA promises to bring to bear the critical elements of competition and innovation to achieve improved system performance and affordability.

Absent an open business model, the ability to modernize the surface force effectively, affordably, and routinely to keep pace against future threats becomes highly problematic. This is well exemplified by the challenges confronting the Navy with a protracted, 20-year plan to modernize the weapon system for Aegis cruisers and destroyers. However, the challenges with implementing OA for surface ship systems are highly problematic in their own right. Absent a comprehensive OA implementation plan that keeps faith with underlying OA principles, the Navy will expend critical financial, technical, and management resources without achieving measurable improvement to system performance or life cycle cost.

The Navy's success in building a future force of 313 ships, and with that, the Navy's ability to meet its long-range warfighting requirements, is directly linked to its success in implementing OA. However, despite having made significant OA investments to date, the Navy's overall progress in transitioning into OA business processes is disappointing. In view of the criticality of this overall effort, Congress needs a clear understanding of the full scope of the effort, the investment required, and the progress achieved towards the objectives outlined above.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, commencing with the fiscal year 2009 budget request, to be updated quarterly, that outlines the Navy's plan and progress with implementing OA. The report shall include: (i) an integrated schedule outlining OA development and the related surface ship fielding plan; (ii) an assessment of OA development, test, procurement, installation, and operating and support costs; (iii) the Navy's acquisition strategy for leveraging competition in software development; and (iv) the Navy's performance to the plan. Additionally, the report shall: (i) identify software that is intended to be available for reuse by third parties in support of the OA implementation plan; (ii) describe the Navy's progress in making that software and related documentation available through the Navy's Software, Hardware Asset Reuse Enterprise (SHARE) Library; (iii) describe how the Navy is assuring quality for software and related documentation deposited in the SHARE Library; (iv) describe how the Navy

is driving reuse of SHARE Library software; (v) outline contracts which have reused third party software from the SHARE Library; and (vi) identify the impediments to entering outstanding Navy system software into the SHARE Library and the plan for managing these impediments.

# TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

## Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

### Explanation of tables

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

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Operation and Maintenance, Army | 28,924,973 | 800,300 | 29,725,273 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy | 33,334,690 | -27,000 | 33,307,690 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps | 4,961,393 | 37,100 | 4,998,493 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force | 33,655,633 | -688,418 | 32,967,215 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide | 22,574,278 | -177,125 | 22,397,153 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve | 2,508,062 | 4,000 | 2,512,062 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve | 1,186,883 | | 1,186,883 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve | 208,637 | | 208,637 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve | 2,692,077 | 129,740 | 2,821,817 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard | 5,840,209 | 21,200 | 5,861,409 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard | 5,041,965 | 427,403 | 5,469,368 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY | 434,879 | | 434,879 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY | 300,591 | | 300,591 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE | 458,428 | | 458,428 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE | 12,751 | | 12,751 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES | 250,249 | 20,000 | 270,249 |
| US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES | 11,971 | | 11,971 |
| OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID | 103,300 | -40,000 | 63,300 |
| FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION | 348,048 | 100,000 | 448,048 |
| **GRAND TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE** | **142,854,017** | **607,200** | **143,461,217** |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Army** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **LAND FORCES** | | | |
| 2020a | 010 | MANEUVER UNITS | 887,030 | 216,700 | 1,103,730 |
| 2020a | 010 | Extended cold weather clothing system | | [4,000] | |
| 2020a | 010 | Grow the Force Transfer from Title XV | | [212,700] | |
| 2020a | 020 | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES | 93,630 | | 93,630 |
| 2020a | 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 693,513 | | 693,513 |
| 2020a | 040 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 771,074 | | 771,074 |
| 2020a | 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,242,988 | | 1,242,988 |
| 2020a | 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 848,171 | | 848,171 |
| | | **LAND FORCES READINESS** | | | |
| 2020a | 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 2,051,266 | 5,000 | 2,056,266 |
| 2020a | 070 | Manufacturing engineering training outreach program (METOP) | | [5,000] | |
| 2020a | 080 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 555,405 | | 555,405 |
| 2020a | 090 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 804,892 | 86,000 | 890,892 |
| 2020a | 090 | Transfer from Aircraft Procurement, Army, Line 3, ARH | | [86,000] | |
| | | **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 2020a | 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 6,802,278 | | 6,802,278 |
| 2020a | 110 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION | 2,031,173 | 15,000 | 2,046,173 |
| 2020a | 110 | Training range improvement | | [15,000] | |
| 2020a | 120 | MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ | 285,198 | | 285,198 |
| 2020a | 130 | UNIFIED COMMANDS | 113,872 | | 113,872 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2020a | 140 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | 233,035 | | 233,035 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **17,413,525** | **322,700** | **17,736,225** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION** | | | |
| | | **MOBILITY OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 2020a | 150 | STRATEGIC MOBILITY | 288,063 | | 288,063 |
| 2020a | 160 | ARMY PREPOSITIONING STOCKS | 156,318 | | 156,318 |
| 2020a | 170 | INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS | | | |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION** | **444,381** | | **444,381** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| | | **ACCESSION TRAINING** | | | |
| 2020a | 180 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 116,804 | | 116,804 |
| 2020a | 190 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 47,608 | | 47,608 |
| 2020a | 200 | ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING | 50,796 | | 50,796 |
| 2020a | 210 | SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS | 364,863 | | 364,863 |
| | | **BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING** | | | |
| 2020a | 220 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 574,212 | | 574,212 |
| 2020a | 230 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 695,377 | | 695,377 |
| 2020a | 240 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 113,769 | | 113,769 |
| 2020a | 250 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 706,416 | | 706,416 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING** | | | |
| 2020a | 260 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 603,498 | 82,000 | 685,498 |
| 2020a | 260 | Grow the Force Transfer from Title XV | | [82,000] | |
| 2020a | 270 | EXAMINING | 152,793 | | 152,793 |
| 2020a | 280 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 238,457 | | 238,457 |
| 2020a | 290 | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 199,956 | | 199,956 |
| 2020a | 300 | JUNIOR ROTC | 147,203 | | 147,203 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **4,011,752** | **82,000** | **4,093,752** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | | **SECURITY PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 2020a | 310 | SECURITY PROGRAMS | 757,874 | 900 | 758,774 |
| 2020a | | Classified program | | [900] | |
| | | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 2020a | 320 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 686,899 | | 686,899 |
| 2020a | 330 | CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES | 642,906 | | 642,906 |
| 2020a | 340 | LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 506,679 | | 506,679 |
| 2020a | 350 | AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT | 476,807 | | 476,807 |
| | | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 2020a | 360 | ADMINISTRATION | 775,819 | | 775,819 |
| 2020a | 370 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 1,192,413 | | 1,192,413 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2020a | 380 | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT | 269,420 | | 269,420 |
| 2020a | 390 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 217,872 | 394,700 | 612,572 |
| 2020a | 390 | Grow the Force Transfer from Title XV | | [394,700] | |
| 2020a | 400 | OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT | 841,825 | | 841,825 |
| 2020a | 410 | ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES | 233,786 | | 233,786 |
| 2020a | 420 | REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT | 48,170 | | 48,170 |
| | | **SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS** | | | |
| 2020a | 430 | SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS | 362,159 | | 362,159 |
| 2020a | 440 | MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS | 42,686 | | 42,686 |
| | | **CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT** | | | |
| 2020a | 450 | FSRM, CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT | | | |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **7,055,315** | **395,600** | **7,450,915** |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army** | **28,924,973** | **800,300** | **29,725,273** |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Navy** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 1804n | 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 3,607,384 | | 3,607,384 |
| 1804n | 020 | FLEET AIR TRAINING | 937,648 | | 937,648 |
| 1804n | 030 | INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | 50,805 | | 50,805 |
| 1804n | 040 | AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT | 127,578 | | 127,578 |
| 1804n | 050 | AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 479,941 | | 479,941 |
| 1804n | 060 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 1,017,876 | 77,000 | 1,094,876 |
| 1804n | 060 | Increased funds | | [77,000] | |
| 1804n | 070 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 152,464 | | 152,464 |
| | | **SHIP OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 1804n | 080 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 3,463,690 | | 3,463,690 |
| 1804n | 090 | SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING | 671,029 | | 671,029 |
| 1804n | 100 | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 4,416,438 | | 4,416,438 |
| 1804n | 110 | SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 1,081,734 | | 1,081,734 |
| | | **COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1804n | 120 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 564,929 | | 564,929 |
| 1804n | 130 | ELECTRONIC WARFARE | 74,888 | | 74,888 |
| 1804n | 140 | SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE | 159,521 | | 159,521 |
| 1804n | 150 | WARFARE TACTICS | 390,335 | | 390,335 |
| 1804n | 160 | OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY | 260,736 | | 260,736 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1804n | 170 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 1,105,254 | | 1,105,254 |
| 1804n | 180 | EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 176,743 | | 176,743 |
| 1804n | 190 | DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 3,925 | | 3,925 |
| | | **WEAPONS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1804n | 200 | CRUISE MISSILE | 138,447 | | 138,447 |
| 1804n | 210 | FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE | 974,235 | | 974,235 |
| 1804n | 220 | IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 99,435 | | 99,435 |
| 1804n | 230 | WEAPONS MAINTENANCE | 486,603 | 29,500 | 516,103 |
| 1804n | 230 | Mk45 Mod 5" gun overhaul | | [29,500] | |
| 1804n | 240 | OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 315,141 | | 315,141 |
| | | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1804n | 250 | ENTERPRISE INFORMATION | 610,899 | | 610,899 |
| 1804n | 260 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 1,246,489 | | 1,246,489 |
| 1804n | 270 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 3,826,778 | 5,000 | 3,831,778 |
| 1804n | 270 | Supplemental environmental impact statement | | [5,000] | |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **26,440,945** | **111,500** | **26,552,445** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION** | | | |
| | | **READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES** | | | |
| 1804n | 280 | SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE | 541,656 | | 541,656 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS** | | | |
| 1804n | 290 | AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS | 7,166 | | 7,166 |
| 1804n | 300 | SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS | 192,440 | | 192,440 |
| | | **MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS** | | | |
| 1804n | 310 | FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM | 29,880 | | 29,880 |
| 1804n | 320 | INDUSTRIAL READINESS | 2,043 | | 2,043 |
| 1804n | 330 | COAST GUARD SUPPORT | 21,538 | | 21,538 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION** | **794,723** | | **794,723** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| | | **ACCESSION TRAINING** | | | |
| 1804n | 340 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 135,602 | | 135,602 |
| 1804n | 350 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 11,308 | | 11,308 |
| 1804n | 360 | RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS | 112,185 | | 112,185 |
| | | **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | | | |
| 1804n | 370 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 486,138 | | 486,138 |
| 1804n | 380 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 475,655 | | 475,655 |
| 1804n | 390 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 161,017 | | 161,017 |
| 1804n | 400 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 161,647 | | 161,647 |
| | | **RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION** | | | |
| 1804n | 410 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 264,309 | | 264,309 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1804n | 420 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 144,828 | | 144,828 |
| 1804n | 430 | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 74,991 | | 74,991 |
| 1804n | 440 | JUNIOR ROTC | 47,515 | | 47,515 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **2,075,195** | | **2,075,195** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1804n | 450 | ADMINISTRATION | 759,691 | | 759,691 |
| 1804n | 460 | EXTERNAL RELATIONS | 5,448 | | 5,448 |
| 1804n | 470 | CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 104,347 | | 104,347 |
| 1804n | 480 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 151,915 | | 151,915 |
| 1804n | 490 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 275,033 | | 275,033 |
| 1804n | 500 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 578,999 | | 578,999 |
| 1804n | 510 | MEDICAL ACTIVITIES | | | |
| | | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1804n | 520 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 237,202 | | 237,202 |
| 1804n | 530 | ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS | | | |
| 1804n | 540 | PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN | 243,861 | | 243,861 |
| 1804n | 550 | ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | 559,214 | | 559,214 |
| 1804n | 560 | HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT | 58,963 | | 58,963 |
| 1804n | 570 | COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS | 17,205 | | 17,205 |
| 1804n | 580 | SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS | 77,793 | | 77,793 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **INVESTIGATIONS AND SECURITY PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 1804n | 590 | NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE | 421,887 | | 421,887 |
| | | **SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS** | | | |
| 1804n | 640 | INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES | 11,290 | | 11,290 |
| 1804n | 650 | PRESIDENTIAL DRAWDOWN AUTHORITY | | | |
| | | **CANCELLED ACCOUNTS** | | | |
| 1804n | 660 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | | |
| | | **OTHER PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 1804n | 999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 520,979 | 2,100 | 523,079 |
| 1804n | | Classified program | | [2,100] | |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **4,023,827** | **2,100** | **4,025,927** |
| | | Unobligated balances | | -60,600 | |
| | | WCF excess balances | | -80,000 | |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy** | **33,334,690** | **-27,000** | **33,307,690** |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **EXPEDITIONARY FORCES** | | | |
| 1106n | 010 | OPERATIONAL FORCES | 867,734 | 22,000 | 889,734 |
| 1106n | 010 | Extended Cold Weather Clothing System | | [6,000] | |
| 1106n | 010 | Family of combat equipment support and services | | [10,000] | |
| 1106n | 010 | Rapid deployable shelter | | [6,000] | |
| 1106n | 020 | FIELD LOGISTICS | 502,437 | 15,100 | 517,537 |
| 1106n | 020 | Mobile corrosion protection | | [15,100] | |
| 1106n | 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 71,240 | | 71,240 |
| 1106n | 040 | BASE SUPPORT | | | |
| | | **USMC PREPOSITIONING** | | | |
| 1106n | 050 | MARITIME PREPOSITIONING | 73,870 | | 73,870 |
| 1106n | 060 | NORWAY PREPOSITIONING | 5,681 | | 5,681 |
| | | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1106n | 070 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION | 517,701 | | 517,701 |
| 1106n | 080 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 1,742,906 | | 1,742,906 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **3,781,569** | **37,100** | **3,818,669** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **ACCESSION TRAINING** | | | |
| 1106n | 090 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 13,242 | | 13,242 |
| 1106n | 100 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 520 | | 520 |
| | | **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | | | |
| 1106n | 110 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 54,185 | | 54,185 |
| 1106n | 120 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 318 | | 318 |
| 1106n | 130 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 16,751 | | 16,751 |
| 1106n | 140 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 284,071 | | 284,071 |
| | | **RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION** | | | |
| 1106n | 150 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 141,378 | | 141,378 |
| 1106n | 160 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 57,523 | | 57,523 |
| 1106n | 170 | JUNIOR ROTC | 17,080 | | 17,080 |
| | | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1106n | 180 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 56,590 | | 56,590 |
| 1106n | 190 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 146,254 | | 146,254 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **787,912** | | **787,912** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1106n | 200 | SPECIAL SUPPORT | 257,131 | | 257,131 |
| 1106n | 210 | SERVICE-WIDE TRANSPORTATION | 81,548 | | 81,548 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1106n | 220 | ADMINISTRATION | 36,078 | | 36,078 |
| | | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1106n | 230 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, AND MODERNIZATION | 3,039 | | 3,039 |
| 1106n | 240 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 14,116 | | 14,116 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **391,912** | | **391,912** |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps** | **4,961,393** | **37,100** | **4,998,493** |
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Air Force** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 3400f | 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 4,260,831 | | 4,260,831 |
| 3400f | 020 | PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS | 279,759 | | 279,759 |
| 3400f | 030 | COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES | 673,384 | | 673,384 |
| 3400f | 040 | AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS) | 1,502,472 | | 1,502,472 |
| 3400f | 050 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 1,839,006 | | 1,839,006 |
| 3400f | 060 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 2,277,479 | | 2,277,479 |
| 3400f | 070 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 1,041,719 | | 1,041,719 |
| 3400f | 080 | BASE SUPPORT | 2,202,105 | | 2,202,105 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 3400f | 090 | GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING | 1,318,235 | 3,300 | 1,321,535 |
| 3400f | 090 | National Security Space Institute | | [3,300] | |
| 3400f | 100 | NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT | 258,712 | | 258,712 |
| 3400f | 110 | OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS | 776,893 | | 776,893 |
| 3400f | 120 | JCS EXERCISES | 27,261 | | 27,261 |
| 3400f | 130 | MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HQ | 327,494 | | 327,494 |
| 3400f | 140 | TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES | 485,784 | | 485,784 |
| | | **SPACE OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 3400f | 150 | LAUNCH FACILITIES | 321,465 | | 321,465 |
| 3400f | 160 | LAUNCH VEHICLES | 51,072 | | 51,072 |
| 3400f | 170 | SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS | 233,190 | | 233,190 |
| 3400f | 180 | SATELLITE SYSTEMS | 87,993 | | 87,993 |
| 3400f | 190 | OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS | 329,184 | | 329,184 |
| 3400f | 200 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 184,632 | | 184,632 |
| 3400f | 210 | BASE SUPPORT | 645,518 | | 645,518 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **19,124,188** | **3,300** | **19,127,488** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION** | | | |
| | | **MOBILITY OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 3400f | 220 | AIRLIFT OPERATIONS | 2,932,076 | | 2,932,076 |
| 3400f | 230 | AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I | 49,152 | | 49,152 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3400f | 240 | MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS | 190,395 | | 190,395 |
| 3400f | 250 | PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA | 300,000 | | 300,000 |
| 3400f | 260 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 337,741 | | 337,741 |
| 3400f | 270 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 214,720 | | 214,720 |
| 3400f | 280 | BASE SUPPORT | 656,828 | | 656,828 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION** | **4,680,912** | | **4,680,912** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| | | **ACCESSION TRAINING** | | | |
| 3400f | 290 | OFFICER ACQUISITION | 85,528 | | 85,528 |
| 3400f | 300 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 11,704 | | 11,704 |
| 3400f | 310 | RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC) | 98,631 | | 98,631 |
| 3400f | 320 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 69,047 | | 69,047 |
| 3400f | 330 | BASE SUPPORT | 92,671 | | 92,671 |
| | | **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | | | |
| 3400f | 340 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 378,009 | | 378,009 |
| 3400f | 350 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 911,673 | | 911,673 |
| 3400f | 360 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 173,051 | | 173,051 |
| 3400f | 370 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 96,679 | | 96,679 |
| 3400f | 380 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 14,309 | | 14,309 |
| 3400f | 390 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 182,756 | | 182,756 |
| 3400f | 400 | BASE SUPPORT | 621,550 | | 621,550 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION | | | |
| 3400f | 410 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 138,895 | | 138,895 |
| 3400f | 420 | EXAMINING | 4,820 | | 4,820 |
| 3400f | 430 | OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION | 189,568 | | 189,568 |
| 3400f | 440 | CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING | 133,167 | | 133,167 |
| 3400f | 450 | JUNIOR ROTC | 70,798 | | 70,798 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **3,272,856** | | **3,272,856** |
| | | BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES | | | |
| | | LOGISTICS OPERATIONS | | | |
| 3400f | 460 | LOGISTICS OPERATIONS | 812,935 | | 812,935 |
| 3400f | 470 | TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 650,478 | | 650,478 |
| 3400f | 480 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 274,722 | | 274,722 |
| 3400f | 490 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 66,246 | | 66,246 |
| 3400f | 500 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 290,267 | | 290,267 |
| 3400f | 510 | BASE SUPPORT | 1,133,524 | | 1,133,524 |
| | | SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES | | | |
| 3400f | 520 | ADMINISTRATION | 221,139 | | 221,139 |
| 3400f | 530 | SERVICE-WIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 578,644 | | 578,644 |
| 3400f | 540 | PERSONNEL PROGRAMS | 229,575 | | 229,575 |
| 3400f | 550 | ARMS CONTROL | 39,300 | | 39,300 |
| 3400f | 560 | OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES | 845,771 | 525 | 846,296 |
| 3400f | 560 | Mobile shear | | [525] | |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3400f | 570 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 36,195 | | 36,195 |
| 3400f | 580 | CIVIL AIR PATROL | 23,753 | | 23,753 |
| 3400f | 590 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 29,772 | | 29,772 |
| 3400f | 600 | BASE SUPPORT | 308,771 | | 308,771 |
| | | **SECURITY PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 3400f | 610 | SECURITY PROGRAMS | 1,001,198 | -600 | 1,000,598 |
| 3400f | | Classified program | | [-600] | |
| | | **SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS** | | | |
| 3400f | 620 | INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT | 35,387 | | 35,387 |
| | | **CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT** | | | |
| 3400f | 630 | FSRM, CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT | | | |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **6,577,677** | **-75** | **6,577,602** |
| | | CAM transfer to O&M, Air Force Reserve | | -129,740 | |
| | | CAM transfer to O&M, Air National Guard | | -413,903 | |
| | | Unobligated balances | | -60,000 | |
| | | WCF excess balances | | -88,000 | |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force** | **33,655,633** | **-688,418** | **32,967,215** |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 0100d | 010 | JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF | 597,309 | | 597,309 |
| 0100d | 020 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND | 3,277,640 | 8,700 | 3,286,340 |
| 0100d | 020 | Language training | | [8,700] | |
| | | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:** | **3,874,949** | **8,700** | **3,883,649** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| | | **DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 0100d | 030 | DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY | 104,596 | | 104,596 |
| | | **RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION** | | | |
| 0100d | 040 | NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY | 91,099 | | 91,099 |
| | | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:** | **195,695** | | **195,695** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | | **DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 0100d | 050 | AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE | 149,631 | | 149,631 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0100d | 060 | CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS | 107,347 | | 107,347 |
| 0100d | 090 | DEFENSE BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY | 148,028 | | 148,028 |
| 0100d | 100 | DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY | 396,578 | | 396,578 |
| 0100d | 110 | DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE | 432 | | 432 |
| 0100d | 120 | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY | 945,594 | | 945,594 |
| 0100d | 140 | DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES | 36,350 | | 36,350 |
| 0100d | 150 | DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY | 299,778 | | 299,778 |
| 0100d | 160 | DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE | 16,400 | | 16,400 |
| 0100d | 170 | DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY AGENCY | 23,671 | | 23,671 |
| 0100d | 180 | DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY | 333,548 | | 333,548 |
| 0100d | 190 | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY | 1,833,431 | | 1,833,431 |
| 0100d | 200 | DOD HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY | 376,292 | | 376,292 |
| 0100d | 210 | DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY | 1,044,139 | | 1,044,139 |
| 0100d | 220 | DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY | 673,400 | -212,400 | 461,000 |
| 0100d | 220 | Center for international issues research | | [-7,400] | |
| 0100d | 220 | Global train and equip program | | [-200,000] | |
| 0100d | 220 | Stability operations fellowship program | | [-5,000] | |
| 0100d | 230 | DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE | 372,457 | | 372,457 |
| 0100d | 250 | OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT | 57,176 | | 57,176 |
| 0100d | 260 | OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE | 1,093,742 | 29,000 | 1,122,742 |
| 0100d | 260 | Defense Readiness Reporting System management tools | | [12,000] | |
| 0100d | 260 | Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative | | [20,000] | |
| 0100d | 260 | Strategic communications and integration | | [-3,000] | |
| 0100d | 270 | WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE | 439,277 | | 439,277 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **OTHER PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 0100d | 999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 10,156,363 | 41,575 | 10,197,938 |
| 0100d | | Classified program | | [41,575] | |
| | | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:** | **18,503,634** | **-141,825** | **18,361,809** |
| | | Impact aid | | 35,000 | 35,000 |
| | | Impact aid for children with severe disabilities | | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| | | Special assistance to local education agencies | | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| | | Unobligated balances | | -54,000 | -54,000 |
| | | WCF excess balances | | -40,000 | -40,000 |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide** | **22,574,278** | **-177,125** | **22,397,153** |
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **LAND FORCES** | | | |
| 2080a | 010 | MANEUVER UNITS | 4,465 | | 4,465 |
| 2080a | 020 | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES | 15,706 | | 15,706 |
| 2080a | 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 443,577 | | 443,577 |
| 2080a | 040 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 154,575 | | 154,575 |
| 2080a | 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 514,510 | | 514,510 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2080a | 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 63,133 | | 63,133 |
| | | **LAND FORCES READINESS** | | | |
| 2080a | 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 230,699 | | 230,699 |
| 2080a | 080 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 84,725 | 4,000 | 88,725 |
| 2080a | 080 | Mobile corrosion protection | | [4,000] | |
| 2080a | 090 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 130,683 | | 130,683 |
| | | **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 2080a | 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 502,679 | | 502,679 |
| 2080a | 110 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION | 222,856 | | 222,856 |
| 2080a | 120 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | 11,367 | | 11,367 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **2,378,975** | **4,000** | **2,382,975** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 2080a | 130 | ADMINISTRATION | 67,309 | | 67,309 |
| 2080a | 140 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 10,427 | | 10,427 |
| 2080a | 150 | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT | 8,321 | | 8,321 |
| 2080a | 160 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 43,030 | | 43,030 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT | | | |
| 2080a | 170 | FSRM, CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT | | | |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **129,087** | | **129,087** |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve** | **2,508,062** | **4,000** | **2,512,062** |
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve** | | | |
| | | BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| | | AIR OPERATIONS | | | |
| 1806n | 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 561,550 | | 561,550 |
| 1806n | 020 | INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | 17,029 | | 17,029 |
| 1806n | 030 | AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT | 3,169 | | 3,169 |
| 1806n | 040 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 121,186 | | 121,186 |
| 1806n | 050 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 393 | | 393 |
| | | SHIP OPERATIONS | | | |
| 1806n | 060 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 49,766 | | 49,766 |
| 1806n | 070 | SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING | 573 | | 573 |
| 1806n | 080 | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 41,616 | | 41,616 |
| 1806n | 090 | SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 559 | | 559 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1806n | 100 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 15,344 | | 15,344 |
| 1806n | 110 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 121,531 | | 121,531 |
| | | **WEAPONS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1806n | 120 | WEAPONS MAINTENANCE | 2,141 | | 2,141 |
| | | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1806n | 130 | ENTERPRISE INFORMATION | 90,262 | | 90,262 |
| 1806n | 140 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 52,000 | | 52,000 |
| 1806n | 150 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 94,642 | | 94,642 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **1,171,761** | | **1,171,761** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1806n | 160 | ADMINISTRATION | 3,260 | | 3,260 |
| 1806n | 170 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 8,509 | | 8,509 |
| 1806n | 180 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 2,936 | | 2,936 |
| 1806n | 190 | COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS | | | |
| | | **CANCELLED ACCOUNTS** | | | |
| 1806n | 210 | CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS | | | |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | OTHER PROGRAMS | | | |
| 1806n | 999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 417 | | 417 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **14,705** | | **14,705** |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve** | **1,186,883** | | **1,186,883** |
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve** | | | |
| | | BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES | | | |
| | | EXPEDITIONARY FORCES | | | |
| 1107n | 010 | OPERATING FORCES | 49,487 | | 49,487 |
| 1107n | 020 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 11,229 | | 11,229 |
| 1107n | 030 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 27,131 | | 27,131 |
| | | BASE SUPPORT | | | |
| 1107n | 040 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 14,827 | | 14,827 |
| 1107n | 050 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 69,998 | | 69,998 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **172,672** | | **172,672** |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | | **SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 1107n | 060 | SPECIAL SUPPORT | 12,417 | | 12,417 |
| 1107n | 070 | SERVICE-WIDE TRANSPORTATION | 826 | | 826 |
| 1107n | 080 | ADMINISTRATION | 9,422 | | 9,422 |
| 1107n | 090 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 8,690 | | 8,690 |
| | | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1107n | 100 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 4,610 | | 4,610 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **35,965** | | **35,965** |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve** | **208,637** | | **208,637** |
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 3740f | 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 1,709,952 | | 1,709,952 |
| 3740f | 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 99,253 | | 99,253 |
| 3740f | 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 399,573 | | 399,573 |
| 3740f | 040 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 83,405 | | 83,405 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3740f | 050 | BASE SUPPORT | 276,854 | | 276,854 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **2,569,037** | | **2,569,037** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | | **SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 3740f | 060 | ADMINISTRATION | 70,152 | | 70,152 |
| 3740f | 070 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 22,704 | | 22,704 |
| 3740f | 080 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC) | 22,995 | | 22,995 |
| 3740f | 090 | OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP) | 6,505 | | 6,505 |
| 3740f | 100 | AUDIOVISUAL | 684 | | 684 |
| | | **CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT** | | | |
| 3740f | 110 | FSRM, CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT | | | |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **123,040** | | **123,040** |
| | | CAM transfer from O&M, Air Force | | 129,740 | |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve** | **2,692,077** | **129,740** | **2,821,817** |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **LAND FORCES** | | | |
| 2065a | 010 | MANEUVER UNITS | 638,508 | 4,000 | 642,508 |
| 2065a | 010 | Extended Cold Weather Clothing System | | [4,000] | |
| 2065a | 020 | MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES | 423,443 | | 423,443 |
| 2065a | 030 | ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE | 555,457 | | 555,457 |
| 2065a | 040 | THEATER LEVEL ASSETS | 627,343 | 1,300 | 628,643 |
| 2065a | | National Guard Interoperability Upgrades | | [1,300] | |
| 2065a | 050 | LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 34,721 | | 34,721 |
| 2065a | 060 | AVIATION ASSETS | 361,885 | | 361,885 |
| | | **LAND FORCES READINESS** | | | |
| 2065a | 070 | FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 309,655 | 6,900 | 316,555 |
| 2065a | 070 | Integrated Disaster & Rapid Data Management Systems | | [6,900] | |
| 2065a | 080 | LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS | 109,561 | 4,000 | 113,561 |
| 2065a | 080 | Mobile corrosion protection | | [4,000] | |
| 2065a | 090 | LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 466,452 | | 466,452 |
| | | **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 2065a | 100 | BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 828,418 | | 828,418 |
| 2065a | 110 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION | 486,341 | | 486,341 |
| 2065a | 120 | MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ | 551,675 | | 551,675 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2065a | 130 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | 92,517 | 5,000 | 97,517 |
| 2065a | 130 | Operator driving simulator | | [5,000] | |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **5,485,976** | **21,200** | **5,507,176** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 2065a | 140 | ADMINISTRATION | 119,227 | | 119,227 |
| 2065a | 150 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 52,250 | | 52,250 |
| 2065a | 160 | MANPOWER MANAGEMENT | 7,396 | | 7,396 |
| 2065a | 170 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 175,360 | | 175,360 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **354,233** | | **354,233** |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard** | **5,840,209** | **21,200** | **5,861,409** |
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 3840f | 010 | AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS | 3,049,334 | 6,000 | 3,055,334 |
| 3840f | 011 | Controlled humidity protection | | [6,000] | |
| 3840f | 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 540,633 | 7,500 | 548,133 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3840f | 020 | Weapons skills trainer (WST) | | [7,500] | |
| 3840f | 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 587,485 | | 587,485 |
| 3840f | 040 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 285,227 | | 285,227 |
| 3840f | 050 | BASE SUPPORT | 525,149 | | 525,149 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **4,987,828** | **13,500** | **5,001,328** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | | **SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 3840f | 060 | ADMINISTRATION | 30,716 | | 30,716 |
| 3840f | 070 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 23,421 | | 23,421 |
| | | **CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT** | | | |
| 2080a | 080 | FSRM, CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT | | | |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **54,137** | | **54,137** |
| | | CAM transfer from O&M, Air Force | | 413,903 | |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard** | **5,041,965** | **427,403** | **5,469,368** |
| | | **TRANSFER ACCOUNTS** | | | |
| 0810a | 010 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY | 434,879 | | 434,879 |
| 0810n | 020 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY | 300,591 | | 300,591 |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0810n | 020 | CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT | | | |
| 0810f | 030 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE | 458,428 | | 458,428 |
| 0810f | 030 | CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT | | | |
| 0810d | 040 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE | 12,751 | | 12,751 |
| 0810d | 040 | CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT | | | |
| 0811d | 050 | ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES | 250,249 | 20,000 | 270,249 |
| 0811d | 050 | Increased funds | | [20,000] | |
| 0811d | 050 | CONTINUING RESOLUTION ADJUSTMENT | | | |
| | | **TOTAL, O&M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS** | **1,456,898** | **20,000** | **1,476,898** |
| | | **MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS** | | | |
| 0104d | 060 | US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES | 11,971 | | 11,971 |
| 0838d | 070 | SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS | | | |
| 0118d | 080 | OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| 4965d | 090 | AFGHAN DEFENSE FORCES | | | |
| 4965d | 100 | IRAQ DEFENSE FORCES | | | |
| 4965d | 110 | IRAQ INTERIOR FORCES | | | |
| 4965d | 120 | IRAQ QUICK RESPONSE | | | |
| 4965d | 130 | IRAQ TRAINING FACILITY | | | |
| 0833d | 140 | EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE | | | |
| 0833d | 150 | EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE | | | |
| 0141d | 160 | IRAQ FREEDOM FUND, DEF | | | |
| 0819d | 170 | OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID | 103,300 | -40,000 | 63,300 |
| 0819d | 170 | Building partnership capacity for humanitarian assistance | | [-40,000] | |
| 1236d | 180 | KAHO'OLAWE | | | |

# Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0134d | 190 | FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION | 348,048 | 100,000 | 448,048 |
| 0134d | 190 | Increased funds | | [100,000] | |
| | | **TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS** | **468,319** | **60,000** | **528,319** |
| | | **TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:** | **142,854,017** | **607,200** | **143,461,217** |

## Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions

### Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for certain costs in connection with Moses Lake Wellfield Superfund Site, Moses Lake, Washington (sec. 311)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse the Environmental Protection Agency for its costs incurred in connection with the former Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake Superfund Site, Moses Lake, Washington, as requested by the Department of Defense.

### Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for certain costs in connection with the Arctic Surplus Superfund Site, Fairbanks, Alaska (sec. 312)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse the Environmental Protection Agency for costs incurred in connection with the Arctic Surplus Superfund Site, Fairbanks, Alaska, as requested by the Department of Defense.

### Payment to Environmental Protection Agency of stipulated penalties in connection with Jackson Park Housing Complex, Washington (sec. 313)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay a stipulated penalty assessed by the Environmental Protection Agency against the Jackson Park Housing Complex, Washington, as requested by the Department of Defense.

## Subtitle C—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

### Availability of funds in Defense Information Systems Agency Working Capital Fund for technology upgrades to Defense Information Systems Network (sec. 321)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) to use up to $500,000 of working capital funds to pay for any project directly related to technology upgrades to the Defense Information System Network (DISN). The committee appreciates that the rate of technological advances in information systems challenges the ability of DISA to keep pace with the opportunities to upgrade the system and provide better service to its users. Increasing the level of authorized investment from the working capital fund would allow DISA greater flexibility to technically refresh the system. The committee notes, however, that this increased authority is not intended to fund major technical insertions that substantially change the form, fit, or function of the DISN, which should continue to be funded through appropriated accounts.

### Extension of temporary authority for contract performance of security guard functions (sec. 322)

The committee recommends a provision that would continue the orderly phase-out of the temporary authority for contract perform-

ance of security guard functions under section 332 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314). Under the provision, the Department of Defense would be required to continue reducing the number of contract security guards employed under section 332 from the baseline number of such personnel as of October 1, 2006. In 2010, the Department would be permitted to employ 70 percent of the baseline number; in 2011, 60 percent of the baseline number; and in 2012, 50 percent of the baseline number.

**Report on incremental cost of early 2007 enhanced deployment (sec. 323)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 323 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) to include a reporting requirement on the incremental increase in reset costs related to the deployment of additional forces to Iraq. The committee remains concerned that the services accurately capture the costs and fully fund the reconstitution or reset of forces committed to the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. This provision requires the military departments to identify and project the increase in costs of reset based on the increase of forces under the new strategy in Iraq.

**Individual body armor (sec. 324)**

The committee notes the continuing controversy over the technical capabilities of commercially available individual body armor and whether it fails, meets, or exceeds the military's ballistic protection requirements. This kind of controversy can undermine peoples' confidence in the quality of the equipment we provide our troops. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would require, within 90 days of enactment of this Act, a joint technical assessment and classified and unclassified reports by the Director, Defense Research and Engineering (DDRE) and the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (DOTE) of individual body armor systems currently available in the domestic market.

## Subtitle D—Workplace and Depot Issues

**Extension of authority for Army industrial facilities to engage in cooperative activities with non-Army entities (sec. 341)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 4544 of title 10, United States Code, to extend, until September 30, 2014, the authority for any working capital funded Army industrial facility to enter into a contract or cooperative arrangement with a non-Army entity to carry out specified military or commercial projects. The committee encourages and supports public-private industrial cooperation and partnerships to increase efficiency, reduce costs, and get the most out of public industrial capacity. However, the Army does not appear to have effectively used existing authority upon which to base a business case assessment of potential costs, benefits, or risks associated with these partnerships at its manufacturing facilities. Accordingly, the committee recommends extending the current authority for 5 years, al-

lowing the Army additional time to enter into no more than eight long-term cooperative arrangements or partnerships. The provision would also provide for an annual report by the Secretary of the Army explaining how the Army is using this extended authority. The committee further recommends that not later than September 30, 2012, the Army submit a business case analysis on the advisability of making this authority permanent.

### Two-year extension of Arsenal Support Demonstration Program (sec. 342)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 343 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), to extend until September 30, 2010 the Arsenal Support Program Initiative. The committee notes that this demonstration program was created in fiscal year 2001 and was extended to fiscal year 2008. The committee recommends a 2–year extension of this program to allow for consideration of a report from the Secretary of the Army, due not later than July 1, 2007, on the results of the demonstration program. The Secretary's report will include the Army's views regarding the benefits of the program as well as an assessment of the success of the program in achieving the purposes specified in section 343. The report will also contain a comprehensive review of contracting at the Army manufacturing arsenals covered by the program and such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate regarding changes to the program. The committee recommends an extension of the Arsenal Support Program Initiative demonstration to allow for consideration of the Secretary of the Army's report and suggested changes.

## Subtitle E—Other Matters

### Enhancement of corrosion control and prevention functions within Department of Defense (sec. 351)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2228 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for a permanent Director of the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight reporting directly to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD-ATL). The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense continues to place a low priority on the management, oversight, and funding of corrosion control policies and programs. The fiscal year 2008 budget request included only $12.0 million for projects to address the Department's estimated $380.0 million corrosion prevention and control-related requirements. With aggressive investment in corrosion control the Department could realize an industry standard 49 to 1 return on investment. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) reports that many Department weapons systems experience significant corrosion-related cost, readiness, and safety problems. Corrosion prevention and control planning is the most effective way to reduce these problems. However, the committee is concerned that the Department and military services have not comprehensively or effectively incorporated corrosion control planning in major defense acquisition or maintenance programs for both older and new systems.

The committee believes that the establishment of a Director for the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight and placing this function directly under the USD–ATL will result in a more comprehensive and aggressive approach to corrosion prevention and control throughout the Department. The committee also recommends provisions that would give the Director additional authorities for oversight of corrosion-related training, development of directives, and interaction with non-Department activities including taking advantage of opportunities for cooperative efforts in science and technology research and development. Finally, the committee recommends that the Department submit an annual report on the implementation of its corrosion control strategy.

**Reimbursement for National Guard support provided to Federal agencies (sec. 352)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 377 of title 10, United States Code, to require federal agencies that receive law enforcement support or support to a national special security event provided by National Guard personnel performing duty under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, to reimburse the Department of Defense for the costs of that support. The provision would continue to exempt from the requirement for reimbursement support that is provided in the normal course of military training or operations, or when the support results in an operational or training benefit to the element of the Department providing the support.

**Reauthorization of Aviation Insurance Program (sec. 353)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 44310 of title 49, United States Code, relating to the expiration of chapter 443, Aviation Insurance program. The provision would extend the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to provide insurance and reinsurance which would otherwise expire during fiscal year 2008. This government-provided insurance program for commercial air carriers supporting Department of Defense transportation activities is an essential requirement for activating the Civil Reserve Air Fleet during wartime.

**Property accountability and disposition of unlawfully obtained property of the Armed Forces (sec. 354)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 661 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to prescribe regulations for the accounting of Navy and Marine Corps property and to fix responsibility for such property. The provision would also add a new section for the Navy and Marine Corps similar to existing laws applicable to the Army and Air Force that prohibit improper disposition of military equipment and authorize seizure of such unlawfully transferred government property. The provision would also modify sections 4836 and 9836 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the meaning and intent of those sections pertaining to property accountability in the Army and Air Force.

**Authority to impose reasonable conditions on the payment of full replacement value for claims related to personal property transported at Government expense (sec. 355)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2636a(d) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to require compliance with reasonable conditions for a military member or civilian employee of the Department of Defense to receive full replacement value for personal property lost or damaged while being transported at government expense.

The committee believes that the Office of the Secretary of Defense, U.S. Transportation Command, and the military departments must take more effective measures to ensure that accurate data about the performance of household goods movers is collected from service members and civilian employees of the Department of Defense following permanent change of station moves. Imposing a duty on service members and civilian employees to complete simple surveys about the quality of the moves is a key factor in measuring the relative merits of household goods movers and should be monitored and enforced.

**Authority for individuals to retain combat uniforms issued in connection with contingency operations (sec. 356)**

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the secretary of a military department to authorize members of the armed forces under their jurisdiction to retain combat uniforms issued as organizational clothing and individual equipment in connection with their deployment in support of contingency operations.

**Modification of requirements on Comptroller General report on readiness of Army and Marine Corps ground forces (sec. 357)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend and expand the assessment and report required of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) by section 345 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). The committee notes that in January of this year the President announced a new strategy for Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) that requires the deployment of additional combat and support forces to Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee remains concerned about the impact of sustained high operational tempo due to ongoing operations on the readiness of our ground forces and their ability to respond to other threats or contingencies.

The committee notes that the GAO has nearly completed its analysis and report as directed by section 345. The GAO has provided the committee with useful interim reviews of their initial findings. The committee looks forward to receiving the next report on June 1, 2007. However, the decision to increase the commitment of U.S. ground forces to OIF and OEF and the subsequent deployment of additional combat brigades and support units to Iraq and Afghanistan indicate that the GAO should continue its assessment to account for these changes to the underlying reality of ground forces commitment.

The committee directs the GAO to include in its continuing analysis an assessment of the Army and Marine Corps ability to provide forces to meet specific contingency plans of the regional combatant commands. While detailed information on readiness and contingency plans are classified, the issues being assessed in this report are of enormous importance to the Department of Defense and the Congress and should be available for open discussion to the extent that classification rules allow. Therefore, this report should be provided in both classified and unclassified form. The various elements required by this report, as with the report required in section 345, may be provided separately, as long as all the required elements are submitted before March 1, 2008, and the information used to satisfy the reporting requirement is current.

The committee expects that the Department of Defense will cooperate fully with the Government Accountability Office throughout its assessment of ground forces readiness.

## Budget Items—Army

### Extended cold weather clothing system

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA) for the Extended Cold Weather Clothing system (ECWCS). The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in OMA for the ECWCS.

### Manufacturing engineering training outreach program

The budget request included $2.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA) for force readiness operations support, but no funds were provided for the Manufacturing Engineering Training Outreach program (METOP). This program assists the Department of Defense to meet the challenge of finding and preparing the next generation of manufacturing engineers. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in OMA for the METOP.

### Live fire ranges modernization and improvements

The budget request included $2.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA) for operating forces facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization. The committee notes that the Army will continue to depend upon home station ranges to prepare units for deployment to Iraq and Afghanistan. The heavy use of existing range and training support equipment accelerates wear and tear, undermining the quality of pre-deployment training. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in OMA for live fire training range upgrades.

## Budget Items—Navy

### Naval aircraft depot maintenance

The budget request included $40.0 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN) but only $1.1 billion for aircraft depot maintenance. The Chief of Naval Operations identified a shortage of resources for aircraft depot maintenance as an unfunded priority for fiscal year 2008. The committee recommends an increase of

$77.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy for aircraft depot maintenance.

**Mk45 mod 5″ gun depot overhaul**

The budget request included $486.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN) for weapons maintenance. The committee recommends an increase of $29.5 million in OMN for Mark-45 gun system overhauls.

**Environmental impact assessment, outlying landing field**

The committee is aware of growing opposition to the placement of an outlying landing field (OLF) at the Washington County, North Carolina site proposed by the Navy as the preferred alternative in their environmental impact statement. At the same time, the committee appreciates the need to establish an OLF within a suitable range of both Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia and Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, North Carolina. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to fund a follow-on supplemental environmental impact statement to assess the feasibility of alternative sites in the region.

**Unobligated balances**

The Department of Defense continues to underexecute its Operation and Maintenance (O&M) appropriations for the active and reserve components. According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Department returned an annual average of $185.7 million in unexpended balances to the U.S. Treasury for fiscal years 1997 through 2001. The Department had $180.4 million in average yearly unobligated balances for fiscal years 2002 through 2006. The military departments, including their reserve components, returned an average of $1.0 billion in unexpended balances to the U.S. Treasury for fiscal years 1997 through 2001. The military departments had $942.8 million in average yearly unobligated balances for fiscal years 2002 through 2006. While the trend continues to improve, the committee remains concerned about the Department's inability to manage the funds which it is authorized and appropriated.

The committee recalls that 2 years ago the Department began to reduce the O&M portion of its annual funding request and future-years defense program before submission to Congress based, in part, on the GAO analysis of unobligated balances. The Department did not, however, reduce the fiscal year 2008 amounts in full accordance with the analysis, or as significantly in the out-years.

The committee notes that the challenges associated with the increased scope and pace of ground force operations in Iraq and Afghanistan create an unusually difficult fiscal management situation, especially for the Army and Marine Corps. This does not, however, relieve the Department or the services from their obligation to provide the best possible stewardship of taxpayer dollars. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $174.6 million to the Department's O&M accounts, as follows: Operation and Maintenance, Navy, $60.6 million; Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, $60.0 million; and Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, $54.0 million.

### Excess cash balances

An analysis of the defense working capital fund budgets shows that the Department of Defense significantly underestimated its fiscal year 2006 ending cash balance. Although the Army, Navy, Air Force, and defense-wide fiscal year 2007 budgets estimated that the year-end cash balance would be $3.4 billion, the actual cash balance, as reported in the fiscal year 2008 budget, was $4.9 billion—a difference of $1.5 billion, or 44 percent. These working capital funds provide important financial flexibility for critical defense support activities. When working capital fund activities earn a profit—revenues exceeding expenses—fund activities are supposed to adjust future rates charged to customers to reduce the excess. The working capital fund, however, needs sufficient levels of cash in order to meet its obligations and ensure its ability to provide uninterrupted services to the military departments and agencies. Department of Defense policy requires the working capital fund to maintain 7 to 10 days of cash.

Last year, the committee noted that the global war on terror, and especially operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, had created increased workflow in and out of working capital funds well over peacetime projections. This was especially true for the Army and defense-wide working capital fund activities that had high end-of-year positive operating balances and excess cash balances.

The committee's analysis of last year's budgets shows that the military departments significantly underestimated their fiscal year 2006 working capital fund cash balances. Specifically, the Army, Navy, Air Force, and defense-wide working capital funds reported actual cash balances in excess of the estimated budgeted cash balances by at least $300.0 million for each of the four funds—or a total of $1.2 billion. For example, while the Air Force estimated that it would end fiscal year 2006 with a cash balance of $1.0 billion, the reported actual cash balance was $1.4 billion. This indicates that the Department continues to base projections of their net operating result for fiscal year 2008 on low revenue estimates.

To ensure proper management of the funds, the committee recommends a decrease of $208.0 million in Operation and Maintenance accounts as follows: Operation and Maintenance, Navy, $80.0 million; Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, $88.0 million; and Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, $40.0 million.

## Budget Items—Marine Corps

### Extended cold weather clothing system

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC) for the Extended Cold Weather Clothing system (ECWCS). The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in OMMC for the ECWCS.

### Family of combat equipment support and services

The budget request included $867.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC) for operational forces. The Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified an unfunded requirement in this account for the Family of Combat Equipment Support and Services. The committee recommends an increase of

$10.0 million in OMMC for the Family of Combat Equipment Support and Services.

**Rapid deployable shelters**

The budget request included $876.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC) but does not include funds for rapid deployable shelters. Tents and shelters are an essential deployable element of an expeditionary force. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in OMMC for rapid deployable shelters.

**Mobile corrosion protection and abatement USMC**

The budget request included $502.4 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC) for field logistics activities. The committee recommends an increase of $15.1 million in OMMC for mobile corrosion protection and abatement.

## Budget Items—Air Force

**National Security Space Institute**

The budget request included $17.3 million for the National Security Space Institute (NSSI) in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) line 90, Global C3I and Early Warning. The committee recommends an additional $3.3 million for the NSSI. The NSSI is the Air Force school for space professionals, serving Air Force and other military services' space training requirements. The additional funding will allow the NSSI to expand the number of classes and students, accelerate development of the advanced space course, and undertake other educational activities. This program is on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priority list.

**Mobile shear**

The budget request included $845.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) for other service wide activities, but provides no funding for Mobile Shear. This equipment will assist Air Force installations to comply with environmental and Department of Defense demilitarization regulations. The committee recommends an increase of $525,000 in OMAF for Mobile Shear.

**Transfer of funds from Air Force centralized asset management program to Air Guard and Air Force Reserve**

The budget request included $41.4 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force. Within this amount the Air Force consolidated $543.6 million of Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Operation and Maintenance funds into a "Centralized Asset Management" (CAM) initiative.

The committee is concerned that consolidation of funds that support Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve operations, readiness, and facilities denies the Congress required visibility into the distribution and utilization of reserve component resources. Therefore, the committee recommends the transfer of $129.7 million to Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve, and $413.9 million to Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard from Operation and Maintenance, Air Force.

## Budget Items—Defense-wide

### Language training shortfalls

The budget request did not include any funding to cover costs associated with improving the language and cultural awareness training of Special Operations Forces (SOF).

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $8.7 million for U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) language training needs in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, Budget Activity 1.

$6.4 million of the total amount would fund a shortfall at the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School to pay for instructor hours, homework books, and reproduction of language and culture training CDs and books. The training programs are components of the Special Forces Qualification Course and are already operated on a very lean basis. This funding will allow for an increase in student load from 772 (Special Forces, Civil Affairs, and Psychological Operators) in 2004, to 1,500 personnel over several years, trained at a higher standard. This funding ensures that the growing training population in Special Forces, Civil Affairs, and Psychological Operations, authorized in the Quadrennial Defense Review, will continue to be trained to the higher 1/1/1 standard. This standard was raised in 2004 by the Commander of U.S. Army Special Operations Command (USASOC) and validated by the Commander of SOCOM as necessary in direct response to global war on terrorism-related capability shortfalls.

$526,000 of the total would be used to fund the foreign language proficiency sustainment training for USASOC units. This includes maintaining proficiency in unit core languages via unit-run training (classroom and live environmental training (LET)). All language requirements directly support SOCOM and regional combatant commander requirements. The 4th Psychological Operations Group (Airborne) and the 95th Civil Affairs Brigade require $526,000 to fund sustainment training. This includes: $277,600 for Foreign Language Training Center Europe and LET events in Bahrain, Colombia, China, Peru, Korea, Russia, France, Indonesia, and Costa Rica; $158,000 for additional instructor contract hours in unit language training facilities; $68,200 for training aids, books, supplies, and internet services; and $21,800 for travel to attend SOCOM training seminars. Without this funding, the command will be unable to fully support training of SOF for unconventional warfare missions, which are a critical SOF core competency. This funding allows units to conduct mission language training in support of operational deployments, and helps ensure that soldiers maintain and increase their language proficiency (part of the SOF for Life/Region for Life concept).

$950,000 of the total amount would fund language training for joint SOF personnel in tailored internet classes. Funding would be used to train about 16 students in full-length 1/1/1 courses and about 56 students in tailored sustainment and enhancement courses. This training would help SOCOM increase its ability to sustain and increase the proficiency of SOF across their careers regardless of their location, and it facilitates full-time courses for SOF teams that are "remissioned" and need a different language

capability. Without this funding many operators would have little or no access to language training conducted by a qualified instructor due to geographic location and work schedule. These regionally-focused operators, preparing for deployment often, are faced with adding a lengthy temporary duty/temporary additional duty in front of a long mission deployment in order to take language classes. This further increases time away from family. Funding internet classes and similar initiatives begins to address this issue.

**Defense Security Cooperation Agency**

The budget request included $673.4 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency. Of this amount, $500.0 million was requested for the Global Train and Equip program to build the capacity of foreign forces. The committee notes that the amount requested for the Global Train and Equip program exceeds the existing authority under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended by section 1206 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), which is limited to $300.0 million of Operation and Maintenance funds in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.

The committee also notes that the request for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency included $7.4 million for the Center for International Issues Research (CIIR) program, which provides updates of open-source media reports. The committee recommends the elimination of this program as an unnecessary duplication of reporting available from other sources.

The request for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency included $5.0 million for the Stability Operations Fellowship program (SOFP). The committee notes that no authority currently exists for the Department of Defense to conduct this fellowship program.

Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $212.4 million to the Department's Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide account for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, as follows: Global Train and Equip—decrease of $200.0 million; CIIR—decrease of $7.4 million; and SOFP—decrease of $5.0 million.

**Defense readiness reporting system and management tools**

The budget request included $4.9 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide for the Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS). The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million for DRRS including $2.0 million only for the acceleration of the Global Force Management Visibility Toolkit in support of U.S. Joint Forces Command requirements.

The committee notes the challenges associated with the accurate, reliable, and timely measurement and reporting of the readiness of military forces. The current readiness reporting system, Global Status of Resources and Training System (GSORTS), is inadequate to the demands of the force rotation strategy that supports operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Department of Defense, Joint Staff, and U.S. Joint Forces Command, the joint force provider, lack the visibility of deployed and non-deployed forces' capabilities and readiness required to manage global military commitments.

The committee supports the Department's development of DRRS as a management modernization and replacement for the current system. DRRS is scheduled to achieve full operational capability at the end of fiscal year 2007. Additional funds will accelerate the delivery of the basic system, programmed functionality expansion, support for system operations, training, and sustainment. The committee recommendation also supports the development and fielding of capabilities within the system that allow near real-time force management for contingencies including capability-gap analysis, risk mitigation, and the Global Force Management Visibility Toolkit.

**Readiness and environmental protection initiative**

The budget request included $30.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI). The committee is encouraged that this is $10.0 million more than requested in fiscal year 2007.

The committee believes that the military departments should continue to pursue voluntary agreements with other public and private entities as authorized under section 2684a of title 10, United States Code, to prevent the development or use of property that would be incompatible with the mission of an installation, and preserve habitat that is compatible with environmental requirements that might otherwise result in current or anticipated environmental restrictions on military bases.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in OMDW for the REPI and directs that the military departments should give priority to projects that benefit critical mission training sites that have the greatest potential to prevent or reduce encroachment through the creation of a compatible use buffer zone.

**Strategic communication and integration**

The budget request included $3.0 million for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for Strategic Communication and Integration. This funding would support a contractor to help institutionalize strategic communications and complete the implementation of the Strategic Communication Execution Roadmap.

Responsibility for strategic communication and public diplomacy rests with the President and Secretary of State, and any Department of Defense efforts to formulate a message should be informed and framed by those efforts. Moreover, public diplomacy, public affairs, and information operations are separate and distinct functions, with different purposes and guidelines for their use. Any attempt to integrate them could compromise the integrity of each of these functions. Nonetheless, the committee supports the use of the Operation and Maintenance funds of the respective offices conducting communications activities in order to improve the Department's communication efforts, including updating regulations and other activities being conducted as part of the strategic communication and integration effort. The level of funding requested is unjustified. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $3.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide.

## Budget Items—Army Reserve

### Mobile corrosion protection and abatement USAR

The budget request included $84.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve (OMAR) for land forces readiness support activities. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in OMAR for mobile corrosion protection and abatement.

## Budget Items—Army National Guard

### Extended cold weather clothing system

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG) for the Extended Cold Weather Clothing system (ECWCS). The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in OMARNG for the ECWCS.

### National Guard interoperability upgrades

The budget request included no funds for command and control interoperability upgrades for the Army National Guard. The committee notes that interoperable communications are required for adequate command and control of federal, state, and local responses to domestic emergencies. The committee recommends an increase of $1.3 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard for command and control interoperability upgrades.

### Integrated disaster and rapid data management systems

The budget request included $309.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG) for force readiness operations support, but did not include funds for the Integrated Disaster Management system (IDMS) or Rapid Data Management system (RDMS). These systems provide near real-time data management and analysis to and from field operators through deployable hand-held and cellular devices. The integration of IDMS and RDMS increases speed and efficiency of command and control during domestic emergencies. The committee recommends an increase of $6.9 million in OMARNG for IDMS and RDMS.

### Mobile corrosion protection and abatement USARNG

The budget request included $109.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG) for land forces systems readiness activities. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in OMARNG for mobile corrosion protection and abatement.

### Operator driving simulator

The budget request included no funding for operator driving simulators for the Army National Guard. The committee notes that a number of casualties have occurred in Iraq and Afghanistan as a result of vehicle accidents, including single vehicle accidents. Ensuring vehicle operators have quality training is vital to the readiness of the armed forces as well as their safety. These driving simulators would ensure that training time for soldiers is maximized, even with limited vehicle assets. The fielding plan includes 79 simulator units at 27 sites, including Army National Guard sites at

nine states. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard, for operator driving simulators.

## Budget Items—Air National Guard

### Controlled humidity protection

The budget request included $3.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (OMANG) for aircraft operations, but included no funds for controlled humidity protection. The committee notes the high readiness costs associated with corrosion and that it is particularly harmful to sensitive and expensive aircraft components. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in OMANG for controlled humidity protection.

### Weapons skills trainer

The budget request included $540.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (OMANG) for mission support operations, but included no funds for the Weapons Skills Trainer (WST). The committee notes the high mobilization rates of members of the Air National Guard and their occasional use in non-traditional ground force roles. Individual and unit weapons training is enhanced by the availability of a multilevel weapons simulator such as the WST. The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million in OMANG for the Weapons Skills Trainer.

## Budget Items—Transfer Accounts

### Funding for formerly used defense sites

The budget request included $250.2 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for environmental restoration of Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS). The committee notes that the budgeted amount is below the level authorized for this program in fiscal year 2007. The committee understands that it is the Department of Defense's goal to achieve a remedy in place or response complete at all FUDS by 2020 under the Installation Restoration program for hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants. It is also the Department's goal to complete preliminary assessments at all FUDS by 2007, and complete site inspections at all FUDS by 2010, under the Military Munitions Response program for clean-up of unexploded ordnance.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in OMDW to expedite the clean-up of FUDS and to move more aggressively to achieve the Department's goals. The committee expects the Department to demonstrate its commitment to these goals, and improve on them where it is possible to do so, by steadily increasing the amount of funding budgeted for this effort.

## Budget Items—Miscellaneous Appropriations

### Building partnership capacity for humanitarian assistance

The budget request included $103.3 million for Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid (OHDACA). Of this amount, $40.0 million was included for building partnership capacity for humani-

tarian assistance. However, no authority was requested by the Department of Defense for this new program.

Therefore, the committee recommends that Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, Budget Activity 4 be decreased by $40.0 million.

## Items of Special Interest

### Comptroller General report on depot work

Section 2466 of title 10, United States Code, requires the Department of Defense to report annually on the expenditures for service contract and organic depot maintenance. This report contains the actual expenditures for the previous fiscal year, as well as projections for the current and future years. The committee directs the Comptroller General to review and make recommendations with respect to the current system of reports, assessments, analysis, or documents required by law or regulation to determine the compliance of the Department of Defense and military departments with the percentage limitation in section 2466(a) of title 10, United States Code. The committee is particularly interested to learn if there are better methods than the current system for meeting its oversight responsibilities of Department compliance with the requirements of this section. This report is due not later than March 1, 2008.

### Department of Defense foreign language training

The budget request included $10.4 million for the Defense Language Institute in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), specifically for satellite communications language training activities (SCOLA).

SCOLA is a unique and innovative satellite-based language training activity that provides television programming in a variety of languages from around the world. SCOLA also has an internet-based streaming video capability that greatly increases the availability of this training medium to military and civilian linguists, virtually anywhere they can obtain an internet connection. In addition, SCOLA is developing a digital archive that will allow users anywhere to review and sort language training on demand.

In the Senate report accompanying S. 2744 (S. Rept. 109–254) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), the committee commended the Department of Defense for increasing investment in language technology. That report noted that SCOLA can help sustain and improve foreign language skills and cultural understanding of military and civilian linguists in the Department.

The committee understands, unfortunately, that the Department has failed to obligate the funds that were authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2007. There are indications that the Department may intend to wait until the last month of the fiscal year before doing so. The committee fails to understand what could have caused a delay in obligating funds for this important activity and encourages the Department to move more expeditiously to do so with the fiscal year 2008 funds.

**Fee-for-service air refueling services**

The committee remains concerned about the ability of the Department of the Air Force to provide adequate air refueling services to support all operational and training requirements. While the average age of the KC–135 fleet is more than 45 years old, the next generation KC–X aircraft is not scheduled to begin low-rate initial production until 2011. The committee is concerned about our ability to meet our air refueling requirements in the immediate future. At a time of historically low readiness levels, the Air Force cannot afford further degradation in air refueling capacity.

The committee is aware of several commercial providers of fee-for-service air refueling. Such an option was one of the alternatives considered in the analysis leading to the release of the KC–X request for proposals. In fact, Air Force officials have indicated a desire to investigate using fee-for-service air refueling services for some portion of their mission. They have referred to this as "Part B" of the KC–X acquisition strategy. This potential commercial capability has been estimated by some to save the Air Force up to 50 percent over current methods of organic air refueling operations. Due to the technological maturity of commercial concepts, the promising business cases presented by several of the commercial providers, and the growing capability gap in the air refueling arena, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to initiate a competitive fee-for-service air refueling pilot program, utilizing currently available Operation and Maintenance funds. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to seek "Part B" proposals to determine the practicality of relying on fee-for-service air refueling services for satisfying some portion of the Air Force refueling mission.

**Next generation enterprise network**

The committee understands that the Department of the Navy is attempting to develop the Next Generation Enterprise Network (NGEN) as a follow-on to the Navy/Marine Corps Intranet. This endeavor depends on seamless coordination between the Department of Defense's Chief Information Officers, the Department's Senior Acquisition Executives, the Navy and Marine Corps, and various other elements of the Department of Defense. Accordingly, the committee directs that the Secretary of the Navy coordinate the NGEN initiative with these relevant entities. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, jointly with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration; the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics; and the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation; to produce a report for Congress describing the plans and schedule, including planned funding for the NGEN initiative. The report should include a description of NGEN's compliance with the policies and architectures of the Business Transformation Agency, testing plans and procedures, and review and coordination mechanisms with all relevant oversight agencies. The report should be delivered to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2008.

**Report on Department of Defense personnel access to the internet**

The committee is concerned with the recent Department of Defense policy changes that seek to limit the access of military personnel to certain popular internet web sites. While the committee understands the need to preserve available bandwidth for military needs and the necessity of ensuring operational security, the potential negative effects on morale must also be carefully considered. Those deployed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere around the world, sometimes for more than a year, deserve every opportunity to connect with their friends and family on a frequent basis. Social networking web sites facilitate that communication for this generation, in the same way letters, phone calls, and telegrams did for previous ones. The committee believes that access to the commercial internet can promote strong morale among personnel in the field as well as family members on the home front.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a report that includes a detailed description of the measurable effect that the use of these sites has had on operations and a detailed analysis of any bandwidth or security challenges that their use poses, as well as a description of any policies and procedures in place for the provision of internet access for deployed personnel when operational security requires denial of access via Government systems. The report should be delivered to the congressional defense committees no later than September 1, 2007.

# TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

## Subtitle A—Active Forces

### End strengths for active forces (sec. 401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize active-duty end strengths for fiscal year 2008, as shown below:

| | Fiscal year | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2007 authorization | 2008 request | 2008 recommendation |
| Army | 512,400 | 489,400 | 525,400 |
| Navy | 340,700 | 328,400 | 328,400 |
| Marine Corps | 180,000 | 180,000 | 189,000 |
| Air Force | 334,200 | 328,600 | 328,600 |

The John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) authorized active-duty end strength for the Army at 512,400 and for the Marine Corps at 180,000. Additional authority was also provided in section 403 of that Act to increase active-duty end strength for the Army by up to 20,000 and for the Marine Corps by up to 4,000 above the fiscal year 2007 authorized levels of 512,400 and 180,000, respectively.

The committee recommends combining the base budget end strength with the end strength funded in recent years in emergency supplementals. Although the Department of Defense has again divided its fiscal year 2008 end strength request between its base and war-related budget requests, the committee believes that it is more appropriate to authorize the total end strengths available to the military services in an integrated manner without regard to whether they are "permanent" or war-related. In the committee's view, the total end strength that is needed to accomplish the military mission should be authorized in this section in a way that does not obscure the true cost that the actual end strength presents.

The committee remains concerned that the planned growth in ground forces will come too late to impact the war in Iraq, and 5 years from now, when the planned growth is scheduled to be complete, the requirements for a larger force may not remain. Nevertheless, the committee supports the planned increases in the ground forces for the coming fiscal year, but will continue to assess this growth on a year-to-year basis. The committee recommends an active-duty end strength for fiscal year 2008 for the Army and Marine Corps of 525,400 and 189,000, respectively.

The Navy and the Air Force continue large manpower reductions achieved through major changes in organizational structure, including deleting redundancies, retiring manpower-intensive platforms, incorporating new technology, and shifting non-core military functions from military personnel to civilians. These efforts con-

tinue to be challenging and will be monitored closely by the committee. The committee is concerned that the Navy and the Air Force may be cutting personnel too far and too fast, opting to spend money on procurement programs and weapons systems to the detriment of personnel. The committee recommends an active-duty end strength for the Navy and Air Force of 328,400 and 328,600, respectively.

## Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

### End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2008, as shown below:

| | Fiscal year | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2007 authorization | 2008 request | 2008 recommendation |
| The Army National Guard of the United States | 350,000 | 351,300 | 351,300 |
| The Army Reserve | 200,000 | 205,000 | 205,000 |
| The Navy Reserve | 71,300 | 67,800 | 67,800 |
| The Marine Corps Reserve | 39,600 | 39,600 | 39,600 |
| The Air National Guard of the United States | 107,000 | 106,700 | 106,700 |
| The Air Force Reserve | 74,900 | 67,500 | 67,500 |
| The Coast Guard Reserve | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 |

### End strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize full-time support end strengths for fiscal year 2008, as shown below:

| | Fiscal year | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2007 authorization | 2008 request | 2008 recommendation |
| The Army National Guard of the United States | 27,411 | 29,204 | 29,204 |
| The Army Reserve | 15,416 | 15,870 | 15,870 |
| The Navy Reserve | 12,564 | 11,579 | 11,579 |
| The Marine Corps Reserve | 2,261 | 2,261 | 2,261 |
| The Air National Guard of the United States | 13,291 | 13,936 | 13,936 |
| The Air Force Reserve | 2,707 | 2,721 | 2,721 |

The committee recommends increases of 1793 in the Army National Guard, 454 in the Army Reserve, 645 in the Air National Guard, and 14 in the Air Force Reserve over levels approved for fiscal year 2007. The committee supports increases in full-time support manning consistent with requested levels to increase readiness in the reserve components.

The committee also recommends a decrease from the fiscal year 2007 level of 985 in the Navy Reserve, consistent with reductions in both active Navy and Navy Reserve end strength. The committee recommends an end strength for the Marine Corps Reserve equal to the fiscal year 2007 level, consistent with the budget request.

### End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize end strengths for military technicians (dual status) for fiscal year 2008, as shown below:

| | Fiscal year | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2007 authorization | 2008 request | 2008 recommendation |
| The Army Reserve | 7,912 | 8,249 | 8,249 |
| The Army National Guard of the United States | 26,050 | 26,502 | 26,502 |
| The Air Force Reserve | 10,124 | 9,909 | 9,909 |
| The Air National Guard of the United States | 23,255 | 22,553 | 22,553 |

### Fiscal year 2008 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish limits on the number of non-dual status technicians who may be employed in the Department of Defense as of September 30, 2008, as shown below:

| | Fiscal year | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2007 authorization | 2008 request | 2008 recommendation |
| The Army National Guard of the United States | 1,600 | 1,600 | 1,600 |
| The Army Reserve | 595 | 595 | 595 |
| The Air National Guard of the United States | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| The Air Force Reserve | 90 | 90 | 90 |

### Maximum number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support (sec. 415)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish limits on the number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support under section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, as of September 30, 2008, as shown below:

| | Fiscal year | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2007 authorization | 2008 request | 2008 recommendation |
| The Army National Guard of the United States | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 |
| The Army Reserve | 13,000 | 13,000 | 13,000 |
| The Navy Reserve | 6,200 | 6,200 | 6,200 |
| The Marine Corps Reserve | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| The Air National Guard of the United States | 16,000 | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| The Air Force Reserve | 14,000 | 14,000 | 14,000 |

## Subtitle C—Authorizations of Appropriations

### Military personnel (sec. 421)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the following amounts for military personnel for fiscal year 2008: (1) for the Army, $34,952,762,000; (2) for the Navy, $23,300,841,000; (3) for the Marine Corps, $11,065,542,000; (4) for the Air Force, $24,091,993,000; (5) for the Army Reserve, $3,701,197,000; (6) for the Navy Reserve, $1,766,408,000; (7) for the Marine Corps Re-

serve, $593,961,000; (8) for the Air Force Reserve, $1,356,618,000; (9) for the Army National Guard, $5,914,979,000; and (10) for the Air National Guard, $2,607,456,000.

The total authorized amount of $109,351,757,000 is $3,948,059,000, or 3.7 percent, above the base budget request. This increase includes a shift of funds from the supplemental budget to the base budget for the end strength requested in the supplemental budget, and an additional $302,000,000 for an across-the-board 3.5 percent pay raise, versus the budget request of 3 percent.

The Department of Defense has consistently underexecuted its military personnel funding authorization and appropriation since fiscal year 1995 for the active and reserve components. According to the Government Accountability Office, from fiscal years 2002 through 2005, the lowest annual unobligated balance was $271.2 million and the highest was $2,169.0 million. The committee recommends a decrease of $507.2 million to military personnel accounts to reflect anticipated unobligated balances, as described in the following table.

# Title IV - Military Personnel Funding Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **MILITARY PERSONNEL ARMY (Direct)** | 31,623,865 | | 31,623,865 |
| Military Pay Raise Increase | | 103,655 | 103,655 |
| Unobligated Balances | | -139,640 | -139,640 |
| Accumulated leave carryover | | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| | | | |
| **Active Duty Overstrength Transfers from Title XV:** | | | |
| BASIC PAY | | 152,123 | 152,123 |
| RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL | | 44,116 | 44,116 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING | | 51,770 | 51,770 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE | | 5,665 | 5,665 |
| RECRUITING AND RETENTION (Total AC) | | 62,000 | 62,000 |
| SPECIAL PAYS | | 26,582 | 26,582 |
| SOCIAL SECURITY TAX | | 11,637 | 11,637 |
| BASIC PAY | | 1,047,717 | 1,047,717 |
| RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL | | 303,838 | 303,838 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING | | 386,219 | 386,219 |
| RECRUITING AND RETENTION (Total AC) | | 958,120 | 958,120 |
| SPECIAL PAYS | | 111,751 | 111,751 |
| SOCIAL SECURITY TAX | | 80,150 | 80,150 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE | | 122,194 | 122,194 |
| | | | |
| **TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL ARMY** | **31,623,865** | **3,328,897** | **34,952,762** |

# Title IV - Military Personnel Funding Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **MILITARY PERSONNEL NAVY (Direct)** | 23,305,233 | | 23,305,233 |
| Military Pay Raise Increase | | 58,528 | 58,528 |
| Unobligated Balances | | -63,920 | -63,920 |
| Accumulated leave carryover | | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| **TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL NAVY** | **23,305,233** | **-4,392** | **23,300,841** |
| **MILITARY PERSONNEL MARINE CORPS (Direct)** | 10,278,031 | | 10,278,031 |
| Military Pay Raise Increase | | 29,414 | 29,414 |
| Unobligated Balances | | -27,310 | -27,310 |
| Accumulated leave carryover | | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| **Active Duty Overstrength Transfers from Title XV:** | | | |
| BASIC PAY | | 97,595 | 97,595 |
| RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL | | 28,303 | 28,303 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING | | 32,823 | 32,823 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE | | 3,075 | 3,075 |
| SOCIAL SECURITY TAX | | 7,466 | 7,466 |
| BASIC PAY | | 206,354 | 206,354 |
| RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL | | 59,843 | 59,843 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING | | 87,381 | 87,381 |
| INCENTIVE PAYS | | 219,881 | 219,881 |
| SOCIAL SECURITY TAX | | 15,786 | 15,786 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE | | 25,900 | 25,900 |

## Title IV - Military Personnel Funding Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL MARINE CORPS** | **10,278,031** | **787,511** | **11,065,542** |
| **MILITARY PERSONNEL AIR FORCE (Direct)** | 24,097,354 | | 24,097,354 |
| Military Pay Raise Increase | | 66,049 | 66,049 |
| Unobligated Balances | | -72,410 | -72,410 |
| Accumulated leave carryover | | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| **TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL AIR FORCE** | **24,097,354** | **-5,361** | **24,091,993** |
| **RESERVE PERSONNEL ARMY (Direct)** | 3,734,620 | | 3,734,620 |
| Military Pay Raise Increase | | 9,377 | 9,377 |
| Unobligated Balances | | -42,800 | -42,800 |
| **TOTAL RESERVE PERSONNEL ARMY** | **3,734,620** | **-33,423** | **3,701,197** |

## Title IV - Military Personnel Funding Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **RESERVE PERSONNEL NAVY (Direct)** | 1,797,685 | | 1,797,685 |
| Military Pay Raise Increase | | 4,443 | 4,443 |
| Unobligated Balances | | -35,720 | -35,720 |
| **TOTAL RESERVE PERSONNEL NAVY** | **1,797,685** | **-31,277** | **1,766,408** |
| **RESERVE PERSONNEL MARINE CORPS (Direct)** | 594,872 | | 594,872 |
| Military Pay Raise Increase | | 1,549 | 1,549 |
| Unobligated Balances | | -2,460 | -2,460 |
| **TOTAL RESERVE PERSONNEL MARINE CORPS** | **594,872** | **-911** | **593,961** |
| **RESERVE PERSONNEL AIR FORCE (Direct)** | 1,370,479 | | 1,370,479 |
| Military Pay Raise Increase | | 3,569 | 3,569 |
| Unobligated Balances | | -17,430 | -17,430 |
| **TOTAL RESERVE PERSONNEL AIR FORCE** | **1,370,479** | **-13,861** | **1,356,618** |

## Title IV - Military Personnel Funding Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL ARMY (Direct)** | 5,959,149 | | 5,959,149 |
| Military Pay Raise Increase | | 18,230 | 18,230 |
| Unobligated Balances | | -63,400 | -63,400 |
| Accumulated leave carryover | | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| **TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL ARMY** | **5,959,149** | **-44,170** | **5,914,979** |
| **NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL AIR FORCE (Direct)** | 2,642,410 | | 2,642,410 |
| Military Pay Raise Increase | | 7,186 | 7,186 |
| Unobligated Balances | | -42,140 | -42,140 |
| **TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL AIR FORCE** | **2,642,410** | **-34,954** | **2,607,456** |
| **TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS** | **105,403,698** | **3,948,059** | **109,351,757** |
| **TRICARE FOR LIFE ACCRUALS** | **10,876,204** | | **10,876,204** |
| **TOTAL DISCRETIONARY SPENDING** | **116,279,902** | **3,948,059** | **120,227,961** |
| **MANDATORY SPENDING: CURRENT LAW** | **2,640,500** | | **2,640,500** |
| **TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL BUDGET AUTHORITY** | **118,920,402** | **3,948,059** | **122,868,461** |

# TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

## Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy

### Increase in authorized strengths for Army officers on active duty in the grade of major to meet force structure requirements (sec. 501)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the table in section 523(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to increase the authorized strength limits for active-duty Army officers in the grade of major to meet the Army's requirement for additional majors in its new modular structure.

### Increase in authorized strengths for Navy officers on active duty in grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain to meet force structure requirements (sec. 502)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the table in section 523(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, to increase the authorized strength limits for active-duty Navy captains, commanders, and lieutenant commanders to meet the Navy's force structure requirements for additional officers in these grades.

### Expansion of exclusion of military permanent professors from strength limitations for officers below general and flag grades (sec. 503)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 523 of title 10, United States Code, to increase from 50 to 85 the number of permanent professors for each of the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy and professors of the United States Navy who are career military professors who may be excluded from the authorized number of commissioned officers who may be serving on active duty in that grade.

### Mandatory retirement age for active-duty general and flag officers continued on active duty (sec. 504)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 637(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, relating to deferral of retirement and continuation on active duty of regular officers to conform with recently enacted extended age limits for mandatory retirement of general and flag officers serving on active duty included in section 502 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

**Authority for reduced mandatory service obligation for initial appointments of officers in critically short health professional specialties (sec. 505)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 651 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive the 8-year minimum service obligation for initial appointments of commissioned officers in critically short health professional specialties. The minimum period of service under such a waiver would be the greater of 2 years or the period of obligated service associated with receipt of an accession bonus or special pay.

**Increase in authorized number of permanent professors at the United States Military Academy (sec. 506)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 4331(b) of title 10, United States Code, to increase from 22 to 28 the authorized number of permanent professors at the United States Military Academy. Although the Military Academy has made numerous changes to the structure of the academic departments, the authorized number of permanent professors has not been increased since 1978. The additional authorization for permanent professors would allow assignment of a permanent professor as deputy department head for each academic department and as Vice-Dean.

The committee understands that the performance of permanent professors at the Military Academy is formally reviewed every 5 years. The committee is concerned that a formal review every 5 years is not sufficient to document the quality of performance and potential for increased responsibility expected of officers in their positions. The committee directs that permanent professors receive a formal evaluation at least annually, consistent with the practice for evaluating other Army officers.

**Expansion of authority for reenlistment of officers in their former enlisted grade (sec. 507)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 3258 and 8258 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize regular Army and Air Force officers to reenlist under certain conditions in their former enlisted grade. Under current law, only reserve officers are authorized to reenlist in their former grade.

**Enhanced authority for reserve general and flag officers to serve on active duty (sec. 508)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 526(d) of title 10, United States Code, to exclude from the limitations on the number of general and flag officers on active duty certain reserve general and flag officers serving on active duty for not more than 365 days. The total number of these officers could not exceed 10 percent of the number of reserve component general and flag officers authorized to be in an active status under section 12004 of title 10, United States Code.

### Promotion of career military professors of the Navy (sec. 509)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize promotion of Navy permanent professors to the grade of captain or colonel pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy. The regulations would include a competitive selection board process to identify those permanent professors best qualified for promotion. The promotion would be effective not earlier than 3 years after the selection of the officer as a permanent professor.

## Subtitle B—Enlisted Personnel Policy

### Increase in authorized daily average of number of members in pay grade E–9 (sec. 521)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 517(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an increase to the upper limit on the authorized daily average of active-duty enlisted members in pay grade E–9 from the current 1 percent of the enlisted force to 1.25 percent.

## Subtitle C—Reserve Component Management

### Revised designation, structure, and functions of the Reserve Forces Policy Board (sec. 531)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 10301 of title 10, United States Code, to redesignate the Reserve Forces Policy Board as the Reserve Policy Advisory Board and restructure it to provide the Secretary of Defense with independent advice and recommendations on matters relating to the reserve components.

This provision implements a recommendation of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves to reconstitute the Reserve Forces Policy Board with a goal of generating and providing the best possible advice to the Secretary of Defense on reserve policy matters.

### Charter for the National Guard Bureau (sec. 532)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 10503 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to prescribe a charter for the National Guard Bureau.

This provision implements a recommendation of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves that the Secretary of Defense be responsible for drafting the charter for the National Guard Bureau to accurately reflect the full scope of the Bureau's required duties and activities.

The committee recognizes that the role of the National Guard in performing federal missions at home and overseas and in assisting governors in responding to State and local emergencies has grown significantly. This dual role and the competing demands for National Guard forces underscores the vital role of the National Guard Bureau as a channel of communication with the States, and of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau as an advisor to the Sec-

retary of Defense, the Secretaries and Chiefs of Staff of the Army and Air Force, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Commander, U.S. Northern Command, and State governors on National Guard matters. The committee believes that an updated charter which takes into account the various missions being performed by the National Guard is essential and urges the Secretary to complete this at the earliest possible time.

**Appointment, grade, duties, and retirement of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau (sec. 533)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 10502(d) of title 10, United States Code, to increase the grade of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau from lieutenant general to general and to require that an officer appointed to this position be recommended by his or her Governor and by the Secretary of the Army or the Air Force, have at least 10 years of federally recognized commissioned service in an active status in the National Guard, be in the grade of major general or above, have significant joint duty experience, and have successfully completed such other assignments and experiences so as to possess a detailed understanding of the status and capabilities of National Guard forces and the missions of the National Guard Bureau. The provision would also designate the Chief of the National Guard Bureau as an advisor to the Secretary of Defense, through the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on matters involving the National Guard not employed in a federal status and would amend section 14512(a) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to defer the mandatory retirement age of an officer serving as Chief of the National Guard Bureau until age 68.

This provision implements a recommendation of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves to increase the grade of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to general and serve as a senior advisor to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and, through the Chairman, to the Secretary of Defense, for matters pertaining to the National Guard in its non-federal role.

The committee believes that this provision reflects the increasing importance of the role of the National Guard in homeland defense and civil support missions, as well as an operational force. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau would be able to provide the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and the Secretary of Defense with valuable advice across a broad spectrum of issues related to the use of non-federalized National Guard forces in these missions.

**Mandatory separation for years of service of Reserve officers in the grade of lieutenant general or vice admiral (sec. 534)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 14508 of title 10, United States Code, to require transfer of reserve officers to the Retired Reserve or discharge from the officer's reserve appointment 30 days after completion of 38 years of commissioned service. This change is consistent with the requirement for mandatory separation for years of service of regular officers in the grade of lieutenant general or vice admiral.

### Increase in period of temporary Federal recognition as officers of the National Guard from six to twelve months (sec. 535)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 308(a) of title 32, United States Code, to increase from 6 to 12 months the period of temporary federal recognition as an officer of the Army or Air National Guard that can be granted to an individual during the period that the individual's appointment as a reserve officer of the Army or Air Force is pending. This provision would allow additional time for processing of appointments for permanent federal recognition and avoid hardships resulting from delays in appointment.

## Subtitle D—Education and Training

### Grade and service credit of commissioned officers in uniformed medical accession programs (sec. 551)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2114(b) and 2121(c) of title 10, United States Code, to require that medical students at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences and persons participating in the armed forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Programs who have prior commissioned service, serve, while on active duty, in pay grade 0–1, or in pay grade 0–2 if they meet specified promotion criteria prescribed by the service secretary. The provision would also amend section 2004a of title 10, United States Code, to impose the same limitations regarding the pay grade and service credit exclusion on officers on active duty with prior commissioned service who are detailed as students at medical schools under section 2004a.

The committee believes that limiting the amount of prior service commissioned officer credit for purposes of rank for medical students in military-sponsored programs is necessary in order to achieve career progression objectives. The limitations should be uniformly applied in various programs for medical students. The committee notes that the services have not implemented the authority extended in section 2004a of title 10, United States Code, despite ongoing difficulty in achieving health professional recruiting goals. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of all health professional commissioning programs with the objective of identifying and remedying impediments to successful recruiting of the most highly qualified students.

### Expansion of number of academies supportable in any State under STARBASE program (sec. 552)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2193b(c) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to support, with Department of Defense funds, the establishment and operation of up to four STARBASE academies in a State.

The committee recognizes the Department of Defense STARBASE program as an effective educational program focused on science, math, technology, and engineering. It has reached over 350,000 youths at 54 locations associated with active, guard, and

reserve commands throughout the United States. The STARBASE program seeks to heighten the interest of students in pursuing careers requiring skills in science, technology, math, and engineering that are in high demand in the Department of Defense. Raising the limit on the number of Department of Defense-funded STARBASE academies per state would enable expansion of this program in States where there is a particularly strong justification for establishing new STARBASE programs.

**Repeal of post–2007–2008 academic year prohibition on phased increase in cadet strength limit at the United States Military Academy (sec. 553)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 4342 of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Army to increase by up to 100 cadets per year the size of the Corps of Cadets at the United States Military Academy to a maximum of 4,400 cadets. This would afford the Secretary of the Army the flexibility to respond to the Army's requirement for additional company grade officers to support the Army's projected increased end strength and force structure.

**Treatment of Southold, Mattituck, and Greenport High Schools, Southold, New York, as single institutions for purposes of maintaining a Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit (sec. 554)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Southhold, Mattituck, and Greenport High Schools, located in Southold, New York, to be treated as a single institution for the purposes of maintaining a Navy Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) unit. This provision would allow the Navy to continue a very successful JROTC program in a unique setting.

## Subtitle E—Defense Dependents' Education Matters

**Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 561)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $35.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for continuation of the Department of Defense assistance program to local educational agencies that are impacted by enrollment of dependent children of military members and civilian employees of the Department of Defense. The committee also recommends authorization of $10.0 million in OMDW, for assistance to local educational agencies with significant changes in enrollment of military and civilian school-aged dependent children due to base closures, force structure changes, or force relocations.

**Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 562)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for impact aid payments for children with disabilities under section 8003(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

(20 U.S.C. 7703(d)), using the formula set forth in section 363 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), for continuation of the Department of Defense's assistance to local educational agencies that benefit dependents with severe disabilities.

**Inclusion of dependents of non-Department of Defense employees employed on Federal property in plan relating to force structure changes, relocation of military units, or base closures and realignments (sec. 563)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 574(e)(3) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), to include dependents of personnel who work on federal property but are not members of the armed forces or civilian employees of the Department of Defense in the plan and annual reports required to identify and assist local educational agencies experiencing growth in enrollment due to force structure changes, relocation of military units, or base closure and realignments. The provision would make the definition of "military dependent students" consistent with the definition used for purposes of computation of payments under the Federal Impact Aid program authorized in section 7703 of title 20, United States Code.

**Authority for payment of private boarding school tuition for military dependents in overseas areas not served by Department of Defense dependents' schools (sec. 564)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to pay tuition for attendance at private boarding schools in the United States for military dependents in overseas areas not served by Department of Defense schools. Under current law, such dependents are sent to other overseas schools rather than to boarding schools in the United States.

## Subtitle F—Military Justice and Legal Assistance Matters

**Authority of judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces to administer oaths (sec. 571)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 936 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces to administer oaths.

**Military legal assistance for Department of Defense civilian employees in areas without access to non-military legal assistance (sec. 572)**

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the authority of the service secretaries to provide legal assistance to civilian employees of the Department of Defense in locations where legal assistance from non-military legal assistance providers is not reasonably available.

### Modification of authorities on senior members of the Judge Advocate Generals' corps (sec. 573)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that the Judge Advocates General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force serve in the grade of lieutenant general or vice admiral, and would exclude them from the authorized number of officers serving in grades above major general or rear admiral. The provision would also authorize the position of Legal Counsel to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and would require that the officer appointed to this position serve in the grade of brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half) and be recommended by a board of officers convened by the Secretary of Defense.

The need for enhanced authority and independence by the most senior military attorneys of the services has become increasingly apparent during the global war on terrorism. The committee believes that the Judge Advocates General and the Legal Counsel to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should serve in higher grades than presently assigned, commensurate with the vital importance of their duties and responsibilities.

## Subtitle G—Military Family Readiness

### Department of Defense Military Family Readiness Council (sec. 581)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a Department of Defense Military Family Readiness Council to review and make recommendations on Department of Defense policy and plans for the support of military family readiness; to monitor requirements for the support of military family readiness; and to evaluate and assess the effectiveness of military family readiness programs and activities of the Department of Defense. The council would consist of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, who would serve as chair, one representative from each of the services, and three individuals from representatives of military family organizations.

The committee has received testimony of senior leaders from throughout the Department of Defense stressing the importance of support for military families. Yet, from a Department-wide perspective, many of these efforts appear to be independent and ad hoc. Creation of the council authorized by this provision would facilitate a coordinated approach across all services for the development and sustainment of such programs and improved oversight by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The committee strongly recommends that the Department move toward the creation of structures similar to the Army Family Action Plan, which has proven to be singularly successful in identifying family readiness needs at the highest levels of Army leadership in a systematic and effective manner.

### Department of Defense policy and plans for military family readiness (sec. 582)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a policy and plans for the support of military family readiness. The policy would ensure that military family readiness programs and activities are comprehensive, effec-

tive, and supported; continuously available to military families in peacetime and in war; available to military families of the regular and reserve components; included in Department of Defense plans, programs, and budgeting activities; and that they undergo continuous evaluation. The plans would include an ongoing identification and assessment of the effectiveness of military family readiness programs and activities; a description of the resources required to support them; an ongoing identification of gaps in the programs and activities and resources required to address those gaps; and a summary of the allocation of funds for major categories of military family readiness programs and activities. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to conduct surveys of service members, family members, and survivors beginning in fiscal year 2009, and not less frequently than once every 3 years thereafter.

The committee has received testimony on numerous Department of Defense and service-specific programs which support military families in important and effective ways. However, these programs appear to be independent and ad hoc.

The committee believes that family readiness is an enduring need and is concerned that many support programs, such as nonmedical counseling and family support services, are funded primarily, or completely, by supplemental appropriations.

The committee expects that the policy and plans required by this provision will ensure that effective family readiness support programs will be included in the basic planning, programming, and budgeting activities of the Department of Defense.

## Subtitle H—Other Matters

### Enhancement of carryover of accumulated leave for members of the Armed Forces (sec. 591)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 701 of title 10, United States Code, to increase for all service members the number of days of accumulated leave they may carry over from one fiscal year to the next from 60 to 90 days. The provision would also increase by 1 year the amount of time available to service members to use leave accumulated under the special leave accrual provisions of section 701(f) of title 10, United States Code. Finally, the provision would amend section 501(b) of title 37, United States Code, to allow enlisted service members who have accumulated more than 120 days of leave under section 701(f)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to sell back, on a one-time basis, up to 30 days of such leave in excess of 120 days.

The committee recognizes that the ongoing high operations tempo has resulted in many service members accumulating more leave than they can use or carry over into the next fiscal year. In section 542 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), Congress authorized service members deployed in certain areas to accumulate up to 120 days of leave and allowed those service members 3 additional years to use that leave. Unfortunately, even under these conditions, some service members eligible for this benefit have lost leave. This provision would enable these members, on a one-time basis, to sell back up to 30 days of that leave in excess of 120 days.

The committee believes it is essential for military and civilian leaders to ensure that their subordinates maintain adequate leave balances for emergencies but that they are encouraged, if not required, to take leave whenever possible for their good and the good of their service. While the enhanced leave carryover authorized by this provision is needed in today's operational environment, the committee expects the services to ensure that all officer and enlisted personnel understand the need to plan to use their excess leave so as to avoid losing this important benefit or to adversely affect their unit's mission.

**Uniform policy on performances by military bands (sec. 592)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide uniform policy for Department of Defense bands regarding when public performances are permitted, the conditions under which band members may perform in their personal capacities, and recording of music for distribution to the public.

**Waiver of time limitations on award of medals of honor to certain members of the Army (sec. 593)**

The committee recommends a provision that would waive the statutory time limits and authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Woodrow W. Keeble for valor during the Korean War; Leslie H. Sabo, Jr., for valor during the Vietnam War; Philip G. Shadrach for valor during the Civil War; Henry Svehla for valor during the Korean War; and George D. Wilson for valor during the Civil War.

## Items of Special Interest

**Army company-grade officer retention**

The committee is concerned about the increasing attrition rate among company-grade officers in the Army, particularly graduates of the United States Military Academy and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps scholarship program, and the potential effects of this trend on the capabilities of the officer corps. This trend is particularly alarming as the Army strives to increase its end strength in a time of war.

The committee applauds the Army's initiatives to improve retention of high caliber company-grade officers, and particularly notes the promising response to the Army's advanced civilian education program. This program has value beyond increased officer retention, expanding the intellectual and professional growth of officers, allowing respite from operational demands, and laying the foundation for the future senior leaders of the Army. The committee urges the Army to continue this program and to explore expanding its use.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to review the programs and incentives in place to increase company-grade officer retention, including identifying additional opportunities to increase the use of advanced civilian education options in exchange for increased service obligations and the use of the critical skills retention bonus to retain officers serving in designated critical branches.

The committee further directs the Secretary to report on this review to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2008.

**Comptroller General study of implementation by the military departments of sexual assault policies and mental health issues related to sexual assault**

The committee is concerned about reports of sexual assaults on service members during deployment and the impact on the mental health of victims of such assaults. The committee expects the military departments to continue to examine ways to ensure that applicable policies aimed at preventing and rapidly and effectively responding to sexual assault are properly executed at all levels of command, in deployed areas as well as on installations in the United States.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to conduct a review of the policies and systems in place within the military departments in response to section 577 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) and in response to the comprehensive policies on sexual assault put in place by the Department of Defense. In particular, the Comptroller General should assess the adequacy of mental health resources available to victims of sexual assault, both in deployed environments and on installations in the United States, and whether current Department of Defense policies, surveys, assessments, and training of military and civilian personnel are effective and adequate to identify and respond to such needs. The Comptroller General should report on this review by August 2008.

**Counter-remote controlled improvised explosive device systems**

The committee is concerned that the Joint Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Defeat Office has become too dependent on a single source of supply for counter-Remote Controlled IED (RCIED) jamming systems and system components, thereby limiting innovation and potentially preventing more effective systems from being fielded. The committee further believes the Joint IED Defeat Office (JIEDDO) should consider identifying and qualifying additional sources for counter-RCIED systems. The committee therefore directs the JIEDDO and the military departments to identify and, as appropriate, qualify additional sources for counter-RCIED systems and system components.

**Explosive ordnance disposal personnel**

The committee recognizes the strains experienced by explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) personnel in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee applauds the professionalism, dedication, and skill of these highly proficient technicians and acknowledges the tremendous danger associated with bomb disposal missions. The committee notes that, in addition to frequent combat tours with limited dwell time in the Unites States, EOD personnel are performing backfill requirements at military installations, as well as supporting the United States Secret Service in their mission to protect the President and other officials. The committee is concerned,

however, that EOD personnel are being stretched too thin for their various missions.

The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on the health and viability of the EOD force by March 1, 2008. The report shall: (1) evaluate whether the EOD force is properly sized, trained, and equipped for the tasks assigned; (2) analyze the sufficiency of pays and incentives available to EOD personnel in light of force requirements and recruiting and retention trends; (3) identify means to reduce operational demands on EOD units; (4) evaluate the need, feasibility, and costs associated with increasing the number of EOD units and personnel in the National Guard; and (5) evaluate the current placement of EOD units within each respective service, specifically evaluating whether EOD units and personnel are more properly organized under a joint command or the U.S. Special Operations Command.

**Feasibility of expanding access to mental health professionals in military units**

The committee is concerned about the stigma associated with seeking mental health services in the military, the availability of mental health care to service members, and the ability of military leaders to identify service members with mental health conditions. Access to mental health care is generally not available at the unit level, requiring service members to go to a military hospital or to a combat stress control team to receive such care.

The committee is interested in the potential value of embedding military mental health professionals in units in a manner similar to the current utilization of military chaplains. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess the efficacy of creating positions within subordinate military organizations, particularly at the battalion level, in which mental health care professionals would serve. The Secretary's assessment shall include, but not be limited to, an evaluation of: (1) the impact on force structure of such a program; (2) the potential value of increasing the number of military mental health professionals; (3) the value of embedding military mental health professionals in subordinate units, particularly at the battalion level; (4) the appropriate professional skills that would be required of mental health professionals placed in such positions; (5) whether such a program would reduce the stigma for service members seeking mental health care; and (6) whether such a program would increase the capability of unit leaders to identify service members with mental health needs. The committee directs the Secretary to submit the results of the assessment, including findings and recommendations, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2008.

**Implementation of clarifying changes to jurisdiction under the Uniform Code of Military Justice**

Section 552 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) amended section 802(a)(10) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the application

of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) to persons serving with or accompanying an armed force in the field.

Prior to the enactment of section 552, section 802(a)(10) provided that "[i]n time of war, persons serving with or accompanying an armed force in the field" would be subject to the UCMJ. In the 1970 case of *United States* v. *Averette,* 19 U.S.C.M.A. 363, the United States Court of Military Appeals interpreted the phrase "in time of war" to mean a war formally declared by Congress. Section 552 modified the provision to apply "in time of declared war or a contingency operation."

A number of contractor groups have expressed the view that this provision is "both broad and vague." According to these groups:

> The Secretary of Defense is unilaterally authorized to declare any military activity a 'contingency operation;' in addition, national disaster declarations made by the President also trigger the 'contingency operation' function. Hurricane Katrina was a military 'contingency operation.' Most of the homeland security operations of the Defense Department's Northern Command are considered 'contingency operations.'

In fact, section 101(13) of title 10, United States Code, authorizes the Secretary of Defense to declare a military operation a "contingency operation" only if members of the military are or may become involved in "military actions, operations, or hostilities against an enemy of the United States or against an opposing military force." A national emergency may also trigger a "contingency operation," but only if it results in the call or order to active duty (in federal status) of the reserve components. This authority was not used in the response to Hurricane Katrina and has never been used in the case of any other natural disaster. Moreover, section 802(a)(10) applies, by its terms, only to persons accompanying an armed force "in the field." The phrase "in the field" has been consistently interpreted to mean in the face of an enemy force. None of the hypothetical situations raised by contractor groups meet any of these tests.

The contractor groups have also expressed concern that the Department of Defense has yet to issue guidance or regulations as to which provisions of the UCMJ will apply to contractor employees accompanying an armed force in the field, and under what circumstances. This issue is appropriately addressed through revisions to the Manual for Courts Martial implementing the new legislation. The committee urges the Department of Defense to expeditiously issue such revisions. The committee expects that the Manual for Courts Martial will implement the provision in a manner that is consistent with the longstanding definitions of terms such as "contingency operations" and "in the field" and mindful of U.S. Supreme Court precedent regarding the application of the UCMJ to civilians.

**Report on programs assessing feasibility of hotlines and video surveillance in recruiting stations**

In response to a requirement contained in the statement of managers accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authoriza-

tion Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), the Secretary of Defense submitted a report on programs designed to prevent recruiter misconduct. Two methods for preventing incidents of recruiter misconduct used by individual services include use of "hotline" numbers for recruits to call and report violations and employment of video surveillance in recruiting stations.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review these programs to determine their efficacy in preventing recruiter misconduct, increasing safety and comfort of potential recruits visiting recruiting stations, and improving the performance and security of military recruiters. The Secretary should also assess the cost of the programs and their impact, if any, on recruiting success. The committee directs the Secretary to submit the results of this review and assessment, including findings, conclusions and recommendations, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2008.

# TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

## Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

### Fiscal year 2008 increase in military basic pay (sec. 601)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a pay raise for the members of the uniformed services of 3.5 percent effective on January 1, 2008. This across-the-board pay raise is 0.5 percent above the budget request.

The committee believes that the 3 percent requested in the budget should be increased by half a percent in order to recognize the outstanding service and sacrifice of the men and women of the armed forces and their families.

### Allowance for participation of Reserves in electronic screening (sec. 602)

The committee recommends a provision that would create a new section 433a in title 10, United States Code, authorizing the military services to pay a member of the Individual Ready Reserve a stipend for participation in electronic screening performed pursuant to section 10149 of title 10, United States Code. The aggregate amount of the stipend paid to a member may not exceed $50 in any calendar year.

The provision would also prohibit a member of the Individual Ready Reserve from receiving compensation under section 206 of title 37, United States Code, for screening for which the member received a stipend under the new section 433a. Finally, the provision would clarify that members may not receive retirement credit for participating in screening, regardless of whether the member received a stipend.

### Midmonth payment of basic pay for contributions of members participating in Thrift Savings Plan (sec. 603)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1014 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Department of Defense to make twice monthly payments to the Thrift Savings Plan on behalf of participating service members.

## Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

### Extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus; the Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus; the special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high priority units; the Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior serv-

ice; the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service; and the Selected Reserve enlistment bonus for persons with prior service.

**Extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals (sec. 612)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the nurse officer candidate accession bonus; the repayment of education loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve; the accession bonus for registered nurses; incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists; special pay for Selected Reserve health professionals in critically short wartime specialities; the accession bonus for dental officers; the accession bonus for pharmacy officers; the accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties; and the accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties.

**Extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending their period of active service; the nuclear career accession bonus; and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus.

**Extension of authorities relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays (sec. 614)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the aviation officer retention bonus; the reenlistment bonus for active members; the enlistment bonus; the retention bonus for members with critical military skills or assigned to high priority units; the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills; the incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage; and the accession bonus for officer candidates.

**Increase in incentive special pay and multiyear retention bonus for medical officers of the Armed Forces (sec. 615)**

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the authorized limits on incentive special pay and the multiyear retention bonus for medical officers from $50,000 to $75,000.

**Increase in dental officer additional special pay (sec. 616)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 302b of title 37, United States Code, to increase the amount of additional special pay for dental officers. Under current law, a dental officer with less than 3 years of creditable service is eligible for a $4,000 bonus, and a dental officer with more than 3 but less than 10 years of creditable service is eligible for a $6,000 bonus. This provision would increase the maximum authorized amounts for those officers to $10,000 and $12,000, respectively.

**Enhancement of hardship duty pay (sec. 617)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 305 of title 37, United States Code, to raise the maximum monthly amount of hardship duty pay to $1,500. The provision would also authorize the payment of hardship duty pay in a lump sum, subject to the member executing a written agreement.

**Inclusion of service as off-cycle crewmember of multi-crewed ship in sea duty for career sea pay (sec. 618)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 305a of title 37, United States Code, to authorize off-cycle crewmembers of multi-crewed ships to be eligible for career sea pay.

**Modification of reenlistment bonus for members of the Selected Reserve (sec. 619)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 308b of title 37, United States Code, to provide the Department of Defense with more flexibility in administering the reenlistment bonus.

The provision would eliminate the 3- and 6-year options currently in law, and require only that the period of reenlistment be at least 3 years. Similarly, the provision would eliminate the tiered bonus structure and require only that the bonus not exceed $15,000.

**Increase in years of commissioned service covered by agreements for nuclear-qualified officers extending periods of active duty (sec. 620)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 312 of title 37, United States Code, to extend the eligibility for the nuclear officer continuation pay from 26 to 30 years of commissioned service.

**Authority to waive 25-year active duty limit for retention bonus for critical military skills with respect to certain members (sec. 621)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 323 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, to waive the 25-year service limitation on eligibility to receive the retention bonus for certain members with designated critical military skills.

**Codification and improvement of authority to pay bonus to encourage members of the Army to refer other persons for enlistment in the Army (sec. 622)**

The committee recommends a provision that would create a new section 331 in title 37, United States Code, that would codify section 645 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended by section 624 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), which authorized a bonus to encourage

Army personnel to refer other persons for enlistment in the Army. The provision would extend the authority for the program to December 31, 2008.

**Authority to pay bonus to encourage Department of Defense personnel to refer other persons for appointment as officers to serve in health professions (sec. 623)**

The committee recommends a provision that would add a new section 331a to title 37, United States Code, that would authorize the payment of up to $2,000, paid in two installments of not more than $1,000, to certain individuals who refer a person to a military recruiter, when such referral leads to an appointment as a commissioned officer in a health profession. The provision would authorize such payments through December 31, 2008.

**Accession bonus for participants in Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance program (sec. 624)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2127 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to pay an accession bonus of not more than $20,000 to participants in the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program (HPSP).

The committee remains concerned that the Army and Navy continue to underfill their HPSP quotas, having failed to achieve recruiting goals in both fiscal years 2005 and 2006. This bonus, in conjunction with existing benefits, is intended to make the HPSP more attractive to prospective medical and dental school students who desire military service.

## Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances

**Payment of expenses of travel to the United States for obstetrical purposes of dependents located in very remote locations outside the United States (sec. 641)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1040 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to pay travel expenses for purposes of childbirth to a location in the United States of a pregnant dependent of a service member assigned to a very remote location outside the United States.

Under current law, payment of travel expenses is authorized for travel to the nearest medical facility in which adequate medical care is available. In many cases, dependents of service members assigned to very remote locations outside the United States are afforded travel expenses to Germany or Japan, but not to the United States where they might receive support from extended family during childbirth.

**Payment of moving expenses for Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps instructors in hard-to-fill positions (sec. 642)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2031 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Depart-

ment of Defense to reimburse moving expenses for certain Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) instructors. The instructor would receive reimbursement from the institution concerned, which would then receive reimbursement from the military department concerned. To be eligible to receive the reimbursement, an instructor must execute a written agreement to serve a minimum of 2 years.

The committee supports the Department's efforts to maximize enrollment and enhance administrative efficiency in the management of the JROTC program. This provision is intended to attract highly qualified instructors to geographically or economically hard-to-fill positions.

## Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits

### Modification of scheme for payment of death gratuity payable with respect to members of the Armed Forces (sec. 651)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1477 of title 10, United States Code, to allow a service member to designate in writing any individual to receive the death gratuity benefit.

The committee believes that service members must receive adequate pre-deployment counseling on survivor benefits, including counseling on the options available to them in order to ensure that their decisions with respect to beneficiaries are well informed and properly recorded. As service members prepare to deploy, their focus may understandably be drawn away from the long-term planning that is necessary to ensure their families are taken care of in the event of serious injury or death. The military departments must focus on providing accurate, timely, and effective pre-deployment counseling.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review pre-deployment counseling and services provided by the military departments to members of the armed forces and to identify best practices among such counseling and services. The committee directs the Secretary to review specifically the counseling and services directed toward unmarried service members with one or more dependent children. The review should include an assessment of counseling and services related to survivor benefits; dependency and indemnity compensation benefits; Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance; traumatic injury protection under section 1980A of title 38, United States Code; the Survivor Benefit Plan; and Social Security benefits. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report on this review to the congressional defense committees by May 1, 2008.

### Annuities for guardians or caretakers of dependent children under Survivor Benefit Plan (sec. 652)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1448 of title 10, United States Code, to allow an unmarried service member with a dependent child or children to elect a guardian or caretaker of that dependent child or children as the beneficiary of the service member's Survivor Benefit Plan annuity.

**Expansion of combat-related special compensation eligibility for chapter 61 military retirees (sec. 653)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1413a of title 10, United States Code, to expand eligibility of combat-related special compensation to all service members eligible for retirement pay who have a combat-related disability, including service members who were retired under chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code.

**Clarification of application of retired pay multiplier percentage to members of the uniformed services with over 30 years of service (sec. 654)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1402 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize, in the case of a member who became a member of the armed services prior to September 8, 1980, and who was recalled to active duty for a period of more than 2 years, recomputation of that member's retirement pay according to the provisions of section 1409 of title 10, United States Code.

The provision would also amend section 6333 of title 10, United States Code, to conform that section to the provisions of section 1409 of title 10, United States Code.

**Commencement of receipt of non-regular service retired pay by members of the Ready Reserve on active Federal status or active duty for significant periods (sec. 655)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 12731 of title 10, United States Code, to reduce the age at which a member of the Ready Reserve could draw retired pay below the age of 60 by 3 months for every aggregate 90 days of active duty performed under certain mobilization authorities. Under this provision, a member of the Ready Reserve could not reduce the age at which they draw retired pay below the age of 50. The provision would apply to service after the date of enactment.

## Subtitle E—Education Benefits

**Tuition assistance for off-duty training or education (sec. 671)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2007 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the authority to pay tuition and related expenses to members of the Ready Reserve, whether enlisted or officer, who agree to serve for 4 years after completion of the education or training for which tuition or expenses are paid. The provision would also authorize the secretaries of the military departments to pay tuition and related expenses of members of the Individual Ready Reserve, in designated military occupational specialties.

**Expansion of Selected Reserve education loan repayment program (sec. 672)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 16301 of title 10, United States Code, to include additional types of loans incurred for educational purposes by members of the

Selected Reserve that would be eligible for repayment by the Department of Defense. The provision would also make both officer and enlisted personnel eligible for loan repayment under this program.

## Subtitle F—Other Matters

### Enhancement of authorities on income replacement payments for Reserves experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for active-duty service (sec. 681)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 910 of title 37, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility criteria for payments under the reserve income replacement program. The provision would change the method for measuring cumulative periods of qualifying service by counting cumulative days, rather than months.

In order to qualify for income replacement payments under current law, a service member must complete 24 out of the previous 60 months. The provision would substitute the equivalent number of days for the number of months in current law. This would correct an inequity affecting reservists who serve a month's worth of days, but who do not actually complete an entire calendar month of service.

The provision would also authorize the continuation of income replacement payments in the case of service members who are retained on active duty to receive authorized medical care or to be evaluated for disability.

### Overseas naturalization of military family members (sec. 682)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 319 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1430), to allow certain permanent-resident spouses and children of members of the armed forces who reside in foreign countries to be naturalized. Under the provision, upon compliance with other requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the spouse or child's physical presence in a foreign country while accompanying the member would be treated as residence in the United States or any State for the purpose of satisfying the continuous presence requirements of the Act.

## Items of Special Interest

### Implementation of limitations on terms of consumer credit extended to service members and dependents

The committee notes the progress of the Department of Defense in drafting rules to implement section 670 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), which provided protections for service members and their dependents against predatory lending. The rules were published on April 11, 2007, in the Federal Register (72 Fed. Reg. 18,157). Eliminating predatory lending is a complex problem, and the committee recognizes the need for sound discretion in ensuring service mem-

bers have access to credit while also ensuring that barriers to predatory lending practices are implemented as Congress intended.

The rules proposed by the Department excluded military installment loans, a form of predatory lending singled out in the Department's "Report on Predatory Lending Practices Directed at Members of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents" of August 9, 2006. The committee expects the Department to carefully consider the risks involved in its approach as it finalizes its rules, to make regulatory changes when appropriate, and to recommend statutory changes when needed to eliminate predatory lending.

The committee is also concerned about the Department's heavy reliance on the States for enforcement in its proposed rules. The committee will look to the Department to monitor enforcement nationally to ensure consistent treatment of service members regardless of where they are stationed. The Department should continue to work with State legislatures to achieve fair and uniform enforcement for the benefit of military personnel and their dependents.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2008 on the Department's implementation of section 670 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), including any recommendations for regulatory or statutory change.

**Survivor Benefit Plan/Dependency and Indemnity Compensation recoupment procedures**

The committee is concerned about reports that many survivors of deceased military personnel are experiencing inadequate service and adverse financial consequences associated with the Defense Finance and Accounting Service's (DFAS) procedures for implementing offsets of Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) annuities and Dependency and Indemnity Compensation (DIC), including refunds of SBP premiums. Survivors have reported extended delays in notification by DFAS of the deduction requirement, resulting in larger than necessary recoupment amounts. Some beneficiaries report receiving virtually no explanation from DFAS of the complicated calculation process for the offset and no statements detailing the deductions recouped versus premiums refunded. They report receiving multiple different recoupment notices, while premium refunds have been processed separately, so that widows first had to pay one or two large recoupment bills and later received large premium refunds, rather than being allowed to deal with much more modest net payments or refunds that would have caused far less disruption to their finances.

Of greatest concern, some beneficiaries report that their inquiries to DFAS have required extended waiting times that led to unhelpful and occasionally rude feedback from representatives who could not answer their specific questions about what was happening to their annuities and why. Many SBP beneficiaries believe they are subjected to an automated and impersonal process that imposes dramatic financial consequences on them at a time when they already are undergoing great emotional and financial stress.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the processes and resources in place for managing the collection of SBP/

DIC recoupments and issuing refunds of SBP premiums. As part of this review, the committee directs the Secretary to survey annuitants who have experienced offsets of their SBP benefits by DIC in order to determine what shortcomings were experienced, what improvements can be made, and to perform an independent evaluation of the adequacy of the system in place for these dependents to receive timely, courteous assistance. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report the results of this study to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2008.

## TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

### Inclusion of TRICARE retail pharmacy program in Federal procurement of pharmaceuticals (sec. 701)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1074g of title 10, United States Code, stating that with respect to any prescription filled on or after October 1, 2007, the TRICARE retail pharmacy network will be covered by the federal pricing limits applicable to covered drugs under section 8126 of title 38, United States Code.

### Surveys on continued viability of TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra (sec. 702)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through 2011 the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to conduct surveys to determine health care and mental health care provider acceptance of the TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra benefit. The provision would require surveys of beneficiaries in addition to surveys of health care and mental health care providers and would require the Secretary of Defense to establish benchmarks for primary and specialty care providers, including mental health care providers, to determine the adequacy of providers available to TRICARE-eligible beneficiaries. The provision would also require the Comptroller General to review the processes, procedures, and analyses used by the Department of Defense (DOD) to determine the adequacy of the number of health care and mental health care providers available to TRICARE-eligible beneficiaries and to submit a report on the results of this review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on a bi-annual basis.

The committee is pleased that DOD surveys in 2005 and 2006 have consistently found a high level of awareness by physicians of the TRICARE program, and relatively high acceptance of new TRICARE Standard patients in many areas. However, the committee believes that DOD needs additional information about the relationship between acceptance of TRICARE and Medicare, as required by section 711 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), to fully assess options for increasing provider participation in TRICARE. The committee remains concerned about reports by military families that mental health services are difficult to access under the TRICARE program.

The committee is also concerned about the availability of TRICARE Standard to members of the Selected Reserve. According to DOD, more than 40 percent of eligible members of the Selected Reserve reside beyond TRICARE Prime service areas in the United States. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on its implementation of the program known as

TRICARE Reserve Select for members of the Selected Reserve, as authorized by section 706 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), with the first report due by March 1, 2008. This report should describe programs and activities to inform members of the Selected Reserve of the option to enroll in TRICARE, the number of enrollees, and the actual DOD costs for implementation of TRICARE for members of the Selected Reserve in fiscal years 2006 and 2007. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to submit additional reports by March 1 of each subsequent year that update the original report and include the projected DOD costs for the TRICARE Reserve Select benefit for the next fiscal year.

## Items of Special Interest

### Comptroller General study of post-deployment health reassessment

The committee commends the Department of Defense for directing the military departments, in March 2005, to conduct a post-deployment reassessment of health status, with a specific emphasis on mental health, between 3 and 6 months after a service member returns from deployment. However, the committee is concerned that there is a need for further evaluation of the effectiveness of this reassessment and its implementation by the military departments. In particular, the committee is concerned about the effectiveness of the web-based Post-Deployment Health Reassessment (PDHRA), and whether the services are consistently providing face to face followup, referrals for further evaluation, and completion by the service members of follow-on evaluations if applicable. The committee is also concerned about the extent to which the PDHRA is included in the Department's quality assurance program for medical tracking, required by section 1074f of title 10, United States Code.

The committee is aware that the Comptroller General intends to include analysis of the PDHRA in ongoing Comptroller General studies to assess compliance by the Department of Defense with requirements in law and policy concerning pre- and post-deployment medical examinations of military personnel who served in Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee directs that the analysis of the PDHRA include members of the active and reserve components and those service members who served in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom and have subsequently separated from military service.

### Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs Joint Executive Council Strategic Plan and Joint Incentive Fund

The committee believes that it is imperative that the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) include in their joint strategic planning process the identification of specific goals, strategies, and initiatives designed to better understand effective ways to diagnose and treat traumatic brain injury and urges the Secretaries of Defense and Veterans Affairs to work together toward this end.

The committee strongly urges the Departments to revise the Joint Strategic Plan and guidelines for the DOD–VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund and to place a priority on programs to improve the diagnosis and treatment of traumatic brain injury. In particular, the Departments should consider a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of using telehealth technology to assess cognitive functioning of members and former members of the armed forces who have sustained head trauma. In addition, the committee recognizes that there is a great need for clinical data on effective treatment approaches for brain-injured patients and strongly urges the Departments to establish a high priority for funding such projects under its Joint Incentive Fund program for fiscal years 2008 through 2010.

**Mental Health Advisory Team IV findings**

The committee commends the Army medical department for conducting a fourth assessment of the mental health and well-being of soldiers and marines in Iraq, the Mental Health Advisory Team (MHAT) IV, and for including, at the request of the Commanding General, Multi-National Force-Iraq, uniquely developed questions addressing attitudes toward the treatment of insurgents and battlefield ethics.

The committee is especially concerned over the MHAT findings that (1) multiple deployments directly correlate with higher levels of acute stress, and that lengthy deployments lead to higher rates of mental health and marital problems; (2) suicide rates for soldiers in Operation Iraqi Freedom from 2003–2006 are 16.1 per 100,000 soldiers versus an Army average of 11.6 per 100,000; (3) approximately 10 percent of soldiers and marines reported mistreating non-combatants, or damaging their property unnecessarily; (4) soldiers who experienced high levels of combat, or screened positive for mental health problems, were nearly twice as likely to mistreat non-combatants; and (5) although the majority of soldiers and marines surveyed reported receiving ethical training, nearly one third reported encountering ethical situations in Iraq in which they did not know how to respond.

The committee urges the Department of Defense to continue to assess the mental health of the force and to explore ways to address mental health issues that arise from military service, including the impact on families. The committee is concerned that extending Army deployments to 15 months while failing to meet necessary dwell times for returning units may exacerbate the mental health issues facing our soldiers and marines. The committee also believes the Department should do more to address the risk of soldiers and marines under combat stress, or who are already at risk for mental health problems, to violate battlefield ethics.

The committee directs the Department of Defense to study and develop a plan to address the MHAT IV findings, and their implications, on all Department policies concerning length and frequency of deployment, and resources needed to address the mental health issues the MHAT IV identified. The committee expects the Department's plan to include specific strategies to improve battlefield ethics and training. The committee directs the Department to report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2008 the re-

sults of this study and its plan to address the MHAT IV findings and recommendations.

The committee notes with great concern that nearly 6 months elapsed from the date of completion of the report, November 17, 2006, until public release of the report's findings on May 4, 2007. During that period, on April 11, 2007, Secretary Gates announced that tours of duty for soldiers serving in Iraq would be extended from 12 to 15 months. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by June 20, 2007 on the extent to which the MHAT IV findings that deployment length was related to higher rates of mental health and marital problems were taken into consideration by the Department in the decision to extend Army tours.

**Reduction in Navy medical personnel and medical efficiency wedge**

The committee is deeply concerned about proposed reductions in Navy military medical end strength. The committee is aware that Navy military end strength is projected to decline in future years by approximately 30,000 personnel. However, the Department of Defense has announced an increase of 22,000 personnel for the Marine Corps. As the Navy medical department will continue to have responsibility for medical care for Navy and Marine Corps personnel and their families, it is essential that the Navy medical military manpower authorization and funding for Navy hospitals be increased to ensure quality health care for the additional marines and their families. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to reevaluate its previous decision to eliminate more than 900 medical billets during fiscal years 2008 through 2012. The same formula used by the Department to calculate reduced requirements for downsizing the Navy should be used to determine new requirements to appropriately fund operation and maintenance for Navy medical treatment facilities and restore up to 900 billets in Navy medical end strength in support of the Marine Corps growth. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees no later than July 1, 2007 on the results of that evaluation.

The committee continues to be very concerned about the Department's policy of reducing Operation and Maintenance funding of military medical treatment facilities by use of an "efficiency wedge." According to the Department of Defense, an efficiency wedge of $486.0 million was assessed against the budgets of military hospitals and clinics for fiscal year 2008. Although the committee agrees that efficiency in health care delivery is desired, it strongly disagrees with an arbitrary reduction of funding for military hospitals and clinics during a time of war. Shortages of equipment, supplies, and personnel in military medicine cannot be alleviated by further funding reductions. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to reassess the validity of the proposed efficiency wedge and any other decrement in funding for fiscal year 2008 and to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by June 30, 2007, on plans to fund military treatment facilities in fiscal year 2008.

**TRICARE program cost sharing increases**

Section 711 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) established a Department of Defense Task Force on the Future of Military Health Care. The task force is required to assess and make recommendations on the beneficiary and Government cost structure required to sustain military health benefits over the long-term. An interim report addressing this issue is required by May 31, 2007.

Section 713 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) required the Comptroller General to conduct audits of Department health care costs and cost saving measures proposed by the President's budget request for fiscal year 2007 in an initiative known as "Sustain the Benefit." The Comptroller General is required to submit a report on the audits conducted under this authority to the congressional defense committees no later than June 1, 2007.

The Department of Defense requested that legislation be included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 that would give the Department broad authority to increase TRICARE program cost sharing amounts for military retirees and their dependents, after first considering the recommendations of the Task Force on the Future of Military Health Care.

During his nomination hearing to become the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs on March 27, 2007, S. Ward Casscells, M.D., acknowledged the concern that "increasing copays and deductibles, particularly at this time, runs the risk of making it harder for us to recruit and retain the very best." Dr. Casscells also stated his belief that "there are other efficiencies which can be sought," such as disease management and prevention.

The committee concluded that this legislative proposal is premature and believes that any increase in TRICARE program cost sharing should be made on the basis of the comprehensive analyses required by Congress and after implementation of efficiencies in the health care program.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to consult with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives on reasonable adjustments in TRICARE program cost sharing following receipt of the final reports required in Public Law 109–364 and following consultation with military beneficiary advocates.

# TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

## Subtitle A—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs

### Substantial savings under multiyear contracts (sec. 801)

The committee recommends a provision that would define the term "substantial savings" for the purposes of authorizing multiyear contracts and require the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on an annual basis on the savings actually achieved under such contracts. The provision would also require the head of the agency seeking the multiyear contract to report to the congressional defense committees, prior to legislative authorization, the specific facts demonstrating that the statutory criteria for entering such a contract have been met.

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

Under the provision recommended by the committee, savings that exceed 10 percent of total anticipated program costs would be considered to be substantial. Savings that exceed 5 percent of total anticipated program costs, but do not exceed 10 percent of such costs could be considered substantial, but only if the agency head makes an exceptionally strong case that the statutory criteria have been met and a multiyear contract is in the interest of the Department and the taxpayers. Savings that do not exceed 5 percent of total anticipated program costs would not qualify as a basis for entering a multiyear contract.

### Changes to Milestone B certifications (sec. 802)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the program manager for a major defense acquisition program (MDAP) that has received Milestone B certification under section 2366a of title 10, United States Code, to immediately notify the milestone decision authority of any changes to the program that are: (a) inconsistent with such certification; or (b) deviate significantly from the material provided to the milestone decision authority in support of such certification. The provision would also require that the milestone decision authority receive a business case analysis prior to making a certification under section 2366a.

Section 2366a prohibits Milestone B approval for an MDAP until the milestone decision authority certifies that the technology in the program has been demonstrated in a relevant environment and certain other key criteria have been met. However, many MDAPs un-

dergo significant changes in technology, funding, or requirements after Milestone B approval. In some cases, such changes could result in the continuation of the program on a basis that would be inconsistent with the certification of the milestone decision authority.

The provision recommended by the committee would ensure that the milestone decision authority is promptly notified of any such changes and is in a position to take appropriate action including, if necessary, withdrawal of the certification or rescission of Milestone B approval.

**Comptroller General report on Department of Defense organization and structure for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 803)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General to report to the congressional defense committees on potential modifications to the organization and structure of the Department of Defense for the acquisition of major weapon systems.

**Investment strategy for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 804)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on Department of Defense organizations, procedures, and approaches for the allocation of funds and other resources under major defense acquisition programs.

The Secretary's report should specifically address the Department's strategy for allocating funds in the cases of joint requirements and requirements that could be met by more than one military department or defense agency. In a March 2007 report, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) recommended that the Department implement an enterprise-wide portfolio management approach to making weapon system investments that integrates the assessment and determination of warfighting needs with available resources and cuts across the services by functional or capability area. The GAO report recommends that the Secretary establish a single point of accountability at the department level with the authority, responsibility, and tools to ensure that portfolio management for weapon system investments is effectively implemented across the Department.

In this regard, the committee notes that the Department has already developed a portfolio management process for certain capability areas, including Joint Command and Control, Joint Net Centric Operations, Battlespace Awareness, and Joint Logistics. In each area, the Department has designated an enterprise-wide capability portfolio manager, who is charged with developing strategic objectives, projected capability mixes, performance metrics, and actions required to meet objectives and mitigate risk. The capability portfolio managers have direct access to the Deputy's Advisory Working Group, the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, and the Defense Acquisition Board. They also provide input to the Concept Decision Tri-chair (which includes the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, the Vice Chairman of

the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation) on capability issues.

The committee urges the Department to consider expanding the portfolio management process to include additional portfolios of joint requirements and requirements that could be met by more than one military department or defense agency. The committee expects the Secretary's report to specifically address GAO's recommendations regarding portfolio management.

### Report on implementation of recommendations on total ownership cost for major weapon systems (sec. 805)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on the extent to which the Department of Defense has implemented the recommendations set forth in the February 2003 report of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) entitled "Setting Requirements Differently Could Reduce Weapon Systems' Total Ownership Costs".

The GAO report states that some major weapon systems, such as the Apache helicopter and the Abrams tank, have experienced costly maintenance problems and low readiness rates, which persisted even after the systems were fielded. The report recommends that the Department address this problem by: incorporating operating and support costs and weapon system readiness rates as key performance parameters in the requirements development process; requiring product developers to establish firm estimates of a weapon system's reliability by no later than the end of the system integration phase; and structuring contracts for major weapon systems so that at Milestone B, the product developer has incentives to ensure that proper trades are made between reliability and performance prior to the production decision.

The GAO report indicates that the Department "partially concurred" with each of these recommendations, but "for the most part, found no further action was needed to lower total ownership cost." The elimination of readiness problems and the reduction of total ownership costs for major weapon systems would yield significant benefits for the Department. Accordingly, the provision recommended by the committee directs the Secretary to report to the congressional defense committees on specific measures taken to implement the GAO recommendations.

## Subtitle B—Amendments Relating to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

### Enhanced competition requirements for task and delivery order contracts (sec. 821)

The committee recommends a provision that would: (1) require that task or delivery order contracts for or on behalf of the Department of Defense (DOD) in excess of $100.0 million be awarded to multiple contractors, with certain exceptions; and (2) establish enhanced competition requirements (including requirements for debriefings and authorization of bid protests) for task or delivery orders in excess of $5.0 million under such multiple award contracts.

At the committee's April 19, 2007 hearing on DOD's management of costs under the Logistics Civil Augmentation Program (LOGCAP) contract in Iraq, Senator Levin asked why the Army had waited 5 years to split the LOGCAP contract among multiple contractors, allowing for the competition of individual task orders. The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics responded: "I don't have a good answer for you." The provision recommended by the committee would ensure that future contracts of this type provide for the competition of task and delivery orders unless there is a compelling reason not to do so.

The committee notes that the enhanced task and delivery order competition requirements in the provision would implement the recommendations of the Acquisition Advisory Panel chartered pursuant to section 1423 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136).

**Clarification of rules regarding the procurement of commercial items (sec. 822)**

The committee recommends a provision that would address recent Inspector General reports regarding the use of questionable commercial item designations to deny the Department of Defense information that it needs to determine price reasonableness for sole-source purchases. The provision would: (1) clarify the circumstances in which a subsystem, component, or spare part for a major weapon system may be purchased as a commercial item; (2) clarify that the terms "general public" and "nongovernmental entity" do not include federal, state, local or foreign governments, or contractors acting on behalf of such governments for the purpose of determining whether an item qualifies as a commercial item; and (3) require the contractor offering a major weapon system, subsystem, component, or spare part as a commercial item to provide information other than certified cost or pricing data that is adequate for evaluating the reasonableness of the proposed price.

**Clarification of rules regarding the procurement of commercial services (sec. 823)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the use of time and materials contracts to purchase commercial services for or on behalf of the Department of Defense (DOD).

Time and materials contracts for commercial services are potentially subject to abuse because the limited information the Department receives under commercial contracts makes it very difficult to ensure that prices are fair and reasonable. Section 1432 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) authorized the following categories of commercial services to be purchased under time and materials contracts: (1) commercial services procured in support of a commercial item; and (2) any other category that is designated by the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) based on a determination that the commercial services in such category are commonly sold to the general public through time and materials contracts and it is in the best interest of the Federal Government to use time and materials contracts for such purchases.

OFPP determined that "a few types of services are sold predominantly on a [time and materials] basis—specifically, emergency repair services." OFPP determined that other categories of commercial services are commonly sold to the general public on a time and materials basis only "when requirements are not sufficiently well understood to complete a well-defined scope of work and risk can be managed by maintaining surveillance of costs and contractor performance." OFPP did not determine that these circumstances commonly occur in sales to the general public. Nonetheless, a final rule was published in the December 12, 2006 Federal Register, designating "all categories of services (i.e., any service) as being available for acquisition on a [time and materials] basis."

The committee concludes that the December 12, 2006 rule exceeds the authority provided by Congress in section 1432. Accordingly, the provision recommended by the committee would authorize the purchase of only the following categories of commercial services under time and materials contracts: (1) services procured in support of commercial items; and (2) emergency repair services. Under the provision, other categories of services may be purchased under time and materials contracts for or on behalf of the Department of Defense only if such contracts are entered in accordance with rules applicable to non-commercial items.

**Modification of competition requirements for purchases from Federal Prison Industries (sec. 824)**

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the competition requirements for Department of Defense (DOD) purchases from Federal Prison Industries (FPI).

Section 2410n of title 10, as added by section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) and amended by section 819 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), gives DOD procurement officials discretion whether to purchase a product from FPI. If DOD officials conclude that an FPI product is not comparable to the best products available from the private sector in terms of price, quality, and time of delivery, the product may be purchased only on a competitive basis.

Despite the enactment of this legislation, FPI officials continue to argue that DOD is required to purchase FPI products on a sole-source basis. The provision recommended by the committee would clarify the competition requirements in section 2410n to ensure that DOD purchases from FPI are made on a competitive basis.

**Five-year extension of authority to carry out certain prototype projects (sec. 825)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 5 years the authority to carry out transactions other than contracts and grants in accordance with section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160).

**Multiyear procurement authority for electricity from renewable energy sources (sec. 826)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into contracts for a period not to ex-

ceed 10 years for the purchase of electricity from sources of renewable energy, as defined in section 203(b)(2) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852(b)(2)).

## Subtitle C—Acquisition Policy and Management

### Joint Requirements Oversight Council (sec. 841)

The committee recommends a provision that would: (1) establish that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) serve as advisors to the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) on matters within their authority and expertise; and (2) require the Secretary of Defense to consult with the JROC on matters relating to program requirements before certifying a program to Congress under section 2433(e)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

### Management structure for the procurement of contract services (sec. 842)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to establish Contract Support Acquisition Centers to serve as executive agents for the acquisition of contract services, should they choose to do so. The provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to accept the transfer of all or part of any organizational unit from another department or agency that is primarily engaged in the acquisition of contract services on behalf of the Department of Defense (DOD) to help staff such centers.

The committee understands that DOD has considered the possibility of accepting transfer of a unit of the Department of the Treasury engaged in the acquisition of contract services on behalf of DOD, but determined that it did not have the legal authority to do so. The provision recommended by the committee would provide the legal authority to accept such a transfer, if DOD determines that it is in the Department's best interest.

### Specification of amounts requested for procurement of contract services (sec. 843)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense to clearly and separately identify in its budget justification materials the amounts requested in each budget account for the procurement of contract services.

### Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund (sec. 844)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish an Acquisition Workforce Development Fund (the "Fund") to ensure that the Department of Defense (DOD) has the workforce capacity, in both personnel and skills, needed to properly perform its mission, provide appropriate oversight of contractor performance, and provide the best value for the expenditure of public resources. The fund would be financed through quarterly remittances by the military departments and de-

fense agencies, based on amounts spent for contract services in the previous fiscal quarter.

Earlier this year, the Acquisition Advisory Panel chartered pursuant to section 1423 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) reported that "curtailed investments in human capital have produced an acquisition workforce that often lacks the training and resources to function effectively." As a result, "The Federal Government does not have the capacity in its current acquisition workforce necessary to meet the demands that have been placed on it." The failure of DOD and other federal agencies to adequately fund the acquisition workforce, the Panel concluded, is "'penny wise and pound foolish,' as it seriously undermines the pursuit of good value for the expenditure of public resources."

During the same period in which the acquisition workforce has been allowed to atrophy, DOD contracts for services have grown without constraint. Over the last 5 years, DOD has almost doubled its spending on service contracts, while the number of procurement personnel available to oversee these contracts has dropped by more than 25 percent. As a result, the Department has become increasingly reliant upon contractors to help manage and oversee the work of other contractors. The provision recommended by the committee would endeavor to reverse this trend by taking money currently spent to hire service contractors and spending it instead to reinvigorate the DOD acquisition workforce.

**Inventories and reviews of contracts for services based on cost or time of performance (sec. 845)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the secretary of each military department and the head of each defense agency to maintain an inventory of activities performed pursuant to contracts for services (other than contracts that provide a fixed price for specific tasks to be performed). Within a reasonable time after an inventory is compiled, the military department or defense agency compiling the inventory would be required to review the inventory and develop a plan to ensure that the activities listed are performed in a manner consistent with the interests of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the taxpayers.

Section 802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) required DOD to conduct spending analyses of its purchases of contract services. As explained in the committee's report on this provision: "[T]he Department has never conducted a comprehensive spending analysis of its services contracts and has made little effort to leverage its buying power, improve the performance of its services contractors, rationalize its supplier base, or otherwise ensure that its dollars are well spent." Five years later, the Department's expenditures for contract services have nearly doubled, but DOD still has not conducted a comprehensive analysis of its spending on these services. The specific criteria and timelines established in this provision for the inventory and review of activities performed by contractors would ensure that such analyses are conducted.

The committee notes that DOD and other federal agencies are already required to maintain inventories of activities performed by

federal employees and to review those inventories and develop plans to conduct public-private competitions for appropriate activities on those lists. The provision recommended by the committee would require the Department to develop a comparable inventory, and conduct a comparable review and planning effort, for activities performed for the Department by service contractors.

### Internal controls for procurements on behalf of the Department of Defense by certain non-defense agencies (sec. 846)

The committee recommends a provision that would: (1) prohibit the Department of Defense (DOD) from making purchases through a non-defense agency unless the head of the other agency certifies that the agency will comply with defense procurement requirements; and (2) require joint reviews to determine whether procurements conducted by non-defense agencies on behalf of DOD have been conducted in compliance with defense procurement requirements.

Section 802 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), and section 817 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) required joint reviews by the DOD Inspector General and the inspectors general of non-defense agencies to determine whether procurements conducted by those agencies were conducted in compliance with defense procurement requirements.

These joint reviews revealed significant deficiencies in interagency procurements conducted by other agencies on DOD's behalf. They also resulted in increased attention to these problems by both DOD and other agencies, leading to a number of improvements. The provision recommended by the committee would require follow-up reviews and certifications, to ensure continued progress in compliance with defense procurement requirements.

## Subtitle D—Department of Defense Contractor Matters

### Protection for contractor employees from reprisal for disclosure of certain information (sec. 861)

The committee recommends a provision that would strengthen the statutory protections available to contractor employees who disclose fraud, waste, and abuse with regard to Department of Defense contracts. The provision would establish a private right of action for contractor employees who are subject to reprisal for their efforts to protect the taxpayers' interests.

### Requirements for defense contractors relating to certain former Department of Defense officials (sec. 862)

The committee recommends a provision that would require contractors that receive defense contracts in excess of $10.0 million, other than contracts for the procurement of commercial items, to report to the Department of Defense on an annual basis on certain former senior Department officials who receive compensation from the contractor.

**Report on contractor ethics programs of major defense contractors (sec. 863)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General to report to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the internal ethics programs of major defense contractors. The report would address the extent to which major defense contractors have internal ethics programs in place, the content of such ethics programs, the extent to which the Department of Defense monitors or approves the programs, and the advantages and disadvantages of legislation requiring the implementation of such programs.

**Report on Department of Defense contracting with contractors or subcontractors employing members of the Selected Reserve (sec. 864)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on contracting with companies who employ members of the Selective Reserve. The report would address: (1) the extent to which companies contracting with the Department of Defense employ members of the Selective Reserve; (2) the extent to which such companies are disadvantaged when members of the Selective Reserve are mobilized as a part of U.S. military operations overseas; and (3) actions that could be taken by the Department to address any such disadvantage.

## Subtitle E—Other Matters

**Contractors performing private security functions in areas of combat operations (sec. 871)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations on the selection, training, equipment, and conduct of personnel performing private security functions in an area of combat operations. The provision would also require that the Federal Acquisition Regulation be revised to ensure that all contractors and subcontractors in a combat area are subject to such regulations.

Section 1205 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) required the Secretary of Defense to issue guidance for contractor personnel who support deployed forces. This requirement was implemented through Department of Defense Instruction 3020.41, "Contractor Personnel Authorized to Accompany the U.S. Armed Forces," dated October 3, 2005. However, section 1205 and DOD Instruction 3020.41 apply only to Department of Defense contractors.

Many contractors perform private security functions in Iraq and elsewhere under contracts or subcontracts with the Department of State, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and other federal agencies. The presence of armed contractor employees on the battlefield can have a direct impact on military operations, regardless of the agency that employs them. Since the beginning of the Iraq war, there have been several reported incidents in which contractor employees have exchanged fire, or threatened to exchange fire, with U.S. forces. Moreover, misconduct by even a few

armed contractor employees may reflect badly on the United States and could undermine the chances of success for military missions.

The provision recommended by the committee would address this problem by ensuring that the Department of Defense and its combatant commanders are in a position to regulate the conduct of all armed contractors in the battlespace, regardless whether they are employed under contracts of the Department of Defense or other federal agencies.

**Enhanced authority to acquire products and services produced in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 872)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a preference for the acquisition of products and services that are produced in Iraq and Afghanistan, if the Secretary determines that: (1) the product or service is to be used by military forces, police, or other security forces in Iraq or Afghanistan; (2) the preference is necessary to provide a stable source of jobs and employment in Iraq or Afghanistan; and (3) the preference will not have an adverse effect on U.S. military operations or the U.S. industrial base.

**Defense Science Board review of Department of Defense policies and procedures for the acquisition of information technology (sec. 873)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to direct a Defense Science Board review of Department of Defense (DOD) policies and procedures for the acquisition of information technology.

The Clinger-Cohen Act (Division E of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106)) and the Paperwork Reduction Act (chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code) form the statutory framework for the management of information resources in the Federal Government. These statutes have not been significantly modified for more than 10 years. In addition, the DOD acquisition and testing regulations for major defense acquisition programs do not always allow for the most effective acquisition of information technology systems. The committee believes that it is appropriate to reexamine these statutes and regulations in light of rapid advances in commercial information technology and evolving Department of Defense requirements.

At the same time, the Department's structure and organization do not always appear to be well-suited to the effective planning and administration of information technology acquisition programs. The committee is particularly concerned about the roles and responsibilities of the acquisition executives and chief information officers of the Department in the acquisition of information technologies that are embedded in weapon systems. The Defense Science Board review should specifically examine the issue of whether the acquisition officials who have overall responsibility for the acquisition of weapons and weapon systems might be better able to develop and implement information technology policies for such weapons and weapon systems than the Department's chief information officers.

The committee is also concerned about future policies and procedures for ensuring information security in commercial microelec-

tronics, software, and networks. While it would be prohibitively expensive for the Department to rely upon defense-unique suppliers to replicate commercially available technologies, there may be some applications for which it is necessary for the Department to develop "trusted" suppliers. The Defense Science Board study should specifically examine the trade-offs between the Department's needs for information security and its continued reliance upon commercial sources for information technology.

### Enhancement and extension of acquisition authority for the unified combatant command for joint warfighting experimentation (sec. 874)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the acquisition authority provided to the U.S. Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) by: (1) providing for both the acquisition and sustainment of equipment; and (2) extending the authority for an additional 2 years.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) requested that JFCOM acquisition authority be made permanent. In April 2007, however, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that shortly after Congress provided JFCOM acquisition authority, the Secretary of Defense created the Joint Rapid Acquisition Cell (JRAC). According to GAO, JRAC and JFCOM acquisition authority may be redundant. By a letter dated April 11, 2007, the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy concurred with the GAO recommendations and agreed to "reassess JFCOM acquisition authority in light of the expanding Joint Rapid Acquisition Cell process."

The provision recommended by the committee would extend JFCOM acquisition authority to ensure that the authority does not expire before DOD completes its reassessment and Congress has an opportunity to consider the results of that reassessment.

### Repeal of requirement for identification of essential military items and military system essential item breakout list (sec. 875)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 813 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), which requires the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report to the congressional defense committees listing essential items, assemblies, and components of military systems and identifying where they are produced.

## Items of Special Interest

### Exceptional circumstance waivers under the Truth in Negotiations Act

Section 817 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) permits the use of an "exceptional circumstances" waiver to the Truth in Negotiations Act (section 2306a of title 10, United States Code) only if the property or services could not reasonably be obtained without the waiver. Under section 817, the Department's belief that sufficient information could be obtained to support the contractor's prices without

complying with the Truth in Negotiations Act is not sufficient to support a waiver.

Earlier this year, the Department of Defense reported that the Navy had exercised an exceptional-circumstances waiver for a multi-year contract, valued at more than $8.0 billion, for the procurement of F/A–18E/F and EA–18G airframes. The report did not indicate that the Navy would not have been able to obtain F–18 air frames without a waiver, as required by section 817. As a result, the Navy failed to obtain cost or pricing data and put itself at risk of paying higher prices on an $8.0 billion contract because of its failure to obtain the most recent and relevant cost and pricing information.

On March 23, 2007, the Director for Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy issued a memorandum addressing exceptional-circumstances waivers under the Truth in Negotiations Act. The memorandum states that "it is DOD policy to apply this waiver authority only to situations where the Government could not otherwise obtain the needed product or service without the waiver." In addition, the memorandum also establishes a schedule of regular meetings within the Department to assist in the early identification of potential waiver issues and to ensure that the policy is applied appropriately.

The committee concludes that the March 23, 2007 memorandum appropriately addresses the use of exceptional-circumstances waivers and, if consistently applied throughout the Department, should preclude the need for further legislation on this issue.

**Guidance on award and incentive fees**

Section 814 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) required the Secretary of Defense to issue regulations linking award and incentive fees to acquisition outcomes.

On April 24, 2007, the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy issued a memorandum for the secretaries of the military departments and directors of the defense agencies requiring that, whenever possible, the Department use objective criteria to measure contract performance. The memorandum establishes specific criteria for linking award fees to performance. The memorandum states that the policies included in the memorandum will be incorporated into the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS).

The committee concludes that the Director's memorandum, together with guidance previously issued by the Department of Defense on award and incentive fees, appropriately reflects the requirements of section 814. Accordingly, the incorporation of the principles reflected in section 814, the Director's memorandum, and previously issued guidance into the DFARS should preclude the need for further legislation on this issue.

**Program manager empowerment and accountability**

Section 853 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) requires the Secretary of Defense to develop a comprehensive strategy for enhanc-

ing the role of Department of Defense program managers in carrying out defense acquisition programs.

Section 853(c) requires that the Secretary issue guidance on, among other things, the authority available to program managers to object to the addition of new program requirements. The statement of managers accompanying the conference report states the conferees' view that the Secretary's guidance should include "the assurance that program requirements will not be modified in a way that would be inconsistent with the business case, the Milestone B decision, and any performance agreement entered without a written determination by a senior Department official that the modifications are necessary in the interest of the national defense" and "program manager authority to make trade-offs between cost, schedule, and performance or to redirect funding within the program, provided that such tradeoffs or redirections of funds are consistent with the parameters established for the program and with applicable requirements of law."

A September 4, 2001 memorandum signed by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development, and Acquisition) states that "Program Managers are responsible for developing budgets that fully fund their programs, and reasonably reflect the projected cost of incorporating necessary contract modifications." The memorandum states that change proposals have introduced unplanned new scope and capability improvements on shipbuilding programs, contributing to unbudgeted cost growth on those programs. The memorandum seeks to address this problem by requiring program managers to reject change orders that would increase program cost, except in narrowly defined circumstances.

The committee believes that this memorandum may serve as a helpful model for the Department of Defense as it implements the requirements of section 853. The committee directs the Secretary to report to the congressional defense committees on how the guidance required by section 853(c) addresses the matters discussed in the memorandum.

**Protection of strategic materials critical to national security**

Section 842 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) modified statutory requirements for the procurement of specialty metals from domestic sources and codified these requirements in a new section 2533b of title 10, United States Code. Section 2533b contained a nonavailability exception to address circumstances in which compliant materials are not available in the required form when and as needed for the national defense.

On January 17, 2007, the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy issued a memorandum implementing the nonavailability exception in section 2533b. The January 17, 2007 memorandum states:

> Several factors can and should be taken into consideration in making a determination that compliant specialty metal is not available. Are compliant parts, assemblies or components available in the required form as and when needed? What are the costs and time delays if requalification of certain parts of the system is required? What will

> be the impact on the program's delivery schedule, program costs and mission needs?

On April 10, 2007, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics applied this exception to make a determination of non-availability of specialty metals in fasteners in certain federal stock classes. The April 10, 2007 determination states:

> [The Defense Contract Management Agency] verified that lead times for compliant material is long, ranging in length from 50 weeks for stainless steel to over 100 weeks for titanium. The lead times for procuring compliant fasteners are similarly lengthy . . . . These delays are impacting the Department's ability to meet requirements.

The committee expects the Department to take advantage of the flexibility provided in section 2533b, including the non-availability exception in that provision, when and as needed to ensure that it can purchase weapon systems and parts in a timely manner for the national defense. For this reason, the committee supports the interpretation of this provision in the January 17, 2007 memorandum of the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy and the application of the exception in the April 10, 2007 determination of non-availability.

**Regulations on excessive pass-through charges**

Section 852 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) required the Secretary of Defense to modify Department of Defense (DOD) regulations to prohibit excessive pass-through charges on contracts or subcontracts that are entered into for or on behalf of the Department.

On April 26, 2007, DOD published an interim regulation in the Federal Register to implement this requirement. The interim regulation: (1) prohibits the payment of excessive pass-through charges; (2) requires contractors to identify in its proposal the percentage of work it intends to perform and the percentage it expects subcontractors to perform; (3) requires the contractor to demonstrate that its charges are consistent with the amount of value-added in any case where the contractor expects subcontractors to perform more than 70 percent of the work on the contract; (4) provides for these requirements to apply at the subcontractor level; and (5) provides for the recovery of excessive pass-through charges in appropriate cases.

The committee concludes that the interim regulation appropriately reflects the requirements of section 852 and, if effectively implemented, should protect DOD against the payment of excessive pass-through charges. The committee notes that the Department received approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to implement this rule until the end of the fiscal year. Should DOD fail to request, or OMB fail to grant, an extension of this approval, further legislation may be required.

# TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

## Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management

### Repeal of limitation on major Department of Defense headquarters activities personnel (sec. 901)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 130a of title 10, United States Code, which imposes a limitation on the number of Department of Defense (DOD) headquarters activities personnel.

Section 130a, which limits the number of DOD headquarters personnel to 85 percent of the number of such personnel as of October 1, 1999, was enacted in section 921 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). Since that time, the events of September 11, 2001 and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have resulted in a doubling of the defense budget and substantial new demands on DOD headquarters personnel.

Because section 130a precludes DOD from meeting these new demands by increasing the number of headquarters personnel, the Department has turned to contractor employees to meet these demands. The administration's legislative proposal notes that section 130a limits the Department's ability to "manage its workforce based upon workload" and ensure that it has "the most cost-effective workforce" to respond to the challenges posed by the current security environment. The committee concludes that section 130a is outdated and should be repealed.

### Chief management officers of the Department of Defense (sec. 902)

The committee recommends a provision that would designate the Deputy Secretary of Defense the Chief Management Officer (CMO) of the Department of Defense (DOD). The provision would also: (1) establish a new position of Under Secretary of Defense for Management (Deputy Chief Management Officer); and (2) designate the under secretaries of the military departments the CMOs of those departments.

The Comptroller General has testified on numerous occasions that DOD is unlikely to successfully address the management challenges facing it without a CMO to lead the effort. In November 2006, the Comptroller General told the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support:

> DOD lacks the sustained leadership at the right level needed to achieve successful and lasting transformation. Due to the complexity and long-term nature of DOD's business transformation efforts, we continue to believe DOD

needs a chief management officer (CMO) to provide sustained leadership and maintain momentum.

Section 907 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) required DOD to provide for one or two independent studies of the feasibility and advisability of establishing a CMO to oversee the Department's business transformation process. In May 2006, the Defense Business Board endorsed the concept of a CMO. In January 2007, the Institute for Defense Analysis (IDA) recommended that the Deputy Secretary of Defense be designated as CMO, with a full-time deputy devoted to management issues. The provision recommended by the committee would take the approach recommended by IDA.

**Modification of background requirement of individuals appointed as Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (sec. 903)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the background requirement for the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to delete the requirement that a nominee have extensive management background "in the private sector." The committee concludes that management experience in the Department of Defense and other federal agencies can be as valuable as management experience in the private sector.

**Department of Defense Board of Actuaries (sec. 904)**

The committee recommends a provision that would consolidate the Department of Defense Retirement Board of Actuaries and the Department of Defense Education Benefits Board of Actuaries into the Department of Defense Board of Actuaries.

**Assistant Secretaries of the military departments for acquisition matters; principal military deputies (sec. 905)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the appointment of a three-star principal military deputy for the service acquisition executive in each of the military departments. The provision would require that the principal military deputy be appointed from among officers who have significant experience in the areas of acquisition and program management and that they keep the respective chiefs of staff informed of the progress of major defense acquisition programs.

At present, the acquisition executives for the Army and the Air Force have military deputies. However, the officers selected to serve in these positions often lack significant experience in the key areas of acquisition and program management. The acquisition executive for the Navy does not have a military deputy.

The appointment of qualified principal military deputies for the service acquisition executives should: (1) strengthen the performance of the service acquisition executives; (2) improve the oversight provided to military officers serving in acquisition commands; and (3) strengthen the acquisition career field in the military.

### Flexible authority for number of Army Deputy Chiefs of Staff and Assistant Chiefs of Staff (sec. 906)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3035(b) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to determine the number of Deputy Chiefs of Staff and Assistant Chiefs of Staff on the Army Staff, not to exceed eight total positions. Current law provides for up to five Deputy Chiefs of Staff and three Assistant Chiefs of Staff.

### Sense of Congress on term of office of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (sec. 907)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that the term of office of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation should be not less than 5 years. The committee believes that this minimum term will strengthen the statutorily intended independence of the position, ensuring adequate operational testing of weapons systems and thereby saving lives and resources.

## Subtitle B—Space Matters

### Space posture review (sec. 921)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, to conduct a comprehensive review of the space posture of the United States. The review would cover a 10-year period beginning February 1, 2009. The Secretary would be required to submit the report on December 1, 2009.

The committee is concerned that most military space capabilities are being modernized simultaneously. All of these modernization programs have exceeded their schedule and cost estimates, some significantly. The growth in and demands on the space budget are occurring at a time when Air Force Space Command is trying to improve its space situational awareness capabilities, and the military and commercial space community in general is concerned about possible threats to space systems. The review in the recommended provision would emphasize the increased focus on space awareness and control activities. In completing the review the committee directs the Secretary and the Director to look at the comparative funding levels for both the space situational awareness and satellite protection programs and the satellite modernization programs.

### Additional report on oversight of acquisition for defense space programs (sec. 922)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the due date for the report on the oversight of defense space acquisition programs required by section 911 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314).

## Subtitle C—Other Matters

### Department of Defense consideration of effect of climate change on Department facilities, capabilities, and missions (sec. 931)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense to assess the risks of projected climate change to the Department's facilities, capabilities, and missions.

### Board of Regents for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (sec. 932)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2113 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to appoint the members of the Board of Regents for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS) without a requirement for the advice and consent of the Senate. The provision would also redesignate the Dean of USUHS as the President of USUHS, consistent with current practice, and would amend section 2114 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the $100 per day limit on per diem for members of the Board of Regents when they perform their duties.

The committee believes that the Board of Regents should play a key advisory role to the Secretary of Defense through the President of USUHS and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs. There is a need for a rapid and flexible process for the identification and appointment of highly qualified civilian experts in fields relating to military medicine and medical education who are willing to voluntarily serve. This requirement would be better accomplished by giving the Secretary of Defense the authority to appoint the members of the Board.

### United States Military Cancer Institute (sec. 933)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a United States Military Cancer Institute in the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. The center would be authorized to establish a data clearinghouse on the incidence of cancer among members and former members of the armed forces, and to conduct research that contributes to early detection or treatment of cancer among military personnel. The committee recognizes that the United States Military Cancer Institute is currently operated and funded by the Department of Defense. In the committee's view, this institution should be authorized in statute in order to ensure its continued viability and service to military members and their families.

### Western Hemisphere Center for Excellence in Human Rights (sec. 934)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a Western Hemisphere Human Rights Center to continue and expand the work begun under U.S. Southern Command's Human Rights Initiative.

The U.S. Southern Command established a human rights policy in 1990, a human rights office in 1995, and began to promote a human rights initiative, "Measuring Progress in Respect for

Human Rights," with the military forces of the nations in its area of responsibility in 1997. By 2002, every Western Hemisphere nation except Cuba had contributed to the initiative's consensus statement that respect for human rights is a fundamental component of a democracy and a precondition for true security. Since then, the ministers of defense of eight Western Hemisphere nations have committed to implement the Human Rights Initiative within their military forces.

The Department of Defense requested this authority. The committee understands that this center would not duplicate any work that the Command or the U.S. Government is already conducting.

**Inclusion of commanders of Western Hemisphere combatant commands in Board of Visitors of Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (sec. 935)**

The Board of Visitors (BOV) of the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC), established in 2001 as mandated by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) includes in its membership the Commander of the U.S. Southern Command, which has responsibility for the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. On October 1, 2002 the United States Northern Command (NORTHCOM) was established. This command has responsibility for the continental United States, Canada, Mexico, and adjoining waters to approximately 500 nautical miles (including Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Cuba, and the Bahamas). NORTHCOM is also responsible for theater security cooperation with Canada and Mexico. Participation by Mexican military personnel in classes at WHINSEC is part of the military-to-military contact between the United States and Mexico, and since NORTHCOM was established, a component of the command's security cooperation with Mexico.

In order to reflect the fact that there are now two geographic commands with responsibility in the Western Hemisphere, the committee recommends a provision that would ensure that all combatant commanders with responsibility for the Western Hemisphere are members of the WHINSEC BOV.

**Comptroller General assessment of proposed reorganization of the office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (sec. 936)**

Last year the committee was informed that the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy had approved a reorganization of his office. In support of his reorganization, the Department of Defense (DOD) requested authority from Congress to establish an additional Assistant Secretary position. In section 901 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), Congress granted this authority. However, the conference report noted the committee's concerns regarding several components of the proposed reorganization.

These concerns included: (1) the role of a global war on terrorism task force that reports directly to the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy; (2) the placement of "Strategic Capabilities" under the Assistant Secretary of Defense (ASD) for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict (SOLIC); (3) the placement of "Forces Trans-

formation and Resources" under the ASD for SOLIC; (4) the very large span of responsibilities for a Deputy ASD (DASD) for "Counternarcotics, Counterproliferation, and Global Threats"; (5) the potential impact on the counternarcotics program execution; (6) the unique placement of both functional and regional issue responsibilities under one ASD for Homeland Defense and Americas' Security Affairs; and (7) the role of the DASD for "Building Partnership Capacity Strategy," relative to a DASD for "Security Cooperation Operations." The committee directed the Secretary of Defense to submit to the defense committees by February 1, 2007, a report on the reorganization.

On February 1, 2007, the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy provided the report mandated by the conferees. Although the report provides additional detail on the background and rationale for the reorganization, it does not fully address the committees' concerns about whether the reorganization will improve oversight of issues within the purview of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, nor does it dispel all of the specific concerns enumerated in the conference report regarding section 901.

On March 26, 2007, the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a briefing on the reorganization, focusing primarily on the impact on the Office of the ASD SOLIC and U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM). The briefing raised further questions regarding whether the Department's policy management of special operations and low intensity conflict activities is currently consistent with the intent, if not the letter, of section 138(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, which mandates the principal duty of the ASD SOLIC.

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Governmental Accountability Office to assess the impact of the reorganization of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. This report should assess:

(1) Whether the reorganization furthers its stated purpose, in the short- and long-term—namely the Department's ability to address current security priorities including the war in Iraq and the global war on terrorism in Afghanistan and elsewhere, the management of geopolitical defense relationships, and to anticipate future strategic shifts;

(2) Whether, and to what extent, the proposed reorganization adheres to generally accepted principles of effective organization such as establishing clear goals, identifying clear lines of authority and accountability, and developing an effective human capital strategy;

(3) The extent to which DOD has developed detailed implementation plans, and the status of the implementation of all aspects of the reorganization;

(4) The extent to which DOD has worked to mitigate congressional concerns and address other challenges that have arisen since the reorganization was announced;

(5) How the Department plans to evaluate progress in achieving the stated goals of the proposed reorganization and what metrics, if any, it has established to assess results;

(6) the impact on the ability of the ASD SOLIC to carry out his/her principal duty as mandated by title 10; and

(7) the impact of the seven issues identified in the conference report for the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Conference Report 109–702).

# TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

## Subtitle A—Financial Matters

### General transfer authority (sec. 1001)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the transfer of up to $5.0 billion of funds authorized in Division A of this Act to unforeseen higher priority needs in accordance with normal reprogramming procedures. This is the amount proposed in the administration's fiscal year 2008 budget request. Transfers of funds between military personnel authorizations would not be counted toward the dollar limitation in this provision.

### Authorization of additional emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2007 (sec. 1002)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional supplemental appropriations for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, and for other purposes, for fiscal year 2007.

### Modification of fiscal year 2007 general transfer authority (sec. 1003)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the transfer authority provided in section 1001 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) by exempting the transfer of funds previously approved by the committee for the training of Iraqi security forces (FY07–07–R PA) and for the Joint Improvised Explosives Defeat Device Fund (FY7–11 PA), and the future transfer of funds to restore the sources used in those two reprogrammings, from the dollar limitation in that provision. The transfers of funds in these reprogrammings were intended to advance funding for these purposes pending the passage of a supplemental appropriations act.

### United States contribution to NATO common-funded budgets in fiscal year 2008 (sec. 1004)

The resolution of ratification for the Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic contained a provision (section 3(2)(c)(ii)) requiring a specific authorization for U.S. payments to the common-funded budgets of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) for each fiscal year, beginning in fiscal year 1999, in which U.S. payments exceed the fiscal year 1998 total. The committee recommends a provision to authorize the U.S. contribution to NATO common-funded budgets for fiscal year 2008, including the use of unexpended balances from prior years.

**Financial management transformation initiative for the Defense Agencies (sec. 1005)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense to carry out an initiative for financial management transformation in the defense agencies.

The Department initiated a Defense Agencies Initiative (DAI) for this purpose in October 2006. The provision recommended by the committee would codify the DAI, to ensure that this effort does not lapse at the end of the current administration.

**Repeal of requirement for two-year budget cycle for the Department of Defense (sec. 1006)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the requirement enacted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986 (Public Law 99–145) for the Department of Defense to submit a biennial budget as part of the President's budget request for even-numbered fiscal years.

While the committee remains supportive of the concept of biennial budgeting and the potential it has to improve congressional oversight, the committee also recognizes that for biennial budgeting to deliver these potential benefits, there must be a comprehensive biennial federal budget process, including biennial budget resolutions and appropriations acts. Although the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives have produced biennial defense authorization bills, most notably in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (Public Law 100–180), no progress has been made on the conversion of the entire federal budget process to biennial budgeting during the two decades since the enactment of this requirement for a biennial defense budget. Under these circumstances the committee believes the existing requirement no longer serves a useful purpose.

**Extension of period for transfer of funds to Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense account (sec. 1007)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend from 2 to 5 fiscal years the length of time by which funds can be transferred back to the "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense" (FCFD) appropriation account to offset losses caused by fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates. This would better align the time frame for the transfer of funds to the FCFD appropriation with the time frames needed for the completion or close-out of contracts and projects.

Section 2779 of title 10, United States Code, authorizes the Department of Defense to transfer funds to the FCFD account to offset losses caused by fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates. Funds previously transferred out of the FCFD account to pay such obligations may be transferred back into the FCFD when those funds are not needed. Unobligated amounts of funds appropriated for operation and maintenance and military personnel also may be transferred to the FCFD account. Current law authorizes the Secretary of Defense to transfer funding for no more than 2 years prior to the current fiscal year.

Projects and contracts may take longer than 2 years to complete. As a result, it may not be possible to determine, with any degree of certainty, that funds previously transferred out of the FCFD account will no longer be needed to meet obligations associated with foreign currency fluctuations. This provision would expand the time frame to 5 years, thus allowing additional time for the completion or close-out of projects and contracts and the identification of funds available for return to the FCFD account.

Similarly, because more than 2 years may be needed to complete contracts and liquidate claims, 2 years may not be sufficient to identify unobligated amounts of funds appropriated for operation and maintenance and military personnel funds that would be available for transfer to the FCFD account. Therefore, this provision would also extend the transfer time frame to 5 years for these funds. This would allow for more certainty in the identification of funds available for transfer and reduce the risk that there will be insufficient funds to cover foreign currency fluctuation requirements.

## Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities

### Expansion of Department of Defense authority to provide support for counter-drug activities to certain additional foreign governments (sec. 1011)

The committee recommends a provision to extend authority to the Department of Defense to provide support to Mexico and the Dominican Republic for their counterdrug activities.

According to the Department of Defense, over 90 percent of the drugs entering the United States come from or via Mexico. Mexican President Felipe Calderon has made fighting the drug cartels and corruption a focus of his administration. The Mexican military lacks the ability to monitor and control air, maritime, and land approaches to Mexico and the security forces need better intelligence-sharing capabilities, among other things.

The Dominican Republic has become, over the last 2 years, a more significant transshipment point for cocaine traveling to the United States from Venezuela. The Dominican security forces lack air, land, and sea mobility, as well as communications and information processing.

The committee, therefore, recommends that counterdrug training and equipment be provided for Mexico and Venezuela under the existing law governing such Department of Defense activities.

## Subtitle C—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations

### Enhancement of authority to pay rewards for assistance in combating terrorism (sec. 1021)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase, for 1 year, the amounts of the monetary rewards that are available to the Department of Defense for assistance in combating terrorism. The maximum reward amount available to the Secretary of Defense or a delegated Under Secretary of Defense would be $5.0 million, and the maximum amount available to combatant commanders would increase to $1.0 million. The Secretary of Defense

would be required to consult with the Secretary of State regarding a reward over $2.0 million.

**Repeal of modification of authorities relating to the use of the Armed Forces in major public emergencies (sec. 1022)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 1076 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) and revive the provisions amended by that section as they were in effect prior to the effective date of that act. Section 1076 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act clarified the Insurrection Act, section 333 of title 10, United States Code; authorized the provision of supplies, services, and equipment necessary for the immediate preservation of life and property under chapter 152 of title 10, United States Code; and amended section 12304(c) of title 10, United States Code, to remove a restriction on the use of the Presidential Selected Reserve Callup Authority in chapter 15 or natural disaster situations.

The intent of section 1076 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act was to clarify and update the so-called Insurrection Act. Section 1076 was never intended to provide additional authority to the President to employ the armed forces inside the United States to restore public order when domestic violence occurred to such an extent that State authorities were not able to enforce the laws and protect the legal rights of its people beyond what existed under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, that were updated. However, concerns have been expressed by governors of the States and others that this provision expanded the President's authority to federalize the National Guard during certain emergencies and disasters. The committee recommends repeal of this provision to allow further examination of this issue.

The committee directs the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves to examine the clarity of section 333 of title 10, United States Code, and the related provisions of law amended by section 1076, as they would be restored by this provision, and assess whether section 1076 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act inadvertently expanded this authority in any way. The Commission should include its findings and any recommendations in its final report to Congress, which is due no later than January 31, 2008.

**Procedures for Combatant Status Review Tribunals; modification of military commission authorities (sec. 1023)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005 (title X of Public Law 109–148) by requiring the Secretary of Defense to conduct Combatant Status Review Tribunals to determine the status of detainees who have been held by the Department of Defense as unlawful enemy combatants for more than 2 years. The provision would establish requirements for the procedures to be used by such tribunals.

In addition, the provision recommended by the committee would amend the Military Commissions Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–366) to clarify: (1) the definition of the term "unlawful enemy combatant";

(2) the rules regarding statements in which the degree of coercion is disputed; and (3) the admissibility of hearsay evidence.

**Gift acceptance authority (sec. 1024)**

The committee recommends a provision that would: (1) make permanent the gift acceptance authority in section 2601(b) of title 10, United States Code; and (2) require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations prohibiting the solicitation of any gift by the Department of Defense (DOD) if the nature or circumstances of the solicitation would compromise the integrity or the appearance of integrity of any DOD program or official.

Section 374 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) added a new subsection (b) to section 2601, authorizing DOD to accept gifts on behalf of wounded members of the military, civilian employees, and their dependents. This authority is scheduled to expire on December 31, 2007. The provision recommended by the committee would make the new gift acceptance authority permanent, while requiring the issuance of regulations regarding the solicitation of gifts to ensure that the authority is not abused.

**Expansion of cooperative agreement authority for management of cultural resources (sec. 1025)**

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that the authority of the Secretary of Defense or the secretary of a military department to enter into a cooperative agreement for the preservation, management, maintenance, and improvement of cultural resources extends to cultural resources located off a military installation, if the cooperative agreement would relieve or eliminate current or anticipated restrictions on military training, testing, or operations.

**Minimum annual purchase amounts for airlift from carriers participating in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (sec. 1026)**

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Department of Defense to guarantee higher minimum levels of business than are currently authorized by law to United States air carriers participating in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF). Awarding sufficient guaranteed amounts of the Department's peacetime business has been an essential method of strengthening the Department's partnership with industry participants in the CRAF program. Opportunities to increase the long-term viability of the CRAF program are possible through low risk increases to guaranteed minimum levels of business. This provision would authorize the Department to guarantee a minimum level of peacetime business for the CRAF participants, based on annual forecast needs, capped at a maximum of 80 percent of the annual average expenditures of peacetime airlift for the prior 5-year period.

**Provision of Air Force support and services to foreign military and state aircraft (sec. 1027)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of the Air Force permanent authority to provide supplies and services to military and state aircraft of a foreign country. Sup-

plies and services would be provided to a foreign country on a reimbursable basis without an advance of funds if similar supplies and services are furnished to U.S. military or other state aircraft by that country. The provision would provide that routine airport services may be provided on a non-reimbursable basis at no cost to the foreign country if providing those services does not result in any direct costs to the Air Force, or the services are provided under an agreement by which the foreign country has agreed to provide on a reciprocal basis routine airport services to U.S. military or other state aircraft without reimbursement. The provision would stipulate that if routine airport services are provided by a working capital fund activity of the Air Force to a foreign country on a non-reimbursable basis under an agreement with that country, the working capital fund activity will be reimbursed for the costs of those services out of Air Force Operation and Maintenance funds.

**Participation in Strategic Airlift Capability Partnership (sec. 1028)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into a multilateral memorandum of understanding authorizing the Strategic Airlift Capability Partnership for the purposes of acquiring, operating, and supporting strategic airlift aircraft. The provision would permit the Secretary of Defense to pay the U.S. share of the costs of the activities and operations of the Partnership from funds available to the Department of Defense for this purpose. The provision provides that the Secretary of Defense, in carrying out the terms of the memorandum of understanding, is authorized to waive reimbursement of the United States for the cost of certain functions performed by Department personnel for the Partnership and waive imposition of surcharges for administrative services provided by the United States that otherwise would be charged to the Partnership. The provision would also authorize the payment of salaries and other expenses of Department personnel assigned to the Partnership without reimbursement or cost sharing for those expenses. The provision provides for the crediting of amounts received by the United States in carrying out the memorandum. The provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer one strategic airlift aircraft to the Strategic Airlift Capability Partnership under the terms and conditions to be agreed to in the memorandum of understanding. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days before transferring a strategic airlift aircraft to the Partnership. The report would include information on the type and tail number of the aircraft to be transferred.

The committee notes the growing strategic airlift requirements of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members and coalition partners, including those resulting from NATO's International Security Assistance Force mission in Afghanistan. The NATO Supreme Allied Commander Europe's Minimum Military Requirements study for the NATO Response Force (NRF) identifies an NRF requirement for the equivalent of eight C–17 aircraft to meet airlift needs. The committee expects the Strategic Airlift Capability

Partnership to give priority to meeting airlift requirements associated with NATO missions.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees evaluating the alternatives for strategic airlift aircraft to be transferred to the Partnership not later than 30 days prior to the transfer of a strategic airlift aircraft under this section. The report should include the extent to which each aircraft would meet the Partnership requirements, and the total cost to the United States Government associated with the transfer of each aircraft. The committee believes that total cost should be determined based on procurement, operating, and support costs. The committee further believes that for aircraft that are excess to United States Transportation Command inventory requirements, procurement costs should be limited to those costs necessary to refurbish and upgrade the aircraft to meet the Partnership's requirements.

The committee notes that establishment of the Strategic Airlift Capability Partnership would require the creation of new organizational structures within NATO. The committee expects to be kept informed on the progress of negotiating and concluding the memorandum of understanding authorized under this provision and any agreement establishing a subsidiary body within NATO to carry out that memorandum.

**Responsibility of the Air Force for fixed-wing support of Army intra-theater logistics (sec. 1029)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to prescribe directives or instructions to provide that the Air Force will be responsible for the missions and functions of fixed-wing support for Army intra-theater logistics.

The budget request included $157.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA, line 1) for buying the Joint Cargo Aircraft (JCA). The budget request also included $42.4 million in PE 41138F for Air Force activities related to joint Live Fire Test and Evaluation (LFT&E) and Initial Operational Test and Evaluation (IOT&E) programs, initiating an Air Force mission equipment integration design/development program, buying test aircraft, and engineering, training, and logistics support studies and analysis. The budget request did not include any funding in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) for the JCA program.

The Army and the Air Force established the JCA program to correct operational shortfalls to cargo mission requirements, provide commonality with other aviation platforms, and replace multiple retiring aircraft systems. In the Senate report accompanying S. 2744 (S. Rept. 109–254) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), the committee noted that the appropriate aircraft mix and the number of intra-theater aircraft assets required for this mission had not been determined and had not been addressed in the Mobility Capabilities Study. The Department of Defense has been conducting an Intra-Theater Lift Capability Study and Force Mix Study to identify the right mix and number of intra-theater aircraft assets required, but has not yet produced any results from those efforts.

Whatever those analyses show, however, the more fundamental question is whether this should be a joint program between the Army and the Air Force, or whether this fixed-wing, intra-theater lift mission should be assigned solely to the Air Force.

The committee has heard frequent anecdotes from Army officials about the lack of logistics support they feel has been provided by the Air Force operating the C–130 aircraft in Iraq and Afghanistan. However, when invited to provide concrete examples that would give substance to the assertions, the Army was not forthcoming. Without concrete examples, there is no way to tell if the perceived shortage of support was due to other Air Force priorities, or whether the Air Force operators were fully engaged in supporting the priorities of the overall ground component commander. If there were a pattern of the joint forces air component commander (JFACC) providing support that did not match the priorities of the joint forces land component commander (JFLCC), that would certainly argue for intervention of the joint forces commander to correct the situation. It would not be a persuasive argument that the JFLCC should have his own air force.

Unfortunately, these arguments have a familiar ring—"I can't count on it in wartime if I don't own it all the time." These were among the loudest arguments against making the reforms included in the Goldwater-Nichols Act.

The committee believes that the Air Force is better positioned to provide this type of support in wartime and in peacetime, and believes that the Army would be better served to focus its scarce resources on those missions and functions for which it is uniquely qualified and which are demonstrably underfunded.

The committee, therefore, recommends this provision, a decrease of $157.0 million in APA, and an increase of $157.0 million in APAF to continue the JCA program in the current schedule.

### Prohibition on sale of parts for F–14 fighter aircraft (sec. 1030)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the sale of F–14 fighter aircraft parts, with an exception for sales to museums or other such organizations involved in restoring F–14 aircraft for historical purposes.

The provision would also prohibit the issuance of any export license for such parts.

## Subtitle D—Reports

### Renewal of submittal of plans for prompt global strike capability (sec. 1041)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 3 fiscal years—2007, 2008, and 2009—the annual report on prompt global strike capabilities required by section 1032 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136).

### Report on threats to the United States from ungoverned areas (sec. 1042)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, to report on the threat posed to the United States by ungoverned areas, especially as they relate to terrorist groups and individuals who aim their activities at the United States and its allies.

The report should describe the intelligence capabilities and the skills that the U.S. Government must have to support U.S. policy aimed at managing these threats, the extent to which the Departments of Defense and State already have these capabilities, and what if anything needs to be done to improve the two departments' capabilities in this area.

The committee notes, on a related subject, that section 1035 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) directed the President to submit a report on improving interagency civil-military support for U.S. national security missions, including peace and stability operations. The report was due on April 1, 2007, but the Senate Committee on Armed Services has not received it.

### Study on national security interagency system (sec. 1043)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into an agreement with an independent, non-profit, non-partisan organization to conduct a study on the national security interagency system.

## Subtitle E—Other Matters

### Revised nuclear posture review (sec. 1061)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to conduct a review of the nuclear posture of the United States for the next 5 to 10 years. The new nuclear posture review (NPR) would be submitted to Congress in December 2009.

The last NPR was conducted at the outset of the Bush administration in December 2001. The committee believes that it is imperative that the next administration clearly articulate its nuclear policy at the outset of its tenure. The new NPR would include a review of the policy objectives with respect to nuclear forces and weapons and include the relationship among United States nuclear deterrence policy, targeting strategy, and arms control objectives. In addition the new NPR would look at the role that missile defense capabilities and conventional strike forces play in determining the size and role of nuclear forces.

The elements in the provision recommended by the committee are identical to the elements that were required to be addressed in the December 2001 NPR. The committee notes that the provision would also direct the Secretary of Defense to submit the new NPR in an unclassified form with a classified annex as necessary. Although the Secretary of Defense was directed to submit the December 2001 NPR in an unclassified form, unfortunately this never happened.

**Termination of Commission on the Implementation of the New Strategic Posture of the United States (sec. 1062)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 1051 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). The provision directed the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to provide for the organization, management, and support of the commission on the implementation of the new strategic posture. The commission was charged with looking at the programmatic requirements of the Department of Defense (DOD) to achieve the goals of the December 2001 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), including the requirements process, and the ability of the current nuclear stockpile to address the evolving strategic threat environment through 2008. The commission's report was originally due on June 30, 2007, and in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) the due date was extended to November 2007.

The DOD has not yet entered into this contract. The committee believes that the intended scope and focus of the report, which are actions of this administration and threats through 2008, the fact that the commission has not yet started its work, and the short time remaining until the term of the commission expires, means that the commission's report would no longer be timely or meaningful. In lieu of this commission the committee has recommended a provision that would direct the next administration to prepare a new NPR. This document will provide forward-looking policy guidance for the actions of the next administration.

**Communications with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives (sec. 1063)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require that the organizations within the U.S. intelligence community provide timely responses to requests by the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives for intelligence assessments, reports, estimates, legal opinions, and other information. The provision would also require that intelligence officials be able to provide testimony before the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives without having to seek approval or clearance of such testimony as a way of ensuring that Congress receives the independent views of such officials.

**Repeal of standards for disqualification from issuance of security clearances by the Department of Defense (sec. 1064)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 986 of title 10, United States Code, which establishes mandatory standards for the disqualification of individuals from the issuance of security clearances. The Department of Defense requested the repeal of this provision on the basis that the mandatory standards "unduly limit the ability of the Department to manage its security clearance program and may create unwarranted hardships for individuals who have rehabilitated themselves as productive and trustworthy citizens."

**Advisory panel on Department of Defense capabilities for support of civil authorities after certain incidents (sec. 1065)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish an advisory panel to carry out a 12 month assessment of the capabilities of the Department of Defense to provide support to civil authorities in the event of a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or high-yield explosive (CBRNE) incident.

The committee notes that although the Department has met the U.S. Northern Command requirements for forces to be made available to support civil authorities should a domestic CBRNE incident occur, the Department acknowledges that it has become increasingly difficult to meet all expected requirements because of the high pace of current military operations overseas. These operations may include the forces that would be directed to support civil authorities for CBRNE incidents. In addition, the Government Accountability Office recently reported that even though 12 of the 15 National Planning Scenarios issued by the Homeland Security Council involve CBRNE response, the ability of Army chemical and biological units, especially National Guard and reserve units, to concurrently perform both their original warfighting mission and their homeland defense mission is doubtful.

**Sense of Congress on the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (sec. 1066)**

The committee recommends a provision that expresses the sense of Congress that the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC) is an invaluable training and education facility.

WHINSEC was established in 2001 by the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) to provide training and education for eligible military personnel, law enforcement officials, and civilians from the United States and other nations of the Western Hemisphere. The primary language of instruction is Spanish, which makes the institute potentially accessible to a broader group of officials in Latin America and the Caribbean than most other U.S. professional military education institutions. The institute supports military-to-military and political-military relations between the United States and the governments of the Western Hemisphere, which today, with the exception of Cuba, are all democratic. The new institute, established when the School of the Americas closed in December 2000, incorporates issues of human rights and democracy in its curriculum, and has a Board of Visitors providing oversight, as mandated by the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398).

**Technical amendments to title 10, United States Code, arising from enactment of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (sec. 1067)**

The committee recommends a provision that would make technical amendments to title 10, United States Code, to reflect

changes made in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004.

**Establishment of National Foreign Language Coordination Council (sec. 1068)**

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a National Foreign Language Coordination Council to develop and monitor the implementation of a comprehensive national foreign language strategy. The strategy shall include: (1) an identification of priorities to expand foreign language skills in the public and private sectors; (2) recommendations for improving coordination of foreign language programs and activities among federal agencies, enhancing foreign language programs and activities, and allocating resources appropriately to maximize the use of resources; (3) effective ways to increase public awareness of the need for foreign language skills and career paths in the public and private sectors that can employ those skills; (4) recommendations for incentives for developing related educational programs, including foreign language teacher training; and (5) effective ways to coordinate public and private sector efforts to provide foreign language instruction and acquire foreign language and area expertise. The Council shall prepare and transmit the strategy to the President and the relevant committees of Congress not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

The committee recognizes that deficits in foreign language and regional expertise undermine U.S. national security. On January 5, 2006, the President launched the National Security Language Initiative (NSLI) to increase the number of Americans learning critical foreign languages through new and expanded programs from kindergarten through university and into the workforce. The committee acknowledges that the NSLI is a positive step toward immediately expanding critical foreign language skills to strengthen national security. However, the committee believes that a longer-term strategic effort is needed to increase language and cultural competency in the United States, and that NSLI needs to be administered by a formalized council in order to ensure continued progress.

**Qualifications for public aircraft status of aircraft under contract with the Armed Forces (sec. 1069)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of Defense the flexibility to determine whether an operational support mission can be conducted as a civil operation in compliance with the Federal Aviation Regulations. The applicable part of the current definition of public aircraft under section 40102 of title 49, United States Code, would be expanded to include such operational missions. These could include flights involving activities such as parachute training, carriage of sling loads, or target towing.

The provision would also amend section 40125 of title 49, United States Code, to reference such missions. The Secretary of Defense currently has the authority to determine when chartered transportation is a civil or public aircraft operation through a designation under section 40125(c)(1)(C).

With adoption of this provision, the Secretary of Defense would have the same authority regarding operational support missions. If the Secretary were not to designate an aircraft chartered to provide operational support as being in the national interest (and thus a public aircraft operation), such operation would be a civil operation and would have to comply with applicable Federal Aviation Administration civil safety regulations.

## Items of Special Interest

### Certification of no pecuniary interest

The committee notes that the Legislative Transparency and Accountability Act of 2007 (S. 1) would require a Senator who requests an earmark to certify that neither the Senator (nor his spouse) has a pecuniary interest in such earmark in violation of Senate Rule XXXVII(4). Although S. 1 has not yet been enacted, the committee has requested that each member requesting funds in this bill provide the certification that would be required by S. 1. The committee has received the requested certification from each Senator requesting funding for a program, project, or activity that is provided in this bill.

The committee takes no position as to which of these items, if any, constitute earmarks under the definition in S. 1 or any other definition. The committee directs the Department of Defense to use all applicable competitive, merit-based procedures in the award of any new contract, grant, or other agreement entered into with funds authorized to be appropriated by this bill. No provision in the bill or report shall be construed to direct funds to any particular location or entity unless the provision expressly so provides.

### Intelligence community operations

In March 2005, and April 2006, respectively, the Department of Defense (DOD) established the Joint Functional Component Command for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (JFCC–ISR) and the Defense Joint Intelligence Operations Center (DJIOC). These organizations are co-located at the Defense Intelligence Agency's (DIA) headquarters and are becoming highly integrated. Together they serve as a "J–3" (operations) for DOD intelligence. They perform collection management, asset allocation, situational awareness, intelligence campaign planning, assessments of intelligence operations, tasking, and coordination with the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) and other elements of the U.S. Government.

The capabilities of these organizations appear to be maturing rapidly, but there is a major impediment to the full realization of their potential: the lack of any similar organization under the DNI. The DNI has tasking authority by law and executive order for both collection and analysis of national intelligence, but has limited and fragmented resources for exercising this vital role.

As a result of intelligence reforms since 9/11, the DNI has established additional community centers and a series of "mission managers" to focus resources on specific missions or targets and to integrate activities and capabilities across the intelligence agencies and disciplines (e.g., signals intelligence, human intelligence, and im-

agery intelligence). However, there does not appear to be a structure or a process for allocating scarce resources among these joint entities. Analysis and collection similarly only come together at the level of the DNI himself. Single-discipline tasking organizations are located within individual agencies, and in some cases are further fragmented.

The Commander of United States Strategic Command (STRATCOM) has expressed concern that the absence of a coherent and integrated operations structure on the DNI side makes the job of the DJIOC and JFCC–ISR more difficult.

The DNI now has representation at the DJIOC, and his staff is gaining an understanding of the value of such structures and the role they are playing. However, much more needs to be done to enable the national intelligence community to operate more efficiently, effectively, and jointly, both across the national intelligence community and with the Department of Defense.

The committee requests that the DNI, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and the Commander of STRATCOM, examine ways to enhance the effectiveness of the DNI's tasking authorities by creating a joint operations organization that centralizes and integrates community tasking operations, resource allocations, situational awareness, collection management, and crisis response. This operations organization could build on the DOD DJIOC/JFCC–ISR model and organization. The committee requests that a summary of the DNI's conclusions on this matter be provided to the congressional defense and intelligence oversight committees by January 15, 2008.

**Language and cultural awareness initiatives review**

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities received testimony which highlighted the growing need for our operational forces to have improved language and cultural awareness capabilities. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has undertaken a set of high level studies on this issue, including through the Defense Science Board, and established initiatives in this area—including the Defense Language Roadmap and a number of training and technology development programs. The committee is supportive of these efforts in general and believes that a combination of training and education and research and technology will have the best chance of producing deployable forces with the requisite language and cultural awareness skills. The committee remains concerned that the Department's efforts are not as effective as they could be and may be underresourced.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General to review Department plans for the development of language and cultural awareness capabilities and report to the congressional defense committees no later than December 31, 2008. The review should include an assessment of Department long- and short-term programs and plans; funding allocations; establishment and use of metrics for success; and plans for training, acquisition, and research programs to address needs in current operations. The review should examine the consistency of Department efforts with high level vision and mission statements and validated require-

ments, as well as recommendations by major independent studies of the Department's language and cultural awareness capabilities.

**Nuclear cruise missiles**

In fiscal year 2007 the Department of Defense decided to retire the Air Force's Advance Cruise Missile (ACM) and a portion of the Air-Launched Cruise Missiles (ALCM). These are two of three types of cruise missiles that carry the same nuclear warhead. The third nuclear cruise missile is the Navy's nuclear Tomahawk (TLAM–N). The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the remaining nuclear cruise missiles and submit a plan with a time line to retire these remaining missiles. The plan should be submitted with the budget request for fiscal year 2009.

**Reporting and remediation of Anti-Deficiency Act violations**

On January 17, 2007, the Acting Inspector General of the Department of Defense (DOD) testified before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support that his office had identified 107 potential Anti-Deficiency Act (ADA) violations in DOD contracting through four non-defense agencies. As of the date of the hearing, a follow-up audit of DOD contracting through the Department of the Interior had identified at least 250 additional potential ADA violations, 189 of which occurred after officials had been warned against the continued use of expired funds.

The committee is concerned about the volume of potential ADA violations in these interagency transactions, the pace and transparency of investigations of these potential violations, and the procedures used to elevate findings of initial investigations. For example, the committee understands that the preliminary investigation of a potential violation may be carried out by personnel within the organizational unit responsible for the violation.

The committee directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review DOD procedures for identifying, reporting, preventing, and investigating potential ADA violations, including: (1) the adequacy of current procedures utilized for preliminary and formal investigations of potential ADA violations; (2) the transparency both inside and outside DOD of the investigation process; (3) the independence and qualifications of personnel utilized at each stage of an investigation of potential ADA violations; (4) the timeliness of investigations of potential ADA violations; (5) the adequacy of ADA training provided to the Department's military and civilian personnel; (6) the effectiveness of existing measures for the prevention of ADA violations; and (7) the use and adequacy of available disciplinary measures for ADA violations. The committee expects GAO to report its findings and recommendations to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**Ship disposal**

Section 231 of title 10, United States Code, requires that the Secretary of Defense submit an annual report on the long-range plan for Navy shipbuilding. This naval vessel construction plan is to include a description of the necessary naval vessel force structure to meet the requirements of the national security strategy of the

United States. The "Annual Long-Range Plan for Construction of Naval Vessels" report to Congress submitted with the President's budget request for fiscal year 2008, describes the Department of the Navy's requirements for a force of "about 313 ships." The report identifies that the Navy will experience shortfalls to expeditionary warfare, aircraft carrier, attack submarine, and surface combatant ship classes for various durations throughout the 30-year period of the long-range plan.

Section 7308 of title 10, United States Code, requires the Chief of Naval Operations to certify, prior to disposal of a combatant vessel of the Navy, that the combatant vessel to be disposed is not essential to the defense of the United States. In calendar year 2006, the Navy conducted sinking exercises on two recently-decommissioned major combatant ships, the ex-*Valley Forge* (CG–50) and the ex-*Belleau Wood* (LHA–3). The decision for decommissioning these ships reflected the Navy's determination that the operating and support cost for maintaining these ships in the active fleet could not be justified based on their respective contributions to national security requirements. However, the Navy's decision to sink these ships, each with relatively significant remaining service life and measurable mission relevance, while older and less relevant combatant ships are maintained as mobilization assets, raises concerns regarding the decision process used to manage the Navy's inactive ships.

In view of these concerns, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to include, as an addendum to the annual report on the construction of naval vessels, commencing with submission of the report for fiscal year 2009, the future-years defense program for the Navy's inactive ships. The addendum shall address: (i) hull numbers of ships that are to be disposed by dismantling or sinking within the future-years defense plan; (ii) hull numbers of ships that are to be decommissioned within the future-years defense program; (iii) gaps in capability that will occur upon the decommissioning of each ship, including duration of that capability gap; and (iv) disposition proposed for each ship upon decommissioning.

In view of the Navy's current inability to meet amphibious lift requirements in support of the Marine Corps, the committee directs the Navy to maintain decommissioned LHA–1 class amphibious assault ships in a reduced operating status until such time that the active fleet can deliver 2.0 Marine Expeditionary Brigade forcible entry lift capability in response to a national emergency. Total forcible lift entry capability shall be assessed under the assumption that no less than 10 percent of the force will be unavailable due to extended duration maintenance availabilities.

**Transparency of earmarks for additional funding**

The committee notes that section 2304(k) of title 10, United States Code, states that it is the policy of Congress that any new contract for a program, project, or technology identified in legislation be entered into through merit-based selection procedures. Section 2374 of title 10, United States Code, establishes the same policy for the award of any new grant for research, development, test, or evaluation to a non-federal entity. Under each statute, the presumption in favor of competitive, merit-based awards may only be

overcome by a provision of law that specifically refers to section 2304 or section 2374, that specifically identifies the particular non-Federal Government entity involved, and that specifically states that award to the entity is required notwithstanding the policy favoring merit-based selection.

Although the statutory policy requiring the Department of Defense to use merit-based selection processes and the presumption in favor of competitive awards for new contracts and grants date from 1989 and 1994, respectively, these statutes have done little to stem the growing number of earmarked projects requested by Congress since their enactment. Moreover, these statutes do not address a common form of earmark, which is additional funding for existing procurement or research and development programs beyond what was requested in the President's budget or included on the unfunded priorities lists of the military services.

Therefore, the policy of this committee shall be one of disclosure of additional funding for projects and items that were not requested in the President's budget, in supplemental requests for emergency funding, or on the unfunded priorities lists of the military services that are included in the bill and conference report. Disclosure shall not be required for additional funding that is consistent with the criteria for additional funding for military construction projects in section 2856 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337) or for additional funding directed to pay, bonuses, pensions, or other personnel or health care benefits for service members or that have a direct benefit for service members' families. Information on such additional funding shall be provided in the committee report on the bill and in the conference report, by electronic means easily accessible by the public, and shall include, if applicable: the budget account, a description of the project or item, the authorized amount, and the name of the requesting member for any funding included in the bill as reported by the committee, or agreed to by the conferees. Such information shall be made available to the general public in an electronically searchable format at least 48 hours before consideration of the bill or conference report.

The information provided in this report does not include the intended location or intended recipient of such additional funding because the committee does not have a complete database of that information at this time. It is the committee's intent to collect such information from members and to provide it with regard to items funded in the conference report on this Act and for future years' National Defense Authorization Acts.

By collecting and reporting information on the locations and recipients intended by requesting members, the committee does not intend in any way to require that funding be directed to such locations or entities. The committee intends that the Department comply with all applicable competitive and merit-based procedures.

## TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

### Compensation for Federal wage system employees for certain travel hours (sec. 1101)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 5544(a) of title 5, United States Code, to authorize compensation of federal wage system employees for hours spent traveling while returning from an event that cannot be scheduled or controlled administratively. Under current law, these employees can be compensated for time spent traveling to the event, but not for the return because return travel can be scheduled.

### Retirement service credit for service as cadet or midshipman at a military service academy (sec. 1102)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 8331(13) and 8401(31) of title 5, United States Code, to clarify an existing practice of awarding retirement service credit for time in service as a cadet or midshipman at a military service academy.

### Continuation of life insurance coverage for Federal employees called to active duty (sec. 1103)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 8706(b) of title 5, United States Code, to authorize federal civilian employees who are members of a reserve component of the armed forces called or ordered to active duty to continue coverage under Federal Employees Group Life Insurance for a period not to exceed 24 months.

### Department of Defense National Security Personnel System (sec. 1104)

The committee recommends a provision that would revise the National Security Personnel System (NSPS) authorized by section 1101 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) by: (1) excluding wage-grade employees of the Department of Defense from NSPS; (2) accelerating by 2 years the expiration of the Department's authority to modify statutory labor relations requirements; and (3) clarifying the treatment of rates of pay established or adjusted in accordance with the requirements of the statute.

### Authority to waive limitation on premium pay for Federal civilian employees working overseas under areas of United States Central Command (sec. 1105)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the head of an executive agency to waive limitations on total compensation to an employee who performs certain work while in an overseas location within the area of responsibility of the Commander of the United States Central Command. The total com-

pensation payable to an employee pursuant to such a waiver would be limited to $212,100 per calendar year.

### Authority for inclusion of certain Office of Defense Research and Engineering positions in experimental personnel program for scientific and technical personnel (sec. 1106)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Director of Defense Research and Engineering (DDR&E) to utilize more flexible hiring practices to recruit and retain high quality scientific talent. The committee notes that this authority has been used very successfully by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to preserve a world-class technical government workforce. The committee notes that the Defense Science Board (DSB) in its study entitled "Roles and Authorities of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering" noted that its "serious concern . . . about DDR&E being able to fulfill its responsibilities stems . . . from the thinness of the staff." The DSB recommended fostering "an initiative to improve the technical competence and industrial management experience of the leadership and staff in the office . . .," and recommended that this could be accomplished by using the authority created by the recommended provision, as well as other mechanisms.

## Items of Special Interest

### Increase in authorized number of employees in the Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service

Section 1102 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) required the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategic plan to shape and improve the senior management, functional, and technical workforce of the Department of Defense (DOD), including persons serving in the Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service (DISES). The provision required DOD to submit a report on this strategic plan to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2007. The required report has not yet been provided.

The DOD legislative proposal for fiscal year 2008 included a provision that would increase by 100 the number of DISES billets. The requested legislation was justified by the observation that civilian personnel levels in the defense intelligence components have increased substantially since September 11, 2001, while the number of DISES billets has not.

The assertion that the ratio between DISES billets and overall civilian employment numbers should be closer to former levels is not alone sufficient to justify the increase. The committee notes that the ratio of DISES billets to civilian employees on September 11 may not be the appropriate benchmark. The increase in civilian employment in the defense intelligence components since September 11 followed a decade of decline in such employment, but DOD has provided no figures about ratios between DISES billets and civilian employment during that period.

In addition, there is a wide variation across the intelligence components in the ratio of DISES billets to civilian employees. The Na-

tional Geospatial Intelligence Agency (NGA) and the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), with civilian populations comparable to that of the National Security Agency, have only two-thirds the number of DISES that NSA does. NSA has a far higher percentage of DISES than any other component, and yet would receive a majority of the additional billets requested by DOD.

Moreover, civilian employment has increased throughout DOD since September 11, 2001. The number of contractor employees performing functions that have previously been performed by federal employees has increased even more dramatically. Yet, DOD has not proposed any significant increase in the number of senior executive personnel outside the intelligence community. The committee believes that any increase in the senior management, functional, and technical workforce of the Department should be made on the basis of sound data and strategic planning, not on a piecemeal basis with limited data.

Accordingly, the committee concludes that it would be premature to approve the Department's request for additional DISES billets until the Department: (1) provides the strategic plan required by section 1102; (2) presents a comprehensive proposal that addresses the need for senior personnel across the entire Department, rather than addressing the needs of a single community; and (3) justifies the proposed allocation of DISES billets within the intelligence community.

**Recruitment, hiring, and retention of Department of Defense civilian medical personnel and faculty and staff of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences**

The committee recognizes that the total force capability of military medicine is a combination of uniformed medical personnel needed for medical readiness, government civilian health care providers, and civilian providers under Department of Defense contracts. Military hospital staff at numerous locations report that their goal of hiring government civilian employees whenever possible is frequently frustrated by low salaries and antiquated hiring procedures. For example, one Navy facility reported that, while waiting more than 7 months for approval to hire a civilian medical professional, qualified candidates sought private sector employment elsewhere. This pattern, which is repeated throughout military hospitals in the United States, hurts military medical readiness and compounds shortfalls in uniformed medical personnel. The committee is concerned that in many cases, hospital commanders are not aware of the civilian hiring tools available to them. The committee commends the Office of Personnel Management for promptly responding to the Department's request for direct hiring authority for certain positions at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, but believes that the need for such authority is greater than one facility.

The committee is also concerned by reports that the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS) is experiencing significant challenges in recruitment and retention of high quality faculty and staff because of a cap on civilian salaries. The committee believes that recruitment and retention of high quality faculty and staff for USUHS is essential to ensure that future mili-

tary physicians are adequately prepared to provide quality medical care and services for military members and their families, in peacetime and in war.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director, Office of Personnel Management, to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than September 15, 2007, on all hiring authorities currently available to the Department of Defense for the hiring of government civilian medical personnel and faculty and staff for USUHS. The report should identify specific salary, allowance, and bonus levels that can be offered for each skill level and provide an analysis of the appropriateness of such compensation levels when compared to compensation offered by the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Health and Human Services, and private sector employers. In particular, the report should address the appropriateness of amounts available for physicians comparability allowances under section 5948 of title 5, United States Code, and whether expansion of such allowance to additional categories of health care professionals and to faculty and staff at USUHS would be beneficial to the Department of Defense. The report should include an analysis of hiring challenges at USUHS, its impact on the mission of the University, how USUHS salary caps compare to other federal agency salaries for medical faculty and staff, and recommendations for addressing the recruiting and retention challenges USUHS is experiencing. The report should assess whether additional direct hiring authority for certain medical and related positions is needed and include a plan to inform medical leadership and human resource personnel in the military departments of all available hiring authorities and best practices in efficient hiring of civilian medical personnel.

# TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

## Subtitle A—Assistance and Training

### Authority to equip and train foreign personnel to assist in accounting for missing United States personnel (sec. 1201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to equip and train foreign personnel to assist in the recovery of, and accounting for, missing U.S. personnel.

The U.S. Pacific Command's Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command (JPAC) is an operational agency responsible for worldwide research, investigation, evacuations, and remains identifications relating to those unaccounted for from past conflicts. Since 2001, JPAC has identified the remains of over 400 missing service members from previous conflicts. Of the approximately 88,000 missing from World War II to Vietnam, about 19,000 can be recovered. In some instances, foreign governments will not allow U.S. personnel to conduct recovery and identification missions on their territory. In these cases, foreign nations are asked by the United States to assist in recovery and accounting efforts, provided the nations have trained and equipped personnel.

No more than $1.0 million in assistance may be provided per fiscal year for this purpose.

### Extension and enhancement of authority for security and stabilization assistance (sec. 1202)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend and enhance the authority for security and stabilization assistance provided under section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). That section authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide the Secretary of State with services, defense articles, or funding to facilitate the provision by the Secretary of State of reconstruction, security, or stabilization assistance to a foreign country.

The provision recommended by the committee would extend the authority of section 1207 for 1 year until September 30, 2008, and increase the aggregate value of all services, defense articles, and funds that may be provided or transferred under this section to $200.0 million. The provision would also add a requirement for the Secretary of State to coordinate with the Secretary of Defense in the formulation and implementation of assistance programs that involve the provision of services or transfer of defense articles or funds under the authority of this section.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has the authority to build the capacity of partner nations' military forces under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended by section 1206 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). Section 1206 authorizes the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to use up to $300.0 million of Operation and Maintenance funds to conduct or support a program to build the capacity of foreign nations' military forces to conduct counterterrorism operations or to participate in or support military or stability operations in which the United States is a participant.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has stated a need to build the capacity of foreign security forces other than military forces, such as gendarmerie, constabulary, and internal defense forces. The committee notes that the Department of State has existing authority to provide assistance for these purposes. To date, the Department of Defense and the Department of State have failed to coordinate in using the authority provided in section 1207 except in a limited number of programs. The committee believes that assistance for foreign countries to build the capacity of their security forces other than military forces could be facilitated by the authorities provided in section 1207, and encourages the Department of Defense and Department of State to improve coordination between the departments to use this authority more effectively in the future.

The committee notes that the authorities of sections 1206 and 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 were provided in the spirit of a pilot program. Consistent with the statement of managers accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, the committee intends to review the implementation of these authorities carefully to determine whether, and if so, in what manner, to reauthorize these or provide other authorities at the conclusion of the pilot program.

The committee stresses that an important factor in its consideration of these matters will be the report required by subsection 1206(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. That report addresses recommended changes, if any, to current laws governing the provision of capacity building assistance; any organizational or procedural changes required to improve the conduct of such assistance programs; and the resources and funding mechanisms required to adequately fund such programs. The committee emphasizes that this report is overdue and directs that it be provided expeditiously.

**Commanders' Emergency Response Program (sec. 1203)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use up to $977,441,000 in Operation and Maintenance funding in fiscal year 2008 for the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP), under which commanders in Iraq receive funds for use in small humanitarian and reconstruction projects in their areas of responsibility that provide immediate assistance to the Iraqi people, and for a similar program in Afghanistan. The provision would require the Secretary to provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the source, allocation, and use of funds pursuant to this authority. The com-

mittee expects the quarterly reports to include detailed information regarding the amount of funds spent, the recipients of the funds, and the specific purposes for which the funds were used.

The committee directs that funds made available pursuant to this authority be used in a manner consistent with the CERP guidance issued by the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) in a memorandum dated February 18, 2005. This guidance directs that CERP funds be used to assist the Iraqi and Afghan people in the following representative areas: water and sanitation; food production and distribution; agriculture; electricity; healthcare; education; telecommunications; economic, financial and management improvements; transportation; irrigation; rule of law and governance; civic cleanup activities; civic support vehicles; repair of civic and cultural facilities; and other urgent humanitarian or reconstruction projects. The provision would require the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees any modification to the February 18, 2005, guidance.

**Government Accountability Office report on Global Peace Operations Initiative (sec. 1204)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Government Accountability Office, not later than March 1, 2008, to examine the President's Global Peace Operation Initiative (GPOI). The report would include an assessment of whether, and to what extent, the initiative has met the goals set by the President at the inception of the program in 2004, and recommendations as to any additional measures that could be taken to enhance the program in terms of: (1) achieving its stated goals; and (2) ensuring that GPOI-trained individuals and units are regularly participating in peace operations.

The GPOI is a 5-year presidential initiative that was unveiled at the June 2004 G–8 summit at Sea Island, Georgia and is aimed at increasing the number of capable peacekeepers and stability police units, to develop means to help countries deploy to peace operations. The goal was to train, over 5 years, 75,000 personnel from various countries—initially focused on Africa. At its inception, the committee was informed that for each year about 10 battalions would be trained in Africa and about five in the Western Hemisphere, Europe, and Asia. Follow-on training to maintain skills would also be planned, a new transportation and logistics support arrangement would be created, and a constabulary training center would be established. Fifty-six to seventy percent of the funding would come from non-U.S. international resources, solicited via the G–8.

In 2005 the existing African Contingency Operations Training and Assistance (ACOTA) program (a successor program to the African Crisis Response Initiative, or ACRI) was subsumed into GPOI and the Italian Government established an international training center—the Center of Excellence for Stability Police Units—in Vincenza, Italy. As of December 2006, about 15,000 peacekeepers had been trained under the program, and according to the Department of State about 21,000 have been trained as of April 2007. An additional 54,000 must be trained by the end of 2009, when authority for the program will expire.

It is unclear whether the readiness of these troops is being monitored or maintained. No depot for caching equipment has been established, though this was a program objective and there is no transportation logistics support arrangement, as originally planned. GPOI appears to remain heavily U.S.-funded, focused on the old ACRI–ACOTA program. Participation among the G–8 members is uneven and there appears to be no effort to solicit partnership with non-G–8 countries such as India, which has rich peacekeeping experience and the resources to participate in training and other activities. One possible challenge to obtaining greater contributions or participation in GPOI may be the fact that at the Department of State, GPOI appears to be mainly administered by the Africa Bureau, rather than the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs.

Given the increasing demand for peacekeeping troops—especially for the United Nations Mission in Sudan—and the likelihood that new missions will emerge in the near future, it is especially critical to have trained forces in Africa ready to respond. The committee's expectation is that troops trained by the United States and its partners under GPOI should be volunteered by their states to the United Nations, and that they would be trained and equipped to deploy, with GPOI partners ready to assist via a transportation-logistics support arrangement. When the Department of Defense originally sought authority and funding for GPOI from the committee, its officials asserted that past U.S. training programs—mainly focused on African militaries—have resulted in better-trained militaries who are also more likely to participate in subsequent peace operations. The committee hopes to strengthen the likelihood that GPOI will be administered in such a fashion and that there will be an expectation, if not a requirement, that GPOI training recipient countries contribute troops to U.N. missions in the near-term, and that GPOI will increase the number of peacekeepers who can remain ready via sustained training and equipping programs.

## Subtitle B—Other Authorities and Limitations

### Cooperative opportunities documents under cooperative research and development agreements with NATO organizations and other allied and friendly foreign countries (sec. 1211)

The committee recommends a provision that would make technical corrections to the statute governing the development of international cooperative research and development agreements. The committee notes that the provision would make the statutory language more consistent with current acquisition program terminology and enable the Department of Defense to evaluate appropriate international cooperative opportunities at an early stage in an acquisition program.

### Extension and expansion of temporary authority to use acquisition and cross-servicing agreements to lend military equipment for personnel protection and survivability (sec. 1212)

The committee recommends a provision that would expand and extend the authority provided under section 1202 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). Under current law, section 1202 provides the Secretary of Defense temporary authority to treat certain significant military equipment as logistical support, supplies, and services under Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreements in order to lend such equipment to military forces of foreign nations participating in combined operations with the United States in Iraq or Afghanistan. The military equipment provided under the authority of that section may be used by the foreign military forces solely for personnel protection or to aid in the personnel survivability of those forces.

The provision would expand the temporary authority provided by that section to permit the use of such equipment by military forces of a nation participating in combined operations with the United States as part of a peacekeeping operation under the Charter of the United Nations or another international agreement, such as the Multinational Force and Observers under the Treaty of Peace Between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the State of Israel of March 26, 1979. The provision would also extend the authority provided under that section until September 30, 2008.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has expressed an interest in making the temporary authority provided under section 1202 permanent. The committee does not believe it is desirable to change the definition of the term "logistic support, supplies, and services" as that term applies to Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreements, which are not intended to facilitate the transfer of significant military equipment.

### Acceptance of funds from the Government of Palau for costs of military Civic Action Teams (sec. 1213)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to accept from the Government of Palau $250,000 to defray Department of Defense (DOD) Civic Action Team costs, provided it is credited to the specific appropriation or account available for the DOD Civic Action Teams.

Under current law, the United States makes available U.S. military Civic Action Teams to help Palau and the Marshall Islands, in recognition of their development needs. Additionally, the Government of Palau was authorized to use $250,000 annually of the current account funds provided under section 211, title 2 of the Compact of Free Association with the Marshall Islands to defray expenditures attendant to the operation of the Civic Action Teams. This $250,000 is currently returned, annually, to the U.S. Treasury. This provision would ensure that the funds would be returned to the DOD Civic Action Team account.

**Extension of participation of the Department of Defense in multinational military centers of excellence (sec. 1214)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through fiscal year 2008 the authority provided under section 1205 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), permitting Department of Defense civilian and military personnel to participate in North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) multinational military centers of excellence. The provision would also modify the reporting provisions under that section to require the Secretary of Defense to provide the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives an annual report on the use of this authority not later than October 31 of each of 2007 and 2008.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has proposed expanding the authority to participate in multinational centers of excellence beyond those accredited and approved by NATO. To further consider this request, the committee urges the Department to provide additional information regarding what would constitute a "center of excellence" outside the NATO context; where such centers exist or would be established; what their purpose would be; and what additional amount of funds would be required to facilitate U.S. participation in such centers.

**Limitation on assistance to the Government of Thailand (sec. 1215)**

On September 19, 2006, the Royal Thai Commander-in-Chief led a bloodless coup against the democratically elected prime minister. The new leaders of Thailand declared their intent to hold parliamentary elections in December 2007.

The coup automatically triggered section 508 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–102), which suspends U.S. Department of State assistance to "the government of any country whose duly elected head of government is deposed by military coup or decree." Department of Defense (DOD) funds for operations appropriated under section 1206 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) were also suspended, because the limitations on that funding include a ban on funding to any country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving military assistance under any other provision of law. These programs can be reinstated after the President determines and certifies that a democratically elected government has again taken office.

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit DOD funding to Thailand in fiscal year 2008 until the President certifies to the defense committees that a democratically elected government has taken office in Thailand. The provision would exclude humanitarian or emergency assistance to Thailand, and provide a national security interest waiver to the President.

**Presidential report on policy objectives and United States strategy regarding Iran (sec. 1216)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from obligating more than 75 percent of the

funds available for fiscal year 2008 to the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy until the report on United States policy for Iran, required by section 1213(b) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), is submitted to Congress.

### Limitation on availability of certain funds pending implementation of requirements regarding North Korea (sec. 1217)

Section 1211 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) directed by the President to appoint a senior coordinator on U.S. policy towards North Korea by December 16, 2006. The President has not made this appointment. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from obligating or expending any funds authorized to be appropriated under section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) until the administration has fully implemented section 1211 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

## Subtitle C—Reports

### Reports on United States policy and military operations in Afghanistan (sec. 1231)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the President to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on U.S. policy and military operations in Afghanistan not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter through the end of fiscal year 2009.

The provision would require each report to include detailed information on: (1) a comprehensive, interagency strategy for achieving the objectives of U.S. policy and military operations in Afghanistan; (2) efforts to train and equip Afghan Security Forces, including key criteria for measuring the capability and readiness of such forces; (3) efforts by the United States to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)-led International Security Assistance Force; (4) efforts to improve governance and expand economic development in the provinces of Afghanistan, including through Provincial Reconstruction Teams; (5) current counternarcotics efforts in Afghanistan, including a description of the U.S. counternarcotics plan for Afghanistan and a statement of priorities among U.S. counterdrug activities within that plan; (6) efforts to aid the Government of Afghanistan in fighting public corruption and strengthening the rule of law; and (7) diplomatic and other efforts to encourage and assist the Government of Pakistan in eliminating safe havens for the Taliban, Al Qaeda, and other violent extremists within the territory of Pakistan which threaten the stability of Afghanistan. Each report would be submitted in unclassified form to the maximum extent practicable, but may include a classified annex.

**Strategy for enhancing security in Afghanistan by eliminating safe havens for violent extremists in Pakistan (sec. 1232)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the President to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, a report describing the U.S. strategy for engaging with the Government of Pakistan to prevent the movement of Taliban, Al Qaeda, and other violent extremist forces across the Afghanistan-Pakistan border and to eliminate their safe havens on the territory of Pakistan. The provision would, for each fiscal quarter of fiscal years 2008 and 2009, prohibit reimbursement of the Government of Pakistan for logistical, military, or other support provided to the United States unless the President certifies to the congressional defense committees that for that fiscal quarter the Government of Pakistan is making substantial and sustained efforts to eliminate safe havens for the Taliban, Al Qaeda, and other violent extremists in areas under Pakistan's sovereign control. The certification would be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex. The provision would allow the President to waive the limitation on reimbursements under this section if the President determines and certifies to the congressional defense committees that doing so is important to U.S. national security interests.

**One-year extension of update on report on claims relating to the bombing of the Labelle Discotheque (sec. 1233)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require a report on the status of negotiations between the Government of Libya and United States claimants in connection with the bombing of the Labelle Discotheque in Berlin, Germany that occurred in April 1986, regarding resolution of their claims. The reporting requirement is an extension of section 1225 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163).

On April 5, 1986, Libya directed its agents to execute a terrorist attack in West Berlin for the sole purpose of killing as many American military personnel as possible. Libya's agents selected the Labelle Discotheque because it was known to be frequented by large numbers of U.S. military personnel. Libya's agents placed a bomb in the discotheque at a time when 260 people, including U.S. military personnel, were present. When the bomb detonated, two U.S. soldiers were killed and over 90 soldiers were severely injured.

In 2002, the victims and the families of deceased soldiers filed a lawsuit in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Since that time, the Libyan Government has settled the claims of the German victims of the LaBelle bombing and the claims of the victims of the Libyan bombing of Pan Am flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland.

The committee continues to closely monitor the details surrounding the case of Labelle claimants against the Libyan Government.

## Items of Special Interest

### Iraqi refugee crisis

The committee continues to monitor closely the ongoing refugee crisis in Iraq, a crisis resulting from the U.S. invasion of Iraq. According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), there are approximately 1.9 million Iraqis displaced internally and 2.0 million more in neighboring states, particularly Jordan and Syria.

The committee notes that the continuing violence across much of Iraq is forcing thousands more to leave their homes every month. Shiites in Sunni controlled areas, Sunnis in Shiite controlled areas, and non-Kurds in Iraqi Kurdistan are particularly susceptible to displacement, and stateless individuals and Iraqi Christians are vulnerable throughout the country. Given its role and its stake in the conflict, the committee believes the United States must play an international leadership role to promote a responsibility sharing approach to address the plight of displaced Iraqis. As noted by the Iraq Study Group (ISG), events in Iraq were set in motion by U.S. decisions and actions. The committee concurs with the ISG's conclusion which stated that if this refugee crisis is not addressed, Iraq and the region could further destabilize.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense has a special responsibility in the case of Iraqis that have assisted the United States to sustain and manage its presence. To date, the Department has not provided any information to the committee to quantify the size of this group, but the committee remains interested in learning how many Iraqis are currently working for the United States, how many Iraqis are currently working for contractors and subcontractors on U.S. contracts, and how many Iraqis have served in either capacity but who no longer work with the United States or its contractors. The committee fears these groups are particularly vulnerable given their support of the United States.

Further, the committee directs the Department, in coordination with the U.S. Department of State and UNHCR, to report, no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, on: (1) what work, if any, has been done with the Government of Iraq and neighboring countries to protect internally displaced people that were forced to flee their homes; (2) how it is working with the Department of State to promote safe passage and resettlement to protect those refugees in the region who remain vulnerable, as well as to promote family reunification for those refugees with parents, sons, daughters, grandparents, grandchildren, and siblings who are lawfully residing in the United States; and (3) what contingency planning is being done to promote refugee protection in the region once there has been a draw down of U.S. troops from Iraq.

### Joint Forces Command support to NATO International Security Assistance Force

The committee recognizes that the United States Joint Forces Command has developed advanced capabilities, including innovative technologies that may enhance battle management, command and control, intelligence analysis, and communications. Many of

these capabilities would be useful to the U.S. forces assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF-X) in Afghanistan, including modeling and simulation tools and the ability to conduct operational net assessments. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense, to the maximum extent practicable, to provide the NATO-led ISAF-X in Afghanistan with these capabilities and, on a temporary basis, to provide appropriate training support to ensure fielded forces sustain these capabilities, as required by the Commander of ISAF-X.

**United States Africa Command**

The committee supports the efforts of the Department of Defense to stand up a new United States Combatant Command for the continent of Africa (AFRICOM). The committee commends the Department for its acknowledgment of the strategic and humanitarian importance of Africa to the interests of the United States. Currently, three U.S. regional commands—U.S. European Command, U.S. Central Command, and U.S. Pacific Command—share responsibility for U.S. security issues in Africa. The committee agrees that one combatant command for Africa will promote greater unity of effort across the Government.

The committee understands that the Department is still in the process of determining the allocation of military and civil functions within AFRICOM. It is the committee's understanding that AFRICOM will be led by a four star general officer, but that the Department may also seek to designate a Department of State official at a senior level within the command.

While the Department has discussed with the committee its plans for incorporating staff from other agencies into the new command, the Department has not provided the committee with details on the planned staffing levels and funding mechanisms for interagency staff, or on the authorities to be exercised by such staff. The committee urges the Department to inform it if new authorities will be needed to stand up and staff AFRICOM. The committee also expects to be consulted early and often on the matter of potential locations for the command's headquarters and the anticipated costs associated with establishing the command.

## TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

### Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds (sec. 1301)

The committee recommends a provision that would define the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs; define the funds as authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this bill; and authorize CTR funds to be available for obligation for 3 fiscal years.

### Funding allocations (sec. 1302)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $448.0 million, an increase of $100.0 million above the budget request, for the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program. This provision would also authorize specific amounts for each CTR program element, require notification to Congress 30 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2008 funds, and require notification to Congress 15 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2008 funds in excess of the specific amount authorized for each CTR program element.

The committee recommends an additional $25.0 million for strategic offensive arms elimination in Russia, $50.0 million for biological threat reduction, $14.0 million for weapons of mass destruction proliferation prevention to support the Black Sea Initiative, $10.0 million for new activities in states outside the former Soviet Union, and $1.0 million for additional expenses associated with Russian chemical weapons destruction activities.

The committee recommends an additional $25.0 million for strategic offensive arms elimination in Russia to accelerate the completion of activities at sites in Russia where the materials and weapons are stored—and to address potential threats while these materials are moving to facilitate consolidation, dismantlement, and disposition.

The committee recommends an additional $50.0 million for biological threat reduction to support threat reduction programs throughout the former Soviet Union and accelerate the highest priority programs. One of the key efforts is to consolidate, or destroy as appropriate, various strain collections and provide safe and secure storage of the consolidated collection. The committee notes the expansion of this work is one area where the Department of Defense (DOD) would like to expand its work beyond the former Soviet Union. The committee expects DOD to provide a cost-effective plan for this expansion with the fiscal year 2009 budget request.

The committee recommends an additional $14.0 million for proliferation prevention initiative efforts to support the Black Sea and other regional initiatives to detect and prevent weapons of mass destruction that might be smuggled across international borders. Smuggling across remote and unprotected borders is particularly

difficult and must involve the joint efforts of many nations to stop. The proliferation prevention effort must also be coordinated with other elements of the DOD as well as other agencies of the U.S. Government. The committee is interested in the plan that will coordinate the CTR efforts with other activities and directs the Secretary to include in the CTR annual report for fiscal year 2008 DOD's plan for synchronizing the various areas of activity.

The committee believes that one of the highest priorities in the CTR programs is to ensure that the facility to destroy Russian chemical munitions in Shchuch'ye, Russia is completed, the workforce is adequately trained, and the new facility successfully passes initial systems integration and startup testing. Once startup is successful, the Russian Government will assume all responsibility for completing destruction of the chemical munitions. To reach the goal of facility hot startup in 2009, the committee urges the Secretary to ensure the project is appropriately managed and funded, and to report promptly to the congressional defense committees any indication that the 2009 startup date will not be met.

**Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs in states outside the former Soviet Union (sec. 1303)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1501 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) by adding a new subsection that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs in states outside of the former Soviet Union. The programs authorized would include elimination, transportation, and storage of biological or chemical weapons or materials, or related materials or components; nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons proliferation prevention programs; and programs to facilitate detection and reporting of certain pathogenic diseases that could impact the armed forces of the United States or its allies.

The committee believes that the CTR program has been key to preventing the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons within and from the states of the former Soviet Union and that the CTR model should be expanded to address threats beyond the states of the former Soviet Union. The committee recommends $10.0 million in section 1302 of this Act to allow the Secretary to begin to address emerging threats through cooperative programs with new state partners. The committee notes that this new authority would be subject to the CTR notification requirements, which require the Secretary to notify Congress 30 days in advance of obligation of any fiscal year 2008 funds.

**Modification of authority to use Cooperative Threat Reduction funds outside the former Soviet Union (sec. 1304)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1308 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) to allow the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to exercise the emergency authority to use prior year balances in the Cooperative Threat Reduction program (CTR) for a proliferation threat reduction project or activity outside of the former Soviet Union. Section 1308 cur-

rently requires a presidential certification. The committee believes that secretarial certification would allow a more rapid response in an emergency situation.

**Repeal of restrictions on assistance to states of the former Soviet Union for cooperative threat reduction (sec. 1305)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal certain provisions of the Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–228), the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (22 U.S.C. 5952), and section 1305 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) that require a number of annual certifications before any Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) funds can be obligated in any fiscal year. In addition, the provision would also repeal section 1303 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, which authorized the President to waive the annual certification requirements.

These certifications are no longer meaningful and serve only to delay the implementation of the CTR programs.

**National Academy of Sciences study of prevention of proliferation of biological weapons (sec. 1306)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) under which the NAS would carry out a study to identify areas for cooperation with states other than states of the former Soviet Union under the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program to prevent the proliferation of biological weapons and dual-use materials. A report on the study would be due to the United States Senate and House of Representatives Committees on Armed Services on December 31, 2008. The report would also include the Secretary's assessment of the study and any recommendations for action. If the Secretary determines that legislation is necessary to implement any actions, the committee urges the Secretary to include in the report a description of the necessary legislation.

The NAS study recommended in this provision would be a follow-on study to the NAS study required by section 1304 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). The original study focused on actions under the CTR program that could be taken to address biological weapons and dual-use materials in the states of the former Soviet Union.

# TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

## Summary and explanation of table

This title contains funding authorizations for working capital and revolving funds, the Defense Health program, the destruction of chemical munitions, drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, and funding for the Department of Defense Inspector General and other programs which contain elements of more than one type of traditional funding account (such as procurement or operation and maintenance) inside a single account.

This title also reflects savings from lower inflation that affect multiple accounts and titles within this Act, legislative proposals regarding the national defense stockpile, and authorizes trust fund expenditures for the Armed Forces Retirement Home, which is outside the national defense budget function.

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

## TITLE XIV -- OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

| | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **MILITARY PROGRAMS** | | | |
| **DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM** | | | |
| Defense Health Program, O&M | 20,182,381 | | 20,182,381 |
| Legislative Proposal scorekeeping adjustment | 1,862,000 | | 1,862,000 |
| Subtotal O&M | **22,044,381** | | **22,044,381** |
| Defense Health Program, RDTE | 134,482 | 2,000 | 136,482 |
| Motor vehicle crash study | | [2,000] | |
| Defense Health Program, Procurement | 362,261 | | 362,261 |
| Continuing Resolution Adjustment | | | |
| **Subtotal Defense Health Program** | **22,541,124** | **2,000** | **22,543,124** |
| **DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| Drug Enforcement and Policy Support | 936,822 | 22,500 | 959,322 |
| Project Athena | | [7,500] | |
| Surveillance technology ACTD | | [15,000] | |
| **Subtotal Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities** | **936,822** | **22,500** | **959,322** |
| **OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL** | | | |
| Office of the Inspector General, O&M | 214,995 | 10,000 | 224,995 |
| Program increase | | [10,000] | |
| Office of the Inspector General, RDTE | | | |
| Office of the Inspector General, Procurement | 1,000 | | 1,000 |
| **Subtotal Office of the Inspection General** | **215,995** | **10,000** | **225,995** |

## TITLE XIV -- OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

| | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION** | | | |
| Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, O&M | 1,162,452 | 24,000 | 1,186,452 |
| Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, RDTE | 274,846 | | 274,846 |
| Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Procurement | 18,426 | 12,000 | 30,426 |
| **Subtotal Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction** | **1,455,724** | **36,000** | **1,491,724** |
| | | | |
| **REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS** | | | |
| Defense Working Capital Funds | 102,446 | | 102,446 |
| Defense Working Capital Funds - DeCA | 1,250,300 | | 1,250,300 |
| Defense Coalition Support Fund | 22,000 | -22,000 | |
| National Defense Sealift Fund | 1,079,094 | -34,900 | 1,044,194 |
| Transfer to RDT&E Navy | | [-4,900] | |
| Rephasing of MPF(F) R&D effort | | [-30,000] | |
| Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund | | | |
| **SUBTOTAL REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS** | **2,453,840** | **-56,900** | **2,396,940** |
| | | | |
| **SUBTOTAL OTHER PROGRAMS - MILITARY** | **27,603,505** | **13,600** | **27,617,105** |
| | | | |
| **CIVIL PROGRAMS** | | | |
| Armed Forces Retirement Home | 61,624 | | 61,624 |
| | | | |
| **SUBTOTAL OTHER PROGRAMS - CIVIL** | **61,624** | | **61,624** |
| | | | |
| **TOTAL OTHER PROGRAMS** | **27,665,129** | **13,600** | **27,678,729** |

## Subtitle A—Military Programs

### Reduction in certain authorizations due to savings from lower inflation (sec. 1407)

The Office of Management and Budget assumed an inflation rate of 2.4 percent in its fiscal year 2008 budget submission. However, the Congressional Budget Office's March 2007 estimate of inflation for 2008 is 1.8 percent, or 0.6 percentage points lower than the administration's estimate. The Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008 (S. Con. Res. 21) adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives on May 17, 2007, was based on the economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office. The committee recommends a provision that would reduce the amounts authorized in division A of this Act by $1.6 billion to bring the inflation assumptions applicable to purchases by the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2008 in line with the economic assumptions previously adopted by the Senate.

## Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile

### Disposal of ferromanganese (sec. 1411)

The committee recommends a provision that would place limitations on the amount of ferromanganese that can be sold by the Department of Defense from the Defense National Stockpile. The provision grants the Secretary of Defense authority to sell ferromanganese beyond specified limitations, provided that the United States Senate and House of Representatives Committees on Armed Services receive certification that certain national security and market conditions were met. The committee believes that this provision would ensure steady and predictable prices on global markets, while continuing stockpile sale levels that are in keeping with the mission and goals of the Defense National Stockpile.

### Disposal of chrome metal (sec. 1412)

The committee recommends a provision that would place limitations on the amount of chrome metal that can be sold by the Department of Defense from the Defense National Stockpile. The provision grants the Secretary of Defense authority to sell chrome metal beyond specified limitations, provided that the United States Senate and House of Representatives Committees on Armed Services receive certification that certain national security and market conditions were met. The committee believes that this provision would ensure steady and predictable prices on global markets, while continuing stockpile sale levels that are in keeping with the mission and goals of the Defense National Stockpile.

### Modification of receipt objectives for previously authorized disposals from the national defense stockpile (sec. 1413)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3402(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) to increase the Department of Defense's stockpile commodity disposal authority from $600.0 million to $729.0 million. The committee understands that the National Defense Stockpile Center anticipates that under current market

conditions, it will exceed its current authority before the end of fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2009 for various commodities. Without these additional authorizations, the Department will stop selling from the stockpile and no longer generate revenues. Moreover, uncertainty about the Department's reliability as a supplier of materials will drive buyers to other sources, thereby jeopardizing future revenue goals. Uncertainty about whether or not the Department will be able to remain in the market could also lead to market disruption and instability.

## Subtitle C—Civil Programs

### Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1421)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $61,624,000 to be appropriated for fiscal year 2008 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

## Subtitle D—Chemical Demilitarization Matters

### Modification of termination requirement for Chemical Demilitarization Citizens' Advisory Commissions (sec. 1431)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the requirements for terminating the chemical demilitarization Citizens' Advisory Commissions that were authorized in section 172(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484). Instead of terminating a commission after the chemical weapons stockpile in a State has been destroyed, the provision would allow a commission to remain in existence, at the discretion of the Governor of the State, until after completion of closure activities of that State's chemical agent destruction facility, or upon the request of the Governor, whichever is earlier. The provision would also provide a technical correction to an outdated reference to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology.

The committee notes that the Citizens' Advisory Commissions have served an important purpose in permitting public involvement in the issues related to chemical demilitarization in their States. This provision would allow such citizen involvement to continue until the closure of each chemical demilitarization facility.

### Repeal of certain qualifications requirement for director of chemical demilitarization management organization (sec. 1432)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the requirement that the Army's Director of the Chemical Materials Agency must be trained in chemical warfare defense operations. The committee believes this requirement is no longer essential to the position of managing the chemical demilitarization program for the Army, acting as executive agent for the Department of Defense. It is important to allow the best qualified individuals to be considered for this critical position, which requires senior program management and acquisition experience. Perpetuating the requirement

for training in chemical warfare defensive operations would limit the ability of the Secretary of the Army to select from among the most qualified individuals.

**Sense of Congress on completion of destruction of United States chemical weapons stockpile (sec. 1433)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that the United States is, and must remain, committed to making every effort to safely dispose of its entire chemical weapons stockpile by the Chemical Weapons Convention extended deadline of April 29, 2012, or as soon thereafter as possible, and that the Secretary of Defense should request adequate funding for chemical demilitarization to complete the elimination of the United States chemical weapons stockpile in accordance with U.S. obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a biannual report to Congress providing: (1) the anticipated schedule for completion of chemical weapons destruction at each of the chemical demilitarization facilities in the United States; (2) a description of options and alternatives for accelerating the completion of chemical weapons destruction, particularly to meet the Chemical Weapons Convention destruction deadline; (3) a description of the level of funding that would be required to achieve those accelerated options; and (4) a description of steps being taken to accelerate the completion of destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents, munitions, and materiel.

The committee is disappointed that the administration does not expect to meet the United States' obligation under the Chemical Weapons Convention to destroy all its chemical weapons by even the extended deadline of April 29, 2012. In order to meet the destruction deadline under the Chemical Weapons Convention at most of its chemical demilitarization facilities, the United States would need to consider options for accelerated destruction and increased funding levels.

It appears that Department of Defense funding limits for the chemical demilitarization program currently preclude the possibility of meeting the destruction deadline at facilities that might be able to meet the deadline with additional funding. Furthermore, shortly before submitting the President's budget request to Congress, the Department of Defense reduced the planned level of funding for the Chemical Materials Agency in the fiscal year 2008 budget request by $53.6 million, thus risking further delay to the destruction schedule. This calls into question the priority the Department places on meeting, or making every reasonable effort to meet, United States treaty obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention.

The committee notes that in a letter to Congress dated April 10, 2006, the Secretary of Defense made a commitment to "continue working diligently to minimize the time to complete destruction without sacrificing safety and security" and to "continue requesting resources needed to complete destruction as close to April 2012 as practicable." The committee urges the Department to fulfill this commitment by requesting increased funding in future budget requests to accelerate the chemical weapons stockpile destruction

schedule to meet the United States' legal obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention.

## Budget Items

### LHA(R) research and development

The fiscal year 2008 budget request included $96.6 million within the National Defense Sealift Fund (NDSF) for various research and development activities, including $67.8 million for the Maritime Prepositioning Force (Future), MPF(F). This amount includes $4.9 million for amphibious assault replacement ships which are to be assigned to the MPF(F), designated MPF(F) LHA(R).

The Navy's concept for MPF(F) operations indicates that these ships will be multi-mission vessels capable of afloat prepositioning, sea basing operations in support of amphibious assault, and routine operations in support of lesser contingencies. MPF(F) ships are planned to be operated by a Military Sealift Command crew. However, the MPF(F) concept of operations differs sharply from current maritime prepositioning ships as a result of the MPF(F) contribution to the Navy's sea basing capability.

The MPF(F) role to embark and deploy marines ashore while sustaining expeditionary warfare operations potentially exposes these ships and embarked marines to hostile fire. The Navy plans to protect the MPF(F) ships through employment of the naval "sea shield," and therefore the Navy does not plan to outfit MPF(F) ships with self defense features. The committee has expressed concern regarding the Navy's MPF(F) survivability concept and, in particular, the Navy's proposal to eliminate the self defense features for the MPF(F) LHA(R). The restoration of the ship's combat system would allow the MPF(F) LHA(R) to fill current shortfalls to the Navy's forcible entry lift capability.

The committee is aware that the Department of the Navy is continuing to review the military features for the MPF(F), and that the Navy expects to present the program plan to the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) later in fiscal year 2007. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 30 days of the JROC MPF(F) decision outlining the findings of the JROC. The report shall include a detailed vulnerability assessment of MPF(F) for major combat operations.

The committee has been advised by the Navy that the Department of the Navy will need to rephase into fiscal year 2009 certain MPF(F) research and development efforts. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $30.0 million for MPF(F) research and development. Furthermore, the committee does not agree with funding development and procurement for amphibious assault ships within the NDSF.

This ship type is specifically not included within the scope of sealift vessels eligible for NDSF, defined within section 2218 of title 10, United States Code. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $4.9 million in PE 48042N, and a corresponding increase of $4.9 million in PE 64567N for MPF(F) LHA(R).

The committee recommends a total authorization of $32.9 million in PE 48042N for MPF(F).

**Defense health program research**

The budget request included $34.8 million in PE 63115HP for medical development within Defense Health program research, development, test, and evaluation activities. The committee notes that these programs are vitally important in their development of new processes, technologies, and systems that improve combat casualty care capabilities, as well as care for injured service members, retired military personnel, and the general populace.

The committee understands that motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of non-combat accidental deaths in theater, and the leading cause of accidental death for active-duty personnel in the continental United States. The committee recommends an additional $2.0 million to study military motor vehicle crashes and resulting injuries for the purpose of developing new safety technologies, tactics, techniques, and operational procedures.

**Funding for chemical weapons demilitarization**

The budget request included $1.5 billion for chemical agents and munitions destruction, defense, including $1.2 billion for operation and maintenance; $274.8 million for research, development, test, and evaluation; and $18.4 million for procurement. The committee notes its disappointment that funding for the Chemical Materials Agency was reduced by $53.6 million shortly before the submission of the budget request. This reduction will increase the risk of delaying the destruction of chemical weapons, which are required under the terms of the Chemical Weapons Convention to be destroyed no later than April 29, 2012. In order to increase the possibility of maintaining the best possible destruction schedule, and thus to meet United States obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention, the committee recommends an increase of $36.0 million for the Chemical Materials Agency, including $24.0 million in operation and maintenance, and $12.0 million in procurement.

The committee notes that in a letter to Congress dated April 10, 2006, the Secretary of Defense committed to "continue working diligently to minimize the time to complete destruction without sacrificing safety and security" and to "continue requesting resources needed to complete destruction as close to April 2012 as practicable." The budget request calls into question the priority assigned by the Department of Defense to meeting the commitment of the Secretary. The committee urges the Department to fulfill this commitment by planning and budgeting sufficient funds to maintain the most timely chemical weapons destruction schedule, consistent with the requirement to protect public health, safety, and the environment, in order to meet the Chemical Weapons Convention destruction deadline, or to come as close thereto as possible. This issue is also addressed elsewhere in a separate legislative provision.

**Counterdrug advanced concept technology demonstration**

The fiscal year 2008 budget request included $936.8 million for Department of Defense Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities. However, it did not include any funding for an Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration (ACTD) to support drug interdiction efforts in the Western Hemisphere. The committee rec-

ommends an increase of $15.0 million for Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities for a counterdrug ACTD. The ACTD would have the following capabilities: (1) electro-optical/infrared/radar to detect and identify small high-speed craft in open water; (2) an extended dwell time of more than 10 to 12 hours; (3) detection of small-to-medium craft wake patterns or variances; (4) geo-location of high frequency and very high frequency low power emitters and other special communications devices; (5) detection and monitoring of semi-submersibles; (6) tracking and monitoring; (7) long-range detection and monitoring of mother-ship operations; (8) on-station airborne early warning for 1,280 hours; and (9) on-station maritime patrol aircraft for 1,420 hours. A successful counterdrug ACTD with these capabilities will allow the U.S. Government to get closer to achieving its goal of disrupting 40 percent of the drugs headed to the United States in the Western Hemisphere transit zone.

**Project Athena**

The fiscal year 2008 budget request included $936.8 million for Department of Defense Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities, including $2.5 million for Project Athena, a domain awareness system that provides a common operational picture (COP) to national, regional, and local users.

Project Athena fuses real-time downlinks from surveillance sensors, multiple databases, and other sources of intelligence reporting into a COP that can be unclassified, or tailored to multiple security levels. It is therefore capable of providing a COP to the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Coast Guard, first responders, and partnered nations in a relatively timely and simultaneous manner. The Department of Defense Counternarcotics Technology Program Office is responsible for the project and has successfully tested Project Athena in maritime tracking in the United States. In fiscal year 2006, Project Athena was used at the Joint Interagency Task Force South in Florida and jointly with the Colombian Navy and the Sri Lankan Navy.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million to Defense Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities for Project Athena.

**Department of Defense Inspector General**

The budget request included $214.9 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Office of the Inspector General (OIG). This is slightly less than the $216.3 million requested and the $218.0 million provided for fiscal year 2007. The committee is concerned that funding levels for this important independent audit and investigative function is not keeping pace with the demands for the Inspectors' General services in the global war on terror.

The OIG audits, investigates, inspects, and evaluates the programs and operations of the Department of Defense (DOD), and recommends policies and process improvements that promote economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity in DOD programs and operations. For the last 3 years, the OIG has achieved $27.5 billion in savings and $1.7 billion in recovery for the nation. The committee notes that in that same 3 years the exponential growth in

the number and cost of Department contracts for operations, procurement, research, and construction within the United States and around the world. The nation's annual defense costs have crossed the $500.0 billion mark, well beyond the annual budgets of just over $200.0 billion before the start of the global war on terror in 2001. Despite this growth, the personnel strength of the OIG has remained nearly constant. The committee is concerned that the capabilities of the OIG are not keeping pace, in terms of qualified personnel, with the growth in the size of the defense budget and the numbers of contracts.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in OMDW for the OIG to start and accelerate the growth of the OIG. The committee directs the Inspector General to provide to the defense committees, by March 31, 2008, an analysis of the current and future personnel, organization, technology, and funding requirements of the OIG. This report shall also include a comprehensive and detailed master plan, with annual objectives and funding requirements, that will provide the fastest possible increase in audit and investigative capabilities.

## Item of Special Interest

### National Defense Sealift Fund report

The fiscal year 2008 budget request included $96.6 million within the National Defense Sealift Fund (NDSF) for various research and development activities. The Navy could use this Fund to conduct research and development for investigating promising technologies or developing capabilities, such as:

(1) agile port, rapid deployment and distribution, and agile sustainment process transformation;

(2) high speed strategic sealift mobility;

(3) advanced cargo and passenger vessel hull design, alternative propulsion systems, and construction employing national defense features;

(4) global logistics network and expeditionary warfare security;

(5) net-centric warfare and logistics, including sense and respond logistics; and

(6) dual use technologies, including information management technology and security employing best practices from the commercial sector.

The committee also understands that there may be opportunities to join with industry or academia to explore or develop these technologies. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, not later than January 1, 2008, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the future viability and availability of defense-related university-based research and development capabilities and the future opportunities for industry collaboration in support of military strategic sealift mobility.

# TITLE XV—OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

## Subtitle A—Authorization of Additional War-Related Appropriations

### Overview

The President's budget requested $141.8 billion in emergency funding in the National Defense budget function for Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), and for other purposes, including some of the "grow the force" costs of increasing Army and Marine Corps active-duty personnel levels.

The Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008 adopted by the Senate on March 23, 2007, fully funded these requested amounts. However, the budget resolution adopted by the Senate concurred with the committee's recommendation to the Committee on the Budget that these costs no longer be treated as "emergency" spending.

The administration's budget proposal met the requirements of section 1008 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), which required an estimate of the full-year costs to be incurred during the fiscal year to support these operations. The committee believes that subjecting these expenditure requests to the full authorization and appropriation process will improve the effectiveness and the accountability of spending on these operations.

The committee believes that treating these requests as non-emergency funding complies with both the spirit and the letter of section 1008. The committee's views and estimates letter to the Committee on the Budget stated the committee's intent to differentiate carefully between the cost of war and the so-called "base budget". That letter stated, in part:

> Because we intend to keep the "base" budget clearly delineated from the "war" budget, it is important that costs be accurately assigned to these categories.

The bill reported by the committee carries out this commitment. Where appropriate, the committee has transferred funding requested in the base budget that is directly related to operations in Iraq and Afghanistan (for example, the costs of running the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization) to this title. As described later in this title, the committee has also transferred funding (for example, the funds for Army and Marine Corps personnel that were requested as a cost of war but which reflect the cost of personnel that are intended to become part of the permanent force) structure back into the base budget where appropriate. The detailed funding tables contained in this report identify such transfers.

The summary table that follows summarizes the funding requested as emergency spending for these operations, together with the committee's action on these requests. Funding for Department of Defense operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, with the exception of funding for military construction projects to support these operations, is included in title XV of this Act. Funding for military construction projects in Iraq and Afghanistan is included in title XXIX of this Act.

**Explanation of tables**

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

## TITLE XV -- OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

In Thousands of Dollars

| | Authorization Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Title XV -- OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM** | | | |
| Aircraft Procurement, Army | 1,900,306 | -1,009,520 | 890,786 |
| Missile Procurement, Army | 492,734 | | 492,734 |
| Weapons &Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army | 4,780,172 | -3,530,995 | 1,249,177 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Army | 313,000 | -10,000 | 303,000 |
| Other Procurement, Army | 13,630,977 | -3,320,922 | 10,310,055 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Navy | 3,099,958 | -836,940 | 2,263,018 |
| Weapons Procurement, Navy | 251,281 | | 251,281 |
| Other Procurement, Navy | 793,311 | 21,000 | 814,311 |
| Procurement, Marine Corps | 2,462,140 | 1,774,000 | 4,236,140 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps | 590,090 | | 590,090 |
| Aircraft Procurement, Air Force | 3,336,809 | -1,267,800 | 2,069,009 |
| Missile Procurement, Air Force | 1,800 | | 1,800 |
| Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force | 74,005 | | 74,005 |
| Other Procurement, Air Force | 3,760,206 | 403,244 | 4,163,450 |
| Procurement, Defense-Wide | 469,768 | 124,000 | 593,768 |
| **Subtotal Procurement** | **35,956,557** | **-7,653,933** | **28,302,624** |

**TITLE XV -- OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM**

In Thousands of Dollars

| | Authorization Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|
| RDT&E, Army | 141,653 | -20,000 | 121,653 |
| RDT&E, Navy | 618,428 | -247,630 | 370,798 |
| RDT&E, Air Force | 1,369,781 | -446,990 | 922,791 |
| RDT&E, Defense-Wide | 727,498 | -192,411 | 535,087 |
| **Subtotal RDT&E** | **2,857,360** | **-907,031** | **1,950,329** |
| | | | |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army | 46,230,964 | -711,700 | 45,519,264 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy | 5,203,800 | -13,800 | 5,190,000 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps | 4,013,093 | | 4,013,093 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air Force | 10,536,330 | -3,700 | 10,532,630 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide | 6,098,990 | -122,774 | 5,976,216 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve | 158,410 | | 158,410 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve | 69,598 | | 69,598 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve | 68,000 | | 68,000 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard | 466,150 | | 466,150 |
| Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard | 31,168 | | 31,168 |
| **Subtotal Operation & Maintenance** | **72,876,503** | **-851,974** | **72,024,529** |

## TITLE XV -- OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

In Thousands of Dollars

| | Authorization Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|
| Military Personnel, Army | 12,504,398 | -3,363,882 | 9,140,516 |
| Military Personnel, Navy | 752,089 | | 752,089 |
| Military Personnel, Marine Corps | 1,601,882 | -784,407 | 817,475 |
| Military Personnel, Air Force | 1,411,890 | | 1,411,890 |
| Military Personnel, Army Reserve | 235,000 | | 235,000 |
| Military Personnel, Navy Reserve | 70,000 | | 70,000 |
| Military Personnel, Marine Corps Reserve | 15,420 | | 15,420 |
| Military Personnel, Air Force Reserve | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| Military Personnel, Army National Guard | 476,584 | | 476,584 |
| **Subtotal Military Personnel** | **17,070,263** | **-4,148,289** | **12,921,974** |
| | | | |
| Defense Health Program | 1,022,842 | | 1,022,842 |
| Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense | 257,618 | | 257,618 |
| Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund | 4,000,000 | 500,000 | 4,500,000 |
| Iraq Security Forces Fund | 2,000,000 | | 2,000,000 |
| Afghanistan Security Forces Fund | 2,700,000 | | 2,700,000 |
| Iraq Freedom Fund | 107,500 | | 107,500 |

**TITLE XV -- OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM**

In Thousands of Dollars

| | Authorization Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorization |
|---|---|---|---|
| Defense Working Capital Funds | 1,676,275 | | 1,676,275 |
| National Defense Sealift Fund | 5,100 | | 5,100 |
| Office of the Inspector General | 4,394 | | 4,394 |
| **Subtotal Other Authorizations** | **11,773,729** | **500,000** | **12,273,729** |
| **TOTAL TITLE XV** | **140,534,412** | **-13,061,227** | **127,473,185** |

**Army procurement (sec. 1501)**

This section would authorize an additional $17.7 billion for fiscal year 2008 procurement of war-related items for the Army.

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Aircraft Procurement, Army** | | | | | | |
| | **Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| | **Fixed Wing** | | | | | | |
| 1 | UTILITY F/W CARGO AIRCRAFT | | 12,500 | | | | 12,500 |
| | **Rotary Wing** | | | | | | |
| 3 | ARMED RECONNAISSANCE HELICOPTER | 29 | 222,600 | | -222,600 | 29 | |
| | Reduction | | | | [-38,600] | | |
| | Transfer to OMA for UH-60 Blackhawk Recapitalization | | | | [-86,000] | | |
| | Transfer to APA to upgrade UH-60A helicopters to UH-60L | | | | [-38,000] | | |
| | Transfer to APA for common missile warning systems for fixed-wing aircraft | | | | [-60,000] | | |
| 5 | UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) | 39 | 527,403 | | -370,380 | 39 | 157,023 |
| 5 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | | | | | |
| | Transfer to Title I | | | | [-370,380] | | |
| | **Modification of Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| 9 | GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA) | | 33,000 | | | | 33,000 |
| 10 | ARL MODS (TIARA) | | 25,000 | | | | 25,000 |
| 11 | AH-64 MODS | 12 | 417,800 | | | 12 | 417,800 |
| 13 | CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS | 21 | 635,607 | | -514,540 | 21 | 121,067 |
| | Transfer to Title I | | | | [-514,540] | | |
| 18 | UH-60 MODS | | | | 38,000 | | 38,000 |
| | Transferred from ARH to upgrade UH-60A helicopters to UH-60L | | | | [38,000] | | |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Spares and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| | **Support Equipment and Facilities** | | | | | | |
| | **Ground Support Avionics** | | | | | | |
| 23 | AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT | | | | 60,000 | | 60,000 |
| | Transferred from ARH for Common Missile Warning System for fixed-wing aircraft | | | | [60,000] | | |
| | **Other Support** | | | | | | |
| 27 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | | 10,000 | | | | 10,000 |
| 28 | AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS | | 10,200 | | | | 10,200 |
| 29 | AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL | | 6,196 | | | | 6,196 |
| | **Total - Aircraft Procurement, Army** | | **1,900,306** | | **-1,009,520** | | **890,786** |
| | **Missile Procurement, Army** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Surface-to-air Missile System** | | | | | | |
| | **Air-to-surface Missile System** | | | | | | |
| 4 | HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY | 2585 | 228,426 | | | 2,585 | 228,426 |
| | **Anti-tank/Assault Missile System** | | | | | | |
| 8 | GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS) | 570 | 67,200 | | | 570 | 67,200 |
| 12 | ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM | 177 | 197,108 | | | 177 | 197,108 |
| | **Modification of Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Modifications** | | | | | | |
| | **Spares and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| | **Support Equipment and Facilities** | | | | | | |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Total - Missile Procurement Army** | | **492,734** | | | | **492,734** |
| | **Procurement of Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| | **Tracked Combat Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 2 | BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT | 481 | 1,402,500 | -481 | -1,402,500 | | |
| | Transfer to Title I | | | | [-1,402,500] | | |
| 5 | STRYKER VEHICLE | 100 | 402,775 | -71 | -285,775 | 29 | 117,000 |
| | Transfer to Title I | | | | [-402,775] | | |
| | Additional Stryker vehicles to replace battle losses | | | | [117,000] | | |
| | **Modification of Tracked Combat Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 8 | CARRIER, MOD | 317 | 132,220 | -317 | -132,220 | | |
| | Transfer to Title I | | | | [-132,220] | | |
| 9 | FIST VEHICLE (MOD) | 44 | 130,000 | -44 | -130,000 | | |
| | Transfer to Title I | | | | [-130,000] | | |
| 10 | BFVS SERIES (MOD) | | 48,000 | | | | 48,000 |
| 13 | IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD) | 100 | 277,400 | -100 | -277,400 | | |
| | Transfer to Title I | | | | [-277,400] | | |
| 18 | M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD) | | 337,565 | | | | 337,565 |
| 19A | ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM (M1A2 SEP) (GA0750) | 235 | 1,303,100 | -235 | -1,303,100 | | |
| | Transfer to Title I | | | | [-1,303,100] | | |
| | **Support Equipment and Facilities** | | | | | | |
| | **Weapons and Other Combat Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 24 | M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62MM) | 3,000 | 42,721 | | | 3,000 | 42,721 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25 | MACHINE GUN, CAL .50 M2 ROLL | 1,278 | 19,000 | | | 1,278 | 19,000 |
| 26 | M249 SAW MACHINE GUN (5.56MM) | | 1,784 | | | | 1,784 |
| 27 | MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN (40MM) | 1,580 | 30,614 | | | 1,580 | 30,614 |
| 28 | MORTAR SYSTEMS | 345 | 29,880 | | | 345 | 29,880 |
| 30 | M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE | | 402 | | | | 402 |
| 31 | XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM) | 1,042 | 3,500 | | | 1,042 | 3,500 |
| 33 | M4 CARBINE | 47,185 | 79,469 | | | 47,185 | 79,469 |
| 34 | SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM (MASS) | 3,109 | 4,000 | | | 3,109 | 4,000 |
| 35 | COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WPNS STATION (CROV | 768 | 220,000 | | | 768 | 220,000 |
| | **Modification of Weapons and Other Combat Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 39 | M4 CARBINE MODS | | 125,115 | | | | 125,115 |
| 40 | M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS | | 9,000 | | | | 9,000 |
| 41 | M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS | | 11,883 | | | | 11,883 |
| 42 | M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS | | 2,648 | | | | 2,648 |
| 43 | PHALANX MODS | 16 | 150,000 | | | 16 | 150,000 |
| 45 | M16 RIFLE MODS | | 1,845 | | | | 1,845 |
| 46 | MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) | | 7,054 | | | | 7,054 |
| | **Support Equipment and Facilities** | | | | | | |
| 50 | SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG) | | 7,697 | | | | 7,697 |
| | **Spares** | | | | | | |
| | **Total - Procurement of WTCV, Army** | | **4,780,172** | | **-3,530,995** | | **1,249,177** |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Procurement of Ammunition, Army** | | | | | | |
| | **Ammunition** | | | | | | |
| | **Small/Medium Caliber Ammunition** | | | | | | |
| 2 | CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES | 8,894 | 10,000 | | | 8,894 | 10,000 |
| 4 | CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES | 3,111 | 13,500 | | | 3,111 | 13,500 |
| 6 | CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES | 284 | 15,000 | | | 284 | 15,000 |
| 7 | CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES | 535 | 40,000 | | | 535 | 40,000 |
| 8 | CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES | 2,014 | 75,000 | | | 2,014 | 75,000 |
| | **Mortar Ammunition** | | | | | | |
| | **Tank Ammunition** | | | | | | |
| | **Artillery Ammunition** | | | | | | |
| 15 | CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES | | 10,000 | | -10,000 | | |
| | 105 MM HERA | | | | [-10,000] | | |
| 18 | MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T | | 20,000 | | | | 20,000 |
| | **Artillery Fuzes** | | | | | | |
| | **Mines** | | | | | | |
| | **Rockets** | | | | | | |
| 23 | SHOULDER FIRED ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | 1,927 | 20,000 | | | 1,927 | 20,000 |
| 24 | ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES | | 28,000 | | | | 28,000 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Other Ammunition** | | | | | | |
| 25 | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | 689 | 8,000 | | | 689 | 8,000 |
| 26 | GRENADES, ALL TYPES | 119 | 10,000 | | | 119 | 10,000 |
| 28 | SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES | 115 | 8,000 | | | 115 | 8,000 |
| | **Miscellaneous** | | | | | | |
| 30 | NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES | 499 | 54,000 | | | 499 | 54,000 |
| 32 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | 538 | 1,500 | | | 538 | 1,500 |
| | **Ammunition Production Base Support** | | | | | | |
| | **Production Base Support** | | | | | | |
| | **Re-Estimate of Guaranteed Loan** | | | | | | |
| | **Interest on Re-Estimate** | | | | | | |
| | **Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Army** | **18,725** | **313,000** | | **-10,000** | **18,725** | **303,000** |
| | **Other Procurement, Army** | | | | | | |
| | **Tactical and Support Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| | **Tactical Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 1 | TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS | | 210,188 | | | | 210,188 |
| 2 | SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED | 117 | 6,226 | | | 117 | 6,226 |
| 4 | HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV) | 6690 | 1,321,630 | | | 6,690 | 1,321,630 |
| 5 | FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV) | 3181 | 185,110 | | | 3,181 | 185,110 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMEN | 10 | 9,000 | | | 10 | 9,000 |
| 7 | FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV) | 2747 | 1,136,455 | | | 2,747 | 1,136,455 |
| 8 | ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV) | 371 | 301,898 | -371 | -301,898 | | |
| | Transfer to Title I | | | | [-301,898] | | |
| 9 | MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY | 155 | 174,440 | 1,552 | 1,552,000 | 1,707 | 1,726,440 |
| | Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles | | | | [1,552,000] | | |
| 10 | TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916 | 1791 | 276,022 | | | 1,791 | 276,022 |
| 13 | HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM | 9255 | 455,000 | | | 9,255 | 455,000 |
| 14 | MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP | | 1,094,789 | | | | 1,094,789 |
| 15 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH) | 1559 | 7,970 | | | 1,559 | 7,970 |
| | **Non-tactical Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| | **Communications and Electronics Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Comm-Joint Communications** | | | | | | |
| | **Comm-Satellite Communications** | | | | | | |
| 23 | DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS | | 18,614 | | | | 18,614 |
| 24 | SHF TERM | | 22,822 | | | | 22,822 |
| 25 | SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE) | | 17,600 | | | | 17,600 |
| 26 | NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE) | 19034 | 50,745 | | | 19,034 | 50,745 |
| 27 | SMART-T (SPACE) | | 2,041 | | | | 2,041 |
| | **Comm-C3 System** | | | | | | |
| 31 | ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS) | 1 | 2,755 | | | 1 | 2,755 |
| | **Comm-Combat Communications** | | | | | | |
| 32 | ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO) | 795 | 23,540 | | | 795 | 23,540 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | SINCGARS FAMILY | 98410 | 1,370,347 | -98,410 | -1,370,347 | | |
| | Transfer to Title I | | | | [-1,370,347] | | |
| 38 | BRIDGE TO FUTURE NETWORKS | 653 | 2,560,571 | -653 | -2,560,571 | | |
| | Transfer to Title I | | | | [-2,560,571] | | |
| 39 | COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING | | 2,000 | | | | 2,000 |
| 42 | COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL) | 3115 | 43,831 | | | 3,115 | 43,831 |
| 43 | RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY | 26785 | 433,398 | | | 26,785 | 433,398 |
| 44 | MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4) | | 12,934 | | | | 12,934 |
| | **Comm-Intelligence Communications** | | | | | | |
| 45 | CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE | | 7,410 | | | | 7,410 |
| | **Information Security** | | | | | | |
| 46 | TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS) | | 51,600 | | | | 51,600 |
| 47 | INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP | 24922 | 96,651 | | | 24,922 | 96,651 |
| | **Comm-Long Haul Communications** | | | | | | |
| | **Comm-Base Communications** | | | | | | |
| | **Elect Equip-Nat For Int Prog (NFIP)** | | | | | | |
| 56 | FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI) | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 57 | GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP) | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| | **Elect Equip-Tact Int Rel Act (TIARA)** | | | | | | |
| 58 | ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (MIP) | 220 | 103,500 | | | 220 | 103,500 |
| 60 | PROPHET GROUND (MIP) | 24 | 23,000 | | | 24 | 23,000 |
| 61 | TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYS (TUAS)MIP | 12 | 213,485 | | | 12 | 213,485 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 62 | SMALL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM (SUAS) | | 10,400 | | | | 10,400 |
| 64 | DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (MIP) | 16 | 12,000 | | | 16 | 12,000 |
| 67 | DCGS-A (MIP) | 14 | 62,331 | | | 14 | 62,331 |
| 71 | CI HUMINT INFO MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CHIMS) | 42 | 1,200 | | | 42 | 1,200 |
| 72 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MIP) | 28 | 15,300 | | | 28 | 15,300 |
| | **Elect Equip-Electronic Warfare (EW)** | | | | | | |
| 73 | LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR | 25 | 10,470 | | | 25 | 10,470 |
| 74 | COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES | | 23,880 | | | | 23,880 |
| | **Elect Equip-Tactical Surv. (TAC SURV)** | | | | | | |
| 77 | NIGHT VISION DEVICES | 109,124 | 340,394 | | | 109,124 | 340,394 |
| 78 | LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTI | | | | 33,000 | | 33,000 |
| | Night Vision Advanced Technology | | | | [33,000] | | |
| 79 | NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT | 3493 | 36,000 | | | 3,493 | 36,000 |
| 84 | PROFILER | 42 | 64,800 | | | 42 | 64,800 |
| 85 | MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS) | | 43,200 | | | | 43,200 |
| 86 | FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2) | 6629 | 374,860 | | | 6,629 | 374,860 |
| 87 | LIGHTWEIGHT LSR DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD) | 206 | 57,000 | | | 206 | 57,000 |
| 88 | COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32 | 297 | 9,400 | | | 297 | 9,400 |
| 89 | MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM | 12 | 1,500 | | | 12 | 1,500 |
| | **Elect Equip-Tactical C2 Systems** | | | | | | |
| 92 | TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS | 397 | 263,709 | | | 397 | 263,709 |
| 93 | FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY | | 17,800 | | | | 17,800 |
| 95 | FAAD C2 | | 21,500 | | | | 21,500 |
| 96 | AIR & MSL DEF PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (AMD) | 12 | 45,200 | | | 12 | 45,200 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 97 | KNIGHT FAMILY | 29 | 50,000 | | | 29 | 50,000 |
| 99 | AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY | | 189,506 | | | | 189,506 |
| 100 | TC AIMS II | | 10,225 | | | | 10,225 |
| 102 | TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER | | 12,400 | | | | 12,400 |
| 104 | MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS) | | 57,905 | | | | 57,905 |
| 105 | SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE) | | 552,520 | | -552,520 | | |
| | Army SALE | | | | [-552,520] | | |
| | **Elect Equip - Automation** | | | | | | |
| 109 | AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP | | 9,949 | | | | 9,949 |
| 110 | CSS COMMUNICATIONS | | 145,380 | | | | 145,380 |
| 110A | Sequoyah Foreign Language Translation System (B88605) | 1658 | 12,813 | | | 1,658 | 12,813 |
| 110B | Counter-Rocket Artillery & Mortar (CRAM) | | 245,000 | | | | 245,000 |
| | **Elect Equip-Audio Visual Sys (A/V)** | | | | | | |
| | **Elect Equip-Mods Tactical Sys/Eq** | | | | | | |
| | **Elect Equip-Support** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Chemical Defensive Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 118 | RADIAC SET AN/PDR 77() | | | | | | |
| 119 | RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM NUCLEAR - BIOLOGICAL CH | | 72,000 | | | | 72,000 |
| 120 | CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION | | 44,564 | | | | 44,564 |
| | **Bridging Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 123 | TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON | | 39,000 | | | | 39,000 |
| | **Engineer (Non-construction) Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 128 | EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT) | | 3,300 | | | | 3,300 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Combat Service Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 131 | HEATERS AND ECU'S | 396 | 6,859 | | | 396 | 6,859 |
| 133 | SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT | | 8,757 | | | | 8,757 |
| 139 | CARGO AERIAL DELIVERY PROGRAM | 270 | 22,400 | | | 270 | 22,400 |
| | **Petroleum Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 143 | QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT | 8 | 12,680 | | | 8 | 12,680 |
| 144 | DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER | | 21,741 | | | | 21,741 |
| | **Water Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 145 | WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS | 3 | 1,600 | | | 3 | 1,600 |
| | **Medical Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 146 | COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL | | 3,617 | | | | 3,617 |
| | **Maintenance Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 147 | MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS | | 69,997 | | | | 69,997 |
| 148 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ) | | 120,586 | | -120,586 | | |
| | Transfer to Title I | | | | [-120,586] | | |
| | **Construction Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 159 | CONST EQUIP ESP | 69 | 9,500 | | | 69 | 9,500 |
| 160 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP) | | | | | | |
| | **Rail Float Containerization Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Generators** | | | | | | |
| 166 | GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP | | 99,998 | | | | 99,998 |
| | **Material Handling Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 167 | ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH) | 37 | 29,219 | | | 37 | 29,219 |
| 168 | ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM | | 22,064 | | | | 22,064 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Training Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 170 | TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM | 136 | 342 | | | 136 | 342 |
| | **Test Measure and Dig Equipment (TMD)** | | | | | | |
| 173 | CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT | | 36,856 | | | | 36,856 |
| 174 | INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE) | | 57,111 | | | | 57,111 |
| 175 | TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD) | 1305 | 10,840 | | | 1,305 | 10,840 |
| | **Other Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 178 | PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3) | | 35 | | | | 35 |
| 180 | MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3) | | 4,620 | | | | 4,620 |
| | **Spares and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| | **OPA2** | | | | | | |
| | **OPA3** | | | | | | |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 1,077 | | | | 1,077 |
| | **Total - Other Procurement, Army** | | **13,630,977** | | **-3,320,922** | | **10,310,055** |
| | **Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund** | | | | | | |
| | **Network Attack** | | | | | | |
| 1 | ATTACK THE NETWORK | | 926,000 | | | | 926,000 |
| | **JIEDDO Device Defeat** | | | | | | |
| 2 | DEFEAT THE DEVICE | | 2,740,000 | | 200,000 | | 2,940,000 |
| | Transfer from Title I | | | | [200,000] | | |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Force Training** | | | | | | |
| 3 | TRAIN THE FORCE | | 334,000 | | | | 334,000 |
| | **Staff and Infrastructure** | | | | | | |
| 4 | OPERATIONS | | | | 300,000 | | 300,000 |
| | Transfer from Title I | | | | [300,000] | | |
| | **Total - Joint IED Defeat Fund** | | **4,000,000** | | **500,000** | | **4,500,000** |

**Navy and Marine Corps procurement (sec. 1502)**

This section would authorize an additional $9.3 billion for fiscal year 2008 procurement of war related items for the Navy and the Marine Corps.

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Aircraft Procurement, Navy** | | | | | | |
| | **Combat Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| 4 | F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) | 12 | 713,540 | -12 | -713,540 | | |
| 4 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | | | | | |
| | Transfer to Title I | | | | [-713,540] | | |
| 8 | V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) | 2 | 140,500 | | | 2 | 140,500 |
| 10 | UH-1Y/AH-1Z | 6 | 123,400 | -6 | -123,400 | | |
| | Delay production ramp-up | | | | [-123,400] | | |
| 11 | MH-60S (MYP) | 3 | 88,000 | | | 3 | 88,000 |
| 13 | MH-60R | 6 | 205,000 | | | 6 | 205,000 |
| | **Airlift Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| | **Trainer Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| 20 | KC-130J | 7 | 495,400 | | | 7 | 495,400 |
| | **Modification of Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| 25 | EA-6 SERIES | | 200,710 | | | | 200,710 |
| 26 | AV-8 SERIES | | 22,600 | | | | 22,600 |
| 28 | F-18 SERIES | | 60,264 | | | | 60,264 |
| 29 | H-46 SERIES | | 35,140 | | | | 35,140 |
| 30 | AH-1W SERIES | | 66,974 | | | | 66,974 |
| 31 | H-53 SERIES | | 94,112 | | | | 94,112 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32 | SH-60 SERIES | | 6,696 | | | | 6,696 |
| 33 | H-1 SERIES | | 42,134 | | | | 42,134 |
| 35 | P-3 SERIES | | 700 | | | | 700 |
| 40 | C-130 SERIES | | 53,100 | | | | 53,100 |
| 43 | E-6 SERIES | | 1,000 | | | | 1,000 |
| 44 | EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES | | 3,360 | | | | 3,360 |
| 45 | SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT | | 2,710 | | | | 2,710 |
| 47 | POWER PLANT CHANGES | | 11,300 | | | | 11,300 |
| 50 | COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT | | 183,180 | | | | 183,180 |
| 54 | V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY | | 107,792 | | | | 107,792 |
| | **Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| 55 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 371,487 | | | | 371,487 |
| | **Aircraft Support Equipment and Facilities** | | | | | | |
| 56 | COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT | | 54,000 | | | | 54,000 |
| 57 | AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES | | 787 | | | | 787 |
| 58 | WAR CONSUMABLES | | 16,072 | | | | 16,072 |
| | **Total - Aircraft Procurement, Navy** | | **3,099,958** | | **-836,940** | | **2,263,018** |
| | **Weapons Procurement, Navy** | | | | | | |
| | **Ballistic Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Modification of Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Support Equipment and Facilities** | | | | | | |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Other Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Strategic Missiles** | | | | | | |
| 3 | TOMAHAWK | | 103,460 | | | | 103,460 |
| | **Tactical Missiles** | | | | | | |
| 4 | AMRAAM | | 825 | | | | 825 |
| 7 | SLAM-ER | | 13,500 | | | | 13,500 |
| 10 | HELLFIRE | | 44,000 | | | | 44,000 |
| | **Modification of Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Support Equipment and Facilities** | | | | | | |
| | **Ordnance Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Torpedoes and Related Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Torpedoes and Related Equip.** | | | | | | |
| | **Mod of Torpedoes and Related Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Destination Transportation** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Weapons** | | | | | | |
| | **Guns and Gun Mounts** | | | | | | |
| 28 | SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | | 22,196 | | | | 22,196 |
| | **Modification of Guns and Gun Mounts** | | | | | | |
| | **Other** | | | | | | |
| 35 | MARINE CORPS TACTIAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM | | 67,300 | | | | 67,300 |
| | **Spares and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Total - Weapons Procurement, Navy** | | **251,281** | | | | **251,281** |
| | **Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps** | | | | | | |
| | **Proc Ammo, Navy** | | | | | | |
| | **Navy Ammunition** | | | | | | |
| 8 | AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES | | 13,250 | | | | 13,250 |
| 12 | OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION | | 85 | | | | 85 |
| 13 | SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO | | 56,057 | | | | 56,057 |
| 14 | PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION | | 127 | | | | 127 |
| | **Proc Ammo, MC** | | | | | | |
| | **Marine Corps Ammunition** | | | | | | |
| 16 | SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION | | 55,289 | | | | 55,289 |
| 20 | LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES | | 7,749 | | | | 7,749 |
| 22 | 40 MM, ALL TYPES | | 46,192 | | | | 46,192 |
| 23 | 60MM, ALL TYPES | | 60,504 | | | | 60,504 |
| 24 | 81MM, ALL TYPES | | 70,002 | | | | 70,002 |
| 25 | 120MM, ALL TYPES | | 118,041 | | | | 118,041 |
| 26 | CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES | | 1,341 | | | | 1,341 |
| 28 | GRENADES, ALL TYPES | | 18,769 | | | | 18,769 |
| 29 | ROCKETS, ALL TYPES | | 16,546 | | | | 16,546 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30 | ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES | | 102,066 | | | | 102,066 |
| 32 | DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES | | 7,077 | | | | 7,077 |
| 33 | FUZE, ALL TYPES | | 1,761 | | | | 1,761 |
| 34 | NON LETHALS | | 11,231 | | | | 11,231 |
| 35 | AMMO MODERNIZATION | | 4,002 | | | | 4,002 |
| 36 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | **Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps** | | **590,090** | | | | **590,090** |
| | **Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Warships** | | | | | | |
| | **Amphibious Ships** | | | | | | |
| | **Auxiliaries, Craft and Prior Yr Program Costs** | | | | | | |
| | **Total - Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Procurement, Navy** | | | | | | |
| | **Ships Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Ship Propulsion Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Navigation Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Underway Replenishment Equipment** | | | | | | |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Periscopes** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Shipboard Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Reactor Plant Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Ocean Engineering** | | | | | | |
| | **Small Boats** | | | | | | |
| 24 | STANDARD BOATS | | 19,396 | | | | 19,396 |
| | **Training Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Production Facilities and Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Ship Support** | | | | | | |
| | **Drug Interdiction Support** | | | | | | |
| | **Communications and Electronics Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Ship Radars** | | | | | | |
| | **Ship Sonars** | | | | | | |
| | **ASW Electronic Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 40 | TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER | | 3,060 | | | | 3,060 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Electronic Warfare Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Reconnaissance Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 43 | SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT | | 44,000 | | | | 44,000 |
| | **Submarine Surveillance Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 44 | SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG | | 17,100 | | | | 17,100 |
| | **Other Ship Electronic Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 47 | GCCS-M EQUIPMENT | | 920 | | | | 920 |
| | **Training Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Aviation Electronic Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 56 | MATCALS | | 26,890 | | | | 26,890 |
| 60 | AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 750 | | | | 750 |
| | **Other Shore Electronic Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 67 | COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS | | 38,000 | | | | 38,000 |
| | **Shipboard Communications** | | | | | | |
| 75 | SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION | | 12,021 | | | | 12,021 |
| 76 | COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M | | 2,200 | | | | 2,200 |
| | **Satellite Communications** | | | | | | |
| | **Shore Communications** | | | | | | |
| | **Cryptographic Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Cryptologic Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Electronic Support** | | | | | | |
| | **Drug Interdiction Support** | | | | | | |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Aviation Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Sonobuoys** | | | | | | |
| | **Aircraft Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 90 | EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS | | 29,750 | | | | 29,750 |
| 93 | METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT | | 10,120 | | | | 10,120 |
| | **Ordnance Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Ship Gun System Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Ship Missile System Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **FBM Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **ASW Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 109 | SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS | | 3,600 | | | | 3,600 |
| | **Other Ordnance Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Expendable Ordnance** | | | | | | |
| | **Civil Engineering Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 118 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | | 4,530 | | | | 4,530 |
| 120 | CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP | | 101,400 | | | | 101,400 |
| 122 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | | 290,535 | | 21,000 | | 311,535 |
| | Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles | | | | [21,000] | | |
| 123 | AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT | | 350 | | | | 350 |
| 126 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION | | 116,531 | | | | 116,531 |
| | **Supply Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 128 | MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT | | 832 | | | | 832 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 131 | SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS | | 11,000 | | | | 11,000 |
| | **Personnel and Command Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Training Devices** | | | | | | |
| 132 | TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 8,445 | | | | 8,445 |
| | **Command Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 133 | COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 15,950 | | | | 15,950 |
| 137 | OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 16,900 | | | | 16,900 |
| 140 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | | 18,806 | | | | 18,806 |
| | **Other** | | | | | | |
| | **Spares and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| 145 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 225 | | | | 225 |
| | **Total - Other Procurement, Navy** | | **793,311** | | **21,000** | | **814,311** |
| | **Procurement, Marine Corps** | | | | | | |
| | **Weapons and Combat Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| | **Tracked Combat Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 2 | AAV7A1 PIP | | 14,467 | | | | 14,467 |
| 5 | LAV PIP | | 113,001 | | | | 113,001 |
| 5A | Improved Recovery Vehicle (IRV) | | 8,247 | | | | 8,247 |
| 6 | M1A1 FIREPOWER ENHANCEMENTS | | 90 | | | | 90 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Artillery and Other Weapons** | | | | | | |
| 8 | 155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER | 12 | 36,000 | | | 12 | 36,000 |
| 10 | WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION | | 16,695 | | | | 16,695 |
| | **Weapons** | | | | | | |
| 11 | MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM | | 17,098 | | | | 17,098 |
| | **Other Support** | | | | | | |
| 12 | MODIFICATION KITS | | 4,906 | | | | 4,906 |
| 13 | WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM | | 34,223 | | | | 34,223 |
| | **Guided Missiles and Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Guided Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Support** | | | | | | |
| 18 | MODIFICATION KITS | | 949 | | | | 949 |
| | **Communications and Electronics Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Command and Control Systems** | | | | | | |
| 19 | UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER | | 92,400 | | | | 92,400 |
| | **Repair and Test Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 20 | REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT | | 7,638 | | | | 7,638 |
| | **Other Support (Tel)** | | | | | | |
| 22 | COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM | | 8,435 | | | | 8,435 |
| 23 | MODIFICATION KITS | | 15,984 | | | | 15,984 |
| | **Command and Control System (Non-tel)** | | | | | | |
| 24 | ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC) | | 2,409 | | | | 2,409 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25 | AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS | | 107,593 | | | | 107,593 |
| | **Repair and Equipment (Non-tel)** | | | | | | |
| 27 | RADAR SYSTEMS | | 22,900 | | | | 22,900 |
| | **Intell/Comm Equipment (Non-tel)** | | | | | | |
| 28 | FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM | | 18,075 | | | | 18,075 |
| 29 | INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 34,348 | | | | 34,348 |
| | **Other Comm/Elec Equipment (Non-tel)** | | | | | | |
| 30 | NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT | | 142,731 | | | | 142,731 |
| | **Other Support (Non-tel)** | | | | | | |
| 31 | COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES | | 87,410 | | | | 87,410 |
| 32 | COMMAND POST SYSTEMS | | 13,416 | | | | 13,416 |
| 33 | RADIO SYSTEMS | | 464,565 | | -165,000 | | 299,565 |
| | Slow execution of radio procurement effort | | | | [-165,000] | | |
| 34 | COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS | | 22,913 | | | | 22,913 |
| | **Support Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| | **Administrative Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| | **Tactical Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 38 | 5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP) | 251 | 46,683 | | | 251 | 46,683 |
| 39 | MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS | | 149,162 | | | | 149,162 |
| 40 | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT | | 13,676 | | | | 13,676 |
| 43 | FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS | | 4,402 | | | | 4,402 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Other Support** | | | | | | |
| 44 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 8,048 | | | | 8,048 |
| | **Engineer and Other Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 45 | ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT | | 2,829 | | | | 2,829 |
| 46 | BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT | | 13,189 | | | | 13,189 |
| 47 | TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS | | 21,702 | | | | 21,702 |
| 48 | POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED | | 91,080 | | | | 91,080 |
| 49 | AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT | | 6,343 | | | | 6,343 |
| 50 | EOD SYSTEMS | | 50,563 | | 1,939,000 | | 1,989,563 |
| | Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles | | | | [1,939,000] | | |
| | **Materials Handling Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 51 | PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT | | 640,000 | | | | 640,000 |
| 53 | MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP | | 17,242 | | | | 17,242 |
| | **General Property** | | | | | | |
| 55 | FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT | | 6,750 | | | | 6,750 |
| 56 | TRAINING DEVICES | | 30,300 | | | | 30,300 |
| 57 | CONTAINER FAMILY | | 18,032 | | | | 18,032 |
| 58 | FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT | | 17,383 | | | | 17,383 |
| 59 | FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV) | | 18,000 | | | | 18,000 |
| 60 | BRIDGE BOATS | | 13,195 | | | | 13,195 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 61 | RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN | | 68 | | | | 68 |
| | **Other Support** | | | | | | |
| 63 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION | | 4,007 | | | | 4,007 |
| | **Spares and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| 64 | SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS | | 2,993 | | | | 2,993 |
| | **Total - Procurement, Marine Corps** | | **2,462,140** | | **1,774,000** | | **4,236,140** |

**Air Force procurement (sec. 1503)**

This section would authorize an additional $6.3 billion for fiscal year 2008 procurement of war related items for the Air Force.

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Aircraft Procurement, Air Force** | | | | | | |
| | **Combat Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| | **Tactical Forces** | | | | | | |
| 1 | F-35 | 1 | 230,000 | -1 | -230,000 | | |
| 1 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | | | | | |
| | *F-35 Joint Strike Fighter* | | | | [-230,000] | | |
| | **Airlift Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| | **Tactical Airlift** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Airlift** | | | | | | |
| 8 | C-130J | 17 | 1,356,300 | -4 | -468,000 | 13 | 888,300 |
| 8 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | | | | | |
| | More realistic production ramp-up | | | | [-468,000] | | |
| | **Trainer Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| | **Operational Trainers** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| | ***Helicopters*** | | | | | | |
| 13 | V22 OSPREY | 5 | 492,500 | -5 | -492,500 | | |
| 13 | LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) | | | | | | |
| | *Delay production ramp-up to complete operational testing* | | | | [-492,500] | | |
| | **Mission Support Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| 22A | TG-10D | 1 | 150 | | | 1 | 150 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Modification of In-service Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| | **Strategic Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| 23 | B-2A | | 45,800 | | -14,000 | | 31,800 |
| | Delay in radar modernization program | | | | [-14,000] | | |
| 24 | B-1B | | 46,120 | | | | 46,120 |
| 25 | B-52 | | 10,395 | | | | 10,395 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Tactical Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| 28 | F-15 | | 152,944 | | -22,000 | | 130,944 |
| | Tactical targeting network technology (TTNT) funding in advance of need | | | | [-22,000] | | |
| | **Airlift Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| 31 | C-5 | | 75,000 | | | | 75,000 |
| 33 | C-17A | | 72,000 | | | | 72,000 |
| 35 | C-32A | | 43,000 | | | | 43,000 |
| 36 | C-37A | | 11,000 | | | | 11,000 |
| | **Trainer Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Aircraft** | | | | | | |
| 46 | C-40 | | 39,000 | | | | 39,000 |
| 47 | C-130 | | 86,340 | | | | 86,340 |
| 50 | COMPASS CALL MODS | | 19,000 | | | | 19,000 |
| 52 | DARP | | 158,800 | | | | 158,800 |
| 53 | E-3 | | 65,000 | | | | 65,000 |
| 55 | E-8 | | 41,300 | | -41,300 | | |
| | JSTARS | | | | [-41,300] | | |
| 57 | H-60 | | 6,900 | | | | 6,900 |
| | **Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| 63 | INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | | 116,900 | | | | 116,900 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Aircraft Support Equipment and Facilities** | | | | | | |
| | **Common Support Equip** | | | | | | |
| 64 | AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP | | 237,360 | | | | 237,360 |
| | **Post Production Support** | | | | | | |
| | **Industrial Preparedness** | | | | | | |
| | **War Consumables** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Production Charges** | | | | | | |
| 78 | OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES | | 25,000 | | | | 25,000 |
| | **Classified Pgms** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Production Charges SOF** | | | | | | |
| | **DARP** | | | | | | |
| 84 | DARP | | 6,000 | | | | 6,000 |
| | **Total - Aircraft Procurement, Air Force** | | **3,336,809** | | **-1,267,800** | | **2,069,009** |
| | **Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force** | | | | | | |
| | **Procurement of Ammo, Air Force** | | | | | | |
| | **Rockets** | | | | | | |
| | **Cartridges** | | | | | | |
| 2 | CARTRIDGES | | 33,954 | | | | 33,954 |
| | **Bombs** | | | | | | |
| 4 | GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS | | 7,887 | | | | 7,887 |
| 6 | JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION | 582 | 13,094 | | | 582 | 13,094 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Flare, IR MJU-7B** | | | | | | |
| 12 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 | | 12,100 | | | | 12,100 |
| | **Fuzes** | | | | | | |
| 13 | FLARES | | 6,495 | | | | 6,495 |
| 14 | FUZES | | 475 | | | | 475 |
| | **Weapons** | | | | | | |
| | **Small Arms** | | | | | | |
| | **Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force** | | **74,005** | | | | **74,005** |
| | **Missile Procurement, Air Force** | | | | | | |
| | **Ballistic Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Missile Replacement Equipment-Ballistic** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Tactical** | | | | | | |
| | **Industrial Facilities** | | | | | | |
| | **Modification of In-service Missiles** | | | | | | |
| | **Class IV** | | | | | | |
| 8 | ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE | | 600 | | | | 600 |
| | **Spares and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| | **Missiles and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| 12 | INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS | | 1,200 | | | | 1,200 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Other Support** | | | | | | |
| | **Space Programs** | | | | | | |
| | **Special Programs** | | | | | | |
| | **Total - Missile Procurement, Air Force** | | **1,800** | | | | **1,800** |
| | **Other Procurement, Air Force** | | | | | | |
| | **Vehicular Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Passenger Carrying Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 2 | PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES | | 23,396 | | | | 23,396 |
| | **Cargo and Utility Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 3 | MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE | | 7,624 | | | | 7,624 |
| | **Special Purpose Vehicles** | | | | | | |
| 7 | SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES | | 155,315 | | 430,000 | | 585,315 |
| | Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles | | | | [430,000] | | |
| | **Fire Fighting Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 8 | FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES | | 15,200 | | | | 15,200 |
| | **Materials Handling Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 9 | HALVERSEN LOADER | | 27,000 | | | | 27,000 |
| | **Base Maintenance Support** | | | | | | |
| 10 | RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU | | 6,987 | | | | 6,987 |
| 11 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000(VEHICLES) | | 1,625 | | | | 1,625 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Cancelled Account Adjustment** | | | | | | |
| | **Electronics and Telecommunications** | | | | | | |
| | **Comm Security Equipment (COMSEC)** | | | | | | |
| | **Intelligence Programs** | | | | | | |
| | **Electronics Programs** | | | | | | |
| 18 | NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM | | 4,200 | | | | 4,200 |
| 21 | STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL | | 4,200 | | | | 4,200 |
| | **Special Comm-Electronics Projects** | | | | | | |
| 24 | GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY | | 15,776 | | | | 15,776 |
| 27 | AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM | | 109,000 | | | | 109,000 |
| 28 | COMBAT TRAINING RANGES | | 10,000 | | | | 10,000 |
| 31 | GCSS-AF FOS | | 15,024 | | | | 15,024 |
| | **Air Force Communications** | | | | | | |
| 34 | BASE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE | | 231,000 | | | | 231,000 |
| | **DISA Programs** | | | | | | |
| 40 | SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE | | 20,000 | | | | 20,000 |
| | **Organization and Base** | | | | | | |
| | **Modifications** | | | | | | |
| | **Other Base Maintenance and Support Equip** | | | | | | |
| | **Personal Safety and Rescue Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Depot Plant and Material Handling Equip** | | | | | | |
| | **Base Support Equipment** | | | | | | |
| 60 | ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (BASE S) | | 156,000 | | | | 156,000 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 61 | PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| | **Special Support Projects** | | | | | | |
| 63 | DISTRIBUTED GROUND SYSTEMS | | 12,500 | | | | 12,500 |
| 64 | SELECTED ACTIVITIES | | [ ] | | [-26,756] | | [ ] |
| 65 | SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 66 | DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG. | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| | **Spares and Repair Parts** | | | | | | |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 2,945,359 | | -26,756 | | 2,918,603 |
| | **Total - Other Procurement, Air Force** | | **3,760,206** | | **403,244** | | **4,163,450** |

**Defense-wide activities procurement (sec. 1504)**

This section would authorize an additional $593.8 million for fiscal year 2008 procurement of war related items for the defense agencies and the United States Special Operations Command.

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Procurement, Defense-Wide** | | | | | | |
| | **Major Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Major Equipment, OSD/WHS** | | | | | | |
| | **Major Equipment, NSA** | | | | | | |
| 2 | INTEL SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPS | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 3 | CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 5 | DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PGM | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 7 | TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| | **Major Equipment, WHS** | | | | | | |
| | **Major Equipment, DISA** | | | | | | |
| | **Major Equipment, DIA** | | | | | | |
| 20 | INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 21 | COMBATANT COMMAND INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 22 | DIA SUPPORT TO SOUTHCOM INTEL OPS | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 23 | DIA SUPPORT TO PACOM MANAGEMENT HQ | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 24 | INTEL SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPS | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 25 | DEFENSE HUMINT INTELLIGENCE (HUMINT) PROGRAM | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| | **Major Equipment, DLA** | | | | | | |
| | **Major Equipment, DCAA** | | | | | | |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Major Equipment, TJS** | | | | | | |
| | **Major Equipment, DHRA** | | | | | | |
| | **National Geospatial Intelligence Agency** | | | | | | |
| 30 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NGA | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| | **Defense Threat Reduction Agency** | | | | | | |
| | **Defense Security Cooperation Agency** | | | | | | |
| | **Major Equipment, AFIS** | | | | | | |
| | **Major Equipment, DODDE** | | | | | | |
| | **Major Equipment, DCMA** | | | | | | |
| | **Major Equipment, DTSA** | | | | | | |
| | **Major Equipment, CIFA** | | | | | | |
| 38 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| | **Major Equipment, BTA** | | | | | | |
| | **Special Operations Command** | | | | | | |
| | **Aviation Programs** | | | | | | |
| 48 | CV-22 SOF MOD | | 286,800 | | | | 286,800 |
| | **Shipbuilding** | | | | | | |
| | **Ammunition Programs** | | | | | | |
| 54 | SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT | | 30,379 | | | | 30,379 |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 55 | SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION | | 3,200 | | | | 3,200 |
| | **Other Procurement Programs** | | | | | | |
| 58 | SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS | | 4,583 | | | | 4,583 |
| 59 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 64 | SPECIAL PROGRAMS | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 65 | TACTICAL VEHICLES | | | | 124,000 | | 124,000 |
| | Mine Resistant Ambush Protected Vehicles | | | | [124,000] | | |
| 70 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAM (GDIP) | | [ ] | | | | [ ] |
| 74 | SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS | | 1,337 | | | | 1,337 |
| | **Chemical/Biological Defense** | | | | | | |
| | **CBDP** | | | | | | |
| 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | | 143,469 | | | | 143,469 |
| | **Total - Procurement, Defense-Wide** | | **469,768** | | **124,000** | | **593,768** |
| | **National Guard & Reserve Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Reserve Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **ARMY RESERVE** | | | | | | |
| | **NAVY RESERVE** | | | | | | |
| | **MARINE CORPS RESERVE** | | | | | | |
| | **AIR FORCE RESERVE** | | | | | | |

# Title XV - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Line | Program Title | FY 2008 Request Qty | FY 2008 Request Cost | Senate Change Qty | Senate Change Cost | Senate Authorized Qty | Senate Authorized Cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **National Guard Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **ARMY NATIONAL GUARD** | | | | | | |
| | **AIR NATIONAL GUARD** | | | | | | |
| | **Total - National Guard & Reserve Equipment** | | | | | | |
| | **Rapid Acquisition Fund** | | | | | | |
| | **Total - Rapid Acquisition Fund** | | | | | | |
| | **TOTAL PROCUREMENT** | | **39,956,557** | | **(7,153,933)** | | **32,802,624** |

**Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 1505)**

This section would authorize an additional $2.0 billion for fiscal year 2008 war-related research and development expenses.

# Title XV-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY** | | | |
| | | **Advanced Technology Development** | | | |
| | | **Advanced Component Development & Prototypes** | | | |
| 0603747A | 63 | SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY | 30,375 | | 30,375 |
| | | **System Development & Demonstration** | | | |
| 0604601A | 83 | INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS | 8,158 | | 8,158 |
| 0604642A | 88 | LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES | 20,000 | -20,000 | |
| | | Transfer to Title II | | [-20,000] | |
| 0604741A | 102 | AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - SI | 38,900 | | 38,900 |
| 0604746A | 104 | AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT | 6,500 | | 6,500 |
| | | **RDT&E Management Support** | | | |
| 0605801A | 145 | PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES | 20 | | 20 |
| | | **Operational Systems Development** | | | |
| 0203764A | 161 | TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 7,500 | | 7,500 |
| 0303140A | 170 | INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM | 23,300 | | 23,300 |
| 0303150A | 173 | WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM | 3,800 | | 3,800 |
| 0303158A | 174 | JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2) | 3,100 | | 3,100 |
| | | **Total, RDT&E Army** | **141,653** | **-20,000** | **121,653** |

# Title XV-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY** | | | |
| | | **Advanced Technology Development** | | | |
| 0603640M | 20 | USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD) | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| | | **Advanced Component Development & Prototypes** | | | |
| 0603635M | 55 | MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM | 35,825 | -20,000 | 15,825 |
| | | Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) - transfer to Title II | | [-20,000] | |
| 0603654N | 56 | JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| 0603764N | 68 | LINK EVERGREEN | 9,300 | | 9,300 |
| 0603851M | 72 | NONLETHAL WEAPONS | 8,000 | | 8,000 |
| | | **System Development & Demonstration** | | | |
| 0604214N | 84 | AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV | 6,406 | | 6,406 |
| 0604215N | 85 | STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT | 6,000 | | 6,000 |
| 0604262N | 94 | V-22A | 82,360 | | 82,360 |
| 0604270N | 97 | ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT | 8,676 | | 8,676 |
| 0604373N | 105 | AIRBORNE MCM | 19,500 | | 19,500 |
| 0604504N | 109 | AIR CONTROL | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| 0604562N | 115 | SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM | 4,900 | | 4,900 |
| 0605013N | 136 | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | 2,810 | | 2,810 |
| 0304785N | 140 | TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS | 13,000 | | 13,000 |

# Title XV-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RDT&E Management Support** | | | |
| 0605152N | 144 | STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY | 150 | | 150 |
| | | **Operational Systems Development** | | | |
| 0204136N | 170 | F/A-18 SQUADRONS | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| 0204152N | 171 | E-2 SQUADRONS | 1,024 | | 1,024 |
| 0205601N | 179 | HARM IMPROVEMENT | 4,330 | | 4,330 |
| 0206313M | 186 | MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS | 80,542 | | 80,542 |
| 0206623M | 187 | MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYS | 20,600 | | 20,600 |
| 0206624M | 188 | MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT | 19,675 | | 19,675 |
| 0305204N | 203 | TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES | 23,500 | | 23,500 |
| 0305207N | 206 | MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | 14,200 | | 14,200 |
| | 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 227,630 | -227,630 | |
| | | Classified program | | [-227,630] | |
| | | **Total, RDT&E Navy** | **618,428** | **-247,630** | **370,798** |
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE** | | | |
| | | **Advanced Technology Development** | | | |
| 0603112F | 20 | ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS | 2,800 | | 2,800 |

# Title XV-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Advanced Component Development & Prototypes** | | | |
| | | **System Development & Demonstration** | | | |
| 0604226F | 67 | B-1B | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| 0604240F | 70 | B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER | 14,100 | | 14,100 |
| 0604329F | 75 | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB) | 27,900 | | 27,900 |
| 0604617F | 84 | AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT | 3,800 | | 3,800 |
| 0604735F | 87 | COMBAT TRAINING RANGES | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| 0207450F | 98 | E-10 SQUADRONS | 178,390 | -178,390 | |
| | | E-10 program cancellation / transfer to PE 27581F (RDAF 157) | | [-178,390] | |
| | | **RDT&E Management Support** | | | |
| 0605807F | 110 | TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT | 21,815 | | 21,815 |
| 0605976F | 113 | FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION - TEST ANI | 1,610 | | 1,610 |
| | | **Operational Systems Development** | | | |
| 0207131F | 129 | A-10 SQUADRONS | 230,000 | | 230,000 |
| 0207133F | 130 | F-16 SQUADRONS | 55,300 | -47,600 | 7,700 |
| | | F-16 beyond line-of-sight (BLOS) funding in advance of need | | [-47,600] | |
| 0207134F | 131 | F-15E SQUADRONS | 97,500 | | 97,500 |
| 0207253F | 141 | COMPASS CALL | 5,600 | | 5,600 |
| 0207268F | 142 | AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| 0207325F | 144 | JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM) | 23,000 | | 23,000 |

# Title XV-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0207417F | 147 | AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS) | 72,500 | | 72,500 |
| 0207581F | 157 | JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JS | 291,600 | -251,000 | 40,600 |
| | | Vanishing vendors development funding ahead of need | | [-251,000] | |
| 0303601F | 178 | MILSATCOM TERMINALS | 79,750 | 79,750 | 159,500 |
| | | Milsatcom Terminals | | [79,750] | |
| 0304311F | 181 | SELECTED ACTIVITIES | [ ] | [-49,750] | [ ] |
| | | Classified program | | [-49,750] | |
| 0305202F | 201 | DRAGON U-2 | 660 | | 660 |
| 0305206F | 202 | AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS | 1,520 | | 1,520 |
| 0305220F | 206 | GLOBAL HAWK UAV | 1,384 | | 1,384 |
| 0305940F | 214 | SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS | 8,900 | | 8,900 |
| 0101314F | 242 | NIGHT FIST USSTRATCOM | 1,640 | | 1,640 |
| | 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 180,012 | -49,750 | 130,262 |
| | | **Total, RDT&E Air Force** | **1,369,781** | **-446,990** | **922,791** |
| | | **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE** | | | |
| | | **RDT&E Management Support** | | | |
| 0605200D8Z | 144 | GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE) | 34,000 | | 34,000 |

# Title XV-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Program Element | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Operational Systems Development** | | | |
| 0301011G | 177 | CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES | [ ] | [-191,511] | [ ] |
| | | Classified program | | [-191,511] | |
| 0304345BQ | 201 | NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (NGP) | [ ] | [-900] | [ ] |
| | | Classified program | | [-900] | |
| 0305125D8Z | 203 | CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP) | 9,000 | | 9,000 |
| 0902298J | 228 | MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS) | 1,028 | | 1,028 |
| 1160428BB | 240 | UNMANNED VEHICLES (UV) | 74,968 | | 74,968 |
| | 999 | CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS | 608,502 | -192,411 | 416,091 |
| | | **Total, RDT&E Defense-Wide** | **727,498** | **-192,411** | **535,087** |
| | | **OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE** | | | |
| | | **Total, Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense** | | | |
| | | **TOTAL RDT&E** | **2,857,360** | **-907,031** | **1,950,329** |

**Operation and maintenance (sec. 1506)**

This section would authorize an additional $72.9 billion for fiscal year 2008 war-related operation and maintenance expenses of the military services, the defense agencies, and the United States Special Operations Command.

# Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Army** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 2020a | 140 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | 34,348,922 | -711,700 | 33,637,222 |
| 2020a | | Grow the Force Transfer to title III | | [-689,400] | |
| 2020a | | Classified program | | [-22,300] | |
| 2020a | | COMMANDERS' EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM | 977,441 | | 977,441 |
| 2020a | | RESET | 7,840,027 | | 7,840,027 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **43,166,390** | **-711,700** | **42,454,690** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | | **SECURITY PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 2020a | 310 | SECURITY PROGRAMS | 1,111,465 | | 1,111,465 |
| | | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 2020a | 320 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 1,953,109 | | 1,953,109 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **3,064,574** | | **3,064,574** |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army** | **46,230,964** | **-711,700** | **45,519,264** |

# Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Navy** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 1804n | 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 993,170 | | 993,170 |
| 1804n | 020 | FLEET AIR TRAINING | 6,566 | | 6,566 |
| 1804n | 030 | INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | 2,948 | | 2,948 |
| 1804n | 040 | AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT | 64,217 | | 64,217 |
| 1804n | 050 | AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 27,243 | | 27,243 |
| 1804n | 060 | AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 147,709 | | 147,709 |
| | | **SHIP OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 1804n | 080 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 560,850 | | 560,850 |
| 1804n | 090 | SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING | 9,938 | | 9,938 |
| 1804n | 100 | SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 339,377 | | 339,377 |
| 1804n | 110 | SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT | 28,062 | | 28,062 |
| | | **COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1804n | 120 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 9,015 | | 9,015 |
| 1804n | 130 | ELECTRONIC WARFARE | 10,294 | | 10,294 |
| 1804n | 150 | WARFARE TACTICS | 10,863 | | 10,863 |
| 1804n | 160 | OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY | 1,812 | | 1,812 |
| 1804n | 170 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 1,773,563 | | 1,773,563 |
| 1804n | | JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF-JOINT PUBLICATION | 3,300 | | 3,300 |
| 1804n | 180 | EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 90,512 | | 90,512 |

# Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **WEAPONS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1804n | 220 | IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT | 18,608 | | 18,608 |
| 1804n | 230 | WEAPONS MAINTENANCE | 68,023 | | 68,023 |
| | | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1804n | 260 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION | 7,033 | | 7,033 |
| 1804n | 270 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 454,181 | | 454,181 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **4,627,284** | | **4,627,284** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION** | | | |
| | | **READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES** | | | |
| 1804n | 280 | SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE | 164,486 | | 164,486 |
| 1804n | | TRANSCOM (Second Destination Transportation) | 62,900 | | 62,900 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION** | **227,386** | | **227,386** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| | | **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | | | |
| 1804n | 370 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 36,593 | | 36,593 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **36,593** | | **36,593** |

# Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1804n | 450 | ADMINISTRATION | 3,435 | | 3,435 |
| 1804n | 460 | EXTERNAL RELATIONS | 337 | | 337 |
| 1804n | 480 | MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT | 1,262 | | 1,262 |
| 1804n | 490 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 6,145 | | 6,145 |
| 1804n | 500 | SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 25,809 | | 25,809 |
| | | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1804n | 520 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 113,231 | | 113,231 |
| 1804n | 550 | ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | 1,289 | | 1,289 |
| 1804n | 570 | COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS | 372 | | 372 |
| | | **INVESTIGATIONS AND SECURITY PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 1804n | | SECURITY PROGRAMS | 155,987 | -13,800 | 142,187 |
| 1804n | | Classified program | | [-13,800] | |
| 1804n | 590 | NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE | 4,670 | | 4,670 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **312,537** | **-13,800** | **298,737** |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy** | **5,203,800** | **-13,800** | **5,190,000** |

# Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **EXPEDITIONARY FORCES** | | | |
| 1106n | 010 | OPERATIONAL FORCES | 2,068,150 | | 2,068,150 |
| 1106n | 020 | FIELD LOGISTICS | 787,879 | | 787,879 |
| 1106n | 030 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 490,638 | | 490,638 |
| | | **USMC PREPOSITIONING** | | | |
| 1106n | 050 | MARITIME PREPOSITIONING | 26,893 | | 26,893 |
| | | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1106n | 070 | SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION | 60,401 | | 60,401 |
| 1106n | 080 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 92,710 | | 92,710 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **3,526,671** | | **3,526,671** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| | | **ACCESSION TRAINING** | | | |
| 1106n | 090 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 1,710 | | 1,710 |
| | | **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | | | |
| 1106n | 110 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 150 | | 150 |
| 1106n | 140 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 141,110 | | 141,110 |

# Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION** | | | |
| 1106n | 150 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 44,187 | | 44,187 |
| | | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1106n | 190 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 88 | | 88 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **187,245** | | **187,245** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | | **SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1106n | 200 | SPECIAL SUPPORT | 167 | | 167 |
| 1106n | 210 | SERVICE-WIDE TRANSPORTATION | 299,010 | | 299,010 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **299,177** | | **299,177** |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps** | **4,013,093** | | **4,013,093** |
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Air Force** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 3400f | 010 | PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES | 2,066,463 | | 2,066,463 |
| 3400f | 020 | PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS | 25,362 | | 25,362 |

# Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3400f | 030 | COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES | 167,200 | | 167,200 |
| 3400f | 040 | AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS) | 32,736 | | 32,736 |
| 3400f | 050 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 695,412 | | 695,412 |
| 3400f | 060 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 518,702 | | 518,702 |
| 3400f | 070 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 190,849 | | 190,849 |
| 3400f | 080 | BASE SUPPORT | 1,698,003 | | 1,698,003 |
| | | **COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 3400f | 090 | GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING | 21,351 | | 21,351 |
| 3400f | 100 | NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT | 6,490 | | 6,490 |
| 3400f | 110 | OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS | 276,728 | | 276,728 |
| 3400f | 130 | MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HQ | 106,907 | | 106,907 |
| 3400f | 140 | TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES | 1,092 | | 1,092 |
| | | **SPACE OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 3400f | 150 | LAUNCH FACILITIES | 1,129 | | 1,129 |
| 3400f | 160 | LAUNCH VEHICLES | 21 | | 21 |
| 3400f | 170 | SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS | 585 | | 585 |
| 3400f | 180 | SATELLITE SYSTEMS | 75 | | 75 |
| 3400f | 190 | OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS | 8,132 | | 8,132 |
| 3400f | 200 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 160 | | 160 |
| 3400f | 210 | BASE SUPPORT | 9,266 | | 9,266 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **5,826,663** | | **5,826,663** |

# Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION** | | | |
| | | **MOBILITY OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 3400f | 220 | AIRLIFT OPERATIONS | 3,629,379 | | 3,629,379 |
| 3400f | 230 | AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I | 12,567 | | 12,567 |
| 3400f | 240 | MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS | 20,447 | | 20,447 |
| 3400f | 260 | DEPOT MAINTENANCE | 115,670 | | 115,670 |
| 3400f | 270 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 1,497 | | 1,497 |
| 3400f | 280 | BASE SUPPORT | 97,494 | | 97,494 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION** | **3,877,054** | | **3,877,054** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | | | |
| | | **ACCESSION TRAINING** | | | |
| 3400f | 300 | RECRUIT TRAINING | 55 | | 55 |
| 3400f | 330 | BASE SUPPORT | 1,545 | | 1,545 |
| | | **BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING** | | | |
| 3400f | 340 | SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING | 116,062 | | 116,062 |
| 3400f | 350 | FLIGHT TRAINING | 25 | | 25 |
| 3400f | 360 | PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION | 708 | | 708 |
| 3400f | 370 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 1,269 | | 1,269 |
| 3400f | 390 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 2,462 | | 2,462 |
| 3400f | 400 | BASE SUPPORT | 15,345 | | 15,345 |

# Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION** | | | |
| 3400f | 410 | RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING | 74 | | 74 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING** | **137,545** | | **137,545** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | | **LOGISTICS OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 3400f | 460 | LOGISTICS OPERATIONS | 251,052 | | 251,052 |
| 3400f | 470 | TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES | 1,126 | | 1,126 |
| 3400f | 480 | SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION | 116,393 | | 116,393 |
| 3400f | 500 | FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION | 149 | | 149 |
| 3400f | 510 | BASE SUPPORT | 15,472 | | 15,472 |
| | | **SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 3400f | 520 | ADMINISTRATION | 2,068 | | 2,068 |
| 3400f | 530 | SERVICE-WIDE COMMUNICATIONS | 41,702 | | 41,702 |
| 3400f | 540 | PERSONNEL PROGRAMS | 227 | | 227 |
| 3400f | 560 | OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES | 48,578 | | 48,578 |
| 3400f | 570 | OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT | 2,663 | | 2,663 |
| 3400f | 600 | BASE SUPPORT | 2,927 | | 2,927 |
| | | **SECURITY PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 3400f | 610 | SECURITY PROGRAMS | 188,537 | -3,700 | 184,837 |
| 3400f | | Classified program | | [-3,700] | |

# Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS | | | |
| 3400f | 620 | INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT | 24,174 | | 24,174 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | **695,068** | **-3,700** | **691,368** |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force** | **10,536,330** | **-3,700** | **10,532,630** |
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 0100d | 010 | JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF | 90,548 | | 90,548 |
| 0100d | 020 | SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND | 1,660,342 | | 1,660,342 |
| | | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:** | **1,750,890** | | **1,750,890** |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| | | **DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES** | | | |
| 0100d | 050 | AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE | 16,409 | | 16,409 |
| 0100d | 100 | DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY | 15,345 | | 15,345 |
| 0100d | 120 | DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY | 175,021 | | 175,021 |
| 0100d | 140 | DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES | 18,242 | | 18,242 |
| 0100d | 150 | DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY | 154,015 | | 154,015 |
| 0100d | 180 | DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY | 12,401 | | 12,401 |

# Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0100d | 190 | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY | 174,813 | | 174,813 |
| 0100d | 200 | DOD HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY | 27,152 | | 27,152 |
| 0100d | 210 | DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY | 6,012 | | 6,012 |
| 0100d | 220 | DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY | 1,700,000 | | 1,700,000 |
| 0100d | 260 | OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE | 63,214 | | 63,214 |
| 0100d | 270 | WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE | 14,410 | | 14,410 |
| | | **OTHER PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 0100d | 999 | OTHER PROGRAMS | 1,971,066 | -122,774 | 1,848,292 |
| 0100d | | Classified program | | [-122,774] | |
| | | **TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:** | **4,348,100** | **-122,774** | **4,225,326** |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide** | **6,098,990** | **-122,774** | **5,976,216** |
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 2080a | 120 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | 158,410 | | 158,410 |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve** | **158,410** | | **158,410** |

# Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 1806n | 010 | MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS | 44,105 | | 44,105 |
| 1806n | 020 | INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE | 94 | | 94 |
| | | **SHIP OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 1806n | 060 | MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS | 2,331 | | 2,331 |
| | | **COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1806n | 100 | COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS | 6,700 | | 6,700 |
| 1806n | 110 | COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES | 16,368 | | 16,368 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **69,598** | | **69,598** |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve** | **69,598** | | **69,598** |
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **EXPEDITIONARY FORCES** | | | |
| 1107n | 010 | OPERATING FORCES | 65,519 | | 65,519 |
| 1107n | 030 | TRAINING SUPPORT | 2,346 | | 2,346 |

# Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **BASE SUPPORT** | | | |
| 1107n | 050 | BASE OPERATING SUPPORT | 135 | | 135 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **68,000** | | **68,000** |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve** | **68,000** | | **68,000** |
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT** | | | |
| 2065a | 130 | ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES | 466,150 | | 466,150 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **466,150** | | **466,150** |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard** | **466,150** | | **466,150** |

# Title XV - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Account | Line | Program Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard** | | | |
| | | **BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES** | | | |
| | | **AIR OPERATIONS** | | | |
| 3840f | 010 | AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS | 24,724 | | 24,724 |
| 3840f | 020 | MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS | 6,444 | | 6,444 |
| | | **TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES** | **31,168** | | **31,168** |
| | | **Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard** | **31,168** | | **31,168** |
| | | **TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:** | **72,876,503** | **-851,974** | **72,024,529** |

**Military personnel (sec. 1507)**

This section would authorize an additional $12.9 billion for fiscal year 2008 war-related military personnel expenses of the active and reserve components, including mobilization costs for reserve and National Guard forces.

# Title XV - War-Related Military Personnel Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Budget Sub Activity Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **MILITARY PERSONNEL ARMY (Direct)** | 12,504,398 | | 12,504,398 |
| **Active Duty Overstrength Transfers to Title IV:** | | | |
| BASIC PAY | | -152,123 | -152,123 |
| RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL | | -44,116 | -44,116 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING | | -51,770 | -51,770 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE | | -5,665 | -5,665 |
| RECRUITING AND RETENTION (Total AC) | | -62,000 | -62,000 |
| SPECIAL PAYS | | -26,582 | -26,582 |
| SOCIAL SECURITY TAX | | -11,637 | -11,637 |
| BASIC PAY | | -1,047,717 | -1,047,717 |
| RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL | | -303,838 | -303,838 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING | | -386,219 | -386,219 |
| RECRUITING AND RETENTION (Total AC) | | -958,120 | -958,120 |
| SPECIAL PAYS | | -111,751 | -111,751 |
| SOCIAL SECURITY TAX | | -80,150 | -80,150 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE | | -122,194 | -122,194 |
| **TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL ARMY** | **12,504,398** | **-3,363,882** | **9,140,516** |
| **MILITARY PERSONNEL NAVY (Direct)** | 752,089 | | 752,089 |

## Title XV - War-Related Military Personnel Authorizations

(Dollars in Thousands)

| Budget Sub Activity Title | FY2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **MILITARY PERSONNEL MARINE CORPS (Direct)** | 1,601,882 | | 1,601,882 |
| **Active Duty Overstrength Transfers to Title IV:** | | | |
| BASIC PAY | | -97,595 | -97,595 |
| RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL | | -28,303 | -28,303 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING | | -32,823 | -32,823 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE | | -3,075 | -3,075 |
| SOCIAL SECURITY TAX | | -7,466 | -7,466 |
| BASIC PAY | | -206,354 | -206,354 |
| RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL | | -59,843 | -59,843 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING | | -87,381 | -87,381 |
| INCENTIVE PAYS | | -219,881 | -219,881 |
| SOCIAL SECURITY TAX | | -15,786 | -15,786 |
| BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE | | -25,900 | -25,900 |
| **TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL MARINE CORPS** | **1,601,882** | **-784,407** | **817,475** |
| **MILITARY PERSONNEL AIR FORCE (Direct)** | 1,411,890 | | 1,411,890 |
| **RESERVE PERSONNEL ARMY (Direct)** | 235,000 | | 235,000 |
| **RESERVE PERSONNEL NAVY (Direct)** | 70,000 | | 70,000 |
| **RESERVE PERSONNEL MARINE CORPS (Direct)** | 15,420 | | 15,420 |
| **RESERVE PERSONNEL AIR FORCE (Direct)** | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| **NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL ARMY (Direct)** | 476,584 | | 476,584 |
| **NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL AIR FORCE (Direct)** | | | |
| **TOTAL WAR-RELATED PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS** | **17,070,263** | **-4,148,289** | **12,921,974** |

**Defense Health Program (sec. 1508)**

This section would authorize an additional $1.0 billion for fiscal year 2008 war-related expenses of the Defense Health program.

**Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide (sec. 1509)**

This section would authorize an additional $257.6 million for fiscal year 2008 war-related drug interdiction and counterdrug expenses.

**Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1510)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $4.5 billion for the fiscal year 2008 war-related expenses of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund. The provision would also specify the authorized use of these funds, authorize the transfer of funds from this account to other accounts of the Department of Defense, require a plan for the use of these funds, and require quarterly reports on the specific use of the funds.

**Iraq Security Forces Fund (sec. 1511)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize an additional $2.0 billion for the fiscal year 2008 war-related expenses of the Iraq Security Forces Fund. The provision would also specify the authorized use of these funds, authorize the transfer of funds from this account to other accounts of the Department of Defense, provide for prior notice to Congress before obligation of these funds, and require quarterly reports on the specific use of these funds.

**Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (sec. 1512)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $2.7 billion in fiscal year 2008 for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund transfer account. These funds would be available to the Secretary of Defense for the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, construction, and for the Afghanistan Security Forces. The provision would require the concurrence of the Secretary of State for the provision of assistance under this section. The provision would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to receive contributions of funds from any person, foreign government, or international organization for the purposes of the fund. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees in writing 5 days prior to the use or transfer of funds from the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund, and to provide quarterly reports summarizing the details of the use or transfer of funds.

**Iraq Freedom Fund (sec. 1513)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize an additional $107.5 million for the fiscal year 2008 war-related expenses of the Iraq Freedom Fund. The provision would also authorize the transfer of funds from this account to other accounts of the Department of Defense and require prior notice to Congress before obligation of these funds.

**Defense Working Capital Funds (sec. 1514)**

This section would authorize an additional $1.7 billion for the fiscal year 2008 war-related working capital fund expenses of the Department of Defense.

**National Defense Sealift Fund (sec. 1515)**

This section would authorize an additional $5.1 million for the fiscal year 2008 war-related expenses of the National Defense Sealift Fund.

**Defense Inspector General (sec. 1516)**

This section would authorize an additional $4.4 million for the fiscal year 2008 war-related expenses of the Defense Inspector General.

## Subtitle B—General Provisions Relating to Authorizations

**Purpose (sec. 1521)**

This section states the purpose of this title which is to authorize additional appropriations for Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2008.

Additional war-related authorizations for military construction programs are contained in title XXIX of this Act.

**Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1522)**

This section would provide that the amounts authorized for war-related purposes in this title are in addition to the amounts otherwise authorized in this Act for the base budget.

**Special transfer authority (sec. 1523)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the transfer of up to $3.5 billion of war-related funding authorizations in this title among the accounts in this title. This special transfer authority is in addition to the general transfer authority contained in section 1001 of this Act, but the same reprogramming procedures applicable to transfers under section 1001 would also apply to transfers under this section.

## Subtitle C—Other Matters

**Limitation on availability of funds for certain purposes relating to Iraq (sec. 1531)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations in this Act to establish permanent bases in Iraq or to exercise United States control over the oil resources of Iraq. This provision would effectively extend the prohibition already in effect during fiscal year 2007.

**Reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations (sec. 1532)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse any key cooperating nation for logistical and military support provided by that nation to, or in con-

nection with, U.S. military operations in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. The total amount of payments made under the authority of this section during fiscal year 2008 may not exceed $1.2 billion. The provision would prohibit the Secretary from entering into any contractual obligation to make a reimbursement under the authority provided by this section. The provision would require the Secretary to prescribe standards for determining the kinds of logistical support that could be reimbursed under this section, and to submit those standards to the congressional defense committees no less than 15 days before those standards take effect. The provision would also require the Secretary to notify the congressional defense committees no less than 15 days before making any reimbursement under this section, and to report to those committees quarterly on reimbursements made during the reporting period under the authority provided by this section.

**Logistical support for coalition forces supporting operations in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 1533)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the use of Operation and Maintenance funds for fiscal year 2008 to provide supplies, services, transportation, and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting U.S. military and stabilization operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Secretary of Defense may provide logistical support under the authority of this section only if he makes a determination that the coalition forces to be supported are essential to the success of the U.S. military or stabilization operation and that those forces would not be able to participate in the operation without the provision of that support. The provision would also require that logistical support provided under this section comply with the Arms Export Control Act and other U.S. export control laws. The total amount of logistical support provided under this section during fiscal year 2008 may not exceed $400.0 million. The provision would require the Secretary to submit quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees on the recipients of logistical support provided under the authority of this section and the type and value of support provided.

**Competition for procurement of small arms supplied to Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 1534)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require a full and open competition for procurement of small arms (pistols and other weapons less than 0.50 caliber) supplied to Iraq and Afghanistan, ensuring that no responsible U.S. manufacturer is excluded and that products manufactured in the U.S. are not excluded from the competition.

The Multi-National Security Transition Command—Iraq (MNSTC–I) is the principal Department of Defense (DOD) activity which supports the training and equipping of Iraqi Security Forces (ISF). DOD awards contracts, using U.S. appropriated Iraq Security Forces Funds (ISSF) in support of the Iraqi Government, specifically, the Iraqi Ministry of Interior (police forces) and Ministry of Defense (military forces). According to DOD, the Iraqi Government, with MNSTC–I advice, has determined that the Glock Model 19 and Beretta 9m pistols are the weapons of choice for the ISF.

DOD has awarded five Indefinite Delivery-Indefinite Quantity contracts for these pistols. U.S. manufactured weapons are not available under these contracts.

The committee believes that U.S. manufacturers should not be excluded from competing for contracts funded by the American taxpayers for procurement of small arms supplied to Iraq and Afghanistan.

## Budget Items

### 105MM high explosive rocket assisted artillery ammunition

The fiscal year 2008 budget requested $10.0 million in war-related funding in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA) for 105MM High Explosive Rocket Assisted (HERA) artillery ammunition. The committee notes that this is a new, developmental program for artillery ammunition that the Army has not procured since fiscal year 1999. Army budget materials lack justification for a new start and fails to explain this ammunition's relationship to war costs or any plans for procurement of this ammunition in the future. The committee recommends a decrease of $10.0 million in war-related PAA for the procurement of 105MM HERA artillery ammunition.

### Mine resistant ambush protected vehicles

The fiscal year 2008 budget request included $441.0 million in the war-related budget request and no funding in the base budget request for the procurement of Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles. Based on the most current information provided by the military services, the Department of Defense has an unfunded requirement of approximately $4.1 billion to procure 7,700 MRAP vehicles.

A May 2007 memorandum from the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of the Army and Secretary of the Navy identifies the procurement of MRAP vehicles as the Department's highest priority. The Department's failure to include any funding in the fiscal year 2008 base budget request and a minor percentage of the requirement in the fiscal year 2008 war-related budget request for the procurement of MRAPs is very troubling in view of the criticality of rapidly fielding this force protection system.

Further, the committee is concerned with the separate and diverging paths the Army and Marine Corps have taken regarding the fielding of MRAP vehicles. At present, the Army projects a requirement of roughly one MRAP for every seven Up-armored High Mobility Multi-purpose Wheeled Vehicles (UAH) in theater, while the Marine Corps intends to replace UAHs with MRAPs. The Department has not provided an adequate explanation for these divergent fielding strategies.

The committee recognizes the challenges the Department faces with regard to this matter given the number of contractors manufacturing MRAP vehicle variants. However, the committee is concerned that the service has not formulated its long-term plan for logistic support to maintain the MRAPs. The committee expects the Army and Marine Corps to evaluate the effectiveness of continuing

contractor logistic support and develop a transition plan to assume the logistics and sustainment of these systems.

Improvised explosive devices (IEDs) remain the number one threat to troops in theater. For this reason, it is critical that the Department deploys the survivability enhancements to our warfighters afforded by MRAPs as quickly as possible.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.1 billion in title XV, including: $1.6 billion in Other Procurement, Army (OPA); $2.0 billion in Procurement, Marine Corps (PMC); $430.0 million in Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF); $21.0 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN); and $124.0 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW) for MRAP vehicles. Additional guidance is contained in the classified annex to this report.

**Night vision advanced technology**

The budget request included $35.9 million in PE 63710A for night visions advanced technology. The committee recognizes the benefits of night vision devices, including the improved situational awareness it provides soldiers and soldiers' enhanced ability to operate at night. The committee funded the Army's $33.0 million unfunded requirement for over 11,000 monocular night vision devices. In addition to procuring these critical devices, the Army must continue to develop more technologically capable and agile night vision devices. To accelerate these developments, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63710A, including $7.5 million for research and development of short-range electro-optic sensors, and $2.5 million for the continued research and development of intelligence surveillance and detection sensors.

**Night vision devices**

The budget request included $278.6 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for night vision devices. The committee recognizes the benefits of night vision devices, including the improved situational awareness it provides soldiers and their enhanced ability to operate at night. According to the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded requirement list submitted to the committee, the Army has an unfunded requirement for over 11,000 monocular night vision devices. These additional night vision goggles would permit the Army to fulfill the equipment shortages of military police and combat engineer units. The additional funding would also provide the Stryker force with a night vision capability, thereby increasing its mobility and situational awareness in times of low light and at night. The committee recommends an increase of $33.0 million in OPA for night vision devices to fulfill the Army's remaining unfunded requirement.

**Single Army Logistics Enterprise**

The Army's fiscal year 2008 base budget request included $53.6 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the Single Army Logistic Enterprise (SALE). The fiscal year 2008 war-related budget request included $602.8 million in OPA for the SALE. Over the next several years, the Army plans to invest billions of dollars to develop and field the General Fund Enterprise Business System (GFEBS), the Global Combat Support System-Army, Field/Tactical

(GCSS-Army), and the Logistics Modernization Program (LMP). The Government Accountability Office (GAO) determined that these three systems will replace about 120 legacy logistics information management systems.

The committee is not satisfied by the Army's progress in implementing these three systems. Last year, based upon its concerns about the cost performance and schedule delays, Congress prohibited the expenditure of funds on LMP until the Secretary of Defense certified that the LMP had addressed its many shortcomings. While the Department of Defense did approve the LMP for further development, the GAO continues to raise concerns that the Army is investing in systems without the benefit of an overarching Army business enterprise architecture. The committee shares the GAO's concerns. The Army's attempt to implement major information technology modernization efforts absent a guiding enterprise architecture could result in systems that are duplicative, are not well integrated, and do not effectively optimize mission performance.

Additionally, the GAO has reported that GCSS-Army and LMP have already experienced significant delays and, as currently structured, there is no certainty that additional delays will not occur. The GAO has determined that GFEBS and LMP will not be fully fielded until fiscal year 2010, and GCSS-Army will not be fully deployed until fiscal year 2014. Further, budget justification materials provided in the fiscal year 2008 war-related budget request fail to relate the costs associated with these information technology modernizations to the current global war on terror. Similarly, the Army's Grow the Force budget request contains an additional $159.0 million for these information technology upgrades, without sufficient justification. Attempts to have the Army provide further detailed justification materials have gone unheeded.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $552.5 million in title XV, OPA for SALE.

**UH–1Y/AH–1Z helicopters**

The budget request included $518.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) to procure 20 UH–1Y/AH–1Z helicopters and $123.4 million requested in fiscal year 2008 war-related APN to procure six more UH–1Y/AH–1Z helicopters. Total production orders in fiscal year 2007 consisted of 11 UH–1Y/AH–1Z helicopters.

The Marine Corps has been developing upgrades and replacements for its existing fleet of attack (AH–1) and utility (UH–1) helicopters. These programs, the AH–1Z and UH–1Y, are being conducted by the same manufacturer. Unfortunately, both programs have experienced delayed deliveries and increasing costs. These problems appear, at least in part, to have been caused by deficient cost control and cost accounting procedures by which the contractor manages the programs and through which Department of Defense acquisition officials can manage the Government's equities in the programs.

This raises concerns with the committee, since these same procedures have been used on other existing programs and could be used on future programs as well. The Marine Corps' MV–22, U.S. Special Operations Command's CV–22, and the Army's Armed Recon-

naissance Helicopter (ARH) programs will all be acquired in whole or in part from the same contractor.

The committee strongly supports modernizing the forces with the UH–1Y and AH–1Z, but doubts that the contractor team will be able to expand production rapidly enough to more than double production in 1 year given these recent problems. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease in war-related APN of six aircraft and $123.4 million.

**Radio systems**

The budget request included $644.4 million for procurement of radios for the Marine Corps in the base budget, the war-related budget, and the "Grow the Force" initiative. For fiscal year 2007, between the base budget and supplementals, the Marine Corps is slated to receive $1,294.3 million for radio procurement. The Marine Corps, like the Army, faces a serious shortage of radios due in part to delays in developing the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS). The Marine Corps also urgently requires new versions of current radios that are resistant to self-jamming in operations against radio-controlled improvised explosive devices.

Obligations of funds have been delayed because the Marine Corps temporarily reprogrammed significant amounts from radio procurement to production of Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles, which the committee agrees was a wise decision. In addition, the Marine Corps will not receive the funds to repay these borrowed funds and for additional radio procurement until almost the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2007, which will further impact budget execution. The committee therefore recommends a reduction of $165.0 million to the request for fiscal year 2008.

The committee believes that the roughly $1.9 billion budgeted for legacy radio system procurement across fiscal years 2007 and 2008 is driven by continued delays in developing and fielding the JTRS. The committee is aware that this joint program was restructured in fiscal year 2006 to improve cost and schedule performance, which seems to have successfully stabilized the program. However, some concerns still persist regarding the JTRS program's ability to achieve a series of critical milestones scheduled in 2008 and 2009, which will lead to operational testing and production. The committee is also concerned about the availability of resources for both the sustainment of legacy radio systems and development of JTRS, and intends to closely monitor the program's progress in achieving upcoming critical milestones.

Therefore, the Secretary of Defense is directed to ensure that detailed quarterly updates are provided to the congressional defense committees, commencing in the first quarter of fiscal year 2008, that describe the JTRS program schedule and progress in completing the critical design, technical, integration, test, and production milestones leading to initial operational capability.

**Joint Strike Fighter**

The budget request included $1,421.7 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) to purchase six Air Force Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) aircraft in fiscal year 2008 and a budget request of $230.0 million in war-related APAF funding to purchase an addi-

tional JSF aircraft. In addition, the budget request included $1,232.2 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) to purchase six Marine Corps JSF aircraft.

The committee believes that producing 12 aircraft in fiscal year 2008 would be adequate to support the planned production expansion and subsequent deliveries to the JSF testing and training activities, and that there are higher priorities for using these funds for other programs in the war-related budget. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $230.0 million in the fiscal year 2008 war-related APAF budget.

**C–130J aircraft**

The budget request included $686.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) to procure nine C–130J tactical airlift aircraft and $1,356.3 million requested in fiscal year 2008 war-related APAF to procure 17 C–130Js. The budget request also included $256.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) to procure four KC–130J aerial refueling aircraft, and $495.4 million in war-related APN to procure seven KC–130Js. This would result in procuring a total of 37 C–130J aircraft for all Department of Defense requirements.

The committee notes that production of the C–130 aircraft has not been at those levels in recent years. In fiscal year 2006, the Air Force and the Navy bought 18 C–130Js and, in fiscal year 2007, the total will be 15 aircraft at most.

The committee strongly supports modernizing the forces with the C–130J, but doubts that the contractor team will be able to expand production rapidly enough to more than double production in 1 year after several years of producing at current rates. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease in war-related APAF of four aircraft and $468.0 million.

**CV–22 Osprey aircraft**

The budget request included $495.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) to procure five CV–22 aircraft and $492.5 million requested in fiscal year 2008 war-related APAF to procure five more CV–22 aircraft. The budget request also included $1,959.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) to procure 21 MV–22 aircraft, and $140.5 million in war-related APN to procure two more MV–22 aircraft. This would result in procuring a total of 33 V–22 aircraft in fiscal year 2008 for all Department of Defense requirements.

The committee notes that the budget request would cause production of the V–22 to increase dramatically. In fiscal year 2006, the Navy and the Air Force bought 14 V–22s and, in fiscal year 2007, the total will be 17 aircraft at most.

The committee strongly supports modernizing the forces with the V–22, but doubts that the contractor team will be able to expand production rapidly enough to more than double production in 1 year after several years of producing at current rates. The committee has expressed similar concerns elsewhere in this report about the production rate increase for the Marine Corps' UH–1Y and AH–1Z helicopters, which are built in the same facility.

Additionally, CV–22 initial operational test and evaluation is scheduled for the first quarter of fiscal year 2008. Ramping up production from two or three aircraft in fiscal year 2007 to a level of five aircraft in fiscal year 2008 would show a strong commitment to the program, while avoiding any risk of unpleasant surprises in testing. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease in war-related APAF of five aircraft and $492.5 million.

**F–15 modifications**

The budget request included $19.2 million for modifications to the F–15 aircraft in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF, line 28) and $152.9 million in fiscal year 2008 war-related APAF for F–15 modifications, including $22.0 million for tactical targeting network technology (TTNT) upgrades.

The Air Force request for $22.0 million to buy and install TTNT is premature. According to the budget justification material, the Air Force would not place these procurement funds on contract until fiscal year 2010. The TTNT system development for the F–15 program is a 3-year effort, expected to begin in fiscal year 2008. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $22.0 million for the TTNT modification.

**Joint surveillance target attack radar system modifications**

The budget request included $79.7 million for modifications to the E–8 joint surveillance target attack radar system (JSTARS) aircraft in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF, line 55) and $41.3 million in fiscal year 2008 war-related APAF for JSTARS modifications. The war-related request would be used to replace components of the JSTARS system affected by vanishing vendors, sometimes known as a diminishing manufacturing sources (DMS) problem.

The Air Force budget justification material indicates that the Air Force could award a research and development contract for the JSTARS DMS program by the end of the third quarter of fiscal year 2008 or at the latest, the beginning of the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2008. Given that circumstance, awarding procurement contracts in fiscal year 2008 would be premature. The committee recommends a decrease of $41.3 million for JSTARS DMS procurement.

**Joint light tactical vehicle**

The budget request included $82.3 million in PE 64642A for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army (RDTEA) for Light Tactical Wheeled Vehicles. The war-related budget request for fiscal year 2008 also included $20.0 million for the same program element. This $20.0 million is requested for acceleration of the development of the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV). The JLTV development program has nothing to do with ongoing military operations and should be funded exclusively in the base budget. The committee recommends a reduction to the war-related JLTV request of $20.0 million and an increase of $20.0 million for JLTV development in the base budget.

**F–16 research and development**

The budget request included $90.6 million in PE 27133F for research and development projects for the F–16 and $55.3 million requested in fiscal year 2008 war-related research and development for the F–16 to develop secure, beyond-line-of-sight (BLOS) capability. The F–16 needs a BLOS capability to communicate over long distances with command and control nodes and ground forces in mountainous terrain.

In the near-term, to develop a capability to fill an urgent need, the Air Force plans to modify 72 aircraft with ARC–210 or equivalent radios and associated hardware to provide the secure line-of-sight (SLOS) capability using funds from the fiscal year 2006 budget. The F–16 BLOS program would build on that effort. The committee supports achieving this BLOS capability. However, only $7.7 million of the war-related request is needed in fiscal year 2008 to support the BLOS effort. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $47.6 million for F–16 BLOS development.

**Military satellite communication terminals**

The fiscal year 2008 war-related budget request included $79.8 million in PE 33601F for military satellite communications terminals. No justification was provided by the Air Force for this request. The committee recommends that no funds for military satellite communication terminals be included in the war-related request.

**Operation and maintenance funding transfers**

The budget request included $689.4 million in operation and maintenance funding for the Army as emergency funding to support modular conversions and the so-called "overstrength" personnel levels above the levels contained in the Quadrennial Defense Review of 482,000 active-duty Army personnel.

The fiscal year 2008 budget now proposes a permanent increase in the Army's personnel level. Under these circumstances the committee does not believe it is appropriate to continue to budget for the costs of personnel we know we will have and intend to retain as emergency war costs. Funding for these support costs has been transferred to the base budget and is included in title III of this Act.

The funding tables for this title and for title III reflect these transfers.

**Military personnel funding transfers**

The budget request included $3.4 billion in military personnel funding for the Army and an additional $784.4 million for the Marine Corps in emergency funding for the cost of so-called "overstrength" personnel levels above the levels contained in the Quadrennial Defense Review of 482,400 active-duty Army personnel and 175,000 active-duty Marine Corps personnel. Both services have maintained and funded personnel ceilings above these levels for the past several years, on a recurring year-to-year "temporary" basis, using emergency funding.

The fiscal year 2008 budget now proposes a permanent increase in these personnel levels. Under these circumstances the committee

does not believe it is appropriate to continue to budget for personnel we know we will have and intend to retain as an emergency war cost. Funding for these personnel, including funding for bonuses that apply to the entire force and not specifically to personnel serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, has been transferred to the base budget and is included in title IV of this Act.

The following table lists the specific amounts transferred.

**Joint improvised explosive device defeat office**

The budget request included $500.0 million in the Joint Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Defeat Fund and the war-related budget request included $4.0 billion in OPA for the Joint IED Defeat Fund.

The Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Office (JIEDDO) was created by the Department of Defense in February 2006 to defeat the IED threat, train the force in tactics and techniques to defend against the IED threat, and to attack the networks that enable IEDs to be used against American service members. In its first year, the organization undertook a number of counter-IED initiatives costing approximately $2.8 billion, as well as hiring staff, establishing a financial management function, and developing performance metrics.

The committee is aware of the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) March 2007 assessment of the JIEDDO which stated that it has not developed a strategic plan to clearly articulate its mission and, as a result, JIEDDO cannot effectively assess whether it is making the right investment decisions or whether it has effectively organized itself to meet its mission. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense has expressed similar concerns.

The committee is also concerned that JIEDDO does not have full visibility over all of the services' counter-IED efforts, which has resulted in duplication of efforts. Moreover, according to the GAO, JIEDDO has not finalized guidance for how and when sustainment costs for all proven counter-IED initiatives will be transitioned to the services.

In addition to concerns about JIEDDO's investment strategy and organizational structure, the committee is concerned about the gaps that exist in training the force. According to the GAO, training efforts do not reach all deploying personnel who may be exposed to the IED threat. This training gap is a serious force protection issue that must be addressed by JIEDDO.

The committee awaits the Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force on IEDs' next quarterly report on the ongoing program and activities in the context of a strategic campaign to address the IED threat. The committee expects that the DSB will address the matter of duplication of effort among the services' respective research and development communities, relevant defense agencies, and JIEDDO. Further, the committee expects the DSB will examine JIEDDO's approach to short- and long-term investments in technology development.

The committee expects that JIEDDO will implement the recommendations already provided to it by the GAO and will implement quickly the recommendations of the DSB Task Force once the

report has been completed. Additional directive guidance to JIEDDO is contained in the classified annex.

The committee views JIEDDO as a war-related expense and, therefore, recommends transferring the funding provided in the base budget to title XV of the bill. To accomplish this, the committee recommends a reduction of $500.0 million in the base budget for the Joint IED Defeat Fund, and an increase of $500.0 million in the fiscal year 2008 war-related budget request for the Joint IED Defeat Fund.

**Blast injury research**

Blast injury from improvised explosive devices (IEDs) continues to be the most significant cause of American casualties in Iraq. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not appropriately allocated resources provided for the defeat of IEDs to the "full range of efforts necessary to defeat the IED threat," including much needed research and training on the prevention, mitigation, and treatment of blast injuries. Section 256 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) established a Department of Defense-wide program to prevent, mitigate, and treat blast injuries. The committee expects that the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Office (JIEDDO), in accordance with the 2006 Act, will be a partner in the Department-wide efforts to coordinate, manage, and fund research efforts for medical blast research.

To support these efforts, the committee directs that JIEDDO fund blast-related medical research, training, and programmatic activities which have been identified as high priorities by the DOD executive agent at a level of not less than $50.0 million in fiscal year 2008. These include: research and development of diagnostics, training, and treatment for traumatic brain injury; collection, storage, and integration of operational, medical, and protective equipment performance data associated with wounding and non-wounding events; body surface wound mapping for investigation of wounding patterns to be included in body armor design; research and training to prevent traumatic eye injury, cranial-facial injury, and burns; and enhanced research on hemorrhage control.

Further, the committee directs JIEDDO to report to the executive agent and to the congressional defense committees on actions, including funding, to fulfill these requirements, no later than March 1, 2008.

**Counter radio-controlled improvised explosive device electronic warfare**

The Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded requirements list included a request for $152.9 million in Other Procurement, Army for the acquisition of counter radio-controlled improvised explosive device electronic warfare (CREW) systems. According to the budget request submitted to the committee by the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Office (JIEDDO), the JIEDDO's budget includes over $745.0 million to assist the military services with urgent requests from in theater. In light of these funds, the committee directs the JIEDDO to provide the Army with the funds necessary to procure 1,000 CREW–2 systems and 8,131 CREW trainers.

**Counter-remote controlled improvised explosive device systems**

The committee is concerned that the Joint Improvised Explosive Defeat (IED) Office has become too dependent on a single source of supply for counter-Remote Controlled IED (RCIED) jamming systems and system components, thereby limiting innovation and potentially preventing more effective systems from being fielded. The committee further believes the Joint IED Defeat Office (JIEDDO) should consider identifying and qualifying additional sources for counter-RCIED systems. The committee therefore directs the JIEDDO and the military departments to identify and, as appropriate, qualify additional sources for counter-RCIED systems and system components.

**Directed energy for improvised explosive device defeat**

The committee is heartened that the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) is starting to invest significant resources in research, development, and production of technologies to counter a broader spectrum of electronics used in improvised explosive devices (IEDs). The committee is concerned that JIEDDO has taken a short-term view of this technology area, looking for off-the-shelf solutions. Not finding fully mature technologies or properly engineered prototypes, JIEDDO has chosen not to invest, expecting the services or the private sector to make the necessary investments. For their part, service advocates have not persuaded their management to invest because the prevailing view is that JIEDDO has the responsibility.

The IED problem is obviously severe and our exposure in Iraq has endured. These devices are almost certainly here to stay as a threat to U.S. and allied military forces. It is incumbent on the Department of Defense to develop robust solutions even if that takes considerable time and resources. JIEDDO, the services, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, and the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics should be working together to develop a rational investment strategy.

More specifically, the committee is persuaded that technology advances in photonic switches and transformers provide potential pulse-power/directed energy capabilities far better than what is currently available. On behalf of JIEDDO, the Technical Support Working Group (TSWG) is rapidly maturing technology for compact, single-cycle, very high peak power, ultra-wideband, extremely short pulse, very fast discharge, and high pulse rate from low prime power sources. The possibility exists that a multiple cycle terawatt system could be built for fielding on an airborne platform. The committee directs that, of the amounts authorized and appropriated for JIEDDO, $20.0 million be used for a competitive award through the TSWG to accelerate ongoing projects and to develop multiple cycle technology.

# DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

## Summary and explanation of funding tables

Division B of this Act authorizes funding for military construction projects of the Department of Defense. It includes funding authorizations for the construction and operation of military family housing as well as military construction for the reserve components, the defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment program. It also provides authorization for the base closure accounts that fund military construction, environmental cleanup, and other activities required to implement the decisions in base closure rounds.

The following tables provide the project-level authorizations for the military construction funding authorized in division B of this Act and summarize that funding by account. Funding for base closure projects is explained in additional detail in the table included in title XXVII of this report.

The budget request for fiscal year 2008 included authorization of appropriations for military construction and housing programs totaling $21.2 billion. Of this amount, $9.8 billion was requested for military construction, $2.9 billion for the construction and operation of family housing, and $8.4 for base closure activities, including $8.2 billion to implement the results of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.

The budget also proposed an additional $907.9 million in emergency spending for Army military construction projects in Iraq and Afghanistan and Navy military construction projects in the United States related to the administration's proposal to grow the size of the Marine Corps. Additional funding for the Army projects is contained in title XXIX of this Act. The funding requested for Marine Corps projects has been included in title XXII of this Act.

Including all funding in division B of this Act, the committee recommends authorization of appropriations for military construction and housing programs totaling $22.6 billion. The total amount authorized for appropriations reflects this committee's continuing commitment to invest in the recapitalization of Department of Defense facilities and infrastructure. The committee recommends an increase of $600.0 million for additional construction projects, and a reduction of $139.1 million in unjustified or lower priority projects, for a net increase of $460.9 million to the amount requested for military construction and family housing.

**SUMMARY OF FY 2008 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS**

| | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Army | 4,039,197 | 16,550 | 4,055,747 |
| Navy | 2,104,276 | 257,015 | 2,361,291 |
| Air Force | 912,109 | 134,166 | 1,046,275 |
| Defense Agencies | 1,799,336 | 95,845 | 1,895,181 |
| Chemical Demilitarization Construction | 86,176 | -86,176 | 0 |
| NATO Security Investment Program | 201,400 | 0 | 201,400 |
| Army National Guard | 404,291 | 54,224 | 458,515 |
| Army Reserve | 119,684 | 15,000 | 134,684 |
| Naval and Marine Corps Reserve | 59,150 | 0 | 59,150 |
| Air National Guard | 85,517 | 130,900 | 216,417 |
| Air Force Reserve | 26,559 | 0 | 26,559 |
| **Subtotal Construction** | **9,837,695** | **617,524** | **10,455,219** |
| Army Family Housing Construction | 419,400 | 0 | 419,400 |
| Army Family Housing Operations | 742,920 | 0 | 742,920 |
| Navy Family Housing Construction | 298,329 | 1,766 | 300,095 |
| Navy Family Housing Operations | 371,404 | 0 | 371,404 |
| Air Force Family Housing Construction | 362,747 | 0 | 362,747 |
| Air Force Family Housing Operations | 688,335 | 0 | 688,335 |
| Defense Agencies Family Housing Operations | 48,848 | 0 | 48,848 |
| Family Housing Improvement Fund | 500 | 0 | 500 |
| **Subtotal Family Housing** | **2,932,483** | **1,766** | **2,934,249** |
| Base Realignment and Closure IV | 220,689 | 0 | 220,689 |
| Base Realignment and Closure 2005 | 8,174,315 | 0 | 8,174,315 |
| **Subtotal BRAC** | **8,395,004** | **0** | **8,395,004** |
| **Subtotal Construction, Housing and BRAC FY2008 Authorizations (Non War-Related)** | **21,165,182** | **619,290** | **21,784,472** |
| **Prior Year Savings** | 0 | -3,100 | -3,100 |
| **Subtotal Excluding war-related contstruction** | **21,165,182** | **616,190** | **21,781,372** |
| **Title XXIX War-Related Construction** | | | |
| Army Military Construction | 738,850 | 13,800 | 752,650 |
| Navy Military Construction | 157,305 | -157,305 | 0 |
| Navy Housing Construction | 11,766 | -11,766 | 0 |
| **Subtotal War-Related Construction** | **907,921** | **-155,271** | **752,650** |
| **Grand Total Division B** | **22,073,103** | **460,919** | **22,534,022** |

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | Alabama | ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT | INDUSTRIAL WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT | 26,000 | | 26,000 |
| Army | Alabama | REDSTONE ARSENAL | SYSTEM SOFTWARE ENGINEERING ANNEX, PH2 | | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Navy | Alabama | EVERGREEN | NOLF EVERGREEN RUNWAY EXTENSION | 9,560 | | 9,560 |
| Army Guard | Alabama | SPRINGVILLE | READINESS CENTER, ADD/ALT (ADRS) | 3,300 | | 3,300 |
| Army | Alaska | FORT RICHARDSON | Military Police Operations Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 42,000 | 42,000 |
| Army | Alaska | FORT RICHARDSON | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 36,000 | 36,000 |
| Army | Alaska | FORT RICHARDSON | Construction Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 14,800 | 14,800 |
| Army | Alaska | FORT WAINWRIGHT | EOD/MP Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 11,600 | 11,600 |
| Army | Alaska | FORT WAINWRIGHT | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Army | Alaska | FORT WAINWRIGHT | RAILHEAD OPERATIONS FACILITY PHASE 1 | | 8,900 | 8,900 |
| Army | Alaska | FORT WAINWRIGHT | REPLACE SUBSTATION/UPGRADE ELECTRIC | 60,000 | | 60,000 |
| Army | Alaska | FORT WAINWRIGHT | COMPANY OPERATIONS FACILITY | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| Air Force | Alaska | ELMENDORF AFB | F-22 JET ENGINE INSPECTION & MAINT | 13,800 | | 13,800 |
| Air Force | Alaska | ELMENDORF AFB | F-22 7 BAY A/C SHELTER | 21,400 | | 21,400 |
| Air Force | Alaska | ELMENDORF AFB | F-22 FIGHTER TOWN EAST INFRASTRUCTURE PHASE 2 | 7,100 | | 7,100 |
| Air Force | Alaska | ELMENDORF AFB | F-22 TAXIWAY, TAXILANE & ARM/DE-ARM PAD | 27,880 | | 27,880 |
| Air Force | Alaska | ELMENDORF AFB | REPLACE JOINT PME CENTER, PHASE 1 | | 13,000 | 13,000 |
| Air Force Reserve | Alaska | ELMENDORF AFB | AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SQUADRON FACILITY | 4,550 | | 4,550 |
| Air Force Reserve | Alaska | ELMENDORF AFB | GROUP HEADQUARTERS | 10,400 | | 10,400 |
| Army | Arizona | FORT HUACHUCA | EFFLUENT REUSE SYSTEM | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| Army | Arizona | FORT HUACHUCA | General Instructional Building (Grow the Force) | | 13,600 | 13,600 |
| Army | Arizona | FORT HUACHUCA | AIT Trainee Complex (Grow the Force) | | 105,000 | 105,000 |
| Navy | Arizona | YUMA | BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS | 22,980 | | 22,980 |
| Navy | Arizona | YUMA | TOWWAY "G" | 10,740 | | 10,740 |
| Air Force | Arizona | DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB | CSAR EC130 MAINT HANGAR/AMU | 11,200 | | 11,200 |
| Army Guard | Arizona | FLORENCE | FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP | | 10,870 | 10,870 |
| Air Force | Arkansas | LITTLE ROCK AFB | REPAIR RUNWAY | | 9,800 | 9,800 |
| Army Guard | Arkansas | CAMP ROBINSON | AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT | 5,500 | | 5,500 |
| Army Guard | Arkansas | CAMP ROBINSON | Professional Educ Ctr/Training Complex (Grow the Force) | | 18,423 | 18,423 |
| Army | California | FORT IRWIN | MILITARY OPERATIONS IN URBAN TERRAIN, PHASE 2 | 18,500 | | 18,500 |
| Army | California | FORT IRWIN | TRAINING LAND IMPROVEMENTS | 5,500 | | 5,500 |
| Army | California | PRESIDIO MONTEREY | GENERAL INSTRUCTION BUILDING | 28,000 | | 28,000 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER | 8,510 | | 8,510 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | BEQ - CHAPPO AREA | 29,050 | | 29,050 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | ISR CAMP - INTEL BATTALION | 17,980 | | 17,980 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | MARSOC SUPPORTING FACILITIES | 17,730 | | 17,730 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | BEQ - HEADQUARTERS | 31,980 | | 31,980 |

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENTS | 5,830 | | 5,830 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | TACTICAL SUPPORT VAN PADS EXPANSION | 6,050 | | 6,050 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | HANGAR ADDITIONS | 4,400 | | 4,400 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | BEQ - MARGARITA | 26,530 | | 26,530 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | INFANTRY SQUAD BATTLE COURSE | 18,090 | -18,090 | 0 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Force Intel Ops Center - HQ Area (Grow the Force) | | 24,990 | 24,990 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Consolidated Comm/Electronics Shop (Grow the Force) | | 16,840 | 16,840 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | 1st MLG Operations Center (Grow the Force) | | 18,160 | 18,160 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | 1st MLG Armory (Grow the Force) | | 8,150 | 8,150 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | 1st MLG Group and Battalion Ops Center (Grow the Force) | | 22,220 | 22,220 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | BEQ - Wounded Warrior Battalion (Grow the Force) | | 25,940 | 25,940 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Armory - Regimental and Battalion HQ (Transfer from Title XXIX) | | 5,160 | 5,160 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Armory - Intelligence Battalion (Transfer from Title XXIX) | | 4,180 | 4,180 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Armory - 5th Marine Regiment (Transfer from Title XXIX) | | 10,890 | 10,890 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Bachelor Quarters and Armory - Horno (Transfer from Title XXIX) | | 34,970 | 34,970 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Bachelor Quarters and Dining Facility (Transfer from Title XXIX) | | 24,390 | 24,390 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Company HQ - Military Police (Transfer from Title XXIX) | | 8,240 | 8,240 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Explosive Ordnance Detachment - Ops Facility (From Title XXIX) | | 13,090 | 13,090 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Intelligence Surveillance Reconnaissance Camp (From Title XXIX) | | 1,114 | 1,114 |
| Navy | California | MIRAMAR MCAS | Hangar Modification (Grow the Force) | | 26,760 | 26,760 |
| Navy | California | SAN DIEGO | PIER 5002 SUB FENDER INSTALLATION | 9,040 | | 9,040 |
| Navy | California | SAN DIEGO | MAGNETIC SILENCING FACILITY MODIFICATION | 14,590 | | 14,590 |
| Navy | California | TWENTYNINE PALMS | BEQ AND PARKING STRUCTURE | 34,329 | | 34,329 |
| Navy | California | TWENTYNINE PALMS | Multi-Battalion Operations Center (Grow the Force) | | 33,770 | 33,770 |
| Navy | California | TWENTYNINE PALMS | Multi-Battalion Operations Center (Grow the Force) | | 33,650 | 33,650 |
| Navy | California | TWENTYNINE PALMS | Armory (Grow the Force) | | 5,920 | 5,920 |
| Navy | California | TWENTYNINE PALMS | Landfill (Grow the Force) | | 13,560 | 13,560 |
| Navy | California | TWENTYNINE PALMS | MOUT Facility (Phase 3) (Grow the Force) | | 21,390 | 21,390 |
| Navy | California | TWENTYNINE PALMS | Regimental Headquarters Addition (Transfer from Title XXIX) | | 4,440 | 4,440 |
| Air Force | California | EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE | MAIN BASE RUNWAY INCREMENT 3 | 35,000 | | 35,000 |
| Air Force | California | TRAVIS AFB | C-17 ROAD IMPROVEMENTS | 4,600 | | 4,600 |
| Air Force | California | TRAVIS AFB | C-17 SOUTHWEST LANDING ZONE | 22,000 | | 22,000 |
| Defense Agencies | California | CAMP PENDLETON | SOF SUPPLY FACILITY | 8,310 | | 8,310 |
| Defense Agencies | California | CAMP PENDLETON | SOF PARALOFT/BOAT/DIVE LOCKER | 5,770 | | 5,770 |
| Defense Agencies | California | CAMP PENDLETON | SOF ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION FACILITY | 5,950 | | 5,950 |
| Defense Agencies | California | CORONADO | SOF SPECIAL BOAT TEAM OPERATIONS FACILITY | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| Defense Agencies | California | POINT LOMA ANNEX | REPLACE FUEL STORAGE FACILITIES | 140,000 | | 140,000 |

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army Guard | California | CAMP ROBERTS | INFANTRY PLATOON BATTLE COURSE | 2,850 | | 2,850 |
| Army Guard | California | SACRAMENTO ARMY DEPOT | READINESS CENTER | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| Army Reserve | California | FORT HUNTER LIGGETT | CONVOY LIVE FIRE RANGE | 2,534 | | 2,534 |
| Army Reserve | California | FORT HUNTER LIGGETT | RANGE CONTROL FACILITY | 4,501 | | 4,501 |
| Army Reserve | California | GARDEN GROVE | ARMY RESERVE CENTER | 25,440 | | 25,440 |
| Naval Reserve | California | MIRAMAR MCAS | RESERVE CENTER ADDITIONS | 5,580 | | 5,580 |
| Army | Colorado | FORT CARSON | INDOOR RANGE | 4,900 | | 4,900 |
| Army | Colorado | FORT CARSON | DEFENSE ACCESS ROAD | 9,300 | -1,000 | 8,300 |
| Army | Colorado | FORT CARSON | Engineer Bn HQ/Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 59,000 | 59,000 |
| Army | Colorado | FORT CARSON | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 53,000 | 53,000 |
| Army | Colorado | FORT CARSON | MP Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 13,000 | 13,000 |
| Army | Colorado | FORT CARSON | Hospital Addition & Dental Clinic (Grow the Force) | | 18,000 | 18,000 |
| Air Force | Colorado | FORT CARSON | AIR SUPT OPS SQUADRON COMPLEX | 13,500 | | 13,500 |
| Air Force | Colorado | SCHRIEVER AFB | AIR AND SPACE INTEGRATION FACILITY | 24,500 | | 24,500 |
| Air Force | Colorado | U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY | UPGRADE ACADEMIC FACILITY PH IVB | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| Chem Demil Const | Colorado | PUEBLO DEPOT | AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY PHASE IX | 35,159 | -35,159 | 0 |
| Defense Agencies | Colorado | PUEBLO DEPOT | AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY PHASE IX | | 35,159 | 35,159 |
| Air National Guard | Colorado | BUCKLEY ANGB | SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY | | 7,300 | 7,300 |
| Navy | Connecticut | NAVAL SUB BASE NEW LONDON | WATERFRONT OPERATIONS FACILITY | | 11,900 | 11,900 |
| Army Guard | Connecticut | NIANTIC | READINESS CENTER (ADRS) | 13,600 | | 13,600 |
| Army | Delaware | DOVER AFB | JOINT PERSONAL EFFECTS DEPOT | 17,500 | | 17,500 |
| Air National Guard | Delaware | NEW CASTLE | REPLACE C-130 MAINTENANCE HANGAR | | 10,800 | 10,800 |
| Air Force | District of Columbia | BOLLING AFB | COMMUNICATION SWITCH FACILITY | 2,500 | | 2,500 |
| Defense Agencies | District of Columbia | BOLLING AFB | INSTALL BACKUP WATER SYSTEM | 1,012 | | 1,012 |
| Army | Florida | EGLIN AFB | OPERATIONS COMPLEX, PHASE 2 | 66,000 | | 66,000 |
| Army | Florida | MIAMI DORAL | SOUTHCOM HEADQUARTERS FACILITY | 237,000 | -3,467 | 233,533 |
| Army | Florida | MIAMI DORAL | SOUTHCOM HQ CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER | 0 | 3,467 | 3,467 |
| Navy | Florida | BLOUNT ISLAND | MAIN GATE IMPROVEMENTS | 7,570 | | 7,570 |
| Navy | Florida | CAPE CANAVERAL | ENGINEERING SERVICES FACILITY | | 9,900 | 9,900 |
| Navy | Florida | PANAMA CITY | LITTORAL WARFARE SYSTEMS FACILITY | 13,870 | | 13,870 |
| Air Force | Florida | EGLIN AFB | F-35 ADAL 53RD JOINT REPROGRAMMING FAC | 8,300 | | 8,300 |
| Air Force | Florida | EGLIN AFB | CONSTRUCT SEAWALLS SANTA ROSA IS RANGE COMP | 35,000 | | 35,000 |
| Air Force | Florida | EGLIN AFB | REPAIR ROADS SANTA ROSA IS RANGE COMPLEX | 49,000 | | 49,000 |
| Air Force | Florida | EGLIN AFB | F-35 INTEGRATED TRAINING CENTER | 39,000 | | 39,000 |
| Air Force | Florida | EGLIN AFB | F-35 SQUADRON OPS/AMU/HANGAR | 27,000 | | 27,000 |
| Air Force | Florida | MACDILL AFB | CENTCOM JOINT INTELLIGENCE CENTER PHASE III | 25,000 | | 25,000 |
| Air Force | Florida | MACDILL AFB | ALTER USCENTCOM HEADQUARTERS | 57,000 | | 57,000 |

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Force | Florida | PATRICK AFB | CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER | 11,854 | | 11,854 |
| Air Force | Florida | TYNDALL AFB | FITNESS CENTER | 19,014 | | 19,014 |
| Air Force | Florida | TYNDALL AFB | REPAIR AIRFIELD | 25,100 | | 25,100 |
| Defense Agencies | Florida | HURLBURT FIELD | SOF MAINTENANCE STORAGE FACILITY | 4,711 | | 4,711 |
| Defense Agencies | Florida | HURLBURT FIELD | SOF OPERATIONS FACILITY | 5,500 | | 5,500 |
| Defense Agencies | Florida | HURLBURT FIELD | SOFCOMBAT WEATHER OPERATIONS FACILITY | 14,900 | | 14,900 |
| Defense Agencies | Florida | HURLBURT FIELD | SOF SQUADRON OPERATIONS ADDITION | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Florida | KEY WEST | REPLACE FUEL PUMP HOUSE | 1,874 | | 1,874 |
| Defense Agencies | Florida | MACDILL AFB | SOF ACQUISITION CENTER | 35,500 | | 35,500 |
| Defense Agencies | Florida | MACDILL AFB | SOF 501-D BUILDING ADDITION PHASE 2 | 12,200 | | 12,200 |
| Defense Agencies | Florida | MACDILL AFB | PHARMACARE ADDITION/ALTERATION | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Florida | MACDILL AFB | CLINIC REPLACEMENT, INCREMENT II | 41,400 | | 41,400 |
| Army Guard | Florida | JACKSONVILLE | ARMY AVN SUPPORT FACILITY ADD/ALT | 12,200 | | 12,200 |
| Army | Georgia | FORT BENNING | RECEPTION STATION, PH 1 | 51,000 | | 51,000 |
| Army | Georgia | FORT BENNING | TRAINEE BARRACKS COMPLEX | 73,000 | | 73,000 |
| Army | Georgia | FORT BENNING | MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE | 5,800 | | 5,800 |
| Army | Georgia | FORT BENNING | SIMULATIONS TRAINING FACILITY | 56,000 | | 56,000 |
| Army | Georgia | FORT STEWART | BARRACKS COMPLEX | 36,000 | | 36,000 |
| Army | Georgia | FORT STEWART | BRIGADE COMPLEX-HEADQUARTERS | 26,000 | | 26,000 |
| Army | Georgia | FORT STEWART | Fire Station (Grow the Force) | | 5,500 | 5,500 |
| Army | Georgia | FORT STEWART | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Army | Georgia | FORT STEWART | Human Resources Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| Army | Georgia | HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD | Quartermaster Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| Air Force | Georgia | ROBINS AFB | AIRCRAFT COMPONENT REPAIR FAC | 14,700 | | 14,700 |
| Defense Agencies | Georgia | AUGUSTA | REGIONAL SECURITY OPERATION CENTER INCREMENT III | 100,000 | | 100,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Georgia | FORT BENNING | SOF BATTALION COMPLEX | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Georgia | FORT BENNING | SOF HQ BUILDING ADDITION | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Georgia | FORT BENNING | SOF TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP | 9,000 | | 9,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Georgia | HUNTER ANGS | SOF SUPPORT COMPANY FACILITY | 13,800 | | 13,800 |
| Air National Guard | Georgia | SAVANNAH IAP | TROOP QUARTERS | | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| Army | Hawaii | FORT SHAFTER | BARRACKS COMPLEX | 31,000 | | 31,000 |
| Army | Hawaii | SCHOFIELD BARRACKS | BARRACKS COMPLEX | 43,000 | | 43,000 |
| Army | Hawaii | SCHOFIELD BARRACKS | BARRACKS COMPLEX | 45,000 | | 45,000 |
| Army | Hawaii | WHEELER AFB | BARRACKS COMPLEX | 51,000 | | 51,000 |
| Navy | Hawaii | KANEOHE BAY | BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS | 37,961 | | 37,961 |
| Navy | Hawaii | PEARL HARBOR | SUB DRIVE-IN MAGNETIC SILENCING FAC | 99,860 | | 99,860 |
| Navy | Hawaii | PEARL HARBOR NAVAL SHIPYARD | DRYDOCK NUMBER 1 AND 2 | | 30,200 | 30,200 |

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Navy | Hawaii | WAHIAWA | COMMUNICATION CENTER | 65,410 | | 65,410 |
| Air Force | Hawaii | HICKAM AFB | DCGS INTELLIGENCE SQUADRON OPS FACILITY | 16,500 | | 16,500 |
| Air Force | Hawaii | HICKAM AFB | C-17 PARKING RAMP | 15,471 | | 15,471 |
| Defense Agencies | Hawaii | HICKAM AFB | REPLACE HYDRANT FUELS SYSTEM | 11,900 | | 11,900 |
| Defense Agencies | Hawaii | KUNIA | REGIONAL SECURITY OPERATION CENTER INCREMENT III | 136,318 | | 136,318 |
| Army Guard | Idaho | GOWEN FIELD | TRAINING AREA RAILHEAD, PH 2 | | 7,615 | 7,615 |
| Army Guard | Idaho | ORCHARD TRAINING AREA | URBAN ASSAULT COURSE | 1,700 | | 1,700 |
| Army | Illinois | ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL | COMBINED FIRE/POLICE FACILITY, PHASE 2 | | 3,350 | 3,350 |
| Navy | Illinois | GREAT LAKES | RTC INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADE INCREMENT 3 | 16,650 | | 16,650 |
| Navy | Illinois | GREAT LAKES | SMALL ARMS MARKMANSHIP TRAINER | 10,221 | | 10,221 |
| Air Force | Illinois | SCOTT AFB | CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER | | 8,200 | 8,200 |
| Air Force | Illinois | SCOTT AFB | SECURITY FORCES OPERATIONS FACILITY | 16,700 | | 16,700 |
| Defense Agencies | Illinois | GREAT LAKES | FEDERAL HEALTHCARE FACILITY | 99,000 | | 99,000 |
| Army Guard | Illinois | ST CLAIR COUNTY | READINESS CENTER (ADRS) | 8,100 | | 8,100 |
| Navy | Indiana | NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY CRANE | SECURED ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYS FAC | | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| Air National Guard | Indiana | HULMAN REGIONAL AIRPORT | DIGITAL GROUND STATION (DGS) BEDDOWN | 7,700 | | 7,700 |
| Army Guard | Iowa | IOWA CITY | READINESS CENTER | | 13,186 | 13,186 |
| Army | Kansas | FORT LEAVENWORTH | BARRACKS COMPLEX | 55,000 | | 55,000 |
| Army | Kansas | FORT LEAVENWORTH | MP HQ & MP I/R Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 23,000 | 23,000 |
| Army | Kansas | FORT LEAVENWORTH | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 12,800 | 12,800 |
| Army | Kansas | FORT RILEY | Engineer Bn HQ/Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 43,000 | 43,000 |
| Army | Kansas | FORT RILEY | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Army | Kansas | FORT RILEY | Child Development Center (Grow the Force) | | 8,500 | 8,500 |
| Army | Kansas | FORT RILEY | Health & Dental Clinic (Grow the Force) | | 8,800 | 8,800 |
| Army | Kansas | FORT RILEY | DIGITAL MULTIPURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX | 28,000 | | 28,000 |
| Air Force | Kansas | FORT RILEY | AIR SUPPORT OPS SQUADRON COMPLEX | 12,515 | | 12,515 |
| Air National Guard | Kansas | SMOKY HILL RANGE | ASOS BEDDOWN | | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| Army | Kentucky | FORT CAMPBELL | INDOOR RANGE | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| Army | Kentucky | FORT CAMPBELL | VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP | 49,000 | | 49,000 |
| Army | Kentucky | FORT CAMPBELL | MP/CID/Medical Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 24,000 | 24,000 |
| Army | Kentucky | FORT CAMPBELL | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 27,000 | 27,000 |
| Army | Kentucky | FORT KNOX | CANTONMENT AREA ROADS, PAVED | 6,700 | | 6,700 |
| Chem Demil Const | Kentucky | BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT | AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY PHASE VIII | 51,017 | -51,017 | 0 |
| Defense Agencies | Kentucky | BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT | AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY PHASE VIII | | 69,017 | 69,017 |
| Defense Agencies | Kentucky | FORT CAMPBELL | SOF BATTALION OPERATIONS COMPLEX | 35,000 | | 35,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Kentucky | FORT CAMPBELL | SOF GROUP SUPPORT BATTALION COMPLEX | 18,500 | | 18,500 |
| Army | Louisiana | FORT POLK | 4TH BDE, HEADQUARTERS | | 9,800 | 9,800 |

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | Louisiana | FORT POLK | CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER | | 6,100 | 6,100 |
| Air National Guard | Louisiana | CAMP BEAUREGARD | UPGRADE ASOS FACILITY | 1,800 | | 1,800 |
| Navy | Maine | PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD | CONSOLIDATED EMERGENCY CONTROL CTR | | 9,700 | 9,700 |
| Army | Maryland | ABERDEEN PG | AUTOMOTIVE TECH EVALUATION FAC | | 12,200 | 12,200 |
| Navy | Maryland | PATUXENT RIVER | AIRCRAFT PROTOTYPE FACILITY PHASE 1 | 17,990 | | 17,990 |
| Navy | Maryland | PATUXENT RIVER | E-2 ADVANCED HAWKEYE RDT&E FACILITY | 13,650 | | 13,650 |
| Navy | Maryland | PATUXENT RIVER | JPALS ADDITION TO BUILDING 2110/2122 | 6,720 | | 6,720 |
| Navy | Maryland | SUITLAND | NATIONAL MARITIME INTELLIGENCE CENTER INC II | 52,069 | | 52,069 |
| Defense Agencies | Maryland | FORT DETRICK | USAMRIID STAGE I, INCREMENT II | 150,000 | | 150,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Maryland | FORT MEADE | NSAW PSC UTILITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM PH II | 7,901 | | 7,901 |
| Defense Agencies | Maryland | FORT MEADE | NSAW OPS1 SOUTH STAIR TOWER | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| Air Force | Massachusetts | HANSCOM AFB | RENOVATE ACQUISITION MGT FACILITY | | 12,800 | 12,800 |
| Air National Guard | Massachusetts | OTIS ANGB | DIGITAL GROUND STATION (DGS) IOC BEDDOWN | 1,800 | | 1,800 |
| Army | Michigan | DETROIT ARSENAL | GROUND SYS POWER & ENERGY LAB | | 18,500 | 18,500 |
| Army Guard | Michigan | CAMP GRAYLING | INFANTRY PL BATTLE COURSE/LIVE FIRE RANGE | | 2,450 | 2,450 |
| Army Guard | Michigan | LANSING | USPFO AND READINESS CENTER, PH 2 | | 4,239 | 4,239 |
| Naval Reserve | Michigan | SELFRIDGE ANGB | RESERVE TRAINING CENTER | 4,030 | | 4,030 |
| Army Guard | Minnesota | CAMP RIPLEY | COMBINED ARMS COLLECTIVE TRAINING FACILITY | 4,850 | | 4,850 |
| Navy | Mississippi | NAVAL AIR STATION MERIDIAN | FIRE STATION | | 6,770 | 6,770 |
| Defense Agencies | Mississippi | STENNIS SPACE CENTER | SOF RIVERINE AND COMBATANT CRAFT OPS FAC | | 10,200 | 10,200 |
| Army Guard | Mississippi | CAMP SHELBY | LIVE FIRE SHOOT HOUSE/URBANASSAULT COURSE | | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| Army | Missouri | FORT LEONARD WOOD | MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE | 3,800 | | 3,800 |
| Army | Missouri | FORT LEONARD WOOD | MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| Army | Missouri | FORT LEONARD WOOD | Automated Multipurpose Machine Gun Range (Grow the Force) | | 4,150 | 4,150 |
| Army | Missouri | FORT LEONARD WOOD | Automated Pistol Range (Grow the Force) | | 2,700 | 2,700 |
| Army | Missouri | FORT LEONARD WOOD | Manuever Enhance Bde Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 56,000 | 56,000 |
| Army | Missouri | FORT LEONARD WOOD | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 26,000 | 26,000 |
| Army | Missouri | FORT LEONARD WOOD | Dining Facility-Basic Combat Training Complex (Grow the Force) | | 22,000 | 22,000 |
| Army | Missouri | FORT LEONARD WOOD | CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER | | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| Army Guard | Missouri | WHITEMAN AFB | ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| Air Force | Montana | MALMSTROM AFB | CONSTRUCT COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTER | | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| Army Reserve | Montana | BUTTE | ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND | 7,629 | | 7,629 |
| Air Force | Nebraska | OFFUTT AFB | ADAL INTELL SQUADRON FAC | 16,952 | | 16,952 |
| Air National Guard | Nebraska | LINCOLN | SECURITY FORCES & COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY | | 8,900 | 8,900 |
| Army | Nevada | HAWTHORNE ARMY AMMO PLANT | GROUND WATER TREATMENT PLANT | 11,800 | | 11,800 |
| Navy | Nevada | NAVAL AIR STATION FALLON | RANGE IMPROVEMENTS, B-20 | | 11,460 | 11,460 |

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Force | Nevada | NELLIS AFB | JOINT TERMINAL AIR CONTROL VIRTUAL TNG FAC | | 4,950 | 4,950 |
| Air National Guard | Nevada | RENO-TAHOE IAP | VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP | | 5,200 | 5,200 |
| Air National Guard | New Hampshire | PEASE ANGB | WING HEADQUARTERS, OPS AND TRAINING FACILITY | | 8,900 | 8,900 |
| Navy | New Jersey | NAVAL AIR STATION LAKEHURST | JOINT INSTALLATION ROAD IMPROVEMENTS | | 4,100 | 4,100 |
| Army Reserve | New Jersey | FORT DIX | COMBINED MAINTENANCE FACILITY | 17,000 | | 17,000 |
| Army | New Mexico | WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE | Engineer Bn HQ/Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 71,000 | 71,000 |
| Air Force | New Mexico | CANNON AFB | ADAL HANGAR 09 FOR C-130 | 1,688 | | 1,688 |
| Air Force | New Mexico | KIRTLAND AFB | PJ/CRO RESCUE/RECOVERY TRNG CENTER | | 11,400 | 11,400 |
| Defense Agencies | New Mexico | CANNON AFB | SOF FLIGHT SIMULATOR FACILITY | 7,500 | | 7,500 |
| Defense Agencies | New Mexico | KIRTLAND AFB | REPLACE FUEL UNLOAD FACILITY | 1,800 | | 1,800 |
| Army | New York | FORT DRUM | INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADES | 12,000 | | 12,000 |
| Army | New York | FORT DRUM | BRIGADE COMPLEX-COMPANY OPERATIONS | 55,000 | | 55,000 |
| Army | New York | FORT DRUM | BRIGADE COMPLEX-BARRACKS/OPERATIONS | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| Army | New York | FORT DRUM | BRIGADE COMPLEX MAINTENANCE FACILITY | 44,000 | -7,839 | 36,161 |
| Army | New York | FORT DRUM | DINING FACILITY | 0 | 7,839 | 7,839 |
| Army | New York | FORT DRUM | BN/Forward Supt/Eng Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 41,000 | 41,000 |
| Army | New York | FORT DRUM | MP BN HQ/MP Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 38,000 | 38,000 |
| Army | New York | FORT DRUM | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 61,000 | 61,000 |
| Defense Agencies | New York | FORT DRUM | MEDICAL CLINIC ADD/ALT | 41,000 | | 41,000 |
| Air National Guard | New York | GABRESKI AIRPORT | PARARESCUE FACILITY, PHASE 1 | | 8,400 | 8,400 |
| Army Reserve | New York | FORT DRUM | ARMY RESERVE CENTER | 15,923 | | 15,923 |
| Army | North Carolina | FORT BRAGG | BARRACKS COMPLEX, INCREMENT 3 | 47,400 | | 47,400 |
| Army | North Carolina | FORT BRAGG | INDOOR RANGE | 4,800 | | 4,800 |
| Army | North Carolina | FORT BRAGG | STUDENT BARRACKS | 51,000 | | 51,000 |
| Army | North Carolina | FORT BRAGG | BLOOD DONOR FACILITY | | 4,800 | 4,800 |
| Army | North Carolina | FORT BRAGG | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 73,000 | 73,000 |
| Army | North Carolina | FORT BRAGG | Ammunition Supply Point/Vehicle Maint (Grow the Force) | | 88,000 | 88,000 |
| Army | North Carolina | FORT BRAGG | Surv/Signal/Qtr/Eng/POL Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 54,000 | 54,000 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | BEQ - FRENCH CREEK | 27,800 | | 27,800 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | FIELD MEDICAL SERVICE SCHOOL | 8,080 | | 8,080 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | MOUT ENHANCEMENTS | 14,120 | | 14,120 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | MARSOC SUPPORT FACILITY | 21,720 | | 21,720 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | MARSOC TRAINING FACILITIES | 12,590 | | 12,590 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | MARSOC FITNESS CENTER/TRAINING TANK | 14,480 | | 14,480 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | MARSOC COMMUNITY SUPPORT FACILITIES | 9,170 | | 9,170 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION FACILITY | 16,460 | | 16,460 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | BEQ - 4TH MEB | 29,970 | | 29,970 |

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | Multi-Purpose Machine Gun Range - G10 (Grow the Force) | | 17,250 | 17,250 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | Landfill Cell (Grow the Force) | | 14,170 | 14,170 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | Wastewater System Modification (Grow the Force) | | 7,070 | 7,070 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | Main Gate Physical Security Upgrade (Grow the Force) | | 7,920 | 7,920 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | Physical Security Upgrades - Piney Green (Grow the Force) | | 6,660 | 6,660 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | BEQ - Wounded Warrior Battalion (Grow the Force) | | 27,270 | 27,270 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | Maintenance/Operations Complex-2/9 (Transfer from Title XXIX) | | 43,340 | 43,340 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CHERRY POINT MCAS | UAV OPERATIONS/MAINTENANCE | 12,110 | | 12,110 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CHERRY POINT MCAS | HANGER RENOVATION & FAC UPGRADES F/A18E/F | 16,500 | | 16,500 |
| Navy | North Carolina | NEW RIVER | BEQ | 22,530 | | 22,530 |
| Navy | North Carolina | NEW RIVER | HANGAR ADDITION (PHASE 2) | 17,330 | | 17,330 |
| Navy | North Carolina | NEW RIVER | JET ENGINE TEST CELL | 14,570 | | 14,570 |
| Navy | North Carolina | NOLF WASHINGTON COUNTY | OUTLYING LANDING FIELD FACS & LAND ACQ (INCRS 5-7) | 10,060 | -10,060 | 0 |
| Defense Agencies | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | DELALIO ES - CONSTRUCT GYMNASIUM | 2,014 | | 2,014 |
| Defense Agencies | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | SOF SUPPLY & PRE-DEPLOYMENT FAC | 10,500 | | 10,500 |
| Defense Agencies | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | SOF ACADEMIC INSTRCUTION FACILITY | 6,910 | | 6,910 |
| Defense Agencies | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | SOF EQUIPMENT FACILITY | 10,800 | | 10,800 |
| Defense Agencies | North Carolina | FORT BRAGG | SOF OPERATIONS/INTEL ADDITION | 8,000 | | 8,000 |
| Defense Agencies | North Carolina | FORT BRAGG | SOF HQ AND MOTOR POOL COMPLEX | 39,250 | | 39,250 |
| Air Force | North Dakota | GRAND FORKS AFB | CONTROL TOWER/RAPCON | | 13,000 | 13,000 |
| Air Force | North Dakota | MINOT AFB | DORMITORY (144 RM) | 18,200 | | 18,200 |
| Army Guard | North Dakota | CAMP GRAFTON | Regional Training Institute Phase 1 (Grow the Force) | | 33,416 | 33,416 |
| Defense Agencies | Ohio | COLUMBUS | DECENTRALIZE HEAT PLANT | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| Naval Reserve | Ohio | WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB | RESERVE TRAINING CENTER - DAYTON OH | 10,277 | | 10,277 |
| Army | Oklahoma | FORT SILL | MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE | 2,900 | | 2,900 |
| Army | Oklahoma | FORT SILL | MULTI-PURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE | | 3,300 | 3,300 |
| Air Force | Oklahoma | ALTUS AFB | C-17 SHEET METAL COMPOSITE SHOP | 2,000 | | 2,000 |
| Air Force | Oklahoma | TINKER AFB | CONSOLIDATED FUEL O/H REPAIR & TEST FAC | 34,600 | | 34,600 |
| Air Force | Oklahoma | VANCE AFB | FUELS SYSTEM MAINTENANCE HANGAR | | 7,700 | 7,700 |
| Army Guard | Oregon | ONTARIO | READINESS CENTER | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| Naval Reserve | Oregon | PORTLAND | OPERATIONAL FACILITIES MIUW 110/IBU 13 | 1,900 | | 1,900 |
| Defense Agencies | Pennsylvania | DIST DEPOT NEW CUMBERLAND | REPLACE CENTRAL HEAT PLANT | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| Army Guard | Pennsylvania | CARLISLE | READINESS CENTER (SBCT) | 7,800 | | 7,800 |
| Army Guard | Pennsylvania | EAST FALLOWFIELD TOWNSHIP | READINESS CENTER (SBCT) | 8,300 | | 8,300 |
| Army Guard | Pennsylvania | FORT INDIANTOWN GAP | AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT UPGRADE (SBCT) | 9,500 | | 9,500 |
| Army Guard | Pennsylvania | GETTYSBURG | READINESS CENTER (SBCT) | 6,300 | | 6,300 |
| Army Guard | Pennsylvania | GRATERFORD | FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP (SBCT) | 7,300 | | 7,300 |

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army Guard | Pennsylvania | HANOVER | READINESS CENTER, ADD/ALT (SBCT) | 5,500 | | 5,500 |
| Army Guard | Pennsylvania | HAZELTON | READINESS CENTER ADD/ALT (SBCT) | 5,600 | | 5,600 |
| Army Guard | Pennsylvania | HOLIDAYSBURG | READINESS CENTER (SBCT) | 9,400 | | 9,400 |
| Army Guard | Pennsylvania | HUNTINGDON | READINESS CENTER (SBCT) | 7,500 | | 7,500 |
| Army Guard | Pennsylvania | KUTZTOWN | READINESS CENTER, ADD/ALT (SBCT) | 6,800 | | 6,800 |
| Army Guard | Pennsylvania | LEBANON | READINESS CENTER, ADD/ALT (SBCT) | 7,800 | | 7,800 |
| Army Guard | Pennsylvania | PHILADELPHIA | FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP, ADD/ALT (SBCT) | 3,650 | | 3,650 |
| Army Guard | Pennsylvania | PHILADELPHIA | READINESS CENTER, ALTERATION (SBCT) | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| Air National Guard | Pennsylvania | FORT INDIANTOWN GAP | AIR SUPT OPS SQUADRON (ASOS) BEDDOWN | 6,400 | | 6,400 |
| Air National Guard | Pennsylvania | FORT INDIANTOWN GAP | OPERATIONS AND TRAINING FACILITY | | 6,300 | 6,300 |
| Navy | Rhode Island | NAVAL STATION NEWPORT | RECONSTRUCT WHARF BETWEEN PIERS 1 AND 2 | | 9,990 | 9,990 |
| Army Guard | Rhode Island | EAST GREENWICH | READINESS CENTER | 8,200 | | 8,200 |
| Army Guard | Rhode Island | N KINGSTOWN | ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY | 33,000 | | 33,000 |
| Air National Guard | Rhode Island | QUONSET STATE AIRPORT | SPECIAL OPERATIONS TRAINING FAC | | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Army | South Carolina | FORT JACKSON | Basic Training Complex (Grow the Force) | | 85,000 | 85,000 |
| Navy | South Carolina | BEAUFORT | FIRE STATION | 6,800 | | 6,800 |
| Navy | South Carolina | PARRIS ISLAND | RECRUIT BARRACKS - 3RD BATTALION (PH 1) | 25,322 | | 25,322 |
| Navy | South Carolina | PARRIS ISLAND | MOTOR TRANSPORTATION COMPLEX | 5,530 | | 5,530 |
| Navy | South Carolina | PARRIS ISLAND MCRD | Consolidated Dining Facility (Grow the Force) | | 24,430 | 24,430 |
| Air Force | South Carolina | CHARLESTON AFB | CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER | | 11,000 | 11,000 |
| Air Force | South Dakota | ELLSWORTH AFB | BASE CIVIL ENGINEERING ADMIN FACILITY | | 16,600 | 16,600 |
| Air National Guard | South Dakota | JOE FOSS FIELD | BASE CIVIL ENGINEERING MAINT FACILITY | | 7,900 | 7,900 |
| Naval Reserve | South Dakota | SIOUX FALLS | JOINT ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER | 3,730 | | 3,730 |
| Air National Guard | Tennessee | MCGHEE-TYSON AIRPORT | MILSTAR BEDDOWN-RELOCATE BASE ACCESS RD | 3,200 | | 3,200 |
| Air National Guard | Tennessee | MEMPHIS IAP | C-5 GROUND RUN-UP ENCLOSURE | 3,200 | | 3,200 |
| Air National Guard | Tennessee | MEMPHIS IAP | C-5 FINAL INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT | 6,676 | | 6,676 |
| Air National Guard | Tennessee | MEMPHIS IAP | C-5 MUNITIONS STORAGE COMPLEX | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| Army | Texas | CAMP BULLIS | URBAN ASSAULT COURSE | 1,600 | | 1,600 |
| Army | Texas | FORT BLISS | Army Eval Task Force Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 84,000 | 84,000 |
| Army | Texas | FORT BLISS | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 11,400 | 11,400 |
| Army | Texas | FORT BLISS | Health & Dental Clinic (Grow the Force) | | 16,500 | 16,500 |
| Army | Texas | FORT HOOD | Air Defense Bde HQ/Patriot Bn Unit Ops Facil (Grow the Force) | | 46,000 | 46,000 |
| Army | Texas | FORT HOOD | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 45,000 | 45,000 |
| Army | Texas | FORT HOOD | BARRACKS COMPLEX | 47,000 | | 47,000 |
| Army | Texas | FORT HOOD | CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER | | 7,400 | 7,400 |
| Army | Texas | FORT SAM HOUSTON | BATTLE COMMAND TRAINING CENTER, PH 1 | 1,950 | | 1,950 |
| Army | Texas | FORT SAM HOUSTON | Medical Companies Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 10,600 | 10,600 |

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | Texas | FORT SAM HOUSTON | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 6,600 | 6,600 |
| Army | Texas | RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT | MANEUVER SYSTEMS SUSTAINMENT CTR, PHASE 2 | 9,200 | | 9,200 |
| Navy | Texas | CORPUS CHRISTI | AVIATION TRAINER/SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY | 14,290 | | 14,290 |
| Air Force | Texas | LACKLAND AFB | BASIC EXPEDITIONARY AIRMAN SKILL TRNG PHASE 2 | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Texas | CAMP BULLIS | HEALTH CLINIC REPLACEMENT | 7,400 | | 7,400 |
| Army Guard | Texas | CAMP BOWIE | MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| Army Guard | Texas | FORT WOLTERS | MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE | 2,100 | | 2,100 |
| Army Reserve | Texas | ELLINGTON FIELD | AFRC/BATTLE PROJECTION CTR, PH 2 | | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| Army Reserve | Texas | FORT WORTH | ARMY RESERVE CENTER | 15,076 | | 15,076 |
| Naval Reserve | Texas | AUSTIN | RESERVE TRAINING CENTER - AUSTIN, TX | 6,490 | | 6,490 |
| Naval Reserve | Texas | FORT WORTH | CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER | 4,920 | | 4,920 |
| Naval Reserve | Texas | FORT WORTH | AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT PARKING FAC | 5,140 | | 5,140 |
| Naval Reserve | Texas | FORT WORTH | JOINT CONTROL TOWER | 12,454 | | 12,454 |
| Air Force | Utah | HILL AFB | AIRCRAFT POWER SYSTEMS REPAIR FACILITY | 8,399 | | 8,399 |
| Air Force | Utah | HILL AFB | HYDRAULIC FLIGHT CONTROL FACILITY | 8,400 | | 8,400 |
| Air Force | Utah | HILL AFB | MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY | | 9,200 | 9,200 |
| Army Guard | Utah | NORTH SALT LAKE | READINESS CENTER | 12,200 | | 12,200 |
| Air Force Reserve | Utah | HILL AFB | WING SUPPORT FACILITY | 3,200 | | 3,200 |
| Army Guard | Vermont | ETHAN ALLEN RANGE | MULTI-PURPOSE MACHINE GUN RANGE | | 1,996 | 1,996 |
| Air National Guard | Vermont | BURLINGTON | POOR FARM ROAD SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS | | 6,600 | 6,600 |
| Army | Virginia | FORT BELVOIR | DEFENSE ACCESS ROAD PHASE 3 | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| Army | Virginia | FORT EUSTIS | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 32,000 | 32,000 |
| Army | Virginia | FORT EUSTIS | Transportation Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 43,000 | 43,000 |
| Army | Virginia | FORT LEE | POL Truck Company Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 9,800 | 9,800 |
| Army | Virginia | FORT LEE | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 6,900 | 6,900 |
| Army | Virginia | FORT MYER | Infantry Company Operations Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 8,400 | 8,400 |
| Army | Virginia | FORT MYER | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 12,400 | 12,400 |
| Navy | Virginia | CHESAPEAKE | MOBILE USER OBJECTIVE SYSTEM INSTALLATION | 8,450 | | 8,450 |
| Navy | Virginia | NORFOLK | E2/C2 AIRCREW TRAINING FACILITY | 11,510 | | 11,510 |
| Navy | Virginia | NORFOLK | MH-60S HANGER & AIRFIELD IMPROVEMENTS | 53,850 | | 53,850 |
| Navy | Virginia | NORFOLK | JOINT FORCES COMMAND HQ FAC - BLDG 1 | | 14,200 | 14,200 |
| Navy | Virginia | QUANTICO | STUDENT QUARTERS - TBS (PHASE 2) | 26,680 | | 26,680 |
| Navy | Virginia | QUANTICO | BEQ - MSGBN HEADQUARTERS | 18,839 | | 18,839 |
| Navy | Virginia | QUANTICO | Warfare Programs Support Center (Grow the Force) | | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Virginia | DAM NECK | SOF OPERATIONAL TRAINING FACILITY | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Virginia | DAM NECK | SOF OPERATIONS FACILITY | 94,500 | | 94,500 |
| Defense Agencies | Virginia | FORT BELVOIR | ENTRANCE GATE SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS | 5,000 | | 5,000 |

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Defense Agencies | Virginia | LITTLE CREEK | SOF SPECIAL BOAT TEAM OPERATIONS FACILITY | 14,000 | | 14,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Virginia | LITTLE CREEK | SOF SEAL TEAM OPS AND SUPPORT FACILITY | 34,000 | | 34,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Virginia | LITTLE CREEK | SOF HEADQUARTERS FACILITY | 51,000 | | 51,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Virginia | NORFOLK | ENVIORNMENTAL PREVENTIVE MEDICINE UNIT 2 REPL | 6,450 | | 6,450 |
| Defense Agencies | Virginia | PENTAGON | PENTAGON RESERVATION ELECTRICAL UPGRADES | 18,531 | -18,531 | 0 |
| Army Guard | Virginia | FORT PICKETT | COMBAT PISTOL QUALIFICATION COURSE | 1,050 | | 1,050 |
| Army Guard | Virginia | FORT PICKETT | Regional Training Institute Phase 1 (Grow the Force) | | 25,161 | 25,161 |
| Army Guard | Virginia | WINCHESTER | FIELD MAINTENANCE SHOP | | 3,113 | 3,113 |
| Naval Reserve | Virginia | QUANTICO | RESERVE CENTER ADDITIONS | 2,410 | | 2,410 |
| Army | Washington | FORT LEWIS | INDOOR RANGE | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| Army | Washington | FORT LEWIS | BRIGADE COMPLEX, INCREMENT 2 | 102,000 | | 102,000 |
| Army | Washington | FORT LEWIS | Railroad Yard Upgrade (Grow the Force) | | 14,600 | 14,600 |
| Army | Washington | FORT LEWIS | Barracks (Grow the Force) | | 32,000 | 32,000 |
| Army | Washington | FORT LEWIS | EOD/Eng/Med/MP Unit Operations Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 62,000 | 62,000 |
| Army | Washington | FORT LEWIS | Battlefield Surveil Bde Unit Ops Facilities (Grow the Force) | | 51,000 | 51,000 |
| Army | Washington | YAKIMA | DIGITAL MULTIPURPOSE RANGE COMPLEX | 29,000 | | 29,000 |
| Navy | Washington | BANGOR | LIMITED AREA PROD & STORAGE COMPLEX INCR IV | 39,750 | | 39,750 |
| Navy | Washington | BREMERTON | BEQ HOMEPORT ASHORE INCREMENT II | 47,240 | | 47,240 |
| Navy | Washington | BREMERTON | CVN MAINTENANCE PIER REPLACEMENT | 91,070 | | 91,070 |
| Navy | Washington | BREMERTON | MISSILE ASSEMBLY BUILDING 3 | 28,690 | | 28,690 |
| Navy | Washington | NAVAL STATION EVERETT | FLEET REGION READINESS CENTER | | 10,940 | 10,940 |
| Navy | Washington | WHIDBEY ISLAND | EA-18G FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS | 23,910 | | 23,910 |
| Defense Agencies | Washington | FORT LEWIS | SOF SUPPORT BATTALION COMPLEX | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Washington | FORT LEWIS | SOF BATTALION OPS COMPLEX | 47,000 | | 47,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Washington | FORT LEWIS | MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC | 21,000 | | 21,000 |
| Army Guard | West Virginia | CAMP DAWSON | MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE | 4,500 | | 4,500 |
| Air National Guard | West Virginia | E WV REG APT - SHEPHERD FIELD | C-5 FUEL CELL MAINT HANGAR AND SHOPS | 26,000 | | 26,000 |
| Air National Guard | West Virginia | E WV REG APT - SHEPHERD FIELD | C-5 FINAL INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADE | 5,176 | | 5,176 |
| Air National Guard | West Virginia | E WV REG APT - SHEPHERD FIELD | C-5 SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY | 7,600 | | 7,600 |
| Air National Guard | West Virginia | E WV REG APT - SHEPHERD FIELD | C-5 PARKING APRON ADD/UPGRADE RUNWAY | | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| Air National Guard | West Virginia | YEAGER | AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR | | 17,300 | 17,300 |
| Air National Guard | Wisconsin | TRUAX FIELD | FIRE/CRASH RESCUE STATION | | 7,300 | 7,300 |
| Army Reserve | Wisconsin | ELLSWORTH | ARMY RESERVE CENTER/LAND | 9,100 | | 9,100 |
| Army Reserve | Wisconsin | FORT MCCOY | REGIONAL MEDICAL TRAINING FACILITY | 8,523 | | 8,523 |
| Air Force | Wyoming | F. E. WARREN AFB | RENOVATE HISTORIC DORMITORIES | 14,600 | | 14,600 |
| Army Guard | Wyoming | CAMP GUERNSEY | QUALIFICATION TRAINING RANGE | 2,650 | | 2,650 |

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | Afghanistan | BAGRAM AB | ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING (Transfer to Title XXIX) | 13,800 | -13,800 | 0 |
| Navy | Bahrain | NAVAL SUPT ACTIVITY BAHRAIN | WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PHASE 1 | 35,500 | | 35,500 |
| Defense Agencies | Bahrain | NAVAL SUPT ACTIVITY BAHRAIN | SOF OPERATIONS FACILITY | 19,000 | | 19,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Belgium | CASTEU | BRUSSELS AMERCIAN SCHOOL ADDITION | 5,992 | | 5,992 |
| Army | Bulgaria | NEVO SELO FOS | BASE CAMP | 61,000 | | 61,000 |
| Navy | Diego Garcia | DIEGO GARCIA | SEWAGE LAGOON, AIR OPS | 7,150 | | 7,150 |
| Navy | Djibouti | CAMP LEMONIER | FUEL FARM | 4,000 | | 4,000 |
| Navy | Djibouti | CAMP LEMONIER | WESTERN TAXIWAY | 2,900 | | 2,900 |
| Navy | Djibouti | CAMP LEMONIER | FULL LENGTH TAXIWAY | 15,490 | | 15,490 |
| Army | Germany | GRAFENWOEHR | BRIGADE COMPLEX-MAINTENANCE/OPERATIONS | 34,000 | | 34,000 |
| Army | Germany | GRAFENWOEHR | BRIGADE COMPLEX-MAINTENANCE/OPERATIONS | 28,000 | | 28,000 |
| Air Force | Germany | RAMSTEIN AB | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB FACILITIES PH 2 | 6,260 | | 6,260 |
| Air Force | Germany | RAMSTEIN AB | JOINT MOBILITY PROCESSING CENTER | 24,000 | | 24,000 |
| Air Force | Germany | RAMSTEIN AB | DORMITORY - 128 RM | 14,949 | | 14,949 |
| Air Force | Germany | RAMSTEIN AB | FIRE TRAINING FACILITY | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Germany | RAMSTEIN AB | RAMSTEIN INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL ADDITION | 5,393 | | 5,393 |
| Defense Agencies | Germany | SPANGDAHLEM AB | MEDICAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT | 30,100 | | 30,100 |
| Defense Agencies | Germany | WEISBADEN | HAINERBER ES/WEIS MS ADDITION | 5,093 | | 5,093 |
| Defense Agencies | Germany | WEISBADEN | H.H. ARNOLD HS ADDITION | 15,379 | | 15,379 |
| Navy | Guam | NAVAL BASE GUAM | KILO WHARF EXTENSION | 101,828 | | 101,828 |
| Navy | Guam | NAVAL BASE GUAM | HARDEN BASE ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS | 59,420 | | 59,420 |
| Navy | Guam | NAVAL BASE GUAM | WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT REPAIRS & UPGRADE | 40,870 | | 40,870 |
| Navy | Guam | NAVAL BASE GUAM | FITNESS CENTER GUAM | 45,250 | -5,300 | 39,950 |
| Navy | Guam | NAVAL BASE GUAM | POTABLE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM PHASE 1 | 31,450 | | 31,450 |
| Air Force | Guam | ANDERSEN AFB | UPGRADE NW FIELD INFRASTRUCTURE | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| Army | Honduras | SOTO CANO AIR BASE | DINING FACILITY | 2,550 | | 2,550 |
| Army | Italy | VICENZA | BRIGADE COMPLEX-OPERATIONS SPT FACILITY (INCR 1) | 87,000 | -37,000 | 50,000 |
| Army | Italy | VICENZA | BRIGADE COMPLEX-BARRACKS/COMMUNITY FAC (INCR 1) | 86,000 | -36,000 | 50,000 |
| Navy | Japan | YOKOSUKA | WHARF UPGRADES (INCREMENT 3) | 8,750 | | 8,750 |
| Army | Korea | CAMP HUMPHREYS | BARRACKS COMPLEX | 22,000 | | 22,000 |
| Army | Korea | CAMP HUMPHREYS | BARRACKS COMPLEX | 35,000 | | 35,000 |
| Air Force | Qatar | AL UDEID AIR BASE | MULTI AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR | 22,300 | | 22,300 |
| Defense Agencies | Qatar | AL UDEID AIR BASE | SOF OPERATIONS COMPLEX | 18,908 | | 18,908 |
| Defense Agencies | Qatar | AL UDEID AIR BASE | SOF AIRCRAFT PARKING RAMP | 18,515 | | 18,515 |
| Defense Agencies | Qatar | AL UDEID AIR BASE | SOF VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FAC | 3,507 | | 3,507 |
| Defense Agencies | Qatar | AL UDEID AIR BASE | SOF STORAGE FACILITY | 3,590 | | 3,590 |
| Defense Agencies | Qatar | AL UDEID AIR BASE | SOF AIR OPERATIONS CENTER | 8,332 | | 8,332 |

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | Romania | MIHAIL KOGALNICEANU FOS | BASE CAMP, PHASE 2 | 12,600 | | 12,600 |
| Air Force | Spain | MORON | TACT LEADERSHIP PROGRAM DORM (400 RM) | 1,800 | | 1,800 |
| Air Force | United Kingdom | MENWITH HILL STATION | POWER AVAIL & INFRASTRUC IMPROVEMENTS | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| Air Force | United Kingdom | MENWITH HILL STATION | ADAL OPS AND TECHNICAL FAC | 31,000 | | 31,000 |
| Air Force | United Kingdom | ROYAL AIR FORCE LAKENHEATH | SMALL DIAMETER BOMB - STORAGE IGLOO | 1,800 | | 1,800 |
| Air Force | United Kingdom | ROYAL AIR FORCE LAKENHEATH | F-15C SQUAD OPS/AMU | 15,500 | | 15,500 |
| Air Force | Worldwide Classified | CLASSIFIED LOCATION | CLASSIFIED MILCON PROJECT | 1,500 | | 1,500 |
| Air Force | Worldwide Classified | CLASSIFIED LOCATION | SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM | 9,889 | | 9,889 |
| Air Force | Worldwide Classified | CLASSIFIED LOCATION | SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM | 4,051 | | 4,051 |
| NSIP | Worldwide Unspecified | NATO SECURITY INVEST PROGRAM | NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM | 201,400 | | 201,400 |
| Army | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | GROWING THE FORCE | 1,608,129 | -1,608,129 | 0 |
| Army | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 23,000 | | 23,000 |
| Army | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | HOST NATION SUPPORT | 23,000 | | 23,000 |
| Army | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | PLANNING & DESIGN (Other) | 75,468 | 3,000 | 78,468 |
| Army | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | PLANNING & DESIGN (GROW THE FORCE) | 383,000 | -150,521 | 232,479 |
| Navy | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | GROWING THE FORCE FACILITIES | 361,120 | -361,120 | 0 |
| Navy | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTR | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| Air Force | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| Air Force | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 2,200 | | 2,200 |
| Air Force | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 49,387 | 9,516 | 58,903 |
| Defense Agencies | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | CLASSIFIED | 1,887 | | 1,887 |
| Defense Agencies | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | ENERGY CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM | 70,000 | | 70,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 3,499 | | 3,499 |
| Defense Agencies | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 666 | | 666 |
| Defense Agencies | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 8,753 | | 8,753 |
| Defense Agencies | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 3,400 | | 3,400 |
| Defense Agencies | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | NSA PLANNING AND DESIGN | 26,749 | | 26,749 |
| Defense Agencies | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 35,900 | | 35,900 |
| Army Guard | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | GROWING THE FORCE | 77,000 | -77,000 | 0 |
| Army Guard | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 8,700 | | 8,700 |
| Army Guard | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | PLANNING AND DESIGN (Other) | 26,841 | 6,755 | 33,596 |
| Army Guard | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | PLANNING AND DESIGN (Grow the Force) | 17,000 | 0 | 17,000 |
| Air National Guard | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 6,500 | | 6,500 |
| Air National Guard | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | PLANNING & DESIGN | 7,965 | 1,000 | 8,965 |

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army Reserve | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 3,000 | | 3,000 |
| Army Reserve | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 10,958 | 0 | 10,958 |
| Naval Reserve | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 2,219 | | 2,219 |
| Navy | Worldwide Unspecified | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | WHARF UTILITIES UPGRADE | 8,900 | | 8,900 |
| Navy | Worldwide Unspecified | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | HOST NATION INFRASTRUCTURE | 2,700 | | 2,700 |
| Navy | Worldwide Unspecified | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN (Other) | 88,375 | 2,000 | 90,375 |
| Navy | Worldwide Unspecified | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING & DESIGN (Grow the Force) | 21,792 | 0 | 21,792 |
| Navy | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | Planning and Design (Transfer from Title XXIX) | | 7,491 | 7,491 |
| Defense Agencies | Worldwide Unspecified | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 3,693 | | 3,693 |
| Defense Agencies | Worldwide Unspecified | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION (S) | 4,100 | | 4,100 |
| Defense Agencies | Worldwide Unspecified | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 69,000 | | 69,000 |
| Defense Agencies | Worldwide Unspecified | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 19,679 | | 19,679 |
| Air Force Reserve | Worldwide Unspecified | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION | 4,909 | | 4,909 |
| Air Force Reserve | Worldwide Unspecified | VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 3,500 | | 3,500 |
| Fam House Con, A | Germany | ANSBACH | FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION | 52,000 | | 52,000 |
| Fam House Con, A | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS | 99,400 | | 99,400 |
| Fam House Con, A | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS (Grow the Force) | 266,000 | -266,000 | 0 |
| Fam House Con, A | Colorado | FORT CARSON | Family Housing Privatization (Grow the Force) | | 98,300 | 98,300 |
| Fam House Con, A | North Carolina | FORT BRAGG | Family Housing Privatization (Grow the Force) | | 59,400 | 59,400 |
| Fam House Con, A | Texas | FORT BLISS | Family Housing Privatization (Grow the Force) | | 35,600 | 35,600 |
| Fam House Con, A | Washington | FORT LEWIS | Family Housing Privatization (Grow the Force) | | 72,700 | 72,700 |
| Fam House Con, A | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | FAMILY HOUSING P&D | 2,000 | | 2,000 |
| Fam House Ops, A | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | UTILITIES ACCOUNT | 145,366 | | 145,366 |
| Fam House Ops, A | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | OPERATIONS | 128,289 | | 128,289 |
| Fam House Ops, A | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | OPERATIONS (Grow the Force) | 11,000 | 0 | 11,000 |
| Fam House Ops, A | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | LEASING | 206,129 | | 206,129 |
| Fam House Ops, A | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY | 215,585 | | 215,585 |
| Fam House Ops, A | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS | 35,694 | | 35,694 |
| Fam House Ops, A | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS (Grow the Force) | 857 | 0 | 857 |
| Fam House Con, N | Guam | GUAM | REPL GUAM OLD APRA PH II, MARIANAS | 57,167 | -10,000 | 47,167 |
| Fam House Con, N | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | USMC GROUND FORCES AUGMENTATION | 75,000 | | 75,000 |
| Fam House Con, N | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | IMPROVEMENTS | 162,990 | | 162,990 |
| Fam House Con, N | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Improvements (Transfer from Title XXIX) | | 10,692 | 10,692 |
| Fam House Con, N | California | TWENTYNINE PALMS | Improvements (Transfer from Title XXIX) | | 1,074 | 1,074 |
| Fam House Con, N | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | DESIGN | 3,172 | | 3,172 |

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fam House Ops, N | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | UTILITIES ACCOUNT | 41,802 | | 41,802 |
| Fam House Ops, N | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT | 14,962 | | 14,962 |
| Fam House Ops, N | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT | 59,422 | | 59,422 |
| Fam House Ops, N | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT | 640 | | 640 |
| Fam House Ops, N | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | SERVICES ACCOUNT | 13,155 | | 13,155 |
| Fam House Ops, N | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | LEASING | 141,757 | | 141,757 |
| Fam House Ops, N | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY | 70,678 | | 70,678 |
| Fam House Ops, N | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS | 28,988 | | 28,988 |
| Fam House Con, AF | Germany | RAMSTEIN AB | REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING (117 UNITS) | 56,275 | | 56,275 |
| Fam House Con, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS | 294,211 | | 294,211 |
| Fam House Con, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | CLASSIFIED PROJECT | 51 | | 51 |
| Fam House Con, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | PLANNING AND DESIGN | 12,210 | | 12,210 |
| Fam House Ops, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | UTILITIES ACCOUNT | 100,176 | | 100,176 |
| Fam House Ops, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT | 1,534 | | 1,534 |
| Fam House Ops, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT | 55,202 | | 55,202 |
| Fam House Ops, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | SERVICES ACCOUNT | 20,673 | | 20,673 |
| Fam House Ops, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT | 43,472 | | 43,472 |
| Fam House Ops, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT | 1,960 | | 1,960 |
| Fam House Ops, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | LEASING ACCOUNT | 1,485 | | 1,485 |
| Fam House Ops, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | LEASING ACCOUNT | 112,909 | | 112,909 |
| Fam House Ops, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | MAINTENANCE ACCOUNT | 2,097 | | 2,097 |
| Fam House Ops, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | MAINTENANCE (RMPA & RMPC) | 296,368 | | 296,368 |
| Fam House Ops, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | DEBT ACCOUNT | 1 | | 1 |
| Fam House Ops, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | HOUSING PRIVATIZATION | 52,458 | | 52,458 |
| Fam House Ops, D | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | UTILITIES ACCOUNT | 445 | | 445 |
| Fam House Ops, D | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT | 34 | | 34 |
| Fam House Ops, D | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT | 4,274 | | 4,274 |
| Fam House Ops, D | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT | 104 | | 104 |
| Fam House Ops, D | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | SERVICES ACCOUNT | 49 | | 49 |
| Fam House Ops, D | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT | 410 | | 410 |
| Fam House Ops, D | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | LEASING | 10,534 | | 10,534 |
| Fam House Ops, D | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | LEASING | 32,662 | | 32,662 |
| Fam House Ops, D | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY | 70 | | 70 |
| Fam House Ops, D | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY | 266 | | 266 |
| FHIF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND | 500 | | 500 |
| | | | | | | 0 |
| BRAC, A | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, ARMY | 73,716 | | 73,716 |

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BRAC, N | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, NAVY | 0 | | 0 |
| BRAC, AF | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, AIR FORCE | 143,260 | | 143,260 |
| BRAC, D | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE IV, DEFENSE AGENCIES | 3,713 | | 3,713 |
| | | | | | | 0 |
| BRAC - Army | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE V, ARMY | 4,015,746 | | 4,015,746 |
| BRAC - Navy | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE V, NAVY | 733,695 | | 733,695 |
| BRAC - Air Force | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE V, AIR FORCE | 1,183,812 | | 1,183,812 |
| BRAC - Def Ag | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE V, DEFENSE AGENCIES | 2,241,062 | | 2,241,062 |
| Air Force Reserve | Alaska | ELMENDORF AFB | FY2006 PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS (Section 2608) | 0 | -3,100 | -3,100 |
| | | | TOTAL TITLES XXI-XXVII AND XXIX | 21,165,182 | 616,190 | 21,781,372 |

### Budget justification material for incrementally funded and phased military construction projects

The committee defines an incrementally funded military construction project as having received an authorization for the full amount of the requirement in the first year, but only a partial authorization of appropriation for the project to provide funds for expected outlays against the project for that specific year. In contrast, a phased project receives authorization for a complete and useable facility or facilities as part of a total requirement, which may need more than one military construction project to complete.

The committee notes that the military departments and defense agencies do not always use the same format to submit budget justification material to the Congress. With respect to each phased requirement, or each incrementally funded military construction project, the committee requests that the budget justification documents for military construction projects (known as the DD1391 form) include, with respect to a phased requirement or any increment of an incrementally funded project, the entire cost of the requirement as well as the cost, by fiscal year, of each past and future phase or increment, in addition to the amount requested for the phase or increment contained in the budget request.

In the fiscal year 2008 budget request, the DD1391 forms for incrementally funded Army and Air Force projects generally contained all this information, while those for the Navy and certain defense agencies, such as the National Security Agency, did not. The committee suggests the table included in the justification material provided by the Air Force for increment 3 of the Main Base Runway project at Edwards Air Force Base, California as a model for presenting this information.

### Budget justification material for military construction

The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) prepares and transmits budget justification material to the Congress describing the budget request of the Department of Defense. Among these documents are line item level descriptions of the budget request for military personnel, operation and maintenance, procurement, research and development, and military construction accounts, known respectively as the M–1, O–1, P–1, R–1, and C–1. With the exception of the C–1 for military construction, all of these documents include a listing of the funding amounts by program for the prior year as well as the current year and the budget year. The C–1 includes information only for the current year and the budget year. However, prior to the fiscal year 2000 budget request, the C–1 also included information for the prior year. The committee believes a public record of the amounts actually obligated as of the end of the fiscal year serves a useful purpose and requests that beginning with the budget request for fiscal year 2009 the C–1 once again include information on the prior year amounts for each line item.

### Short title (sec. 2001)

The committee recommends a provision that would designate division B of this Act as the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008.

## TITLE XXI—ARMY

### Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $4.0 billion for military construction and $1.2 billion for family housing for the Army for fiscal year 2008.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $4.1 billion for military construction and $1.2 billion for family housing for fiscal year 2008.

The budget request included "placeholders" in the Army's military construction and family housing budget accounts of $2.4 billion related to facilities to support the administration's "Grow the Force" proposal to increase the size of the Army. On March 30, 2007, the Army provided a detailed breakout and supporting budget justification materials to the committee requesting a specific allocation of these funds. While this was not an official administration budget amendment, the committee has reviewed this request and included these proposed changes in the committee recommendation. These projects are identified in the State list table included in this report.

The committee recommends the following reductions and modifications to projects requested by the Army. The committee has deleted $1.0 million included in a defense access road project at Fort Carson, Colorado which was unrelated to the project for which funds were requested.

The committee has also reduced the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2008 for two projects requested to support the stationing of a full brigade complex at Vicenza, Italy. The budget requested $86.0 million for a barracks and community facilities project and an additional $87.0 million for an operations support complex. The committee values the strong relationship between the United States and Italy, but notes with concern that the proposal to expand into these facilities at Dal Molin has yet to receive the required approvals from the Government of Italy. Therefore, the committee recommends these projects be incrementally funded at $50.0 million each in fiscal year 2008. Should host nation approval not be forthcoming in a timely manner, further reductions in this funding may be warranted.

The congressional defense committees and the Department of Defense have traditionally analyzed requirements and funding for mission projects and quality of life projects as important and distinct categories. Several projects requested by the Army blur these traditional distinctions. The funding requested for a headquarters facility for the U.S. Southern Command in Miami included funding for a child development center inside the overall project cost for the headquarters. Funding requested for a brigade complex maintenance facility at Fort Drum, New York combined funding for a dining facility with funding for mission-oriented projects such as vehi-

cle maintenance shops. The committee has separated these mission and quality of life requests into separate projects. The committee accepts the practice of combining dining facilities with other quality of life projects such as unaccompanied housing. However, the committee directs the Army, and the other elements of the Department of Defense, to refrain from combining mission facilities and quality of life facilities into single project requests in future budget submissions.

**Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the active component of the Army for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

**Family housing (sec. 2102)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2008. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices and housing maintenance and storage facilities.

**Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2103)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funding for fiscal year 2008 to improve existing Army family housing units.

**Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Army authorized for construction for fiscal year 2008 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty component of the Army. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Termination of authority to carry out fiscal year 2007 Army projects for which funds were not appropriated (sec. 2105)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the project authorizations and authorization of appropriations for military construction projects authorized in fiscal year 2007 for which no funds were appropriated. No appropriations were provided in fiscal year 2007 for projects that were authorized but were not included in the President's original budget request. The entire list of fiscal year 2007 active Army projects for which the authorizations would be repealed follows. The committee has provided new authorizations for some of these projects for fiscal year 2008. Details on the projects that received new fiscal year 2008 authorizations can be found in the State list of fiscal year 2008 projects contained in this report.

The committee urges the Department of Defense and the military departments to review any projects on this list that are not authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2008 and re-insert those projects, if the requirements are still valid, in the fiscal year 2009 future-years defense program.

**TERMINATION OF FY2007 AUTHORIZATIONS**

| Account | Location | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | FY 2007 Conference Authorization | Authorization Amount Terminated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | Alabama | Redstone Arsenal | Software Engineering Annex, Phase 2 | | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Army | Alabama | Redstone Arsenal | Explosive Cargo Handling Apron | | 2,300 | 2,300 |
| Army | Alabama | Redstone Arsenal | Child Development Center | | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| Army | Alaska | Fort Wainwright | Railhead Operations Facility | | 8,800 | 8,800 |
| Army | California | Fort Irwin | Child Development Center | | 8,200 | 8,200 |
| Army | Colorado | Fort Carson | Utility Upgrades, Phase 1 | | 6,800 | 6,800 |
| Army | Kansas | Fort Riley | Vehicle Inspection/Cargo Processing Facility | | 10,200 | 10,200 |
| Army | Kansas | Fort Leavenworth | Child Development Center | | 8,200 | 8,200 |
| Army | Kentucky | Fort Campbell | Warrior Rehabilitation/Fitness Center | | 11,800 | 11,800 |
| Army | Kentucky | Fort Campbell | Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Facility | | 8,100 | 8,100 |
| Army | Louisiana | Fort Polk | Construct Brigade Facility (4th BDE 10th HQ) | | 9,800 | 9,800 |
| Army | Louisiana | Fort Polk | Child Development Center | | 6,100 | 6,100 |
| Army | Maryland | Fort Detrick | Research Acquisition Building | | 12,400 | 12,400 |
| Army | Maryland | Aberdeen PG | Automotive Technology Evaluation Facility, Ph 1 | | 8,800 | 8,800 |
| Army | Michigan | Detroit Arsenal | Ground System Power and Energy Lab | | 18,500 | 18,500 |
| Army | Missouri | Fort Leonard Wood | Vehicle Maintenance Shop - 58th Trans Bn | | 10,600 | 10,600 |
| Army | Missouri | Fort Leonard Wood | Child Development Center | | 6,900 | 6,900 |
| Army | New Jersey | Picatinny Arsenal | Armament Integration Facility | | 9,900 | 9,900 |
| Army | New York | Fort Drum | Automated Qualification Training Range | | 9,400 | 9,400 |
| Army | North Carolina | Fort Bragg | Child Development Center | | 7,900 | 7,900 |
| Army | Pennsylvania | Letterkenny Depot | Construct Port Staging Facility | | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| Army | Texas | Fort Hood | CH-47 Maintenance Hangar | | 18,000 | 18,000 |
| Army | Texas | Corpus Christi Depot | Aircraft Component Maintenance Shop | | 12,200 | 12,200 |
| Army | Texas | Fort Bliss | Physical Fitness Center | | 8,200 | 8,200 |
| Army | Texas | Red River Depot | Construct Maneuver Sys Sustainment Ctr, Ph 1 | | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| Army | Virginia | Fort Lee | Deployment Staging Area | | 4,150 | 4,150 |
| | | | **Army Authorization Terminations** | | | **242,750** |

**Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2006 project (sec. 2106)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (division B of Public Law 109–163) to increase the project authorizations for Fort Bragg, North Carolina by $7.0 million. This increase was requested by the Department of Defense in its legislative proposal to the Congress.

**Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2107)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain Army fiscal year 2005 military construction projects until October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Department of Defense in their legislative proposal to the Congress.

**Technical amendments to the Military Construction Authorization Act for 2007 (sec. 2108)**

The committee recommends a provision that would make two corrections to the table of project authorizations in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–364). One amendment would modify the name of a specific location of a project in Romania to reflect a modification of the original plan. This modification was proposed by the Army and understood by the conferees prior to the adoption of the fiscal year 2007 legislation. The second amendment would correct an enrolling error and align the text of the public law with the text of the conference report.

**Ground lease, SOUTHCOM Headquarters Facility, Miami-Doral, Florida (sec. 2109)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require amendments to the existing ground lease agreement between the United States Government and the State of Florida for the land proposed as the site of a new headquarters for the U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) before the Secretary of the Army could begin construction of the headquarters. The committee is concerned that the existing agreement does not allow sufficient flexibility for the use of this facility by other federal agencies in the event future requirements change, and that the lease term should be a more standard 50-year period, rather than 20 years with options for extensions as under the current agreement. The committee understands the State is willing to make these modifications to the lease agreement.

## Item of Special Interest

**Army budget justification material for military construction**

The military departments and defense agencies prepare detailed justification documents for each military construction project and transmit these to the Congress as part of the annual budget justification materials. These documents are known as DD1391 forms.

The budget justification materials submitted by the Army in February in support of the fiscal year 2008 budget contained, in 44 different projects, an assertion that "Title to utility infrastructure constructed as a result of this MILCON project may be transferred to the utility privatization contractor notwithstanding any other provision of law."

The committee appreciates any attempt to make the DD1391 forms as informative as possible. However, the committee notes that an executive branch assertion in a budget justification document of a right to take an action "notwithstanding any other provision of law" has no force and effect and does not create any such right. Committee approval in this Act of funding for any Army military construction project containing this phrase does not constitute an endorsement or acceptance of any right by the Army to take actions contrary to existing law. The committee directs the Army to refrain from inserting such an assertion into DD1391 forms in the future.

## TITLE XXII—NAVY

### Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $2.1 billion for military construction and $669.7 million for family housing for the Department of the Navy for fiscal year 2008 in the base budget request, plus an additional $169.1 million in emergency funding for projects to support increasing the size of the Marine Corps.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $2.4 billion for military construction and $671.5 million for family housing for fiscal year 2008. Included in this amount is the $169.1 million which was requested as emergency funding. The committee has transferred funding for these projects from title XXIX of this Act and included these projects in the regular State list on a non-emergency basis. These transfers are identified in the State list.

The budget request also included "placeholders" in the Navy's military construction and family housing budget accounts of $382.9 million related to facilities to support the administration's "Grow the Force" proposal to increase the size of the Marine Corps. On April 20, 2007, the Navy provided a detailed breakout and supporting budget justification materials to the committee requesting a specific allocation of these funds. While this was not an official administration budget amendment, the committee has reviewed this request and included these proposed changes in the committee recommendation. These projects are identified in the State list table included in this report.

The committee recommends the following reductions and modifications to projects requested by the Navy. The committee has deleted $18.1 million requested for an infantry squad battle course at Camp Pendleton, California. The budget justification material for this project indicated that only about 9 percent of the cost of this project was for the primary facility, while the rest was for supporting facilities and extensive site work and mitigation. The committee urges the Navy to find a more efficient way to construct this project.

The committee has also deleted funding requested for the Outlying Landing Field (OLF) project in Washington County, North Carolina. The committee is aware that the Navy is in the process of reconsidering the siting for this project. The committee has added funding for an expanded environmental impact statement that would evaluate other potential sites in title III of this Act.

The committee is concerned by the cost of the $45.3 million request for a fitness center in Guam. In particular, the committee considers the $5.3 million requested for an outdoor running track to be excessive in light of the $7.9 million already included in the project for a lighted synthetic field, which would appear to be a suitable alternative for jogging.

The committee is also concerned by the cost of proposed family housing construction in Guam. The budget requests $57.2 million for just 73 units in Guam, which equates to a per unit cost of $783,198 per building including site work and utilities. The average unit cost of the dwelling units alone is $437,562. The committee understands that construction costs in Guam are very high, but finds these unit costs unacceptable and has accordingly reduced this request by $10.0 million. The proposal to relocate 8,000 marines from Okinawa to Guam over the next several years will not be affordable, even with cost sharing between the United States and the Government of Japan, at these prices.

**Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Navy and Marine Corps military construction projects for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

**Family housing (sec. 2202)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2008. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices and housing maintenance and storage facilities.

**Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funding for fiscal year 2008 to improve existing Navy family housing units.

**Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Department of the Navy authorized for construction for fiscal year 2008 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty components of the Navy and the Marine Corps. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Termination of authority to carry out fiscal year 2007 Navy projects for which funds were not appropriated (sec. 2205)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the project authorizations and authorization of appropriations for military construction projects authorized in fiscal year 2007 for which no funds were appropriated. No appropriations were provided in fiscal year 2007 for projects that were authorized but were not included in the President's original budget request.

The entire list of fiscal year 2007 active Navy projects for which the authorizations would be repealed follows. The committee has provided new authorizations for some of these projects for fiscal

year 2008. Details on the projects that received new fiscal year 2008 authorizations can be found in the State list of fiscal year 2008 projects contained in this report.

The committee urges the Department of Defense and the military departments to review any projects on this list that are not authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2008 and re-insert those projects, if the requirements are still valid, in the fiscal year 2009 future-years defense program.

**TERMINATION OF FY2007 AUTHORIZATIONS**

| Account | Location | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | FY 2007 Conference Authorization | Authorization Amount Terminated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Navy | California | MCB 29 Palms | MOUT Facility, Phase 2 | | 19,000 | 19,000 |
| Navy | California | NSA Monterey | Global Weather Ops Center Expansion | | 7,380 | 7,380 |
| Navy | Connecticut | NSB New London | Waterfront Operations Small Craft Facility | | 9,580 | 9,580 |
| Navy | Florida | Cape Canaveral | Engineering Services Facility | | 9,900 | 9,900 |
| Navy | Georgia | MCLB Albany | Combat Vehicle Warehouse | | 4,960 | 4,960 |
| Navy | Georgia | Blount Island | Waterfront Operations Facility | | 3,580 | 3,580 |
| Navy | Hawaii | NSY Pearl Harbor | Dry Dock Ship Support Services | | 22,000 | 22,000 |
| Navy | Hawaii | NAVMAG Pearl Harbor | Fire Station | | 6,010 | 6,010 |
| Navy | Indiana | NSA Crane | Special Weapons Assessment Facility | | 6,730 | 6,730 |
| Navy | Maine | NSY Portsmouth | Drydock #3 Waterfront Support Facility | | 9,650 | 9,650 |
| Navy | Mississippi | NAS Meridian | Construct Fire Station | | 5,870 | 5,870 |
| Navy | Nevada | NAS Fallon | Improve Range B-20 | | 7,730 | 7,730 |
| Navy | North Carolina | MCAS Cherry Point | Commercial Power/Cargo Refueling Lane | | 2,790 | 2,790 |
| Navy | Rhode Island | NS Newport | Replace Vehicle Bridge, Incr 2* | | 3,410 | 3,410 |
| Navy | South Carolina | MCAS Beaufort | Nuclear/Bio/Chem Facility | | 3,350 | 3,350 |
| Navy | Virginia | NSA Norfolk | JFCOM Headquarters Building | | 13,250 | 13,250 |
| Navy | Virginia | NSWC Dahlgren | Construct Electromagnetic Launch RDT&E Fac | | 9,850 | 9,850 |
| Navy | Washington | NAS Whidbey Island | Indoor Aircraft Washrack | | 9,650 | 9,650 |
| Navy | Washington | NB Kitsap | Ocean Engineering Support Facility | | 4,110 | 4,110 |
| Navy Housing | Worldwide | Unspecified Worldwide | Construction Improvements (29 Palms) | 176,446 | 180,146 | 3,700 |
| | | | **Navy Authorization Terminations** | | | **162,500** |

## TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

### Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $912.1 million for military construction and $1.1 billion for family housing for the Air Force in fiscal year 2008.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1.0 billion for military construction and $1.1 billion for family housing for fiscal year 2008.

### Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Air Force military construction projects for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

### Family housing (sec. 2302)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2008. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices and housing maintenance and storage facilities.

### Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funding for fiscal year 2008 to improve existing Air Force family housing units.

### Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Air Force authorized for construction for fiscal year 2008 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty component of the Air Force. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

### Termination of authority to carry out fiscal year 2007 Air Force projects for which funds were not appropriated (sec. 2305)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the project authorizations and authorization of appropriations for military construction projects authorized in fiscal year 2007 for which no funds were appropriated. No appropriations were provided in fiscal year 2007 for projects that were authorized but were not included in the President's original budget request. The entire list of fiscal year 2007 active Air Force projects for which the authoriza-

tions would be repealed follows. The committee has provided new authorizations for some of these projects for fiscal year 2008. Details on the projects that received new fiscal year 2008 authorizations can be found in the State list of fiscal year 2008 projects contained in this report. The committee urges the Department of Defense and the military departments to review any projects on this list that are not authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2008 and re-insert those projects, if the requirements are still valid, in the fiscal year 2009 future-years defense program.

**TERMINATION OF FY2007 AUTHORIZATIONS**

| Account | Location | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | FY 2007 Conference Authorization | Authorization Amount Terminated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Force | Alaska | Elmendorf AFB | Replace Joint PME Center, Phase 1 | | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| Air Force | Arizona | Davis-Monthan AFB | Consolidated Mission Support Center | | 7,200 | 7,200 |
| Air Force | Arkansas | Little Rock AFB | Multi-Purpose Education Center | | 9,800 | 9,800 |
| Air Force | California | Travis AFB | Construct Large Fire/Crash Rescue Station | | 11,900 | 11,900 |
| Air Force | Colorado | Peterson AFB | Acquire Land - Command Complex Force Prot | | 4,900 | 4,900 |
| Air Force | Delaware | Dover AFB | Construct Precision Measurement Equipmt Lab | | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| Air Force | Florida | Eglin AFB | Child Development Center | | 11,000 | 11,000 |
| Air Force | Florida | Tyndall AFB | 1st Air Force Headquarters Facility, Phase 3 | | 6,400 | 6,400 |
| Air Force | Georgia | Robins AFB | Construct Software Support Facility, Phase 1 | | 14,000 | 14,000 |
| Air Force | Georgia | Robins AFB | Construct Software Support Facility, Phase 2# | | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| Air Force | Illinois | Scott AFB | Child Development Center | | 8,200 | 8,200 |
| Air Force | Kansas | McConnell AFB | Upgrade Ramp Lighting North and South | | 3,875 | 3,875 |
| Air Force | Massachusetts | Hanscom AFB | Renovate Acquisition Management Facility | | 12,400 | 12,400 |
| Air Force | Missouri | Whiteman AFB | Animal Clinic/SF Kennel Complex | | 3,800 | 3,800 |
| Air Force | Montana | Malmstrom AFB | Community Activity Center | | 5,700 | 5,700 |
| Air Force | New Jersey | McGuire AFB | Unified Security Forces Operations Facility | | 13,000 | 13,000 |
| Air Force | New Mexico | Kirtland AFB | Rescue/Recovery Training Ctr (PJ/CRO) | | 11,400 | 11,400 |
| Air Force | North Dakota | Minot AFB | Air Traffic Control Complex, Phase 1 | | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| Air Force | Oklahoma | Altus AFB | Construct Visiting Quarters | | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| Air Force | Oklahoma | Tinker AFB | Electrical Substation | | 5,700 | 5,700 |
| Air Force | South Carolina | Charleston AFB | Child Development Center | | 10,200 | 10,200 |
| Air Force | South Carolina | Shaw AFB | Air Defense Alert Airfield Pavements | | 9,300 | 9,300 |
| Air Force | South Dakota | Ellsworth AFB | Base Water Well | | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| Air Force | Texas | Laughlin AFB | Student Officers Quarters, Phase 2 | | 12,600 | 12,600 |
| Air Force | Texas | Sheppard AFB | Base Operations Ramp, Phase 1 | | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| Air Force | Utah | Hill AFB | Construct Consolidated ALC Warehouse | | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Air Force | Washington | Fairchild AFB | Physiological Training Facility | | 4,250 | 4,250 |
| | | | **Air Force Authorization Terminations** | | | **225,625** |

**Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2006 project (sec. 2306)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2301 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (division B of Public Law 109–163) to increase the project authorizations for MacDill Air Force Base, Florida by $25.0 million. This increase was requested by the Department of Defense in its legislative proposal to the Congress.

**Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2307)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain Air Force fiscal year 2005 military construction projects until October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Air Force.

**Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2004 projects (sec. 2308)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain Air Force fiscal year 2004 military construction projects until October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Department of Defense in their legislative proposal to the Congress.

## TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

### Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $1.8 billion for military construction for the defense agencies, $49.3 million for family housing for the defense agencies and the Family Housing Improvement Fund, and $86.2 million for chemical demilitarization construction in fiscal year 2008.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1.9 billion for military construction and $49.3 million for family housing for the defense agencies and the Family Housing Improvement Fund for fiscal year 2008. These amounts include the funding for chemical demilitarization construction.

The Department of Defense requested funding for chemical demilitarization as a new separate funding title. The committee bill funds this program in title XXIV, as in previous years. The funding tables reflect the elimination of the $86.2 million request from the proposed new title, the transfer of these funds into title XXIV, the net increase of $18.0 million to this program, and the total of $104.2 million authorized in this title for chemical demilitarization construction.

The committee does not agree to authorize the $18.5 million requested by the Washington Headquarters Service for electrical upgrades for the Pentagon Reservation. The committee invites the Department of Defense to resubmit a modified version of this project in future years once the Department has reached agreement with the relevant electric utility companies on a more comprehensive approach that fulfills all the objectives this project was intended to address.

### Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

### Energy conservation projects (sec. 2402)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

### Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2403)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the military construction and family housing projects of the defense agencies authorized for construction for fiscal year 2008 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction

and family housing projects for the defense agencies. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Termination or modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2007 Defense Agencies projects (sec. 2404)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the project authorizations and authorization of appropriations for military construction projects authorized in fiscal year 2007 for which no funds were appropriated. The provision would also increase the authorized amount for prior year base realignment and closure (BRAC) funding for fiscal year 2007 to authorize the additional amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2007.

No appropriations were provided in fiscal year 2007 for projects that were authorized but were not included in the President's original budget request. The entire list of fiscal year 2007 projects of the defense agencies for which the authorizations would be repealed follows.

The committee has provided new authorizations for some of these projects for fiscal year 2008. Details on the projects that received new fiscal year 2008 authorizations can be found in the State list of fiscal year 2008 projects contained in this report. The committee urges the Department of Defense and the military departments to review any projects on this list that are not authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2008 and re-insert those projects, if the requirements are still valid, in the fiscal year 2009 future-years defense program.

**TERMINATION OF FY2007 AUTHORIZATIONS**

| Account | Location | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | FY 2007 Conference Authorization | Authorization Amount Terminated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Defense Agencie: | Mississippi | Stennis Space Center | Riverine and Combat Craft Operations Facility | | 10,200 | 10,200 |
| Defense Agencie: | North Carolina | Fort Bragg | SOF Communications Training Facility | | 6,900 | 6,900 |
| Defense Agencie: | Kentucky | Blue Grass Depot | Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Phase 7 | 89,157 | 99,157 | 10,000 |
| | | | **Defense Agency Authorization Terminations** | | | **27,100** |

**Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2405)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain defense agency fiscal year 2005 military construction projects until October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Department of Defense in their legislative proposal to the Congress.

# TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

## Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriation of $201.4 million for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2008. The committee recommends an authorization of appropriation of $201.4 million for this program. The committee notes that a significant portion of the NATO Security Investment Program is currently devoted to support of the NATO mission in Afghanistan, and expects that a significant portion of the funding for fiscal year 2008 would be used to continue those efforts.

## Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this title and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

## Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations of $201.4 million for the United States' contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2008.

## TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

### Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of $695.2 million for military construction in fiscal year 2008 for National Guard and reserve facilities. The committee recommends a total of $895.3 million for military construction for the reserve components. The detailed funding recommendations are contained in the State list table included in this report.

### Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Army National Guard for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

### Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2602)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Army Reserve for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

### Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2603)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

### Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2604)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Air National Guard for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

### Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2605)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Air Force Reserve for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

**Authorization of appropriations, Guard and Reserve (sec. 2606)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the reserve component military construction projects authorized for construction for fiscal year 2008 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction projects for each of the reserve components of the military departments. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Termination of authority to carry out fiscal year 2007 Guard and Reserve projects for which funds were not appropriated (sec. 2607)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the project authorizations and authorization of appropriations for military construction projects authorized in fiscal year 2007 for which no funds were appropriated. No appropriations were provided in fiscal year 2007 for projects that were authorized but were not included in the President's original budget request. The entire list of fiscal year 2007 reserve component projects for which the authorizations would be repealed follows. The committee has provided new authorizations for some of these projects for fiscal year 2008. Details on the projects that received new fiscal year 2008 authorizations can be found in the State list of fiscal year 2008 projects contained in this report. The committee urges the Department of Defense and the military departments to review any projects on this list that are not authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2008 and re-insert those projects, if the requirements are still valid, in the fiscal year 2009 future-years defense program.

**TERMINATION OF FY2007 AUTHORIZATIONS**

| Account | Location | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | FY 2007 Conference Authorization | Authorization Amount Terminated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army Guard | Arizona | Florence | Field Maintenance Shop | | 10,870 | 10,870 |
| Army Guard | Florida | Camp Blanding | Regional Training Institute, Phase 3 | | 14,800 | 14,800 |
| Army Guard | Idaho | Gowen Field | Construct Railhead, Phase 2 | | 6,964 | 6,964 |
| Army Guard | Iowa | Iowa City | Construct Readiness Center | | 10,724 | 10,724 |
| Army Guard | Kentucky | London | Readiness Center | | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| Army Guard | Michigan | Lansing | USPFO/Readiness Center Phase 2 | | 4,239 | 4,239 |
| Army Guard | Minnesota | Camp Ripley | Urban Assault Course | | 1,700 | 1,700 |
| Army Guard | Mississippi | Camp Shelby | Joint Use Simulation Center | | 14,839 | 14,839 |
| Army Guard | Pennsylvania | Waynesburg | Readiness Center | | 8,012 | 8,012 |
| Army Guard | Rhode Island | East Greenwich | Combined Support Maintenance Shop | 27,472 | 29,547 | 2,075 |
| Army Guard | Virginia | Winchester | Organizational Maintenance Shop | | 3,113 | 3,113 |
| Army Guard | West Virginia | Camp Dawson | Multi-Purpose Building | | 4,842 | 4,842 |
| | | | **Army National Guard Authorization Terminations** | | | **84,678** |
| Air Guard | Alabama | Birmingham IAP | Alert Quarters Mobility Complex | | 4,500 | 4,500 |
| Air Guard | California | Fresno/Yosemite | Replace Squadron Operations Facility | | 9,800 | 9,800 |
| Air Guard | Colorado | Buckley AFB | Replace Squadron Ops Facility | | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| Air Guard | Colorado | Buckley AFB | Air Sovereignty Alert Crew Quarters | | 3,100 | 3,100 |
| Air Guard | Georgia | Savannah CRTC | Troop Training Quarters | | 8,700 | 8,700 |
| Air Guard | Iowa | Fort Dodge | Vehicle Maint Communications Training Center | | 5,600 | 5,600 |
| Air Guard | Maryland | Martin State Airport | Fire/Rescue Station | | 8,800 | 8,800 |
| Air Guard | Massachusetts | Barnes ANGB | Add/Alt Fire Crash Rescue Station | | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| Air Guard | Montana | Great Falls | Replace Operation and Training Facility | | 9,600 | 9,600 |
| Air Guard | Nevada | Reno-Tahoe IAP | Vehicle Maintenance Complex | | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Air Guard | New Jersey | Atlantic City IAP | Arm/Disarm Apron | | 1,800 | 1,800 |
| Air Guard | New York | Hancock Field | Upgrade Base Facilities | | 8,000 | 8,000 |

**TERMINATION OF FY2007 AUTHORIZATIONS**

| Account | Location | Installation | Project Title | Budget Request | FY 2007 Conference Authorization | Authorization Amount Terminated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Guard | New York | Griffiss | Construct NEADS Support Facility, Phase 2 | | 6,600 | 6,600 |
| Air Guard | Ohio | Rickenbacker ANG Base | Security Forces Complex/Communications Building | | 7,200 | 7,200 |
| Air Guard | Pennsylvania | Fort Indiantown Gap | Operations and Training Facility | | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| Air Guard | South Dakota | Joe Foss Field | Replace Civil Engineer Maintenance Complex | | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| Air Guard | Tennessee | McGhee Tyson | Replace Squadron Operations Facility | | 11,200 | 11,200 |
| Air Guard | Vermont | Burlington | Improve Base Security, Phase 1 | | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| Air Guard | West Virginia | Yeager | Replace Aircraft Maintenance Hangar | | 17,300 | 17,300 |
| Air Guard | West Virginia | Martinsburg ANGS | Construct C-5 Avionics Shop, ASE, Aerial Port | | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Air Guard | Wisconsin | Truax Field | Add/Alt Fire Crash Rescue Station | | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| Air Guard | Wyoming | Cheyenne Airport | Replace Squadron Operations Facility | | 7,600 | 7,600 |
| | | | **Air National Guard Authorization Terminations** | | | **160,300** |
| Army Reserve | Nebraska | North Platte | Reserve Center/OMS/AMSA/Storage | | 7,630 | 7,630 |
| Army Reserve | Texas | Ellington Field | Construct Armed Forces Reserve Ctr, Ph 2 | | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| | | | **Army Reserve Authorization Terminations** | | | **22,630** |
| Naval Reserve | Texas | NAS/JRB Fort Worth | Joint Multi-Level Parking Facility | | 6,500 | 6,500 |
| | | | **Navy Reserve Authorization Terminations** | | | **6,500** |
| Air Force Reserve | Florida | Patrick AFB | ISO/Phase Dock Extension, Hangar 630 | | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| Air Force Reserve | Minnesota | Minneapolis-St. Paul IAP | Aerial Port Facility | | 6,400 | 6,400 |
| | | | **Air Force Reserve Authorization Terminations** | | | **9,400** |

### Modification of authority to carry out fiscal year 2006 Air Force Reserve construction and acquisition projects (sec. 2608)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the authorization for a fiscal year 2006 Air Force Reserve project to convert a hanger into a headquarters for a C–17 unit at Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska. Earlier this year, the Air Force submitted a reprogramming request to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives seeking to use this $3.1 million in funding for a project supporting the F–22 program rather than the C–17 program. The committee does not believe that construction of facilities not authorized by law is an appropriate use of existing authorities. The reprogramming was not approved, and the Air Force later turned to an existing statutory authority to construct the F–22 project. Therefore, the funding proposed by the Air Force as a source of funds is no longer required. The committee has included a separate legislative provision to address the reprogramming process more generally.

### Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2005 projects (sec. 2609)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain guard and reserve fiscal year 2005 military construction projects until October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Department of Defense in their legislative proposal to the Congress.

### Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2004 projects (sec. 2610)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain guard and reserve fiscal year 2004 military construction projects until October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later. These extensions were requested by the Department of Defense in their legislative proposal to the Congress.

## Items of Special Interest

### Planning and design, Army National Guard

The committee directs that the amount of $3.5 million, added to the authorization of appropriations for planning and design for the Army National Guard, be used to complete the design of the Joint Forces Headquarters for the Minnesota National Guard at the Arden Hills Army Training Site, and that $960,000 added to this account be used to complete the design of a readiness center in The Dalles, Oregon.

## TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

### Summary and explanation of tables

The budget request included $220.7 million for the ongoing cost of environmental remediation and other activities necessary to continue implementation of the 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) rounds. The committee has authorized the amount requested for these activities in section 2701 of this Act.

In addition, the budget requested an authorization of appropriations of $8.2 billion for implementation of the 2005 BRAC round. Section 2703 of this Act authorizes the full $8.2 billion requested for BRAC activities in fiscal year 2008. Included in the $8.2 billion requested for BRAC is an authorization of appropriations for $6.4 billion in military construction projects that would be initiated in fiscal year 2008. The full project authorization amount of these projects is $8.7 billion. Section 2702 of this Act provides the authorization for these projects.

The following table provides the specific amount authorized for each BRAC military construction project as well as the amount authorized for appropriations for all BRAC activities, including military construction, environmental costs, relocation and other operation and maintenance costs, permanent change of station costs for military personnel, and other BRAC costs.

## TITLE XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

| Agency | Commission Number | Location | State | Project | Project Authorization | Authorization of Appropriation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Force | 80 110 | Elmendorf AFB, AK | AK | Aircraft Maintenance Complex | 11,400 | 11,400 |
| Air Force | 80 110 | Elmendorf AFB, AK | AK | Ops and Med Training | 12,200 | 12,200 |
| Air Force | 80 110 | Elmendorf AFB, AK | AK | Composite Support Complex | 9,600 | 9,600 |
| Army | 11 | JFHQ Montgomery | AL | Headquarters Building, Joint Forces | 36,100 | 36,100 |
| Army | 148 | Redstone Arsenal | AL | AMC & USASAC Headquarters Increment 1 | 127,000 | 30,000 |
| MDA | 134 | Redstone Arenal, AL | AL | Construct Von Braun Complex | 221,800 | 73,600 |
| Army | 13 | Arkadelphia | AR | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 12,200 | 12,200 |
| Army | 13 | Fort Chaffee | AR | Vehicle Maintenance Facility, Joint Forces | 31,300 | 31,300 |
| Air Force | 92 93 103 | Little Rock AFB, AR | AR | AGE / Engine Facility | 2,800 | 2,800 |
| Army | 73 | AFRC Bell | CA | Armed Forces Reserve Center, Increment 2 | 22,100 | 22,100 |
| Navy | 184 | China Lake | CA | Fuse Test Facility | 9,476 | 9,476 |
| Navy | 184 | China Lake | CA | Hardware In the Loop Facility | 13,890 | 13,890 |
| Navy | 188 | China Lake | CA | Fixed Wing Transfer Facility/AF | 8,600 | 8,600 |
| Navy | 71 | NS San Diego | CA | Renovate COMINEWARCOM HQ | 19,558 | 19,558 |
| Navy | 71 | NS San Diego | CA | Child Development Center | 7,079 | 7,079 |
| Navy | 71 | NWS Seal Beach | CA | MOMAU 15 Collocation to Building 78 | 5,150 | 5,150 |
| Navy | 71 | NS San Diego | CA | Upgrade Magnetic Silencing Facility for MCMs | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| Army | 6 | Fort Carson | CO | Hospital Addition | 27,000 | 27,000 |
| Army | 6 | Fort Carson | CO | Troop Health Clinic | 54,000 | 54,000 |
| Army | 6 | Fort Carson | CO | Brigade Combat Team Complex, Increment 3 | - | 90,000 |
| Army | 6 | Fort Carson | CO | Division Headquarters Complex, Increment 2 | - | 20,000 |
| Army | 6 | Fort Carson | CO | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 13,200 | 13,200 |
| Air Force | 91 143B | Buckley AFB, CO | CO | Utility Infrastructure Construction | 10,080 | 10,080 |
| CIFA | 131 | Peterson AFB, CO | CO | CIFA West Offcie Building | 2,363 | 2,363 |
| Army | 4 | Eglin Air Force Base | FL | Indoor Firing Range | 4,850 | 4,850 |
| Army | 4 | Eglin Air Force Base | FL | Live Fire Exercise Shoothouse | 3,300 | 3,300 |
| Army | 4 | Eglin Air Force Base | FL | Live Fire Exercise Breach Facility | 3,750 | 3,750 |
| Army | 4 | Eglin Air Force Base | FL | Shotgun Assault Course | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| Army | 4 | Eglin Air Force Base | FL | Grenade Launcher Range | 1,050 | 1,050 |
| Army | 4 | Eglin Air Force Base | FL | Hand Grenade Qualification Course | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Army | 4 | Eglin Air Force Base | FL | Urban Assault Course | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| Navy | 65 | Jacksonville | FL | Hangar/Parking Apron | - | 19,761 |

## TITLE XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

| Agency | Commission Number | Location | State | Project | Project Authorization | Authorization of Appropriation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Force | 104 | MacDill AFB, FL | FL | AFR CE and Disaster Prep Training | 3,500 | 3,500 |
| Air Force | 104 | MacDill AFB, FL | FL | AFR FF Admin/Training | 1,150 | 1,150 |
| Air Force | 104 | MacDill AFB, FL | FL | AFR Aeromedical Stag Sqd Training | 3,150 | 3,150 |
| Air Force | 104 | MacDill AFB, FL | FL | AFR Comm Squadron Training | 940 | 940 |
| Air Force | 104 | MacDill AFB, FL | FL | AFR Add Services Flight Training | 840 | 840 |
| Air Force | 104 | MacDill AFB, FL | FL | AFR SF Squadron Training | 2,200 | 2,200 |
| Air Force | 113 115 | Homestead ARB, FL | FL | AFRC Add Avionics and ECM Shop | 2,150 | 2,150 |
| Air Force | 125 | Eglin AFB, FL | FL | JSF Academic Simulator Facility | 26,000 | 26,000 |
| Air Force | 125 | Eglin AFB, FL | FL | USMC Hangar | 16,800 | 16,800 |
| Air Force | 128 | NAS Pensacola, FL | FL | AF CSO Training Hangar | 36,500 | 36,500 |
| Air Force | 128 | NAS Pensacola, FL | FL | CSO Training Facility | 13,000 | 13,000 |
| Army | 9 | Fort Benning | GA | Troop Health Clinic - Winder, Sand Hill | 5,100 | 5,100 |
| Army | 9 | Fort Benning | GA | Troop Health Clinic - Harmony Church | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| Army | 9 | Fort Benning | GA | Troop Dental Clinic - Solomon, Sand Hill | 3,550 | 3,550 |
| Army | 9 | Fort Benning | GA | Modified Record Fire Range 2 | 4,500 | 4,500 |
| Army | 9 | Fort Benning | GA | Modified Record Fire Range 1 | 4,500 | 4,500 |
| Army | 9 | Fort Benning | GA | Vehicle Maintenance Facility | 23,000 | 23,000 |
| Army | 9 | Fort Benning | GA | General Instruction Complex 1 | 24,000 | 24,000 |
| Army | 9 | Fort Benning | GA | Training Aid Support Center Conversion | 3,800 | 3,800 |
| Army | 9 | Fort Benning | GA | Infrastructure Support Increment 1 | 148,000 | 74,000 |
| Army | 9 | Fort Benning | GA | Training Support Brigade Complex Increment 2 | 73,000 | 73,000 |
| Navy | 62 | Fort Gillem | GA | RIA-14 Facility | 3,764 | 3,764 |
| Air Force | 79 103 | Moody AFB, GA | GA | Dormitory, 120-PN | 14,000 | 14,000 |
| Air Force | 87 | Robins AFB, GA | GA | Relocate 202 EIS Ops | 1,700 | 1,700 |
| Army | 18 | Keauhaha | HI | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 49,200 | 49,200 |
| Army | 162 | Iowa AAP | IA | Industrial Waste Treatment Plant | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| Air Force | 106 | Cheyenne MAP AGS, ID | WY | Squadron Operations Addition | 3,200 | 3,200 |
| Army | 19 | Lake County | IL | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Army | 19 | Mt Vernon Armory | IL | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 26,400 | 26,400 |
| Army | 151 | Rock Island Arsenal | IL | Metal Parts Production Add/Alt | 10,600 | 10,600 |
| Air Force | 142 | Scott AFB, IL | IL | HQ USTRANSCOM Facilities | 83,800 | 83,800 |
| Army | 20 | Lafayette | IN | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 28,605 | 28,605 |

## TITLE XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

| Agency | Commission Number | Location | State | Project | Project Authorization | Authorization of Appropriation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | 10 | Fort Riley | KS | Combat Aviation Brigade Complex Increment 2 | - | 109,000 |
| Army | 9 | Fort Knox | KY | Armed Forces Reserve Center Phase 1 | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| Army | 143 | Fort Knox | KY | Human Resources Command Cplx, Ph 2 Incr 1 | - | 55,000 |
| Army | 23 | Baton Rouge | LA | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 40,666 | 40,666 |
| Army | 73 | Baton Rouge | LA | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| Navy | 64 | NAS/JRB New Orleans | LA | Flag Housing | 1,527 | 1,527 |
| Navy | 64 | NAS/JRB New Orleans | LA | Library | 3,377 | 3,377 |
| Navy | 64 | NAS/JRB New Orleans | LA | Recreation Center | 2,186 | 2,186 |
| Navy | 64 | NAS/JRB New Orleans | LA | General Administrative Building | 9,158 | 9,158 |
| Navy | 64 | NAS/JRB New Orleans | LA | Veterinary Facility | 806 | 806 |
| Air Force | 108 | New Orleans ARS, NAS New Orl JRB | LA | Relocate 214 EIS Ops | 1,200 | 1,200 |
| Air Force | 94 | Barnes MPT AGS, MA | MA | Add To Munitions Stge | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Air Force | 94 | Barnes MPT AGS, MA | MA | ASA Alert Complex | 16,500 | 16,500 |
| Army | 5 | Aberdeen Proving Ground | MD | C4ISR Facilities Phase 3, Increment 1 | 245,000 | 141,000 |
| Army | 5 | Aberdeen Proving Ground | MD | C4ISR (I2WD) Facilities Phase 2 | 104,000 | 104,000 |
| Army | 169 | Aberdeen Proving Ground | MD | Medical Research Lab, Chem Bio Defense | 27,000 | 27,000 |
| Army | 187 | Aberdeen Proving Ground | MD | Research Lab, Army | 2,900 | 2,900 |
| Navy | 184 | Indian Head | MD | Explosives Development Facility | 28,789 | 28,789 |
| Air Force | 129 | Andrews AFB, MD | MD | HQ & Readiness Center (Increment 1) | 51,000 | 28,000 |
| DISA | 140 | Fort Meade, MD | MD | Construct DISA Building | 151,994 | 151,994 |
| NSA | 130 | Fort Meade, MD | MD | Construct Adjudication Facility | 94 | 94 |
| TMA | 169 | WRNMMC Bethesda | MD | MEDCEN Add/Alt Increment 1 | 497,000 | 214,800 |
| Navy | 65 | Kittery | ME | SERE School and Addition to Building B315 | 12,740 | 12,740 |
| Navy | 65 | Brunswick | ME | NMCB 27 Facilities | 9,295 | 9,295 |
| Air Force | 95 | Selfridge ANGB, MI | MI | Add to Fuel/Corrosion Control | 1,050 | 1,050 |
| Army | 27 | Faribault Army Natl Guard | MN | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| Army | 28 | AFRC Jefferson Brk | MO | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 27,100 | 27,100 |
| Army | 29 | Missoula Armory | MT | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 19,200 | 19,200 |
| Air Force | 94 | Great Falls IAP AGS, MT | MT | Upgrade Munitions Storage | 3,300 | 3,300 |
| Army | 4 | Fort Bragg | NC | Troop Medical Clinic | 16,500 | 16,500 |
| Air Force | 103 | Pope AFB, NC | NC | Reconfigure Base Supply Building 560 | 796 | 796 |
| Air Force | 103 | Pope AFB, NC | NC | Reconfigure Wing HQ Bldg 753 | 778 | 778 |

## TITLE XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

| Agency | Commission Number | Location | State | Project | Project Authorization | Authorization of Appropriation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Force | 104 119 | Seymour Johnson AFB, NC | NC | Fitness Center Addition B4210 | 1,600 | 1,600 |
| Air Force | 104 119 | Seymour Johnson AFB, NC | NC | Recreation Center Addition Bldg 3728 | 820 | 820 |
| Air Force | 104 119 | Seymour Johnson AFB, NC | NC | Construct Flightline Kitchen Facility | 960 | 960 |
| Air Force | 104 | Grand Forks AFB, ND | ND | Convert Hangar for UAV Corrosion Control | 1,280 | 1,280 |
| Navy | 68 | McGuire AFB | NJ | Construct Helicopters Hangars & MAG HQ | 37,809 | 37,809 |
| Navy | 68 | McGuire AFB | NJ | Joint Use Reserve Training Center | 20,580 | 20,580 |
| Navy | 68 | McGuire AFB | NJ | NAVY VR Fleet Logistics Operations Facility | 65,824 | 27,558 |
| Air Force | 187 | Kirtland AFB, NM | NM | Space Vehicle Facility | 42,700 | 42,700 |
| Army | 34 | AFRC Farmingdale | NY | Armed Forces Reserve Center, Increment 1 | 86,000 | 65,000 |
| Army | 34 | AFRC Niagara Falls | NY | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 27,000 | 27,000 |
| Army | 53 | Fort Hamilton | NY | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 64,000 | 64,000 |
| Army | 37 | Columbus | OH | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 29,000 | 29,000 |
| Army | 37 | Springfield | OH | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 25,400 | 25,500 |
| Navy | 174 | Wright-Patterson AFB, OH | OH | Naval Aero-Medical Research Lab | 13,600 | 13,600 |
| Air Force | 170 188A | Wright-Patterson AFB, OH | OH | Alter Acquisition Mgt Fac (HSG/YA & Fixed Wing) | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| Air Force | 170 | Wright-Patterson AFB, OH | OH | Alter Materials Laboratory (HSG/YA Labs) | 6,200 | 6,200 |
| Air Force | 170 | Wright-Patterson AFB, OH | OH | Radiation Calibration Factiliy | 4,600 | 4,600 |
| Air Force | 170 | Wright-Patterson AFB, OH | OH | AFIOH Facility | 54,000 | 54,000 |
| Air Force | 170 | Wright-Patterson AFB, OH | OH | AFRL/HE (Brooks) | 32,000 | 32,000 |
| Air Force | 170 | Wright-Patterson AFB, OH | OH | USAFSAM Consult Service | 18,500 | 18,500 |
| Air Force | 170 | Wright-Patterson AFB, OH | OH | USAFSAM (Increment 1) | 81,000 | 51,000 |
| Air Force | 170 187 188A | Wright-Patterson AFB, OH | OH | Dining Facility | 980 | 980 |
| Air Force | 187 | Wright-Patterson AFB, OH | OH | AFRL/HE (MESA) | 34,000 | 34,000 |
| Army | x | Fort Sill | OK | ADA Brigade Complex, Increment 1 | 156,000 | 89,000 |
| Army | 38 | Fort Sill | OK | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 34,000 | 34,000 |
| Army | 38 | McAlester | OK | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| Army | 38 | Norman | OK | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 43,200 | 43,200 |
| Army | 38 | Vance AFB | OK | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| Army | 38 | West Oklahoma City | OK | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 41,000 | 41,000 |
| Army | 126 | Fort Sill | OK | Training Aids Support Center | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| Army | 126 | Fort Sill | OK | ADA School Complex Incr 2 | | 87,000 |
| Air Force | 108 | Tinker AFB, OK | OK | AFR Squad Ops/Life Support | 6,900 | 6,900 |

## TITLE XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

| Agency | Commission Number | Location | State | Project | Project Authorization | Authorization of Appropriation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DLA | 177 | Def Distrib Depot Ok City (DDOO) | OK | Construct General Purpose Warehouse | 22,000 | 22,000 |
| Army | 7 | Letterkenny Army Depot | PA | Guided Missle Launcher Eqmt Shop, Depot | 11,600 | 11,600 |
| Army | 40 | AFRC Bristol | PA | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Army | 40 | AFRC Scranton | PA | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 32,000 | 32,000 |
| Army | 57 | Tobyhanna Army Depot | PA | Radar Test Range | 2,450 | 2,450 |
| Navy | 73 | NMCRC Lehigh Valley | PA | NMCRC Reading to NMCRC Lehigh Valley, PA | 8,600 | 8,600 |
| DLA | 177 | Def Dist Depot Susquehanna | PA | Construct General Purpose Warehouse | 38,350 | 38,350 |
| Army | 50 | Fort Jackson | SC | Drill Sergeant School | 24,000 | 24,000 |
| Army | 124 | Fort Jackson | SC | Joint Religous Education & Training Center | 11,600 | 11,600 |
| Navy | 71 | Goose Creek | SC | EODMU-6 Detachment Boat Shops | 1,580 | 1,580 |
| Air Force | 3A | Shaw AFB, SC | SC | BOS Project for HQ 3rd Army | 25,000 | 25,000 |
| Army | x | Fort Bliss | TX | Combined Arms Collective Training Facility | 18,500 | 18,500 |
| Army | 10 | Fort Bliss | TX | Brigade Combat Team Complex #3 Increment 1 | 286,000 | 103,000 |
| Army | 10 | Fort Bliss | TX | Digital Multipurpose Training Range | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| Army | 10 | Fort Bliss | TX | Urban Assault Course | 2,300 | 2,300 |
| Army | 10 | Fort Bliss | TX | Convoy Live Fire Training Range | 3,200 | 3,200 |
| Army | 10 | Fort Bliss | TX | Infantry Squad Battle Course | 2,400 | 2,400 |
| Army | 10 | Fort Bliss | TX | Troop Health Clinic | 42,000 | 42,000 |
| Army | 10 | Fort Bliss | TX | Physical Fitness Facility | 22,000 | 22,000 |
| Army | 10 | Fort Bliss | TX | Youth Center Expansion | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| Army | 10 | Fort Bliss | TX | Information System Processing Center | 6,100 | 6,100 |
| Army | 10 | Fort Bliss | TX | Infrastructure Support Phase 2 | 55,000 | 55,000 |
| Army | 10 | Fort Bliss | TX | Combat Aviation Brigade Complex Increment 2 | - | 90,000 |
| Army | 10 | Fort Bliss | TX | Close Combat Tactical Trainer Facility | 6,100 | 6,100 |
| Army | 10 | Fort Bliss | TX | Brigade Combat Team Complex #2 Increment 2 | - | 70,000 |
| Army | 44 | AFRC East Houston | TX | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 36,000 | 36,000 |
| Army | 44 | AFRC Fort Bliss | TX | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 49,900 | 49,900 |
| Army | 44 | Northwest Houston | TX | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 31,900 | 31,900 |
| Army | 174 | Fort Sam Houston | TX | Battlefield Health & Trauma, Incr 2 | - | 53,000 |
| Air Force | 137C | Randolph AFB, TX | TX | Randolph - CPOs Admin Center Facility Construction | 10,900 | 10,900 |
| Air Force | 147 170 | Lackland AFB, TX | TX | HQ Admin Center (AFCEE & AFRPA & AFWSE) | 37,000 | 37,000 |
| Navy | 174 | Fort Sam Houston, TX | TX | Battlefield Health & Trauma Bio-Med Lab | 7,473 | 7,473 |

## TITLE XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

| Agency | Commission Number | Location | State | Project | Project Authorization | Authorization of Appropriation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Air Force | 113 | Carswell ARS, NAS Fort Worth JRB | TX | AFR Munitions Igloos | 1,250 | 1,250 |
| Air Force | 172 | Fort Sam Houston, TX | TX | Medical Training Facilities (Increment 1) | 225,000 | 96,400 |
| Air Force | 172 | Fort Sam Houston, TX | TX | Medical E&T - Dining Facilities | 38,000 | 38,000 |
| Air Force | 172 | Fort Sam Houston, TX | TX | METC Student Dorm #1 (Increment 1) | 87,700 | 46,500 |
| Air Force | 172 | Fort Sam Houston, TX | TX | METC Student Dorm #2 (Increment 1) | 80,700 | 47,000 |
| TMA | 172 | Fort Sam Houston | TX | ADA+E51L San Antonio Military MEDCEN North Incr 1 | 467,300 | 156,035 |
| TMA | 172 | Fort Sam Houston | TX | Health Clinic | 43,100 | 43,100 |
| Army | 121 | Fort Lee | VA | Combat Service Support School Phase 2 Increment 2 | - | 212,000 |
| Army | 121 | Fort Lee | VA | Combat Service Support School Phase 1 Increment 1 | 427,000 | 173,000 |
| Army | 122 | Fort Lee | VA | Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation | 13,400 | 13,400 |
| Army | 169 | Fort Belvoir | VA | Infrastructure Support Increment 1 | 152,000 | 20,000 |
| Navy | 131 | Quantico | VA | Investigative Agency Facilities | 143,132 | 143,132 |
| Navy | 164 | NSY Norfolk | VA | Ship Maintenance Engineering Facility Modification | 19,362 | 19,362 |
| Navy | 166 | NSY Norfolk | VA | Engineering Management Facility Conversion | 9,506 | 9,506 |
| Navy | 184 | Dahlgren | VA | RDA-T&E Consolidated Facility | 28,930 | 28,930 |
| DECA | 139 | Fort Lee, VA | VA | Facility for Consolidation | 23,389 | 23,389 |
| DIA | 167 | Rivanna Station, Charlottesville | VA | Joint Use Intelligence Facility - Phase 1 | 62,000 | 41,000 |
| MDA | 134 | Fort Belvoir, VA | VA | Construct Headquarters Command Center | 25,100 | 25,100 |
| NGA | 168 | Fort Belvoir, VA | VA | Construct NGA Building | 1,114,800 | 428,879 |
| TMA | 169 | Fort Belvoir | VA | Hospital 1st Increment | 498,000 | 219,400 |
| WHS | 133 | Fort Belvoir, VA | VA | Office Complex, Increment 1 | 702,199 | 321,546 |
| Army | 45 | AFRC Rutland | VT | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 23,000 | 23,000 |
| Army | 46 | AFRC Yakima | WA | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 20,000 | 20,000 |
| Navy | 166 | Bremerton | WA | Ship Maint Engineering Consolidation | 130 | 130 |
| Navy | 76 | Fort Lewis | WA | Relocate Navy Cargo Handling Fac, Battalion 5 | 7,333 | 7,333 |
| Army | 49 | JFHQ Cheyenne | WY | Armed Forces Reserve Center | 32,500 | 32,500 |
| Army | | Various Locations | | Planning and Design | - | 183,900 |
| Navy | | Washington | DC | Planning and Design | - | 20,127 |
| Air Force | | Various Locations | | MILCON Planning and Design | 0 | 25,487 |
| | | | | **Total Military Construction and P&D** | **8,718,988** | **6,419,758** |

## TITLE XXVII -- BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

| Agency | Commission Number | Location | State | Project | Project Authorization | Authorization of Appropriation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | | Various | Various | Environmental | 0 | 86,756 |
| Navy | | Various | Various | Environmental | 0 | 16,953 |
| Air Force | | Various | Various | Environmental | 0 | 8,696 |
| Defense Wide | | Various | Various | Environmental | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | **Total Environmental** | **0** | **112,405** |
| Army | | Various | Various | Operations and Maintenance | 0 | 442,967 |
| Navy | | Various | Various | Operations and Maintenance | 0 | 205,656 |
| Air Force | | Various | Various | Operations and Maintenance | 0 | 222,601 |
| Defense Wide | | Various | Various | Operations and Maintenance | 0 | 317,492 |
| | | | | **Total Operation and Maintenance** | **0** | **1,188,716** |
| Army | | Various | Various | Military Personnel PCS | 0 | 0 |
| Navy | | Various | Various | Military Personnel PCS | 0 | 2,499 |
| Air Force | | Various | Various | Military Personnel PCS | 0 | 12,256 |
| Defense Wide | | Various | Various | Military Personnel PCS | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | **Total Military Personnel PCS** | **0** | **14,755** |
| Army | | Various | Various | Other | 0 | 244,502 |
| Navy | | Various | Various | Other | 0 | 1,711 |
| Air Force | | Various | Various | Other | 0 | 30,548 |
| Defense Wide | | Various | Various | Other | 0 | 161,920 |
| | | | | **Total Other** | **0** | **438,681** |
| | | | | **TOTAL FY2008 FUNDING FOR BRAC 2005** | **8,718,988** | **8,174,315** |

**Authorization of appropriations for base closure and realignment activities funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 (sec. 2701)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decisions of the 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995 base realignment and closure (BRAC) rounds.

**Authorized base closure and realignment activities funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 (sec. 2702)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for fiscal year 2008 that are required to implement the decisions of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round. The table included in this title of the report lists the specific amounts authorized at each location.

**Authorization of appropriations for base closure and realignment activities funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 (sec. 2703)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for military construction projects for fiscal year 2008 that are required to implement the decisions of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for BRAC military construction projects. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Authorized cost and scope of work variations (sec. 2704)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require that each Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) military construction project carried out with amounts authorized for appropriations by sections 2701 and 2703 of this title be subject to the limits on cost and scope variations contained in section 2853 of title 10, United States Code. Furthermore, this provision would establish, as a baseline for the determination of variations, the cost and scope contained in the military construction project data for each project provided to the congressional defense committees annually in justification material accompanying each President's budget request.

# TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

## Subtitle A—Effective Date and Expiration of Authorizations

### Effective Date (sec. 2801)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, and XXIX of this Act take effect on October 1, 2007 or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

### Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2802)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the expiration date for authorizations in this Act for military construction projects, repair of real property, land acquisition, family housing projects, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program, as October 1, 2010, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2011, whichever is later.

## Subtitle B—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

### General military construction transfer authority (sec. 2811)

The committee recommends a provision that would create a transfer authority for military construction authorizations similar to that already in use by the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The provision would provide that up to $200.0 million could be transferred among the military construction authorizations available to a particular military department or defense agency for fiscal year 2008. Funds could be transferred only to cover cost or scope changes on previously authorized and appropriated projects, not to create "new start" construction projects.

This provision is more limited than the general transfer authority provided in section 1001 for funds in division A of this Act, which allows funds to be transferred between military departments. The committee is willing to consider such additional flexibility, in consultation with the other congressional defense committees, in the future.

At present, military construction reprogrammings are presented only to the Committees on Appropriations, while notifications of cost and scope changes are provided to the Committees on Armed Services. The committee believes that it should have the same information on the proposed reprogramming of funds used as sources to cover cost and scope increases as the Committees on Appropriations.

The committee is concerned by the proposal made by the Air Force to the Committees on Appropriations in January 2007 to use the existing reprogramming process to carry out a "new start" military construction project that had not been authorized by law. The committee does not see a need at this time for a military construction transfer authority that would allow the Department of Defense to construct "new start" construction projects through the reprogramming process. At a minimum, all four congressional defense committees would have to agree on a common reprogramming procedure before the committee would entertain such an expansion of the reprogramming process.

**Modifications of authority to lease military family housing (sec. 2812)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the existing authorities in section 2828 of title 10, United States Code, regarding the leasing of family housing by the Department of Defense. The provision would grant the Secretary of the Army additional authority to enter into high cost leases for up to 600 units in the United States. The provision would also set an annual per-unit cap on high cost leases overseas. The provision would combine and consolidate the existing authorities for high cost leases in Italy for the Army and the Navy into a single limit applicable to the entire Department of Defense. The provision would also raise the threshold for which congressional notification of overseas leases is required to $1.0 million in annual rental payments.

The provision would also modify one of the limits on high cost housing leases in Korea. The committee values the strong alliance between the United States and the Republic of Korea, and supports the implementation of the Land Partnership Plan and the Yongsan Relocation Plan.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to proceed with an economic analysis comparing the life cycle cost of military construction to build-to-lease construction of family housing units in Korea as soon as possible, in order to assess the likely size and quality of units that could be constructed in a competitive bidding situation. The committee also strongly urges the Secretary of the Army to issue a request for information to help inform this analysis. Taking these steps expeditiously would better inform the conferees of the need for any specific changes in the cost ceilings. The committee does not believe that the full increase in the leasing unit cost ceilings proposed by the Department is affordable, and urges the Secretary of the Army to review all the alternatives identified in the economic analysis, and then proceed with a request for proposals for a full and open competition for leasing or military construction in order to find the most economical means to provide suitable family housing units.

**Increase in thresholds for unspecified minor military construction projects (sec. 2813)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2805(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, by raising the threshold of the cost of a construction project authorized by this section from $1.5 million to $2.5 million. This provision would also

raise the threshold of the cost of a construction project intended solely to correct a deficiency that is life-threatening, health-threatening, or safety-threatening from $3.0 million to $4.0 million.

The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office, in a report released in February 2004 entitled "Long-term Challenges in Managing the Military Construction Program," estimated that construction costs for the military have increased by an average of 41 percent since the thresholds amended by this provision were last adjusted.

An identical provision was included in the last three defense authorization bills reported by the committee and passed by the Senate. The committee continues to believe that this change is necessary and appropriate.

**Modification and extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects outside the United States (sec. 2814)**

The committee recommends a provision that would further amend section 2808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), as amended, to extend for 1 year, through the end of fiscal year 2008, the temporary authority provided to the Secretary of Defense to use funds appropriated for operation and maintenance to carry out construction projects intended to satisfy certain operational requirements in support of a declaration of war, national emergency, or other contingency. The provision would also remove the authority in current law to waive the annual dollar limitation on this authority.

**Temporary authority to support revitalization of Department of Defense laboratories through unspecified minor military construction projects (sec. 2815)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Department of Defense (DOD) with additional authority to improve DOD laboratories using minor construction authorities similar to those already contained in section 2805 of title 10, United States Code. The temporary authority would expire on September 30, 2012. The Department of Defense requested similar language in their fiscal year 2008 legislative proposal to the Congress. DOD laboratories are generally funded with research and development funds and do not have the same access to military construction funds as other types of DOD facilities.

**Two-year extension of temporary program to use minor military construction authority for construction of child development centers (sec. 2816)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2810 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (division B of Public Law 109–163) to extend by 2 years the temporary authority provided to the Secretary of Defense to use higher thresholds contained in section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, for the construction of child development centers. This provision would also require the Secretary to report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2009, on the use of this temporary program.

### Extension of authority to accept equalization payments for facility exchanges (sec. 2817)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority provided in section 2809 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) by an additional 3 years, until September 30, 2010. This provision was requested by the Department of Defense.

## Subtitle C—Real Property and Facilities Administration

### Requirement to report transactions resulting in annual costs of more than $750,000 (sec. 2831)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense, the secretaries of the military departments, or their designees, to notify Congress prior to entering into a transaction or contract action that results in or includes the acquisition, lease or license, or any other use by entities of the Department of Defense of real property if the estimated annual rental or cost is more than $750,000.

In hearings before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support earlier this year, the committee received testimony that elements of the Department of Defense may have violated existing law through the use of service contracts to acquire office space without providing the required notifications to Congress regarding what was a lease under another name. The provision recommended by the committee is in no way intended to imply that such actions were or are legal or appropriate under existing law. Rather, this provision is intended to clarify that elements of the Department of Defense are required to notify Congress before entering into any type of contract, including service contracts, for the use of real property or facility space.

### Modification of authority to lease non-excess property (sec. 2832)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, to require the secretary of a military department to use competitive procedures to select lessees for transactions authorized by paragraph (a) of section 2667. The provision would also eliminate the authority for the secretary concerned to receive in-kind consideration or to use rental and other proceeds for facility operation support.

The committee is concerned that the authority granted to the secretary of a military department by section 2667 to provide an opportunity to gain benefit for underutilized real or personal property may be used to acquire services beyond that intended by Congress. The committee urges the military departments to use the proceeds gained in transactions carried out under this authority prudently to address military facility requirements directly related to maintenance, repair, improvements, and construction.

**Enhanced flexibility to create or expand buffer zones (sec. 2833)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Department of Defense (DOD) with additional flexibility in entering into partnerships with non-federal entities to protect or enhance the capability of DOD installations. The provision would allow such agreements to provide for the ongoing upkeep and management of buffer zones bordering defense installations, in addition to the authority to acquire the property provided under current law. The committee also recognizes that the military value of such buffer zones may exceed the appraised value of the real property. The provision would provide additional authority in such cases for DOD entities to acquire an interest in property where the cost of acquiring the interest exceeds the fair market value of the property, if the Secretary of Defense or the secretary of a military department provides a certification to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the military value of the acquisition provides benefits that justify a payment in excess of the fair market value.

**Reports on Army and Marine Corps operational ranges (sec. 2834)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify a reporting requirement on changing requirements for Army training ranges that was contained in section 2827 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (division B of Public Law 109–364). This report, which was due on February 1, 2007, has not been submitted. The provision would expand this reporting requirement to include the impact of the proposal contained in the fiscal year 2008 budget to permanently increase the size of the active-duty component of the Army by 65,000 personnel. The report by the Secretary of the Army would also include an assessment of the potential expansion of the Joint Readiness Training Center at Fort Polk, Louisiana, and an assessment of the available training capacity in Germany.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense might propose to base these additional 65,000 personnel in a way that would not effectively utilize the existing training capacity the Army already has in Germany. The committee expects a full assessment of this issue, including the cost of constructing any facilities that would duplicate any existing underutilized capacity in Germany, as part of this report. The report should also incorporate the analysis done for, and if possible the results of, the programmatic environmental impact statement the Army plans to conduct on the growth of the Army.

The provision would also add a similar reporting requirement with respect to the proposal in the fiscal year 2008 budget request to expand the size of the Marine Corps by 27,000 personnel. This report would include an analysis of a proposal under consideration by the Marine Corps to expand the training range at Marine Corps Base Twentynine Palms, California.

**Consolidation of real property provisions without substantive change (sec. 2835)**

The committee recommends a provision that would consolidate the real property authorities provided under sections 2663 and 2677 of title 10, United States Code. This provision was requested by the Department of Defense.

## Subtitle D—Base Closure and Realignment

**Niagara Air Reserve Base, New York, basing report (sec. 2841)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of the Air Force to report to the congressional defense committees on the current and future missions planned for Niagara Air Reserve Base in Niagara, New York.

## Subtitle E—Land Conveyances

**Land conveyance, Lynn Haven Fuel Depot, Lynn Haven, Florida (sec. 2851)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, for consideration, a parcel of approximately 40 acres, including real property, at the Lynn Haven Fuel Depot in Lynn Haven, Florida. The committee expects the consideration received by the Air Force to approximate the fair market value of the property to be conveyed.

**Modification to land conveyance authority, Fort Bragg, North Carolina (sec. 2852)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Section 2836 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey without consideration to Harnett County, North Carolina, a parcel of real property totaling 137 acres at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, for educational purposes and the construction of public school structures. The provision would also authorize the Secretary to require the County to cover administrative and other costs for the conveyance.

**Transfer of administrative jurisdiction, GSA property, Springfield, Virginia (sec. 2853)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration (GSA) to transfer control of a parcel of property adjacent to the Springfield metro station in Springfield, Virginia to the Secretary of the Army in return for fair market value compensation from the Army. The compensation provided by the Army could be provided through a combination of property or services. The property transferred to the Army would become part of Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

The committee believes the use of this GSA site to accommodate a portion of the workforce relocating to Fort Belvoir under the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process would greatly benefit the Army and the workforce by allowing a much greater use of public transportation. The committee believes that the relocation of Wash-

ington Headquarters Service employees to this site should be given priority consideration. The committee is aware that the parties may be able to reach an agreement on such a transfer under current law, but that the provision recommended by the committee would provide additional benefits and authorities. The committee urges the Army and the GSA to assess the terms and conditions available under current law and those available under this legislation and conclude an agreement that is fair to both parties as quickly as possible.

## Subtitle F—Other Matters

### Report on condition of schools under jurisdiction of Department of Defense Education Activity (sec. 2861)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report by March 1, 2008 on the condition of schools under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense Education Activity (DODEA).

The committee is concerned that the recent and proposed amounts of investment for the maintenance, repair, and recapitalization of DODEA school facilities are not adequate to sustain acceptable conditions for the education of the dependents of military personnel. In addition, the committee is concerned that the proposed amounts for the construction of new schools and the elimination of temporary trailers are inadequate to address the requirements resulting from the 2005 Defense Base Realignment and Closure process, the Global Defense Realignment Plan, and initiatives by the Army and Marine Corps to increase their respective end strengths.

This provision would require the Secretary of Defense to establish standards for acceptable sizes and conditions of DODEA school facilities, to assess the existing inventory of facilities, and to develop a master plan and investment strategy to quickly correct identified deficiencies. Finally, this provision would require the Secretary to submit this plan to the congressional defense committees to facilitate further oversight and diligence to ensure the timely investment of resources to bring the entire DODEA school system up to acceptable standards.

### Repeal of requirement for study and report on impact to military readiness of proposed land management changes on public lands in Utah (sec. 2862)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal a reporting requirement and associated restriction contained in section 2815 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). This provision of law restricted the actions of the Department of the Interior until the Secretary of Defense submitted a report. The Department of Defense has failed, for over 6 years, to submit this report, and has not given the committee any indication the report will ever be submitted. The committee does not believe it is fair for one government agency to restrict the actions of another agency indefinitely simply through inaction. Furthermore, circumstances have changed in the inter-

vening years, and the committee sees no further need for this restriction.

### Additional project in Rhode Island (sec. 2863)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the terms and conditions applicable to an Army Corps of Engineers project in Rhode Island contained in section 2866 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) to an additional project in Woonsocket, Rhode Island.

## Items of Special Interest

### Host nation burdensharing

The committee notes that the United States Government has entered into separate agreements with the Governments of the Republic of Korea and Japan to share the costs of relocating United States military forces away from urban areas onto new bases to be constructed over the next 5 years. In Korea, two initiatives to consolidate over 14,000 U.S. military personnel, 11,000 family members, and 9,000 other civilians at Camp Humphreys from 59 smaller locations and the U.S. Army post in Seoul will cost approximately $9.0 billion through fiscal year 2012. In Japan, over 8,000 U.S. marines and their families are planned to be relocated from Okinawa to Guam by 2015 at a current estimated cost of over $10.0 billion.

For both countries, the United States Government currently maintains cost sharing arrangements for the sustainment and support of U.S. forces contributing to the common defense of each country. In Korea, for non-personnel stationing costs of U.S. forces, the U.S. goal is a 50–50 cost sharing arrangement for the total estimated amount of $1.8 billion annually. Unfortunately, the Korean Government's contribution fell short in 2006, funding only 38 percent of the total costs, and the contribution for 2007 is expected to be 41 percent for a total of $770.0 million. The Government of Japan contributes approximately $4.0 billion annually for the support and operations of U.S. forces stationed throughout Japan and on Okinawa.

The committee is concerned that host nation plans to share costs specifically for the initiatives to relocate U.S. forces in each country will be funded from amounts already agreed to in existing burdensharing arrangements. Since these amounts are required to sustain the entirety of U.S. forces in each country, the net effect of this arrangement would be to defer or cancel other U.S. forces mission critical requirements in each country while host nation funding is diverted to pay for the relocations. The committee is concerned that this deferment would result in either a decrease in the readiness and mission effectiveness of forces in each country, or an increase of requirements to be funded through U.S. Department of Defense appropriations.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than December 31, 2007 that details the sources of funds to be used to fund the relocation of U.S. forces in the Republic of Korea and

Japan, by year, through completion of each initiative as well as the anticipated costs each year to sustain remaining forces and the expected contribution from the host nation to share in these costs. The committee further directs the Secretary to assess the impact on the readiness, training, and operations of U.S. forces stationed in each country of any deferment of facility and support requirements as a result of the funding proposed to be provided by the host nation in each agreement for the relocation of U.S. forces to be from amounts provided in existing burden-sharing arrangements.

**Military investment strategy in facilities that support training for military operations in urban terrain**

The committee continues to be concerned that the current range and facilities and infrastructure supporting U.S. military forces around the world for military operations in urban terrain (MOUT) does not comprehensively simulate the type of environment encountered by military units in the battlefield. This concern remains despite a proliferation of military construction projects over the past 5 years to construct new MOUT facilities and shoot houses. In addition, the committee believes that the current practice for the development and construction by each military service of MOUT complexes to serve their specific training requirements does not adequately account for the battlefield integration of joint operations and combined arms.

The committee is aware that, in response to consistent congressional oversight, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness established on April 13, 2007 a formal process to synchronize individual Department of Defense (DOD) Component efforts and to establish policies and responsibilities for evaluating and certifying military construction projects to upgrade existing or to construct new urban training facilities. The committee commends the Secretary of Defense's initiative to establish the Urban Training Facilities Review Group (URFRG) responsible for the implementation of the DOD policy to evaluate all proposals for new construction or modifications to MOUT complexes. Another positive step is the formal distinction of MOUT's that acknowledges the difference between regional urban training facilities to serve as national assets for complex large unit maneuvers and operations involving integrated components, and local urban training facilities to support individual and small unit basic skills training. But despite this progress, the committee notes that the Department still lacks a joint, future- year plan to combine resources from all components to construct and sustain a national infrastructure consisting of a varied range of MOUT complexes offering military units of all sizes, and from all components, a series of options to accomplish critical combined arms training in realistic settings truly simulating the atmosphere and conditions of a challenging urban battlefield.

Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to use the framework recently adopted to develop a comprehensive joint investment strategy, including an integrated priority list, to address the combined arms training needs and challenges of the warfighter for 21st century urban operations. The Secretary would

then be able to certify that military construction projects to construct MOUT complexes are in compliance with the adopted investment strategy to ensure the most efficient use of resources to establish and maintain this critical asset. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the MOUT facility investment strategy by March 1, 2008.

**Naval master jet basing**

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) continues to be inundated with requests to reconsider decisions made by the 2005 Defense Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission, which were approved by the President of the United States and reviewed by Congress without further action in November 2005. These requests are made without regard to the resources and manpower required within the military services to faithfully and fully respond with the required information. Furthermore, the requests serve to undermine the intent and integrity of the 2005 BRAC process by requiring the military services to justify decisions made by an independent commission, which was established by Congress to reduce the political influence on DOD's efforts to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of its domestic basing.

As an example, the Secretary of the Navy was recently encouraged to assess the viability and costs of relocating the east coast master jet base from Naval Air Station (NAS) Oceana, Virginia to numerous other locations around the country. This request came after the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations stated in testimony to the Committee on Armed Services in the House of Representatives on March 1, 2007 that "[t]he service is committed to staying at Oceana as long as these things continue to go well."

The committee notes that DOD previously conducted an assessment of naval master jet bases in 2004 in preparation of recommendations submitted to the BRAC Commission in May 2005. At that point, the Department recommended no realignment or closure actions for the master jet base at NAS Oceana. The BRAC Commission further studied alternate locations for the master jet base and also concluded that no viable alternative existed within the current inventory of Navy and Marine Corps installations. Finally, the Chief of Naval Operations received a report on December 9, 2005, entitled "Master Jet Base Assessment," which assessed NAS Oceana to have the highest score for operational training support due to its "proximity to the offshore training areas and ranges a Master Jet Base requires."

The 2005 Defense BRAC Commission did recommend a series of actions to be undertaken by the local community around NAS Oceana to control encroachment upon the airfield. As the Navy leadership indicated to the Committee on Armed Services in the House of Representatives, these actions have been successful to date in establishing a cooperative relationship between the community and the Navy for the preservation of safe flying operations at NAS Oceana, and, if continued, will allow for compatible airfield operations into the future. Therefore, a request to the Secretary of

the Navy to readdress a decision of the 2005 Defense BRAC round in order to satisfy parochial interests is not in the best interests of the United States Navy or the Department of Defense.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, if deciding to conduct the study, to expend the absolute minimal amount of manpower and resources necessary to satisfy the request to assess, once again, basing alternatives for naval air jet basing on the east coast of the United States. The committee also directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide to the congressional defense committees, prior to the commencement of the study, an estimate of the cost to satisfy the request, and a list of the activities deferred or cancelled in order to direct manpower and resources to the request. Furthermore, this committee strongly encourages the Secretary of the Navy to include in the Navy's assessment, as required, a review of the actions taken to date by the Commonwealth of Virginia and the community of Virginia Beach to work collaboratively with the Navy to proactively address encroachment concerns at NAS Oceana, with the intent that this review will serve as a positive example to the local communities around the country supporting naval and Marine Corps aviation operations.

**Temporary facilities**

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) continues to allow the proliferation on military installations worldwide of the use of non-permanent or temporary facilities, defined as having a useful design life of less than 25 years. The military services are using temporary structures to respond to the increased operational pace of our military and the realignment of U.S. forces, including the modular conversion of the U.S. Army. The committee also notes that the DOD is not adhering to internal policy requiring the approval of the use of temporary facilities only as an interim solution and accompanied by a plan for replacement with permanent facilities as quickly as possible. Temporary facilities do not offer the same level of durability, security, and safety from severe climatic events. The potential that non-permanent facilities would eventually be considered an acceptable working or living standard increases the risk over time of possible harm to military and DOD civilian personnel due to less sturdy construction.

The committee is also concerned about the use of procurement or operation and maintenance funding to lease or acquire temporary facilities. The practice of using a service contract to lease space in temporary buildings provided by a contractor on a military installation can be viewed as a deliberate attempt to circumvent federal statutes pertaining to the authorization of military construction. In addition, entering into a lease of non-permanent, temporary space with an option to purchase the building is equally problematic when it leads to overpayment for an inadequate facility over its life cycle. The committee is also concerned that the initial costs of acquiring and installing non-permanent facilities are eclipsed by increased sustainment requirements over the life cycle of the facility. These costs may not be readily apparent as they are included in a service contract or lease of a temporary building. In addition,

when temporary facilities are replaced by permanent facilities, the taxpayer ends up paying twice.

Therefore, in order for this committee to provide diligent oversight on the use of temporary facilities, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD–ATL) is directed to report to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the use of non-permanent, temporary facilities within the Department of Defense. Specifically, the Under Secretary shall report on: (1) a list of the acquisition or leasing actions of temporary facilities in each service over the past 5 years; (2) amounts spent on temporary facilities in the following categories: (a) operation and maintenance funding obligated in service contracts; (b) operation and maintenance funding obligated solely for non-permanent, temporary facility construction or procurement; (c) operation and maintenance funding obligated for leases of non-permanent, temporary facilities; and (d) procurement funding spent to procure non-permanent, temporary facilities; (3) the plan for the construction of permanent facilities to replace each temporary facility acquired or leased in the DOD inventory to include project title, planned budget year, and estimated cost; and (4) the number of non-permanent, temporary facilities previously leased by the Department or the military services that were later purchased, and the costs associated with these arrangements. The Under Secretary shall include within the report recommendations for improvements, as appropriate, in each area reported on. Non-permanent or temporary facilities used overseas at forward operating sites or cooperative security locations are exempted from this reporting requirement.

The committee directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to analyze and report on the findings of the Under Secretary 90 days after the receipt of the Under Secretary's report. The GAO may conduct independent research, make independent findings, and make independent recommendations as required.

# TITLE XXIX—WAR-RELATED MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

## Summary

The committee bill would fund the $752.7 million requested by the Department of Defense for military construction projects for the Army in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The President's budget also requested, as emergency funding, $169.1 million in military construction funds for projects for the Department of the Navy. However, because those projects were inside the United States and related to the proposal to increase the size of the Marine Corps rather than to operations in Iraq or Afghanistan, the committee has authorized funding for those projects in title XXII of this Act.

## TITLE XXIX - WAR-RELATED MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Armory - Regimental and Battalion HQ (Transfer to Title XXII) | 5,160 | -5,160 | 0 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Armory - Intelligence Battalion (Transfer to Title XXII) | 4,180 | -4,180 | 0 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Armory - 5th Marine Regiment (Transfer to Title XXII) | 10,890 | -10,890 | 0 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Bachelor Quarters and Armory - Horno (Transfer to Title XXII) | 34,970 | -34,970 | 0 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Bachelor Quarters and Dining Facility (Transfer to Title XXII) | 24,390 | -24,390 | 0 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Company HQ - Military Police (Transfer to Title XXII) | 8,240 | -8,240 | 0 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Explosive Ordnance Detachment - Ops Facility (To Title XXII) | 13,090 | -13,090 | 0 |
| Navy | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Intelligence Surveillance Reconnaissance Camp (To Title XXII) | 1,114 | -1,114 | 0 |
| Navy | California | TWENTYNINE PALMS | Regimental Headquarters Addition (Transfer to Title XXII) | 4,440 | -4,440 | 0 |
| Navy | North Carolina | CAMP LEJEUNE | Maintenance/Operations Complex-2/9 (Transfer to Title XXII) | 43,340 | -43,340 | 0 |
| Army | Afghanistan | BAGRAM AB | ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING (Transfer from Title XXI) | | 13,800 | 13,800 |
| Army | Afghanistan | BAGRAM AB | Ammunition Supply Point | 62,000 | | 62,000 |
| Army | Afghanistan | BAGRAM AB | Power Plant | 41,000 | | 41,000 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP ADDER | Power Plant | 39,000 | | 39,000 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP ADDER | Petroluem Oil & Lubricant Storage Area | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP ADDER | Waste Water Treatment and Collection System | 9,800 | | 9,800 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP ADDER | Multi Class Storage Warehouse | 17,000 | | 17,000 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP ADDER | Entry Control Point | 4,850 | | 4,850 |
| Army | Iraq | AL ASAD | Power Plant | 40,000 | | 40,000 |
| Army | Iraq | AL ASAD | Landfill Construction | 3,100 | | 3,100 |
| Army | Iraq | AL ASAD | Urban By Pass Road | 43,000 | | 43,000 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP ANACONDA | Landfill Construction | 6,200 | | 6,200 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP ANACONDA | Power Plant | 39,000 | | 39,000 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP ANACONDA | Urban By Pass Road | 43,000 | | 43,000 |
| Army | Iraq | FALLUJAH | Landfill Construction | 880 | | 880 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP MAREZ | Landfill Construction | 880 | | 880 |
| Army | Iraq | MOSUL | Urban By Pass Road | 43,000 | | 43,000 |
| Army | Iraq | Q-WEST | Power Plant | 26,000 | | 26,000 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP RAMADI | Landfill Construction | 880 | | 880 |
| Army | Iraq | SCANIA | Entry Control Point | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP SPEICHER | Power Plant | 39,000 | | 39,000 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP SPEICHER | Landfill Construction | 5,900 | | 5,900 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP SPEICHER | Waste Water Treatment and Collection System | 9,800 | | 9,800 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP SPEICHER | Rotary Wing Parking Apron | 49,000 | | 49,000 |

**TITLE XXIX - WAR-RELATED MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**

| Account | State/ Country | Installation | Project Title | FY2008 Budget Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | Iraq | CAMP TAQQADUM | Landfill Construction | 880 | | 880 |
| Army | Iraq | TIKRIT | Urban By Pass Road | 43,000 | | 43,000 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP VICTORY | Landfill Construction | 6,200 | | 6,200 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP VICTORY | Entry Control Point | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP VICTORY | Level 3 Hospital | 13,400 | | 13,400 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP VICTORY | Waste Water Treatment and Collection System | 9,800 | | 9,800 |
| Army | Iraq | CAMP WARRIOR | Landfill Construction | 880 | | 880 |
| Army | Iraq | IRAQ VARIOUS | Facilities Replacement, Phase I | 36,000 | | 36,000 |
| Army | Iraq | IRAQ VARIOUS | Facilities Replacement, Phase II | 36,000 | | 36,000 |
| Army | Iraq | IRAQ VARIOUS | Overhead Cover- eGlass | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| Army | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | Planning and Design | 19,400 | | 19,400 |
| Navy | Worldwide Unspecified | UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE | Planning and Design (Transfer to Title XXII) | 7,491 | -7,491 | 0 |
| Fam House Con, N | California | CAMP PENDLETON | Improvements (Transfer to Title XXII) | 10,692 | -10,692 | 0 |
| Fam House Con, N | California | TWENTYNINE PALMS | Improvements (Transfer to Title XXII) | 1,074 | -1,074 | 0 |
| | | | **TOTAL TITLE XXIX** | **907,921** | **-155,271** | **752,650** |

**Authorized war-related Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2901)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize war-related military construction projects in Iraq and Afghanistan for the Army for fiscal year 2008. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

**Authorizations of war-related military construction appropriations, Army (sec. 2902)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for war-related military construction projects of the Army authorized for construction for fiscal year 2008 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction projects for the Army. The project list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

# DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

## TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

### Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations

#### Overview

Title XXXI authorizes appropriations for atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2008, including: the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment; research and development; nuclear weapons; naval nuclear propulsion; environmental restoration and waste management; operating expenses; and other expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91). This title authorizes appropriations in four categories: (1) National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA); (2) defense environmental cleanup; (3) other defense activities; and (4) defense nuclear waste disposal.

The budget request for atomic energy defense activities at the Department totaled $15.9 billion, a less than 1 percent increase above the fiscal year 2007 appropriated level. Of the total amount requested:

(1) $9.4 billion is for NNSA, of which

(a) $6.5 billion is for weapons activities;

(b) $1.7 billion is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities;

(c) $808.2 million is for naval reactors; and

(d) $394.7 is for the Office of the Administrator;

(2) $5.4 billion is for defense environmental cleanup;

(3) $764.0 million is for other defense activities; and

(4) $292.0 million is for defense nuclear waste disposal.

The budget request also included $5.9 million within energy supply.

The fiscal year 2008 budget requested $50.0 million in war-related funding for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities.

The committee recommends $15.9 billion for atomic energy defense activities at the Department, a decrease of $5.0 million below the budget request.

Of the amounts authorized, the committee recommends:

(1) $9.5 billion for NNSA, of which

(a) $6.5 billion is for weapons activities, a decrease of $39.1 million below the budget request;

(b) $1.8 billion is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, including the fiscal year 2008 funds requested for war-re-

lated funding, an increase of $87.0 above the combined budget request;

(c) $808.2 million is for naval reactors, the amount of the budget request; and

(d) $399.7 million is for the Office of the Administrator, an increase of $5.0 million above the budget request;

(2) $5.4 billion for defense environmental cleanup activities, an increase of $47.0 million above the budget request;

(3) $663.1 million for other defense activities, a decrease of $100.9 million below the budget request; and

(4) $242.0 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, a decrease of $50.0 million below the budget request.

The committee recommends no funds for energy supply, a reduction of $5.9 million.

The following table summarizes the budget request and the authorizations:

# Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Discretionary Summary By Appropriation** | | | |
| Appropriation Summary: | | | |
| Energy supply and conservation | 5,860 | -5,860 | |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities | | | |
| National nuclear security administration: | | | |
| Weapons activities | 6,511,312 | -39,140 | 6,472,172 |
| Defense nuclear nonproliferation | 1,722,646 | 87,000 | 1,809,646 |
| Naval reactors | 808,219 | | 808,219 |
| Office of the administrator | 394,656 | 5,000 | 399,656 |
| IAEA Fuel Bank | | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| **Total, National nuclear security administration** | **9,436,833** | **102,860** | **9,539,693** |
| Environmental and other defense activities: | | | |
| Defense environmental cleanup | 5,363,905 | 47,000 | 5,410,905 |
| Other defense activities | 763,974 | -100,900 | 663,074 |
| Defense nuclear waste disposal | 292,046 | -50,000 | 242,046 |
| **Total, Environmental & other defense activities** | **6,419,925** | **-103,900** | **6,316,025** |
| **Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities** | **15,856,758** | **-1,040** | **15,855,718** |
| **Total, Discretionary Funding** | **15,862,618** | **-6,900** | **15,855,718** |

# Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Energy Supply And Conservation** | | | |
| Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability | | | |
| Operations and analysis | | | |
| Infrastructure security & energy restoration | 5,860 | -5,860 | |
| **Weapons Activities** | | | |
| Directed stockpile work | | | |
| Life extension programs | | | |
| B61 Life extension program | 63,115 | | 63,115 |
| W76 Life extension program | 175,571 | -60,000 | 115,571 |
| W80 Life extension program | | | |
| **Total, Life extension programs** | **238,686** | **-60,000** | **178,686** |
| Stockpile systems | | | |
| B61 Stockpile systems | 75,091 | | 75,091 |
| W62 Stockpile systems | 2,153 | | 2,153 |
| W76 Stockpile systems | 69,238 | | 69,238 |
| W78 Stockpile systems | 38,991 | | 38,991 |
| W80 Stockpile systems | 32,372 | | 32,372 |
| B83 Stockpile systems | 25,012 | | 25,012 |
| W84 Stockpile systems | | | |
| W87 Stockpile systems | 57,147 | | 57,147 |
| W88 Stockpile systems | 46,713 | | 46,713 |
| **Total, Stockpile systems** | **346,717** | | **346,717** |
| Reliable replacement warhead | 88,769 | 106,300 | 195,069 |
| Weapons dismantlement and disposition | 52,250 | 20,000 | 72,250 |

## Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Stockpile services | | | |
| Production support | 284,979 | | 284,979 |
| Research and development support | 33,329 | | 33,329 |
| R&D certification and safety | 181,984 | | 181,984 |
| Management, technology, and production | 205,576 | | 205,576 |
| Responsive infrastructure | 14,946 | | 14,946 |
| **Total, Stockpile services** | **720,814** | | **720,814** |
| **Total, Directed stockpile work** | **1,447,236** | **66,300** | **1,513,536** |
| Campaigns: | | | |
| Science campaign | | | |
| Primary assessment technologies | 63,527 | | 63,527 |
| Dynamic materials properties | 98,014 | | 98,014 |
| Advanced radiography | 30,995 | | 30,995 |
| Secondary assessment technologies | 80,539 | | 80,539 |
| Test readiness | | | |
| **Total, Science campaign** | **273,075** | | **273,075** |
| Engineering campaign | | | |
| Enhanced surety | 24,803 | -19,300 | 5,503 |
| Weapon systems engineering assessment technology | 19,691 | -13,200 | 6,491 |
| Nuclear survivability | 8,813 | -5,600 | 3,213 |
| Enhanced surveillance | 80,614 | -48,300 | 32,314 |

## Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Engineering campaign construction activities | | | |
| MESA, other project costs | 7,630 | | 7,630 |
| Construction: | | | |
| 01-D-108 Microsystem & engineering science applications (MESA), Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM | 11,198 | | 11,198 |
| **Total, Engineering campaign construction activities** | **18,828** | | **18,828** |
| **Total, Engineering campaign** | **152,749** | **-86,400** | **66,349** |
| | | | |
| Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign | | | |
| Ignition | 97,537 | 2,000 | 99,537 |
| Support of stockpile programs | | | |
| NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support..... | 67,935 | 1,674 | 69,609 |
| Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion | 10,440 | | 10,440 |
| University grants/other ICF support | | | |
| Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas | 3,213 | | 3,213 |
| Facility operations and target production | 86,083 | 6,000 | 92,083 |
| Inertial fusion technology | | | |
| NIF assembly and installation | 136,912 | | 136,912 |
| High-energy petawatt laser development | | | |
| **Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign** | **402,120** | **9,674** | **411,794** |

## Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Construction: | | | |
| 96-D-111 National ignition facility (NIF), Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA | 10,139 | | 10,139 |
| **Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign** | **412,259** | **9,674** | **421,933** |
| | | | |
| Advanced simulation and computing campaign | | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 585,738 | | 585,738 |
| | | | |
| Pit manufacturing and certification | | | |
| Pit manufacturing | 155,838 | | 155,838 |
| Pit certification | 45,999 | -8,000 | 37,999 |
| Pit manufacturing capability | 54,479 | -5,000 | 49,479 |
| Modern pit facility | | | |
| Pit campaign support activities at NTS | | | |
| Consolidated plutonium center other project cost (OPC) | 24,914 | -24,914 | |
| **Total, Pit manufacturing and certification** | **281,230** | **-37,914** | **243,316** |
| | | | |
| Readiness Campaign | | | |
| Stockpile readiness | 18,924 | | 18,924 |
| High explosives and weapon operations | 9,835 | | 9,835 |
| Non-nuclear readiness | 25,592 | | 25,592 |

## Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Tritium readiness | | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 73,231 | | 73,231 |
| Construction: | | | |
| 98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC | | | |
| **Total, Tritium readiness** | **73,231** | | **73,231** |
| Advanced design and production technologies | 33,587 | | 33,587 |
| **Total, Readiness campaign** | **161,169** | | **161,169** |
| **Total, Campaigns** | **1,866,220** | **-114,640** | **1,751,580** |
| Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF) | | | |
| Operations of facilities | | | |
| Operations of facilities | 1,159,305 | | 1,159,305 |
| Operations of facilities | | | |
| Kansas City Plant | | | |
| Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory | | | |
| Los Alamos National Laboratory | | | |
| Nevada Test Site | | | |
| Pantex | | 36,800 | 36,800 |
| Sandia National Laboratory | | | |
| Savannah River Site | | | |
| Y-12 Production Plant | | | |
| Institutional site support | | | |
| **Total, Operations of facilities** | | **36,800** | **36,800** |
| **Total, Operations of facilities** | **1,159,305** | **36,800** | **1,196,105** |

## Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Program readiness | 71,466 | | 71,466 |
| Material recycle and recovery | 69,962 | | 69,962 |
| Containers | 19,184 | | 19,184 |
| Storage | 35,133 | | 35,133 |
| **Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities** | **1,355,050** | **36,800** | **1,391,850** |
| Construction: | | | |
| 08-D-801 High pressure fire loop (HPFL) Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX | 7,000 | | 7,000 |
| 08-D-802 High explosive pressing facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX | 25,300 | | 25,300 |
| 08-D-804 TA-55 Reinvestment project Los Almos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM | 6,000 | | 6,000 |
| 07-D-140 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations | 2,500 | | 2,500 |
| 07-D-220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, | 26,672 | | 26,672 |
| 06-D-140 Project engineering design (PED) various locations | 23,862 | | 23,862 |
| 06-D-402 NTS replace fire stations 1 & 2 Nevada Test Site, NV | 6,719 | | 6,719 |

## Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| 06-D-403 Tritium facility modernization Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA | | | |
| 06-D-404 Building remediation, restoration, and upgrade, Nevada Test Site, NV | | | |
| 05-D-140 Project engineering design various locations | 7,000 | | 7,000 |
| 05-D-401 Building 12-64 production bays upgrades Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX | | | |
| 05-D-402 Beryllium capability(BEC) project, Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN | | | |
| 04-D-103 Project engineering and design, (PED) various locations | | | |
| 04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM | 95,586 | -50,000 | 45,586 |
| 04-D-126 Building 12-44 production cells upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX | | | |

## Department of Energy National Security Programs
(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| 04-D-128 TA-18 Criticality experiments facility (CEF), Los Alamos National Laboratory, NM and Nevada Test Site, NV | 29,455 | | 29,455 |
| 03-D-102 National security sciences building Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM | | | |
| 03-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations | | | |
| 01-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations | | | |
| 01-D-124 HEU materials facility, Y-12 National Security Complex,Oak Ridge, TN | 77,000 | | 77,000 |
| **Total, Construction** | **307,094** | **-50,000** | **257,094** |
| **Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities** | **1,662,144** | **-13,200** | **1,648,944** |
| Secure transportation asset | | | |
| Operations and equipment | 130,845 | | 130,845 |
| Program direction | 84,801 | | 84,801 |
| **Total, Secure transportation asset** | **215,646** | | **215,646** |
| Nuclear weapons incident response | 161,748 | 10,000 | 171,748 |

## Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 231,023 | | 231,023 |
| Construction | | | |
| 08-D-601 Mercury highway Nevada Test Site, NV | 7,800 | | 7,800 |
| 08-D-602 Potable water system upgrades Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN | 22,500 | | 22,500 |
| 07-D-253 TA 1 heating systems modernization (HSM) Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM | 13,000 | | 13,000 |
| 06-D-160 Project engineering and design various locations | | | |
| 06-D-601 Electrical distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX | 2,500 | | 2,500 |
| 06-D-602 Gas main and distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX | 1,900 | | 1,900 |
| 06-D-603 Steam plant life extension project (SLEP), Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN | 15,020 | | 15,020 |

# Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| 05-D-160 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program project engineering and design (PED), various locations | | | |
| 05-D-601 Compressed air upgrades project (CAUP), Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN | | | |
| 05-D-602 Power grid infrastructure upgrade (PGIU), Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM | | | |
| **Total, Construction** | **62,720** | | **62,720** |
| **Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program** | **293,743** | | **293,743** |
| Environmental projects and operations | | | |
| Long term response actions | | | |
| Long term stewardship | 17,518 | | 17,518 |
| **Total, Environmental projects and operations** | **17,518** | | **17,518** |
| Safeguards and security | | | |
| Defense nuclear security | | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 721,318 | 62,400 | 783,718 |

## Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Construction: | | | |
| 08-D-701 Nuclear materials S&S upgrade project, Los Almos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM | 49,496 | | 49,496 |
| 05-D-170 Project engineering and design, various locations | 8,000 | | 8,000 |
| **Total, Construction** | **57,496** | | **57,496** |
| **Total, Defense nuclear security** | **778,814** | **62,400** | **841,214** |
| Cybersecurity | 102,243 | | 102,243 |
| **Total, Safeguards and security** | **881,057** | **62,400** | **943,457** |
| **Subtotal, Weapons Activities** | **6,545,312** | **10,860** | **6,556,172** |
| Adjustments | | | |
| Use of prior year unobligated balances | | -50,000 | -50,000 |
| Less security charge for reimbursable work | -34,000 | | -34,000 |
| Transfer to Office of the Administrator | | | |
| **Total, Adjustments** | **-34,000** | **-50,000** | **-84,000** |
| **Total, Weapons Activities** | **6,511,312** | **-39,140** | **6,472,172** |
| **Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation** | | | |
| Nonproliferation and verification R&D | | | |
| Operations and maintenance | 265,252 | 50,000 | 315,252 |
| Construction: | | | |
| 07-SC-05 Physical Science Facility Pacific Northwest National Laboratory Richland, WA | | | |

## Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| 06-D-180 06-01 Project engineering and design (PED), Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA | | | |
| **Total, Construction** | | | |
| **Total, Nonproliferation & verification R&D** | **265,252** | **50,000** | **315,252** |
| Nonproliferation and international security | 124,870 | 13,000 | 137,870 |
| Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention | | {8,000} | |
| International Regimes and Agreements | | {5,000} | |
| International nucleaer materials protection and cooperation | 371,771 | 10,000 | 381,771 |
| Second Line of Defense core program | | {10,000} | |
| Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program..... | 181,593 | 14,000 | 195,593 |
| Zheleznogorsk | | {14,000} | |
| Fissile materials disposition | 215,685 | | 215,685 |
| U.S. surplus materials disposition | | {-14,000} | |
| Russian surplus materials disposition | | {14,000} | |
| Construction: | | | |
| 99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC | 60,000 | | 60,000 |
| 99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC | 333,849 | | 333,849 |
| **Total, Construction** | **393,849** | | **393,849** |

## Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Total, Fissile materials disposition** | **609,534** | | **609,534** |
| Global threat reduction initiative | 119,626 | | 119,626 |
| Megaports from FY08 cost of war | 30,000 | | 30,000 |
| International Radiological threats from FY08 cost of war | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| **Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation** | **1,672,646** | **87,000** | **1,759,646** |
| Adjustments: | | | |
| Use of prior year balances | | | |
| **Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation** | **1,722,646** | **87,000** | **1,809,646** |
| Naval Reactors | | | |
| Naval reactors development | | | |
| Operation and maintenance | 765,519 | | 765,519 |
| Transfer to nuclear energy | | | |
| **Total, Operation and maintenance** | **765,519** | | **765,519** |
| Construction: | | | |
| 08-D-901 Shipping and receiving and warehouse complex (SRWC), Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory (BAPL), Pittsburgh, PA | 9,000 | | 9,000 |
| 08-D-190 Project engineering and design Expended Core Facility M-290 recovering discharge station, Naval Reactors Facility, ID | 550 | | 550 |

## Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| 07-D-190 Materials research technology complex (MRTC), Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory (BAPL), Pittsburgh, PA | 450 | | 450 |
| 05-D-900 Materials development facility building, Schenectady, NY | | | |
| **Total, Construction** | **10,000** | | **10,000** |
| **Total, Naval reactors development** | **775,519** | | **775,519** |
| Program direction | 32,700 | | 32,700 |
| **Total, Naval Reactors** | **808,219** | | **808,219** |
| Office Of The Administrator | | | |
| Office of the administrator | 394,656 | 5,000 | 399,656 |
| Use of prior year balances | | | |
| **Total, Office Of The Administrator** | **394,656** | **5,000** | **399,656** |
| IAEA Nuclear Fuel Bank | | | |
| Nuclear Fuel Bank | | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| **Total, Nuclear Fuel Bank** | | **50,000** | **50,000** |
| Defense Environmental Cleanup | | | |
| Closure sites: | | | |
| Ashtabula | 295 | | 295 |
| Columbus | | | |

## Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Closure sites administration | 11,834 | | 11,834 |
| Fernald | | | |
| Miamisburg | 30,308 | | 30,308 |
| Rocky Flats | | | |
| **Total, Closure sites** | **42,437** | | **42,437** |
| | | | |
| Hanford site: | | | |
| 2012 completion projects | | | |
| Nuclear material stabilization and disposition plutonium finishing plant ( PFP) | 98,002 | | 98,002 |
| SNF stabilization and disposition | 99,815 | | 99,815 |
| Nuclear facility D&D river corridor closure project | 215,221 | | 215,221 |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition | | | |
| HAMMER facility | | | |
| B-reactor museum | | | |
| **Total, 2012 completion projects** | **413,038** | | **413,038** |
| | | | |
| 2035 completion projects | | | |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition | | | |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition 2035 | 236,788 | | 236,788 |
| Soil and water remediation - groundwater vadose zone | 105,552 | | 105,552 |
| Nuclear facility D&D - remainder of Hanford | 98,753 | | 98,753 |
| Operate waste disposal facility | 3,329 | | 3,329 |
| SNF stabilization and disposition/storage | | | |

# Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Richland community and regulatory support | 19,620 | | 19,620 |
| **Total, 2035 completion projects** | **464,042** | | **464,042** |
| **Total, Hanford site** | **877,080** | | **877,080** |
| | | | |
| Office of River Protection: | | | |
| Waste treatment and immobilization plant | | | |
| Construction: | | | |
| 01-D-416 Waste treatment and immobilization plant | | | |
| 01-D-16A Low activity waste facility | 143,000 | | 143,000 |
| 01-D-16B Analytical laboratory | 45,000 | | 45,000 |
| 01-D-16C Balance of facilities | 72,000 | | 72,000 |
| 01-D-16D High level waste facility | 177,000 | | 177,000 |
| 01-D-16E Pretreatment facility | 253,000 | | 253,000 |
| **Total, Construction** | **690,000** | | **690,000** |
| **Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant** | **690,000** | | **690,000** |
| | | | |
| Tank farm activities | | | |
| Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition | 272,972 | | 272,972 |
| River protection community and regulatory support | 471 | | 471 |
| **Total, Tank farm activities** | **273,443** | | **273,443** |
| **Total, Office of River protection** | **963,443** | | **963,443** |

# Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Idaho National Laboratory: | | | |
| SNF stabilization and disposition/storage | | | |
| Nuclear material stabilization and disposition | 2,250 | | 2,250 |
| SNF stabilization and disposition - 2012 | 29,188 | | 29,188 |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition | 168,623 | | 168,623 |
| Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition | 61,616 | | 61,616 |
| Construction | | | |
| 06-D-401 Sodium bearing waste treatment project, Idaho | 112,800 | | 112,800 |
| 04-D-414 Sodium bearing waste treatment facility, PED, Idaho | | | |
| **Total, Construction** | **112,800** | | **112,800** |
| Soil and water remediation - 2012 | 112,389 | | 112,389 |
| Nuclear facility D & D | 13,373 | | 13,373 |
| Non-nuclear facility D & D | | | |
| Idaho community and regulatory support | 3,787 | | 3,787 |
| **Total, Idaho National Laboratory** | **504,026** | | **504,026** |
| NNSA sites | | | |
| Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory | 8,680 | | 8,680 |
| NNSA Service Center | 29,096 | | 29,096 |
| Nevada | 81,106 | | 81,106 |

## Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Kansas City Plant | | | |
| California site support | 370 | | 370 |
| Pantex | 12,411 | | 12,411 |
| Sandia National Laboratories | | | |
| Nevada off-sites | | | |
| Los Alamos National Laboratory | 139,467 | | 139,467 |
| **Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites** | **271,130** | | **271,130** |
| | | | |
| Oak Ridge Reservation: | | | |
| Solid waste stabilization and completion - 2006 | | | |
| Soil and water remediation - Melton Valley | | | |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition - 2012 | 72,285 | | 72,285 |
| Soil and water remediation - offsites | 6,379 | | 6,379 |
| Nuclear facility D & D, East Tennessee technology park | 3,353 | | 3,353 |
| Nuclear facility D & D, Y-12 National Security Complex | 19,855 | | 19,855 |
| Nuclear facility D & D, Oak Ridge National Laboratory | 51,446 | | 51,446 |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition | | | |
| Science current generation | | | |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition | | | |
| OR reservation community and regulatory support | 5,966 | | 5,966 |
| Building 3019 | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| **Total, Oak Ridge Reservation** | **179,284** | | **179,284** |

# Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Savannah River sites: | | | |
| 2012 completion projects | | | |
| Nuclear facility D&D | | | |
| Nuclear material stabilization and disposition | | | |
| Construction: | | | |
| 04-D-423 Container surveillance capability in 105K | 31,000 | | 31,000 |
| 04-D-414 Container surveillance capability in 235F, Project engineering and design | | | |
| **Total, Construction** | **31,000** | | **31,000** |
| **Total, 2012 completion projects** | **31,000** | | **31,000** |
| 2035 completion projects | | | |
| SNF stabilization, disposition/storage | | | |
| SR community and regulatory support | 12,500 | | 12,500 |
| Nuclear material stabilization and disposition | 311,811 | | 311,811 |
| Spent nuclear fuel sabilization and disposition | 31,133 | | 31,133 |
| Solid waste stabilization and disposition | 61,528 | 16,000 | 77,528 |
| Soil and water remediation | 75,191 | | 75,191 |
| Nuclear facility D&D | 2,908 | 21,000 | 23,908 |
| Construction: | | | |
| 08-D-414 Project engineering and design Plutonium Vitrification Facility, VL | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| **Total, Construction** | **15,000** | | **15,000** |
| **Total, 2035 completion projects** | **510,071** | **37,000** | **547,071** |

## Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Tank farm activities | | | |
| Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition | 524,018 | | 524,018 |
| Construction: | | | |
| 05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River | 131,000 | | 131,000 |
| 04-D-408 Glass waste storage building #2, Savannah River | | | |
| 03-D-414 Salt waste processing facility PED, Savannah River | 10,001 | | 10,001 |
| **Total, Construction** | **141,001** | | **141,001** |
| **Total, Tank farm activities** | **665,019** | | **665,019** |
| **Total, Savannah River site** | **1,206,090** | **37,000** | **1,243,090** |
| Waste Isolation Pilot Plant | | | |
| Waste isolation pilot plant | 133,018 | | 133,018 |
| Central characterization project | 32,898 | | 32,898 |
| Transportation | 27,134 | | 27,134 |
| Community and regulatory support | 26,689 | | 26,689 |
| **Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant** | **219,739** | | **219,739** |
| Program direction | 309,760 | | 309,760 |
| Program support | 33,146 | | 33,146 |

# Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Safeguards and Security: | | | |
| Waste Isolation Pilot Project | 4,927 | | 4,927 |
| Oak Ridge Reservation | 18,490 | | 18,490 |
| Fernald | | | |
| West Valley | 1,600 | | 1,600 |
| Paducah | | | |
| Portsmouth | 11,667 | | 11,667 |
| Richland/Hanford Site | 87,297 | | 87,297 |
| Savannah River Site | 149,400 | | 149,400 |
| **Total, Safeguards and Security** | **273,381** | | **273,381** |
| Technology development | 21,389 | 10,000 | 31,389 |
| Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution | 463,000 | | 463,000 |
| **Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup** | **5,363,905** | **47,000** | **5,410,905** |
| Use of prior year balances | | | |
| Salt waste processing facility FY 2005 uncosted balance | | | |
| **Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup** | **5,363,905** | **47,000** | **5,410,905** |
| | | | |
| Other Defense Activities | | | |
| Health, safety and security | | | |
| Health, safety and security | 329,305 | -1,900 | 327,405 |
| Program direction | 100,043 | | 100,043 |
| **Total, Health, safety and security** | **429,348** | **-1,900** | **427,448** |

# Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Office of security and safety performance assurance | | | |
| Nuclear safeguards and security | | | |
| Security investigations | | | |
| Program direction | | | |
| **Total, Security and safety performance assurance** | | | |
| Environment, safety & health | | | |
| Environment, safety and health (defense) | | | |
| Program direction | | | |
| **Total, Environment, safety and health** | | | |
| Office of Legacy Management | | | |
| Legacy management | 148,063 | | 148,063 |
| Program direction | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| **Total, Office of Legacy Management** | **159,063** | | **159,063** |
| Nuclear energy | | | |
| Infrastructure | | | |
| Idaho facilities management | | | |
| INL infrastructure O&M | | | |
| Idaho sitewide safeguards and security | 75,949 | | 75,949 |
| **Total, Infrastructure** | **75,949** | | **75,949** |
| Program direction | | | |
| **Total, Nuclear energy** | **75,949** | | **75,949** |

# Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

| | FY 2008 Request | Senate Change | Senate Authorized |
|---|---|---|---|
| Defense related administrative support | 99,000 | -99,000 | |
| Office of hearings and appeals | 4,607 | | 4,607 |
| **Subtotal, Other defense activities** | **767,967** | **-100,900** | **667,067** |
| Adjustments: | | | |
| Use of prior year balances | -990 | | -990 |
| Less security charge for reimbursable work (NE) | -3,003 | | -3,003 |
| **Total, Adjustments** | **-3,993** | | **-3,993** |
| **Total, Other Defense Activities** | **763,974** | **-100,900** | **663,074** |
| Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal | | | |
| Defense nuclear waste disposal | 292,046 | -50,000 | 242,046 |

**National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of $9.5 billion for the Department of Energy (DOE) in fiscal year 2008 for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to carry out programs necessary to national security.

**Weapons activities**

The committee recommends $6.5 billion for weapons activities, a decrease of $39.1 million below the budget request. The committee authorizes the following activities: $1.5 billion for directed stockpile work; $1.8 billion for campaigns; $1.6 billion for readiness in the technical base; $215.6 million for the secure transportation asset; $171.7 million for nuclear weapons incidence response; $943.5 million for safeguards and security; $293.7 million for facilities and infrastructure recapitalization; and, $17.5 million for environmental projects and operations.

**Directed stockpile work**

The committee recommends $1.5 billion for directed stockpile work, an increase of $66.3 million above the amount of the budget request. The directed stockpile account supports work directly related to weapons in the stockpile, including day-to-day maintenance as well as research, development, engineering, and certification activities to support planned life extension programs and the reliable replacement warhead. This account also includes fabrication and assembly of weapons components, feasibility studies, weapons dismantlement and disposal, training, and support equipment.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for weapons dismantlements to sustain the pace of dismantlements. The committee congratulates the NNSA on its Pantex throughput initiative, which has maintained nuclear operating safety and resulted in more efficient operations. Funding for the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) is reduced by $43.0 million and is discussed later in this report. The committee recommends a reduction of $60.0 million for the W–76 life extension program. The reduction brings the funding for the W–76 life extension program to the fiscal year 2008 funding level that was planned in fiscal year 2007. The additional funds were included in the budget request to accelerate the W–76 life extension. The committee supports the W–76 life extension program, but sees no justification for an accelerated program.

**Campaigns**

The committee recommends $1.8 billion for campaigns, a decrease of $114.6 million below the amount of the budget request. The campaigns focus on science and engineering efforts involving the three nuclear weapons laboratories, the Nevada Test Site, and the weapons production plants. Each campaign is focused on a specific activity to support and maintain the nuclear stockpile without full-scale underground nuclear weapons testing. These efforts form the scientific underpinning of the Department's certification that the stockpile remains safe, secure, and reliable without nuclear weapons testing.

The reductions in the engineering campaigns reflect a shift in funds that were requested for the RRW but were included in the engineering campaigns, from the engineering campaigns to the RRW account. The committee also recommends an increase of $9.7 million in the Inertial Confinement Fusion and High Yield campaign for the National Ignition Facility (NIF) to fully fund the national ignition campaign, consistent with the approved baseline plan. The committee supports the goal of ignition in 2010 and urges the NNSA to utilize the NIF as soon as possible to conduct stockpile stewardship experiments.

**Readiness in the technical base**

The committee recommends $1.6 billion for readiness in the technical base and facilities (RTBF), a decrease of $13.2 million below the budget request. This account funds facilities and infrastructure in the nuclear weapons complex to ensure the operational readiness of the complex and includes construction funding for new facilities.

The committee recommends an increase of $36.8 million for deferred maintenance and infrastructure needs at Pantex, including operations of facilities and critical infrastructure and nuclear safety upgrades, including replacement of nuclear facility hoists and high pressure fire loop lead-ins. The committee further recommends a $50.0 million decrease in the Chemistry and Metallurgy Facility Replacement project (CMRR), Project 04–D–125, at the Los Alamos National Laboratory as a result of changing project requirements of the nuclear facility component of the CMRR. The NNSA has taken a pause in the design activities for the nuclear facility component of the CMRR while continuing with the design of the radiological laboratory.

**Secure transportation asset**

The committee recommends $215.6 million for the secure transportation asset, the amount of the budget request. The secure transportation asset is responsible for the transportation of nuclear weapons, weapons materials and components, and other materials requiring safe and secure transport. The committee commends the secure transportation asset and its federal agents for increasing the number of secure convoys in recent years, under constrained funding. The committee is aware that workload requirements for the secure transportation asset will escalate significantly as the Department proceeds with the consolidation of its nuclear materials and deals with increased weapons dismantlements. The committee urges the DOE and the NNSA to budget adequate funding to undertake this important activity. The committee is concerned that as the workload increases the NNSA maintains a robust training program, which is essential to the long-term effectiveness of the federal agents.

**Nuclear weapons incident response**

The committee recommends $171.7 million for nuclear weapons incident response, an increase of $10.0 million above the budget request, to address shortfalls in the ability to attribute an incident to a state or non-state actor.

**Safeguards and security**

The committee recommends $943.5 million for weapons safeguards and security, an increase of $62.4 million above the budget request. The committee recommends the additional funds to address training and equipment shortages at many of the NNSA sites.

Sites that store and use weapons grade fissile materials must meet the defined, rigorous Design Basis Threat (DBT) standards for security. The committee urges the NNSA to work with the DOE to consolidate these nuclear materials at a minimum number of sites. The consolidation effort should go forward independent of any plans to restructure the nuclear weapons complex. The committee questions the wisdom of moving nuclear materials numerous times, which appears to be the current plan. The committee continues to be concerned with the lack of results coming from the Department's nuclear materials consolidation coordinating committee and the length of time needed to decide on and implement a comprehensive consolidation. The extended delay can only serve to reduce the security posture in the long-term. As a result, the NNSA and the DOE must either invest significant resources to maintain the required level of security, or defer the necessary upgrades to meet the DBT at sites that are to be de-inventoried, thus calling into question the security posture at those sites. Neither of these outcomes is acceptable or responsible.

The NNSA has initiated the Complex 2030 study to review the nuclear weapons complex and decide on the design for the complex of the future. The committee is troubled by the scope and timing of the study and the options under consideration. The study does not include any options that would significantly reduce the size of the complex or that would consolidate operations and NNSA sites. The committee urges the NNSA to expand the scope of the Complex 2030 study to look at site consolidation, including the possibility of closing NNSA sites that are surplus to mission needs.

**Facilities and infrastructure**

The committee recommends $293.7 million for the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization program (FIRP), the amount of the budget request. FIRP is a capital renewal program which was established to reduce the approximately $2.4 billion backlog of NNSA deferred maintenance which developed during the 1980s and 1990s. While the FIRP program has been successful, the committee is concerned that at some sites, particularly the Pantex site, the ongoing routine maintenance activities are once again lagging and a new backlog of deferred maintenance is being created.

**Environmental projects and operations**

The committee recommends $17.5 million for environmental projects and operations, the amount of the budget request.

The committee was cautious in its support of the creation of the environmental projects and operations account and office, and was concerned that activities that are appropriately within the scope of the Defense Environmental Management (EM) program would be transferred to the NNSA. The DOE fiscal year 2008 budget request made clear that the EM program will continue to assume responsi-

bility for dismantlement of excess contaminated facilities. As a result, the committee believes that this new organization is a valuable addition to support long-term NNSA environmental stewardship responsibilities.

**Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program**

The committee recommends $1.8 billion for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program, an increase of $87.0 million above the total amount of the fiscal year base budget request and the amount requested in fiscal year 2008 war-related funding. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has management and oversight responsibilities for the nonproliferation programs of the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program. The committee recommends funding for these programs as follows: $315.3 million for nonproliferation and verification research and development—an increase of $50.0 million for next generation nuclear detection technologies, the nuclear explosion monitoring program, and technologies to support improved nuclear material forensic capabilities, including a nuclear forensic library, research on improvised nuclear explosive devices, and new nuclear energy production concepts; $137.9 million for nonproliferation and international security—an increase of $8.0 million for global initiatives for proliferation prevention, and an increase of $5.0 million for international regimes and agreements, including technical assistance to the International Atomic Energy Agency for enhanced safeguards activities; $381.8 million for international nuclear materials protection and cooperation—an increase of $10.0 million for the second line of defense core program; $195.6 million for elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production—an increase of $14.0 million to accelerate shutdown of the plutonium producing reactor at Zheleznogorsk, Russia; $609.5 million for fissile materials disposition—the amount of the request, including a $14.0 million reduction in U.S. surplus materials disposition and a $14.0 million increase in Russian surplus materials disposition for the U.S./Russia partnership in Gas Turbine-Modular Helium reactor technology; and $169.6 million for the global threat reduction initiative—the amount of the budget request, including funds in the fiscal year 2008 war-related funding budget request.

**Nuclear Forensics**

In the event that a non-state actor would ever detonate a nuclear device or explode a dirty bomb in the United States, correctly ascertaining the responsible party would be a difficult task, complicated by the fact that the nuclear material or weapon used would most likely be stolen. The committee supports the efforts in the NNSA, in conjunction with the Air Force and the intelligence community, to develop the tools to determine the source of the materials or weapons. There are two key aspects to successful forensics and attribution: technical capabilities to assess and collect samples, and the ability to compare them with material of known origin. The committee includes additional funding for research and development to develop the necessary collection and analytic capabilities, both pre-detonation and post-detonation, and to support

the development of the Department of Energy (DOE) forensic library of nuclear materials.

An additional element of the nuclear forensics capability is the nuclear explosion monitoring program. Attention to these technologies has lagged in recent years. New capabilities for ground and space monitoring technologies, as well as analytic capabilities are needed to detect low level, uncoupled, clandestine underground nuclear explosions. Such technologies would include hydroacoustic and signature element detection capabilities as well as other technologies.

**Radiation Detection**

The committee also recommends additional funding for work on basic nuclear detection technologies. The NNSA is responsible for all of the U.S. Government's basic nuclear and radiation detection research and development. Today the ability to detect the most dangerous nuclear materials, weapons-grade plutonium and highly enriched uranium, is limited. The consequences of a terrorist using these materials in a nuclear explosive device would be catastrophic. The committee believes that additional effort should be focused on research that could detect these largely undetectable materials.

**Fissile Materials Disposition program**

The committee notes its continuing and serious concerns regarding the Russian and U.S. Fissile Materials Disposition programs. The program consists of three separate functional areas, the Mixed Oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication facility, the plutonium pit disassembly facility, and the waste solidification facility. The MOX facility total project cost is estimated by the NNSA to be $4.7 billion, and the pit disassembly and waste solidification facilities total project cost (TPC) is estimated to be $2.7 billion. All of these projects have focused on the effort to disposition 34 metric tons of plutonium over a 13–year period without respect to the need to disposition all the many additional tons of excess plutonium that will be excess as the nuclear weapons stockpile draws down significantly in the future. Even with the $7.4 billion TPC for the disposition facilities there are still tons of plutonium that are not sufficiently pure to be used in the MOX process. The fate of this plutonium is unknown and not included in the $7.4 billion TPC. Given all of the other demands on the defense budget, the committee is becoming more concerned about the entire approach to disposition. The committee also recognizes that long-term storage is not a good long-term option, given cost, security and environmental concerns.

The committee notes that the NNSA has failed to conduct an independent cost estimate of the MOX facility and directs the NNSA to conduct an independent cost estimate of the pit disassembly and waste solidification facilities.

The committee further notes that the United States and Russia have still not finalized an agreement whereby each country agrees to complete disposition of the original 34 metric tons of excess plutonium by a date certain.

The committee directs the Department of Energy to look at all of the plutonium that is currently excess or that could be declared excess in the next 15 years and develop a complete plan that in-

cludes a comprehensive, coordinated disposition path for all of the excess plutonium. The plan should be provided to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2008.

**International Atomic Energy Agency nuclear fuel bank**

The committee recommends a provision that would recommend $50.0 million for the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) nuclear fuel bank. As described by Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei, Director General of the IAEA, the fuel bank would have four key aspects:

(1) provide assurance of supply of reactor technology and nuclear fuel;

(2) accept a time-limited moratorium (of perhaps 5 to 10 years) on new uranium enrichment and plutonium separation facilities—at the very least for countries that do not currently have such technologies;

(3) establish a framework for multilateral management and control of the "back end" of the fuel cycle (i.e. spent fuel reprocessing and waste disposal); and

(4) create a similar framework for multilateral management and control of the "front end" of the fuel cycle (i.e. enrichment and fuel production).

The committee notes that the Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI) has contributed $50.0 million to the IAEA to jump-start the nuclear fuel bank and to help create a low enriched uranium stockpile to support nations that make the sovereign choice not to build indigenous nuclear fuel cycle capabilities. This grant to the IAEA was contingent on two conditions: that the IAEA takes the necessary actions to approve establishment of this reserve, and that one or more member states contribute an additional $100.0 million in funding or an equivalent value of low enriched uranium to jump-start the reserve. The committee believes that the U.S. should lead the way and match the NTI funding.

**Naval reactors**

The committee recommends $808.2 million for Naval reactors, the amount of the budget request.

**Office of the Administrator**

The committee recommends $399.7 million for program direction for the NNSA, an increase of $5.0 million above the the budget request, to support increased nonproliferation program activities. This account provides program direction funding for all elements of NNSA, except for the Naval reactors program and the secure transportation asset.

**Defense environmental cleanup (sec. 3102)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of $5.4 billion for the Department of Energy in fiscal year 2008 for environmental cleanup activities, an increase of $47.0 million above the budget request.

The committee recommends an increase of $37.0 million above the budget request for 2035 completion projects at the Savannah River Site that would reduce long-term costs, avoid the possible as-

sessment of fines and penalties for failing to meet enforceable milestones, and would allow the site to package and ship additional transuranic waste. The committee also recommends an increase of $10.0 million above the budget request for technology development to address new technologies for treating liquid wastes and increasing the ability to remove additional sludge from high level radioactive waste tanks cost effectively.

**Other defense activities (sec. 3103)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $663.1 million for the Department of Energy for other defense activities, $100.9 million below the budget request.

**Health, safety, and security**

The committee recommends $427.4 million for health, safety, and security, $1.9 million below the budget request. The committee notes that in late 2006 the Department of Energy established a new Office of Health, Safety, and Security, combining elements of the Office of Environment, Safety, and Health and the Office of Security and Safety Performance Assessment. The committee remains concerned that this important office, which is responsible for a broad range of oversight, was not established under the direction of an assistant secretary. This new account supports the operation of this new office.

**Office of Legacy Management**

The committee recommends $159.1 million for the Office of Legacy Management, the amount of the budget request. The Office of Legacy Management is responsible for ensuring pension and benefit continuity to the Department's former contractor work force. This work force was formerly employed at seven of the Department's sites at which cleanup has now been completed. As additional sites are cleaned up and closed down, and their benefit programs transferred to the Office of Legacy Management, the budget for the Office of Legacy Management is expected to increase sharply. The committee encourages the Department to avail itself of the ready expertise existing in the private sector specializing in administering health and pension benefit programs instead of "reinventing the wheel" inside the Department.

**Nuclear energy**

The committee recommends $75.9 million for nuclear energy, the amount of the budget request.

**Defense-related administrative support**

The budget request included $99.0 million for defense-related administrative support. The committee recommends no funds for these activities. The committee views these administrative support activities as inherently part of the nondefense activities of the Department and resists their categorization as defense-related. The committee does not support the use of atomic energy defense funds for nondefense activities.

### Office of Hearings and Appeals

The committee recommends $4.6 million for the Office of Hearings and Appeals, the amount of the budget request.

### Defense nuclear waste disposal (sec. 3104)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $242.0 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, a decrease of $50.0 million below the budget request. The committee notes that the Department of Energy is currently unable to provide a predicted timetable for either when a Nuclear Regulatory Commission license for the geologic repository would be granted, or a prediction of when a repository might begin operating. In addition, there is uncertainty about the disposition of the administration's legislative proposal that would permanently withdraw the land for the repository and would eliminate the administrative cap on the total amount of waste placed in the repository. The committee remains supportive of the effort to establish a geologic repository as delays in the repository delay the ability of the Defense Environmental Management program to complete its work with respect to high level waste and spent nuclear fuel, and increase the overall cost of cleanup.

## Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

### Reliable Replacement Warhead program (sec. 3111)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $195.1 million for the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) program, a decrease of $43.0 million from the budget request. In addition, the provision would restrict the RRW program to activities in phase 2A and below and limit the funds that could be used in fiscal year 2008 for the RRW program to $195.1 million.

The Department of Energy (DOE) budget request for fiscal year 2008 for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) included a specific line item for the RRW that included $88.8 million. Additional funds for the RRW program were included in: the NNSA budget in the engineering campaigns, $86.4 million; the pit manufacturing and certification campaign, $37.9 million; and the readiness campaign, $25.0 million; for a total of $238.1 million. The budget request included funds that could be used for activities up to and including early phase 3 activities, although there was no specific request for phase 3 funding.

The committee does not support RRW activities beyond the phase 2A level at this time. Moreover, authorizing funds for the RRW phase 2A study does not signal support to manufacture or deploy an RRW. Phase 2A is at the beginning of the nuclear weapons acquisition process and the committee believes that many years of research are necessary before any such decision can be made or even meaningfully discussed.

Section 3111 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) directed the Secretary of Energy to carry out an RRW program and established eight enumerated objectives. In November 2006, the NNSA completed a feasibility study for an RRW and in February 2007, the Nuclear Weapons

Council (NWC) approved a candidate design and authorized the NNSA and the Navy to begin phase 2A of the nuclear weapons acquisition process to see if the objectives in section 3111 were achievable.

The nuclear weapons acquisition is comprised of eight well-understood, numbered steps, referred to as phases (1, 2, 2A, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7), that cover the life cycle of a nuclear weapon. This process starts at phase 1, which is a concept development study, and ends with phase 7, which is retirement, storage, and dismantlement. Phase 2A, the phase that the provision recommended by the committee would authorize, is the design definition and cost study. Phase 3 is the full scale engineering development phase. This phase, like phase 2A and all subsequent phases, must be approved by the NWC, and the activities and funding must be specifically authorized and appropriated by Congress.

The RRW as envisioned by the NNSA and the NWC would be a new warhead, designed to fit within a current weapon and delivery system, the Trident D–5 ballistic missile carried on the Trident ballistic missile submarines. The RRW design approved by the NWC is planned to replace the current W–76 warhead and meet the same military requirements as the W–76. As a new warhead, there are many policy questions, concerns, and issues that must be raised, discussed, and resolved before any decision can be made to move to phase 3 or beyond. The committee urges the administration to begin to address these policy issues while concurrently addressing the technical and cost issues for the RRW.

The current nuclear weapons stockpile is safe, secure, and reliable and the Stockpile Stewardship program (SSP), established 15 years ago, has been extremely successful. With the new computational and analytic tools developed under the SSP, nuclear weapons scientists and engineers are able to understand nuclear weapons performance and behavior with more fidelity than was possible prior to the cessation of nuclear weapons testing. With the experience gained through the SSP, these weapons scientists and engineers have high confidence that the nuclear weapons could be maintained through stockpile life extension programs well into the next decade.

The life extension programs are designed to anticipate, identify, and fix or replace the non-nuclear components and fix, if necessary, the nuclear components. Most of the non-nuclear components have a relatively limited lifetime and will eventually have to be replaced as part of a life extension program.

Currently the life extension programs are not designed to replace the nuclear components, the plutonium, primary and the uranium secondary, and have somewhat limited latitude with respect to the manner in which non-nuclear components can be replaced with more modern components.

Recent studies have determined that one of the most troublesome nuclear components of a nuclear weapon, the plutonium primary, or pit, will have minimum lifetimes of at least 85 years. Given that most of the weapons in the stockpile were put into the inventory between 1960 and 1989, this determination is particularly important in making future stockpile decisions.

The NNSA is, however, on the verge of regaining the ability to make an identical pit that could be used to replace a pit in an existing weapon. Even if this effort is successful, a life extension program would be limited to replacing a pit with an identical pit.

An RRW would not be so constrained, as the design approved by the NWC would incorporate new nuclear and non-nuclear components. As such it could be designed to be more safe and secure, to avoid many hazardous materials during manufacture, to be periodically dismantled, and to eliminate any need to resume testing. Equally, if not more important, an RRW would enable substantial reductions in the total number of nuclear weapons in the stockpile by restoring confidence in the nuclear complex. Maintaining multiple levels of redundancy would no longer be necessary to ensure reliability, as is currently the case. Today the stockpile ensures reliability through redundant types of nuclear weapons and through redundant numbers of nuclear warheads. The result of these levels of redundancy is that there are between three and four nuclear warheads in some form of reserve for every deployed weapon. The RRW could have the potential to shrink these ratios to 1 to 1 or lower.

In spite of these potential advantages, however, there are several potential draw backs to the RRW. A new warhead has not been placed in the inventory without testing since the earliest days of the nuclear weapons program. There is significant concern that placing a new, untested weapon in the inventory could reduce reliability or increase the possibility of a return to nuclear weapons testing. Some have suggested it is an option that should not even be considered. As a January 15, 2007, editorial in the New York Times questioned, "while experts debate whether the lab can really build a weapon without testing it, the more important question is whether any president would stake America's security on an untested arsenal."

Historically, the United States has sought to prevent the development of nuclear weapons by non-nuclear weapons states by being the world leader for nonproliferation. Many critics and skeptics of the RRW, including former Senator Sam Nunn, are deeply concerned that if Congress gives a green light to this program, such an action will be "misunderstood by our allies, exploited by our adversaries, complicate our work to prevent the spread and use of nuclear weapons . . . and make resolution of the Iran and North Korea challenges all the more difficult."

The idea of a new nuclear warhead and leadership in nonproliferation are distinctly at odds in the absence of additional steps and policies to reduce the reliance on nuclear weapons, accelerate reductions in the size of the stockpile, formalize the moratorium on nuclear weapons testing, strengthen the nonproliferation regime, and renew commitments to all aspects of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

As Dr. Sidney Drell, a preeminent expert in nuclear weapons and policy, testified before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, "a clear decision on our long-term nuclear policy goals is needed in order to decide on the appropriate size and scope" of the new complex as well as the size of the stockpile and the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. defense planning.

The committee believes that the technical work must go forward apace with the policy discussion and before any decision on RRW development, manufacturing, or deployment. This dual track process must be undertaken cautiously, openly, and with the goals of the RRW clearly stated and well understood. Technical evaluations and conclusions must be reviewed by experts in the DOE laboratories, in the military services, and by outside experts. A consensus in the technical community is necessary to inform the policy discussion. There is no rush on either front.

The committee believes that whether the future decision is to support or not to support an RRW, there may be opportunities presented through the technical work on the RRW to address and improve the safety and security of the existing stockpile as well as for an RRW.

Before this country can collectively come to a thoughtful decision on the RRW, many questions must be answered. Today there are goals and objectives for the RRW, but no answers. Determining whether the goals can be met will be a daunting technical and policy challenge but the committee believes it is worth the effort to try, for now.

The committee notes that section 1061 would direct the next administration to undertake a new nuclear posture review, one of the steps necessary to evaluate the RRW in a policy context.

**Limitation on availability of funds for Fissile Materials Disposition program (sec. 3112)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Energy to certify to the congressional defense committees what portions of the fiscal year 2008 and prior fiscal years' funding for the fissile materials disposition program will be obligated and expended in fiscal years 2008 and 2009, before any of the fiscal year 2008 funds are obligated or expended. In the event that any of the fiscal year 2008 funds will not be obligated in fiscal years 2008 or 2009, the provision would authorize the Secretary to use the fiscal year 2008 funds that would not be obligated in fiscal years 2008 and 2009 for fissile materials disposition to be obligated for any other nonproliferation program in which the funds could be obligated and expended in the 2 fiscal years.

**Modification of limitations on availability of funds for Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (sec. 3113)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3120 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) to strike the requirement for the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) to review the earned value management system (EVMS) to be used by the construction contractor at the Department of Energy (DOE) Waste Treatment and Immobilization plant (WTP) under construction at the DOE Hanford Site in Richland, Washington. The provision would direct the Secretary of Energy to have the EVMS reviewed by an independent entity chosen by the Secretary.

The committee has learned that subsequent to the passage of section 3120, the DCMA changed its approach to reviewing EVM systems. Furthermore, the committee believes that the change in

approach is not practical for large, technically complex construction projects. The committee notes that the WTP is the largest construction project in the United States. A change in the EVMS at this late stage would delay the construction of the WTP and place the people and the environment in Washington State at prolonged risk of contamination from high level radioactive waste.

## Subtitle C—Other Matters

### Nuclear test readiness (sec. 3121)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 3152 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–06), as amended, and section 3113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). The recommended provision would reconcile several competing provisions of legislation and report language and is consistent with current test readiness posture. The provision would retain the requirement for a test readiness report, which is due in every odd-numbered year, and allow the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to establish the appropriate level of test readiness. In the most recent test readiness report, dated March 2007, the Secretary of Energy reported that at the end of 2006, the Department of Energy had achieved a 24–month level of test readiness.

### Sense of Congress on the nuclear nonproliferation policy of the United States and the Reliable Replacement Warhead program (sec. 3122)

The committee recommends a provision that would set forth the sense of the Congress that the United States should take a number of actions to restore its leadership in nonproliferation matters. These actions outlined in the provision should be taken or initiated before any decision is made to manufacture or deploy a reliable replacement warhead.

### Report on status of environmental management initiatives to accelerate the reduction of environmental risks and challenges posed by the legacy of the Cold War (sec. 3123)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a report on the status of environmental management initiatives, and would expand the scope of the report to include the status of enforceable milestones and plans for the future. When the report is completed the Government Accountability Office would be allotted 180 days to review and assess the required report and then submit a report setting forth the results of the review.

The Department of Energy (DOE) Environmental Management program has taken significant steps to streamline and accelerate the rate of cleanup at DOE sites. In February 2002, the DOE completed a top-to-bottom review of the Environmental Management program that set out new approaches for cleanup. Congress received the first environmental status report in 2003.

Some notable progress, such as the closure of the Rocky Flats, Fernald, and Columbus Plants has occurred in the last several

years. Fiscal year 2008 marks the first year in which the DOE Environmental Management budget request does not include funds for any of these three sites. The committee notes that without the need to fund these sites, and with progress at other sites, the fiscal year 2008 budget request is approximately $1.0 billion less than fiscal year 2006 funding. The committee believes that it is appropriate to get a wrap-up of the accomplishments in the 5 years since the last report and an estimate of what remains to be done. As the Department completes the report the committee would like the DOE to address the method and status of efforts to establish final cleanup and end-state standards.

**Comptroller General report on Department of Energy protective force management (sec. 3124)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the security protection forces at Department of Energy (DOE) sites on which category I nuclear materials are maintained.

The Department of Energy is in the process of changing the nature of its security protective forces from defense focused forces to offensive forces functioning in small, military-like, tactical units. These small tactical response units are necessary to meet the most recent Design Basis Threat issued by the DOE.

Protective forces at DOE sites are civilians provided by contractors through individual contracts administered at each site. Both the contractors and the contracting mechanisms differ from site to site, with varying subcontractor and prime contractor arrangements. At a time when threats to nuclear materials and weapons are escalating, the committee wants to make sure that the protective forces are managed, trained, equipped, organized, and compensated in the most appropriate and cost-effective manner to ensure a continued high level of security at DOE sites.

The committee notes that in April the guard force at the Pantex site went on strike on a variety of issues including issues associated with the change in approach to security.

**Technical amendments (sec. 3125)**

The committee recommends a provision that would make technical amendments to the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2521 et seq.).

## TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

### Authorization (sec. 3201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $27.5 million—an increase of $5.0 million—to the budget request for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB). The DNFSB has the responsibility to ensure that the health and safety of the public and workers at Department of Energy (DOE) defense nuclear facilities is adequately protected.

Currently, the DNFSB is evaluating 25 defense nuclear facility design activities with a total project cost of about $20.0 billion. Many of these new facilities have significant safety and technical challenges, and are often first of a kind or one of a kind projects. Staffing for the DNFSB is authorized by statute at 150 full-time staff, but the DNFSB fiscal year 2008 budget request supports just 98 full-time staff to ensure adequate protection of public health and safety of nuclear operations at all DOE defense nuclear facilities as well as the construction projects. The committee is concerned that the DNFSB is not sufficiently staffed to meet the challenges presented by the growth in DOE nuclear facility construction and nuclear operations. As a result, the committee believes that additional technical staff are needed.

The committee notes that the statement of managers accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) directed the DOE and the DNFSB to submit a joint report to the congressional defense committees on efforts to "improve the timeliness of issues resolution, including recommendations, if any, for legislation that would strengthen and improve technical oversight of the Department's nuclear design and operational activities" (H. Rept. 109–702).

Eight months have elapsed since the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) was enacted and the DOE and DNFSB have yet to submit the required report. The committee directs the DOE and the DNFSB to submit the report no later than July 1, 2007.

The committee finds the DNFSB quarterly reports, which were also required in the statement of managers, to be very useful and directs the DNFSB to continue those reports until October 1, 2008.

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| I | APA | | 7 | CH-47 Helicopters | 6,000 | * |
| I | APA | | 13 | CH-47 Cargo Helicopter Modifications | 16,000 | * |
| I | APA | | 18 | Electronic Digital Engine Control Unit | 3,000 | Lieberman |
| I | APA | | 18 | Electronic Digital Engine Control Unit | 3,000 | Dodd |
| I | APA | | 19 | Transfer to Kiowa Warrior | 31,000 | * |
| I | APA | | 28 | Aircraft Wireless Intercom System | 5,000 | Clinton |
| I | APA | | 28 | Aircraft Wireless Intercom System | 5,000 | Schumer |
| I | APA | | 28 | Air Warrior | 2,000 | Warner |
| I | APA | | 28 | Air Warrior | 2,000 | Webb |
| I | MPA | | 2 | PAC-3 Procurement | 75,000 | * |
| I | WTCV | | 24 | M240 Medium Machine Gun (7.62 mm) | 19,400 | Graham |
| I | WTCV | | 49 | Arsenal Support Program Initiative (ASPI) | 12,000 | Clinton |
| I | WTCV | | 49 | Arsenal Support Program Initiative (ASPI) | 12,000 | Schumer |
| I | PAA | | 26 | Smoke Grenades | 13,000 | Pryor |
| I | PAA | | 26 | Smoke Grenades | 13,000 | Lincoln |
| I | PAA | | 34 | Ammunition Outloading Test Bed | 5,000 | Inhofe |
| I | PAA | | 34 | Ammunition Outloading Test Bed | 5,000 | Lugar |
| I | PAA | | 34 | Ammunition Outloading Test Bed | 5,000 | Bayh |
| I | OPA | | 54 | DISN Hardware Enhancements | 1,700 | Levin |
| I | OPA | | 135 | Land Warrior | 49,500 | * |
| I | OPA | | 142 | Recon-Navigation System (RNAV) | 4,500 | Clinton |
| I | OPA | | 142 | Recon-Navigation System (RNAV) | 4,500 | Schumer |
| I | OPA | | 170 | Urban Training Center | 24,800 | Lugar |
| I | OPA | | 170 | Urban Training Center | 24,800 | Bayh |
| I | OPA | | 170 | Laser Collective Combat Training System (LCCATS) Fielding Program | 10,000 | Reed |
| I | OPA | | 170 | Call for Fire Trainer II/JFETS | 5,000 | Inhofe |
| I | APN | | 29 | H-46 Series Modifications | 2,000 | Webb |
| I | APN | | 29 | H-46 Series Modifications | 2,000 | Warner |
| I | APN | | 31 | H-53 Series Modifications | 2,900 | Thune |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| I | APN | | 35 | P-3C Modifications | 8,900 | Graham |
| I | WPN | | 17 | Allegany Ballistics Laboratory | 30,000 | Byrd |
| I | SCN | | 4 | Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement | 470,000 | Lieberman |
| I | SCN | | 4 | Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement | 470,000 | Reed |
| I | SCN | | 4 | Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement | 470,000 | Dole |
| I | SCN | | 4 | Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement | 470,000 | Dodd |
| I | SCN | | 4 | Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement | 470,000 | Feingold |
| I | SCN | | 4 | Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement | 470,000 | Voinovich |
| I | OPN | | 31 | AN / SPQ-9B | 6,000 | Clinton |
| I | OPN | | 31 | AN / SPQ-9B | 6,000 | Schumer |
| I | OPN | | 88 | Sonobuoys | 15,000 | Levin |
| I | OPN | | 88 | Sonobuoys | 15,000 | Lugar |
| I | OPN | | 88 | Sonobuoys | 15,000 | Stabenow |
| I | OPN | | 88 | Sonobuoys | 15,000 | Bayh |
| I | OPN | | 88 | Sonobuoys | 15,000 | Bill Nelson |
| I | OPN | | 89 | Multi-Spectral Threat Emitters (MTES) | 8,000 | Clinton |
| I | OPN | | 89 | Multi-Spectral Threat Emitters (MTES) | 8,000 | Schumer |
| I | OPN | | 89 | Multi-Spectral Threat Emitters (MTES) | 8,000 | Graham |
| I | OPN | | 115 | NULKA Decoy Procurement | 6,000 | Kennedy |
| I | OPN | | 117 | SSN Training Device Mods | 5,000 | Reed |
| I | APAF | | 25 | B-52 | 19,000 | * |
| I | APAF | | 47 | LAIRCM for AFSOC AC-130 & MC-130 Aircraft | 14,000 | Bill Nelson |
| I | APAF | | 47 | LAIRCM for AFSOC AC-130 & MC-130 Aircraft | 14,000 | Martinez |
| I | APAF | | 47 | LAIRCM for AFSOC AC-130 & MC-130 Aircraft | 14,000 | Reid |
| I | APAF | | 49 | KC-135 Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) | 9,000 | Sessions |
| I | APAF | | 49 | KC-135 Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) | 9,000 | Inhofe |
| I | APAF | | 49 | KC-135 Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) | 9,000 | Cornyn |
| I | APAF | | 49 | KC-135 Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) | 9,000 | Bill Nelson |
| I | APAF | | 78 | Litening Advanced Targeting Pods | 49,500 | Stabenow |
| I | APAF | | 78 | Litening Advanced Targeting Pods | 49,500 | Sessions |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| I | APAF | | 78 | Litening Advanced Targeting Pods | 49,500 | Thune |
| I | APAF | | 78 | Litening Advanced Targeting Pods | 49,500 | Crapo |
| I | APAF | | 78 | Litening Advanced Targeting Pods | 49,500 | Craig |
| I | APAF | | 78 | Litening Advanced Targeting Pods | 49,500 | Salazar |
| I | MPAF | | 13 | AEHF 4 | 125,000 | * |
| I | OPAF | | 28 | Joint Threat Emitters | 8,000 | Levin |
| I | OPAF | | 28 | Joint Threat Emitters | 8,000 | Isakson |
| I | OPAF | | 36 | SBIRS Backup Ground Station | 27,600 | * |
| I | OPAF | | 53 | Self Deploying Infrared Streamers | 2,500 | Akaka |
| I | PDW | | 18 | Defense Information System Network Enhancement | 14,000 | Levin |
| I | PDW | | 78 | M291 Skin Decontamination Kit | 14,000 | Clinton |
| I | PDW | | 78 | M291 Skin Decontamination Kit | 14,000 | Schumer |
| I | PDW | | 78 | M291 Skin Decontamination Kit | 14,000 | Pryor |
| I | PDW | | 78 | M291 Skin Decontamination Kit | 14,000 | Lincoln |
| I | PDW | | 80 | CP DEPMEDS | 1,500 | Pryor |
| I | PDW | | 80 | CP DEPMEDS | 1,500 | Lincoln |
| I | PDW | | 81 | M22 ACADA | 20,000 | Thune |
| I | PDW | | 81 | M22 ACADA | 20,000 | Reid |
| I | PDW | | 81 | Improved Chemical Agent Monitor | 10,000 | Thune |
| I | PDW | | 81 | Improved Chemical Agent Monitor | 10,000 | Reid |
| I | PDW | | 81 | Joint Biological Point Detection System | 4,000 | Dole |
| II | RDA | 0601102A | 2 | Respiratory Infections Research | 2,000 | Ben Nelson |
| II | RDA | 0601102A | 2 | Document Exploitation Systems | 3,000 | Warner |
| II | RDA | 0601102A | 2 | Organic Semiconductor Modeling and Simulation Research | 1,000 | Cornyn |
| II | RDA | 0601102A | 2 | Nanostructure De-Icing Research | 1,500 | Pryor |
| II | RDA | 0601102A | 2 | Nanostructure De-Icing Research | 1,500 | Lincoln |
| II | RDA | 0601103A | 3 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Kennedy |
| II | RDA | 0601103A | 3 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Collins |
| II | RDA | 0601103A | 3 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0601103A | 3 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Stabenow |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| II | RDA | 0601103A | 3 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Bingaman |
| II | RDA | 0601103A | 3 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Roberts |
| II | RDA | 0601103A | 3 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Domenici |
| II | RDA | 0601103A | 3 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Clinton |
| II | RDA | 0601103A | 3 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Dodd |
| II | RDA | 0601103A | 3 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Kerry |
| II | RDA | 0601103A | 3 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Lautenberg |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Automotive Research | 3,000 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Automotive Research | 3,000 | Stabenow |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Information Assurance Research | 1,500 | Warner |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Information Assurance Research | 1,500 | Webb |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Nanoscale Biosensor Research | 2,500 | Pryor |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Nanoscale Biosensor Research | 2,500 | Lincoln |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Integrated Sensing and Communications Systems | 2,000 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Integrated Sensing and Communications Systems | 2,000 | Stabenow |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Urban Simulation and Training Research | 1,400 | McConnell |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Network Security Research | 2,000 | McConnell |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Low Temperature Vehicle Performance Research | 2,000 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Machine Interface Research | 1,500 | McConnell |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Transparent Nanocomposite Armor Research | 300 | Thune |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Nanocomposite Materials Research | 2,000 | Bill Nelson |
| II | RDA | 0601104A | 4 | Nanocomposite Materials Research | 2,000 | Martinez |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | Nanosensor Manufacturing Research | 2,000 | Kerry |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | Nanosensor Manufacturing Research | 2,000 | Kennedy |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | Ballistic Materials for Future Combat Systems | 2,000 | Reed |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | IED Protection Materials Research | 4,000 | Ben Nelson |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | IED Protection Materials Research | 4,000 | Hagel |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | Advanced Composite Materials Research | 3,000 | Stabenow |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | Advanced Composite Materials Research | 3,000 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0602105A | 5 | Soldier Torso Armor Systems | 2,000 | Chambliss |
| II | RDA | 0602120A | 6 | Advanced Microelectronics Manufacturing | 2,000 | Clinton |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| II | RDA | 0602120A | 6 | Advanced Microelectronics Manufacturing | 2,000 | Schumer |
| II | RDA | 0602120A | 6 | Operationally Responsive Space Research | 5,000 | Sessions |
| II | RDA | 0602120A | 6 | Integrated Remote Sensing Technologies | 2,000 | Bill Nelson |
| II | RDA | 0602303A | 10 | Materials for Munitions Protection Research | 2,000 | Reid |
| II | RDA | 0602308A | 12 | Photonics Research for Sniper Detection | 4,000 | Kennedy |
| II | RDA | 0602601A | 13 | Medium/Heavy Duty Fuel Cell Vehicle Demonstration | 3,000 | Lieberman |
| II | RDA | 0602601A | 13 | Medium/Heavy Duty Fuel Cell Vehicle Demonstration | 3,000 | Dodd |
| II | RDA | 0602601A | 13 | Transparent Armor Research | 2,000 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0602601A | 13 | Military Fuels Research | 2,000 | McConnell |
| II | RDA | 0602623A | 16 | Recoil Mitigation Technologies | 2,000 | Reed |
| II | RDA | 0602624A | 17 | UGV Weaponization Technologies | 3,000 | Snowe |
| II | RDA | 0602624A | 17 | UGV Weaponization Technologies | 3,000 | Collins |
| II | RDA | 0602705A | 18 | High-Frequency, High-Power Electronic and Optoelectronic Devices | 3,000 | Dole |
| II | RDA | 0602705A | 18 | Advanced Rechargeable Batteries | 3,000 | Dole |
| II | RDA | 0602712A | 20 | Standoff IED Detection Technologies | 5,000 | Akaka |
| II | RDA | 0602712A | 20 | Standoff IED Detection Technologies | 5,000 | Bill Nelson |
| II | RDA | 0602712A | 20 | Standoff IED Detection Technologies | 5,000 | Pryor |
| II | RDA | 0602712A | 20 | Standoff IED Detection Technologies | 5,000 | Lincoln |
| II | RDA | 0602786A | 27 | Ballistic Materials for Force Protection | 5,000 | Snowe |
| II | RDA | 0602786A | 27 | Ballistic Materials for Force Protection | 5,000 | Collins |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Advanced Fibrin Dressings | 2,000 | Clinton |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Advanced Fibrin Dressings | 2,000 | Schumer |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Advanced Fibrin Dressings | 2,000 | Dole |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Battlefield Head Injury Diagnostic Tools | 1,000 | Graham |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Biomechanics Research | 2,000 | Warner |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Biomechanics Research | 2,000 | Webb |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Bioengineering Research | 1,500 | Isakson |
| II | RDA | 0602787A | 28 | Bioengineering Research | 1,500 | Chambliss |
| II | RDA | 0603001A | 29 | AGAS Technology Development | 2,000 | Lieberman |
| II | RDA | 0603001A | 29 | AGAS Technology Development | 2,000 | Dodd |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Lower Limb Prosthetics Research | 3,000 | Kerry |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Lower Limb Prosthetics Research | 3,000 | Kennedy |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Combat Wound Initiative | 2,000 | Reed |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Electronic Vital Signs Monitoring Systems | 2,000 | Reed |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Robotic Telesurgery Research | 2,000 | Ben Nelson |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Robotic Telesurgery Research | 2,000 | Hagel |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Blast Trauma Detection Research | 2,000 | Clinton |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Blast Trauma Detection Research | 2,000 | Schumer |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Dengue Infections Research | 5,000 | Graham |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Dengue Infections Research | 5,000 | Lieberman |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Dengue Infections Research | 5,000 | Dodd |
| II | RDA | 0603002A | 30 | Tissue Regeneration Research | 3,000 | Dole |
| II | RDA | 0603003A | 31 | UAV Payload Delivery Systems | 2,000 | Sessions |
| II | RDA | 0603003A | 31 | UAV Munitions Technologies | 3,000 | Reed |
| II | RDA | 0603003A | 31 | UAV Munitions Technologies | 3,000 | Kennedy |
| II | RDA | 0603003A | 31 | UAV Munitions Technologies | 3,000 | Kerry |
| II | RDA | 0603004A | 32 | Cannon Recoil Reduction System | 1,000 | Ensign |
| II | RDA | 0603004A | 32 | Cannon Recoil Reduction System | 1,000 | Reid |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Unmanned Ground Vehicle Initiative | 12,000 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Hostile Fire Detection Systems | 3,000 | Cornyn |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Military Hybrid Engine Development Program | 10,000 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Composite Ceramic Vehicle Armor Program | 1,000 | Reed |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Solid Hydrogen Storage Vehicle Research | 4,000 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Fuel Cell Cost Reduction Research | 3,000 | Stabenow |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Fuel Cell Cost Reduction Research | 3,000 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Tactical Vehicle APS Research | 7,500 | * |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Solid Oxide Fuel Cell Manufacturing Research | 1,500 | Stabenow |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Solid Oxide Fuel Cell Manufacturing Research | 1,500 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Antibalistic Windshield Armor | 4,000 | Bayh |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Antibalistic Windshield Armor | 4,000 | Lugar |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Vehicle Design Optimization Tools | 1,500 | Levin |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Composite Armor Cab Development | 3,000 | Reed |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Composite Armor Cab Development | 3,000 | Carper |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Dynamometer Facility Upgrade | 3,000 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Dynamometer Facility Upgrade | 3,000 | Stabenow |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Fastening and Joining Research | 1,500 | Stabenow |
| II | RDA | 0603005A | 33 | Fastening and Joining Research | 1,500 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0603015A | 38 | Joint Leadership Training Systems | 4,000 | Inhofe |
| II | RDA | 0603710A | 50 | Intelligence Surveillance and Detection Sensor Suite | 2,500 | Chambliss |
| II | RDA | 0603710A | 50 | Intelligence Surveillance and Detection Sensor Suite | 2,500 | Isakson |
| II | RDA | 0603710A | 50 | FCS Short Range Electro Optic (SREO) Sensor for Stryker | 7,500 | Bill Nelson |
| II | RDA | 0603710A | 50 | Night Vision Advanced Technology | 33,000 | Martinez |
| II | RDA | 0603734A | 52 | Direct Methanol Fuel Cell Development | 3,000 | Martinez |
| II | RDA | 0603734A | 52 | Fuel Cells for Continuity of Operations | 3,000 | Clinton |
| II | RDA | 0603734A | 52 | Fuel Cells for Continuity of Operations | 3,000 | Schumer |
| II | RDA | 0603734A | 52 | Fuel Cells for Continuity of Operations | 3,000 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0603772A | 53 | Advanced Radar Technologies | 3,000 | Reed |
| II | RDA | 0603772A | 53 | Phraselator Improvement Program | 3,000 | Reed |
| II | RDA | 0603653A | 62 | Stryker Active Protection System Integration | 40,000 | * |
| II | RDA | 0603779A | 66 | Undersea Chemical Weapons Assessment | 8,000 | Akaka |
| II | RDA | 0603782A | 67 | Warfighter Information Network - Tactical | 100,000 | * |
| II | RDA | 0603807A | 72 | Future Medical Shelter Systems | 7,500 | Dodd |
| II | RDA | 0603807A | 72 | Future Medical Shelter Systems | 7,500 | Lieberman |
| II | RDA | 0603807A | 72 | Future Medical Shelter Systems | 7,500 | Pryor |
| II | RDA | 0603807A | 72 | Future Medical Shelter Systems | 7,500 | Lincoln |
| II | RDA | 0603827A | 73 | Nickel Boron Metal Coating Technology for Crew Served Weapons | 5,300 | Bill Nelson |
| II | RDA | 0603305A | 76 | Rad Hard | 2,000 | Sessions |
| II | RDA | 0604622A | 86 | Advanced Thermal and Oil Management Controls | 5,000 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0604642A | 88 | Army Fuel Cell Non-Tactical Vehicle Propulsion | 3,000 | Levin |
| II | RDA | 0604642A | 88 | Army Fuel Cell Non-Tactical Vehicle Propulsion | 3,000 | Schumer |
| II | RDA | 0604642A | 88 | Army Fuel Cell Non-Tactical Vehicle Propulsion | 3,000 | Stabenow |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| II | RDA | 0604642A | 88 | Army Fuel Cell Non-Tactical Vehicle Propulsion | 3,000 | Clinton |
| II | RDA | 0604660A | 92 | FCS Active Protection System Acceleration | 25,000 | * |
| II | RDA | 0604663A | 95 | FCS Armed Robotic Vehicles | 90,000 | * |
| II | RDA | 0604817A | 115 | SINCGARS Based Combat Identification Research | 2,000 | Bayh |
| II | RDA | 0604817A | 115 | SINCGARS Based Combat Identification Research | 2,000 | Lugar |
| II | RDA | 0604827A | 120 | Land Warrior | 30,400 | * |
| II | RDA | 0605605A | 137 | HELSTF | 7,500 | Domenici |
| II | RDA | 0603778A | 151 | HIMARS Modular Launcher Communications System (MLCS) | 2,500 | Inhofe |
| II | RDA | 0203735A | 155 | Vehicle Health Management Systems Development | 6,000 | Sessions |
| II | RDA | 0203735A | 155 | Combat Vehicle Transmission Improvement | 4,900 | Bayh |
| II | RDA | 0203735A | 155 | Combat Vehicle Transmission Improvement | 4,900 | Lugar |
| II | RDA | 0203744A | 157 | Helicopter Autonomous Landing System (HALS) | 5,000 | Reid |
| II | RDA | 0305206A | 175 | Constant Hawk | 30,000 | * |
| II | RDN | 0601103N | 1 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Kennedy |
| II | RDN | 0601103N | 1 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Collins |
| II | RDN | 0601103N | 1 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Stabenow |
| II | RDN | 0601103N | 1 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Bingaman |
| II | RDN | 0601103N | 1 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Roberts |
| II | RDN | 0601103N | 1 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Levin |
| II | RDN | 0601103N | 1 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Domenici |
| II | RDN | 0601103N | 1 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Clinton |
| II | RDN | 0601103N | 1 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Dodd |
| II | RDN | 0601103N | 1 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Kerry |
| II | RDN | 0601103N | 1 | URI Program Increase | 9,000 | Lautenberg |
| II | RDN | 0601153N | 3 | Science and Technology Educational Outreach Programs | 1,000 | Warner |
| II | RDN | 0601153N | 3 | Science and Technology Educational Outreach Programs | 1,000 | Webb |
| II | RDN | 0602114N | 4 | Infrared Materials Research | 3,000 | Inhofe |
| II | RDN | 0602123N | 5 | Undersea Perimeter Security Systems | 3,500 | Reed |
| II | RDN | 0602123N | 5 | Port Security Technologies | 2,000 | Reed |
| II | RDN | 0602123N | 5 | Unmanned Sea Surface Vessel Propulsion and Power Research | 3,000 | Collins |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| II | RDN | 0602123N | 5 | Energy Systems Integration Research | 2,000 | Bill Nelson |
| II | RDN | 0602123N | 5 | Energy Systems Integration Research | 2,000 | Martinez |
| II | RDN | 0602123N | 5 | UAV Fuel Cell Technologies | 2,000 | Clinton |
| II | RDN | 0602123N | 5 | UAV Fuel Cell Technologies | 2,000 | Schumer |
| II | RDN | 0602123N | 5 | Critical Composite Technologies for SOF Medium Range Endurance Craft | 1,000 | Collins |
| II | RDN | 0602123N | 5 | Critical Composite Technologies for SOF Medium Range Endurance Craft | 1,000 | Snowe |
| II | RDN | 0602131M | 6 | Rapid Awareness Systems | 4,500 | Akaka |
| II | RDN | 0602271N | 10 | RF Power Technologies | 3,000 | Dole |
| II | RDN | 0602747N | 13 | Vector Sensor Technology Development | 3,000 | Reed |
| II | RDN | 0603114N | 15 | Excalibur UAV | 1,000 | Warner |
| II | RDN | 0603114N | 15 | Excalibur UAV | 1,000 | Webb |
| II | RDN | 0603114N | 15 | Free Electron Laser Research | 4,000 | Warner |
| II | RDN | 0603114N | 15 | Free Electron Laser Research | 4,000 | Webb |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Navy Manufacturing and Repair Cell | 5,000 | Levin |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Navy Manufacturing and Repair Cell | 5,000 | Stabenow |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Electrochemical Field-Deployable System for Potable Water Generation | 3,000 | Ensign |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Electrochemical Field-Deployable System for Potable Water Generation | 3,000 | Reid |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Development of Wide-Band Gap Semiconductor Materials | 5,000 | Stabenow |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Development of Wide-Band Gap Semiconductor Materials | 5,000 | Levin |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Single Generator Operations Lithium Ion Battery | 5,000 | Reid |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Navy/USMC Fuel Cell Non-Tactical Vehicle Initiative | 4,900 | Schumer |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Navy/USMC Fuel Cell Non-Tactical Vehicle Initiative | 4,900 | Levin |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Navy/USMC Fuel Cell Non-Tactical Vehicle Initiative | 4,900 | Clinton |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Autonomous Superconducting Fault Current Limiting Systems | 3,000 | Stabenow |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Autonomous Superconducting Fault Current Limiting Systems | 3,000 | Levin |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Fuel Cell Manufacturability Research | 3,400 | Clinton |
| II | RDN | 0603123N | 16 | Fuel Cell Manufacturability Research | 3,400 | Schumer |
| II | RDN | 0603640M | 20 | Acoustic Combat Sensors | 5,000 | Inhofe |
| II | RDN | 0603506N | 34 | Sensor Arrays for Multiple Applications (SAMA) | 1,500 | Bill Nelson |
| II | RDN | 0603513N | 36 | Smart Valve | 3,000 | Collins |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| II | RDN | 0603513N | 36 | Smart Valve | 3,000 | Snowe |
| II | RDN | 0603513N | 36 | Power Conversion Equipment | 2,500 | Inhofe |
| II | RDN | 0603513N | 36 | High Temperature Superconducting AC Synchronous Propulsion Motor | 14,400 | Kennedy |
| II | RDN | 0603513N | 36 | Shipboard Flywheel Energy Storage System | 9,500 | Kennedy |
| II | RDN | 0603553N | 41 | Improved Surface Vessel Torpedo Tube Launcher | 4,000 | Reed |
| II | RDN | 0603561N | 43 | Undersea Missile Launch Study (ULMS) | 25,000 | Lieberman |
| II | RDN | 0603561N | 43 | Undersea Missile Launch Study (ULMS) | 25,000 | Reed |
| II | RDN | 0603561N | 43 | Undersea Missile Launch Study (ULMS) | 25,000 | Dodd |
| II | RDN | 0603561N | 43 | Twinline Thin Line Towed Array | 4,500 | Dodd |
| II | RDN | 0603561N | 43 | Twinline Thin Line Towed Array | 4,500 | Lieberman |
| II | RDN | 0603563N | 45 | Next Generation Shipboard Monitoring | 4,000 | Warner |
| II | RDN | 0603563N | 45 | Next Generation Shipboard Monitoring | 4,000 | Webb |
| II | RDN | 0603739N | 63 | Highly Integrated Optical Interconnects for Advanced Air Vehicles | 4,000 | Levin |
| II | RDN | 0604272N | 78 | High Power Fiber Laser- Base Pod | 4,000 | Lugar |
| II | RDN | 0604272N | 78 | High Power Fiber Laser- Base Pod | 4,000 | Bayh |
| II | RDN | 0604300N | 100 | Permanent Magnet Motor System | 9,000 | Dodd |
| II | RDN | 0604300N | 100 | Permanent Magnet Motor System | 9,000 | Kennedy |
| II | RDN | 0604300N | 100 | Permanent Magnet Motor System | 9,000 | Lieberman |
| II | RDN | 0604300N | 100 | Advanced Wireless Encryption Module | 6,000 | Ben Nelson |
| II | RDN | 0604503N | 108 | Improved Submarine Towed Thin Line Array Handler and Array Reliability | 4,400 | Reed |
| II | RDN | 0604518N | 112 | Combat Information Center Conversion | 4,000 | Graham |
| II | RDN | 0604558N | 113 | Submarine Electronic Chart Updates | 6,000 | Bill Nelson |
| II | RDN | 0604567N | 116 | LHA[R] | 4,900 | * |
| II | RDN | 0604756N | 127 | Phalanx Next Generation | 9,800 | Hatch |
| II | RDN | 0604756N | 127 | Phalanx Next Generation | 9,800 | Sessions |
| II | RDN | 0604756N | 127 | Phalanx Next Generation | 9,800 | McConnell |
| II | RDN | 0604757N | 128 | NULKA Decoy R&D | 9,000 | Kennedy |
| II | RDN | 0604771N | 130 | Hemostatic Agent Research | 4,000 | Dole |
| II | RDN | 0604800N | 133 | JSF Alternate Engine | 240,000 | Warner |
| II | RDN | 0604800N | 133 | JSF Alternate Engine | 240,000 | Bayh |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| II | RDN | 0604800N | 133 | JSF Alternate Engine | 240,000 | Kennedy |
| II | RDN | 0604800N | 133 | JSF Alternate Engine | 240,000 | McConnell |
| II | RDN | 0604800N | 133 | JSF Alternate Engine | 240,000 | Voinovich |
| II | RDN | 0604800N | 133 | JSF Alternate Engine | 240,000 | Brown |
| II | RDN | 0101221N | 165 | LINAC | 9,000 | Bayh |
| II | RDN | 0101221N | 165 | LINAC | 9,000 | Lugar |
| II | RDN | 0205633N | 183 | Structural Life Tracking of Navy and Marine Corps Helicopter Aircraft | 4,000 | Webb |
| II | RDN | 0205633N | 183 | Structural Life Tracking of Navy and Marine Corps Helicopter Aircraft | 4,000 | Warner |
| II | RDN | 0206623M | 187 | Ultrasonic Consolidation of Embedded Sensors | 3,900 | Levin |
| II | RDN | 0206623M | 187 | Ultrasonic Consolidation of Embedded Sensors | 3,900 | Stabenow |
| II | RDN | 0303109N | 195 | UHF Gap Risk Reduction | 10,000 | * |
| II | RDN | 0303109N | 195 | IPv6 | 3,000 | Akaka |
| II | RDN | 0708011N | 212 | Materials Stress Measurement Technologies | 2,500 | Levin |
| II | RDN | 0708011N | 212 | Materials Stress Measurement Technologies | 2,500 | Stabenow |
| II | RDN | 0708730N | 213 | National Shipbuilding Research Program | 15,000 | Sessions |
| II | RDN | 0708730N | 213 | National Shipbuilding Research Program | 15,000 | Lott |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | High-Energy Laser Systems Research | 3,000 | Ben Nelson |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | High-Energy Laser Systems Research | 3,000 | Hagel |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | Military Decision Cycle Time Research | 3,000 | Hagel |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | Military Decision Cycle Time Research | 3,000 | Ben Nelson |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | Secure Grid Research | 3,000 | Cornyn |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | URI Program Increase | 10,000 | Kennedy |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | URI Program Increase | 10,000 | Collins |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | URI Program Increase | 10,000 | Stabenow |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | URI Program Increase | 10,000 | Levin |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | URI Program Increase | 10,000 | Bingaman |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | URI Program Increase | 10,000 | Roberts |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | URI Program Increase | 10,000 | Domenici |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | URI Program Increase | 10,000 | Clinton |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | URI Program Increase | 10,000 | Dodd |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | URI Program Increase | 10,000 | Kerry |
| II | RDAF | 0601103F | 2 | URI Program Increase | 10,000 | Lautenberg |
| II | RDAF | 0602102F | 5 | Advanced Carbon Fiber Research and Testing Initiative | 3,000 | Graham |
| II | RDAF | 0602201F | 6 | Optical Connector Research | 1,500 | Stabenow |
| II | RDAF | 0602201F | 6 | Optical Connector Research | 1,500 | Levin |
| II | RDAF | 0602203F | 8 | X-51B Scramjet Research | 3,500 | Clinton |
| II | RDAF | 0602203F | 8 | X-51B Scramjet Research | 3,500 | Schumer |
| II | RDAF | 0602204F | 9 | Net Centric Sensor Grid Research | 1,000 | Bayh |
| II | RDAF | 0602204F | 9 | Net Centric Sensor Grid Research | 1,000 | Voinovich |
| II | RDAF | 0602601F | 11 | Nuclear Test Seismic Research | 11,800 | Kerry |
| II | RDAF | 0602601F | 11 | Rocket Payload Shielding Technologies | 400 | Thune |
| II | RDAF | 0602702F | 14 | Cyber Situational Awareness Research | 2,000 | Clinton |
| II | RDAF | 0602702F | 14 | Cyber Situational Awareness Research | 2,000 | Schumer |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 20 | Metals Affordability Initiative | 5,000 | Bingaman |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 20 | Metals Affordability Initiative | 5,000 | Feingold |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 20 | Metals Affordability Initiative | 5,000 | Lieberman |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 20 | Metals Affordability Initiative | 5,000 | Reid |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 20 | Metals Affordability Initiative | 5,000 | Salazar |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 20 | Metals Affordability Initiative | 5,000 | Dodd |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 20 | Metals Affordability Initiative | 5,000 | Kohl |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 20 | Metals Affordability Initiative | 5,000 | Rockefeller |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 20 | Metals Affordability Initiative | 5,000 | Wyden |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 20 | Metals Affordability Initiative | 5,000 | Levin |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 20 | Metals Affordability Initiative | 5,000 | Reed |
| II | RDAF | 0603112F | 20 | Deployable Fuel Cell Processors | 2,000 | Chambliss |
| II | RDAF | 0603211F | 22 | Titanium Structures Initiative | 2,500 | Levin |
| II | RDAF | 0603211F | 22 | Titanium Structures Initiative | 2,500 | Warner |
| II | RDAF | 0603401F | 28 | Thin Film Amorphous Solar Cells | 5,600 | Levin |
| II | RDAF | 0603789F | 34 | Optical Interconnects Research | 2,000 | Ensign |
| II | RDAF | 0603789F | 34 | Optical Interconnects Research | 2,000 | Reid |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| II | RDAF | 0603858F | 53 | SR Tech Study | 80,000 | * |
| II | RDAF | 0604857F | 61 | ORS | 15,000 | * |
| II | RDAF | 0604421F | 76 | Space Control Test | 5,200 | Sessions |
| II | RDAF | 0604421F | 76 | RAIDRS Block 20 | 5,000 | * |
| II | RDAF | 0604425F | 77 | JSIDS | 7,500 | Ben Nelson |
| II | RDAF | 0604441F | 79 | SBIRS GEO-4 | 100,000 | * |
| II | RDAF | 0604800F | 91 | JSF Alternate Engine | 240,000 | Warner |
| II | RDAF | 0604800F | 91 | JSF Alternate Engine | 240,000 | Bayh |
| II | RDAF | 0604800F | 91 | JSF Alternate Engine | 240,000 | Kennedy |
| II | RDAF | 0604800F | 91 | JSF Alternate Engine | 240,000 | McConnell |
| II | RDAF | 0604800F | 91 | JSF Alternate Engine | 240,000 | Voinovich |
| II | RDAF | 0604800F | 91 | JSF Alternate Engine | 240,000 | Brown |
| II | RDAF | 0605860F | 111 | BMRST | 13,700 | Bill Nelson |
| II | RDAF | 0205219F | 128 | Upgrade MQ-9 SIGINT Payload | 10,000 | * |
| II | RDAF | 0205219F | 128 | Predator Trainer Upgrade | 4,000 | Clinton |
| II | RDAF | 0205219F | 128 | Predator Trainer Upgrade | 4,000 | Schumer |
| II | RDAF | 0207581F | 157 | JSTARS RTIP | 275,400 | Lieberman |
| II | RDAF | 0207581F | 157 | JSTARS RTIP | 275,400 | Dodd |
| II | RDAF | 0207581F | 157 | JSTARS RTIP | 275,400 | Martinez |
| II | RDAF | 0208161F | 165 | Special Evaluation Systems | 150,000 | * |
| II | RDAF | 0304111F | 179 | Classified Program | 20,000 | * |
| II | RDAF | 0305111F | 185 | Operations Risk Management Visualization & Integration (ORM-VIZ) | 6,000 | Ben Nelson |
| II | RDAF | 0305219F | 205 | Upgrade MQ-1 SIGINT Payload | 10,000 | * |
| II | RDAF | 0305221F | 207 | NCCT | 25,000 | * |
| II | RDAF | 0305924F | 213 | NSSO | 7,000 | * |
| II | RDAF | 0305940F | 213 | SAA Operations | 16,800 | * |
| II | RDAF | 0401115F | 217 | C-130 De-Icing System | 3,000 | Webb |
| II | RDAF | 0401115F | 217 | C-130 De-Icing System | 3,000 | Warner |
| II | RDAF | 0408011F | 228 | Combat Casualty Management System for AFSOC | 3,600 | Reid |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| II | RDAF | 0708011F | 231 | Laser Materials Processing | 2,000 | Ben Nelson |
| II | RDDW | 0601111D8Z | 3 | Semiconductor Focus Research Center Program | 5,000 | Clinton |
| II | RDDW | 0601111D8Z | 3 | Semiconductor Focus Research Center Program | 5,000 | Isakson |
| II | RDDW | 0601111D8Z | 3 | Semiconductor Focus Research Center Program | 5,000 | Schumer |
| II | RDDW | 0601111D8Z | 3 | Semiconductor Focus Research Center Program | 5,000 | Martinez |
| II | RDDW | 0601111D8Z | 3 | Semiconductor Focus Research Center Program | 5,000 | Kerry |
| II | RDDW | 0601111D8Z | 3 | Semiconductor Focus Research Center Program | 5,000 | Hatch |
| II | RDDW | 0601111D8Z | 3 | Semiconductor Focus Research Center Program | 5,000 | Cornyn |
| II | RDDW | 0601384BP | 6 | Superstructural Particle Evaluation | 3,000 | Dole |
| II | RDDW | 0602227D8Z | 8 | MFEL Program Increase | 8,000 | Kennedy |
| II | RDDW | 0602227D8Z | 8 | MFEL Program Increase | 8,000 | Kerry |
| II | RDDW | 0602227D8Z | 8 | MFEL Program Increase | 8,000 | Dole |
| II | RDDW | 0602384BP | 14 | Chem-Bio Protective Textile Fabric | 1,500 | Stabenow |
| II | RDDW | 0602384BP | 14 | Chem-Bio Protective Textile Fabric | 1,500 | Levin |
| II | RDDW | 0602384BP | 14 | Chem-Bio IR Detector | 2,000 | Collins |
| II | RDDW | 0602384BP | 14 | Chemical Agent Fate Model Verification | 1,000 | Levin |
| II | RDDW | 0602718BR | 21 | Blast Mitigation and Protection Analysis | 1,000 | Warner |
| II | RDDW | 0602718BR | 21 | Blast Mitigation and Protection Analysis | 1,000 | Webb |
| II | RDDW | 0602718BR | 21 | Comprehensive National Incident Management System | 4,000 | Warner |
| II | RDDW | 0602718BR | 21 | Comprehensive National Incident Management System | 4,000 | Webb |
| II | RDDW | 0602718BR | 21 | Classified Program | 26,500 | * |
| II | RDDW | 1160401BB | 23 | FOPEN Radar Technologies | 2,500 | Akaka |
| II | RDDW | 0603122D8Z | 28 | Arabic Language Analysis Systems | 2,000 | Warner |
| II | RDDW | 0603122D8Z | 28 | Arabic Language Analysis Systems | 2,000 | Webb |
| II | RDDW | 0603175C | 30 | Directly Printed Electronic Components | 4,000 | Inhofe |
| II | RDDW | 0603384BP | 34 | Semiconducting Metal Oxide Sensors | 2,000 | Collins |
| II | RDDW | 0603384BP | 34 | Improved CBR Filters | 2,000 | Warner |
| II | RDDW | 0603384BP | 34 | Improved CBR Filters | 2,000 | Webb |
| II | RDDW | 0603384BP | 34 | Raman Chemical ID System | 4,000 | Kennedy |
| II | RDDW | 0603665D8Z | 38 | Standoff Biometrics Technology | 4,000 | Kennedy |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| II | RDDW | 0603680D8Z | 40 | High Performance Defense Manufacturing Technology Research | 10,000 | * |
| II | RDDW | 0603680D8Z | 40 | Disruptive Manufacturing Technologies Research | 10,000 | * |
| II | RDDW | 0603712S | 42 | Vehicle Fuel Cell and Hydrogen Logistics Program | 10,000 | Levin |
| II | RDDW | 0603712S | 42 | Solid Hydrogen Storage Initiative | 6,000 | Levin |
| II | RDDW | 0603712S | 42 | UAV Battery Technologies | 2,000 | Bayh |
| II | RDDW | 0603712S | 42 | UAV Battery Technologies | 2,000 | Lugar |
| II | RDDW | 0603712S | 42 | Biofuels Program | 3,000 | Levin |
| II | RDDW | 0603712S | 42 | Emerging Critical Interconnect Technology Program | 4,000 | Bayh |
| II | RDDW | 0603712S | 42 | Emerging Critical Interconnect Technology Program | 4,000 | Lugar |
| II | RDDW | 0603712S | 42 | Mobile Microgrid Research | 3,000 | Levin |
| II | RDDW | 0603712S | 42 | Mobile Microgrid Research | 3,000 | Stabenow |
| II | RDDW | 0603716D8Z | 44 | Enhanced Water Remediation Research | 2,500 | Levin |
| II | RDDW | 0603755D8Z | 50 | High Performance Computing Modeling and Simulation | 2,000 | Bill Nelson |
| II | RDDW | 0603826D8Z | 60 | Small Craft Integrated Common Operating Picture | 1,500 | Snowe |
| II | RDDW | 0603826D8Z | 60 | Small Craft Integrated Common Operating Picture | 1,500 | Collins |
| II | RDDW | 0603826D8Z | 60 | APS Comparative Testing | 15,000 | * |
| II | RDDW | 0603826D8Z | 60 | APS Technical Assessment | 1,000 | * |
| II | RDDW | 0603828D8Z | 61 | Asymmetric Warfare Initiative | 1,500 | Collins |
| II | RDDW | 0603828D8Z | 61 | Asymmetric Warfare Initiative | 1,500 | Warner |
| II | RDDW | 0603828D8Z | 61 | Asymmetric Warfare Initiative | 1,500 | Webb |
| II | RDDW | 0603828D8Z | 61 | Asymmetric Warfare Initiative | 1,500 | Snowe |
| II | RDDW | 0603828D8Z | 61 | Cultural and Societal Modeling and Simulation | 3,200 | * |
| II | RDDW | 0603828D8Z | 61 | Joint Urban Fires Prototype | 1,500 | * |
| II | RDDW | 0603941D8Z | 63 | Test Range and Resource Analysis | 1,000 | Ensign |
| II | RDDW | 0603941D8Z | 63 | Test Range and Resource Analysis | 1,000 | Reid |
| II | RDDW | 1160402BB | 65 | Advanced Generator Technologies | 2,000 | Kennedy |
| II | RDDW | 1160402BB | 65 | Portable Power Sources Development | 3,000 | Stabenow |
| II | RDDW | 1160402BB | 65 | Portable Power Sources Development | 3,000 | Levin |
| II | RDDW | 1160402BB | 65 | Standoff Precision Guided Munitions | 6,000 | Sessions |
| II | RDDW | 1160402BB | 65 | Advanced Tactical Airborne C4ISR Systems | 3,000 | Bill Nelson |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| II | RDDW | 0603714D8Z | 70 | Advanced Sensor Applications Program (ASAP) | 20,000 | * |
| II | RDDW | 0603881C | 72 | Short-Range Ballistic Missile Defense (SRBMD) | 25,000 | Kyl |
| II | RDDW | 0603881C | 72 | Short-Range Ballistic Missile Defense (SRBMD) | 25,000 | Lott |
| II | RDDW | 0603881C | 72 | Short-Range Ballistic Missile Defense (SRBMD) | 25,000 | Sessions |
| II | RDDW | 0603881C | 72 | Arrow | 25,000 | Lott |
| II | RDDW | 0603881C | 72 | Arrow | 10,000 | Lott |
| II | RDDW | 0603881C | 72 | Arrow | 10,000 | Sessions |
| II | RDDW | 0603881C | 72 | Arrow | 25,000 | Sessions |
| II | RDDW | 0603881C | 72 | THAAD | 105,000 | Sessions |
| II | RDDW | 0603884BP | 75 | Real-Time Viral Agent Detectors | 4,000 | Dole |
| II | RDDW | 0603892C | 82 | Aegis BMD | 75,000 | Pryor |
| II | RDDW | 0603892C | 82 | Aegis BMD | 75,000 | Lincoln |
| II | RDDW | 0604940D8Z | 131 | SAM Hardware Simulators | 4,000 | Chambliss |
| II | RDDW | 0604940D8Z | 131 | SAM Hardware Simulators | 4,000 | Isakson |
| II | RDDW | 0303140G | 191 | Software Assurance Education and Research | 1,000 | Levin |
| II | RDDW | 0303140G | 191 | ISSP Tech Base | 30,000 | * |
| II | RDDW | 0304345BQ | 201 | Commercial Imagery | 200,000 | * |
| II | RDDW | 0708011S | 226 | Manufacturing Supply Chain Research | 3,000 | Reed |
| II | RDDW | 0708011S | 226 | Manufacturing Supply Chain Research | 3,000 | Snowe |
| II | RDDW | 0708011S | 226 | Manufacturing Supply Chain Research | 3,000 | Collins |
| II | RDDW | 0708011S | 226 | Castings Research | 2,000 | Reed |
| II | RDDW | 0708011S | 226 | Military High Pressure Packaging Program | 4,000 | Bayh |
| II | RDDW | 0708011S | 226 | Military High Pressure Packaging Program | 4,000 | Lugar |
| II | RDDW | 0708011S | 226 | Defense Fuel Cell Manufacturing | 3,000 | Graham |
| II | RDDW | 0708011S | 226 | Industrial Base Innovation Fund | 30,000 | * |
| III | OMA-1 | | 10 | Extended Cold Weather Clothing System | 4,000 | Kennedy |
| III | OMA-1 | | 10 | Extended Cold Weather Clothing System | 4,000 | Kerry |
| III | OMA-1 | | 10 | Extended Cold Weather Clothing System | 4,000 | Graham |
| III | OMA-1 | | 70 | Manufacturing Engineering Training Outreach Program | 5,000 | Levin |
| III | OMA-1 | | 110 | Training Range Improvement | 15,000 | Chambliss |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| III | OMN-1 | | 230 | Mk45 Mod 5" Gun Overhaul | 29,500 | McConnell |
| III | OMN-1 | | 270 | Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement | 5,000 | * |
| III | OMMC-1 | | 10 | Extended Cold Weather Clothing System | 6,000 | Stabenow |
| III | OMMC-1 | | 10 | Rapid Deployable Shelter | 6,000 | Clinton |
| III | OMMC-1 | | 10 | Rapid Deployable Shelter | 6,000 | Schumer |
| III | OMMC-1 | | 10 | Mobile Corrosion Protection | 15,100 | Akaka |
| III | OMMC-1 | | 10 | Mobile Corrosion Protection | 15,100 | Clinton |
| III | OMMC-1 | | 10 | Mobile Corrosion Protection | 15,100 | Schumer |
| III | OMAF-1 | | 90 | National Security Space Institute | 3,300 | Allard |
| III | OMAF-4 | | 560 | Mobile Shear | 525 | Reid |
| III | OMDW-1 | | 20 | Language Training | 8,700 | * |
| III | OMDW-4 | | 260 | Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative | 20,000 | * |
| III | OMDW-4 | | 260 | Defense Readiness Reporting System | 12,000 | Warner |
| III | OMDW-4 | | 260 | Defense Readiness Reporting System | 12,000 | Webb |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid | 35,000 | Ben Nelson |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid | 35,000 | Chambliss |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid | 35,000 | Isakson |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Reed |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Inhofe |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Kennedy |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Murray |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Dorgan |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Mikulski |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Menendez |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Roberts |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Salazar |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Clinton |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Akaka |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Conrad |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Feingold |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Durbin |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Obama |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Boxer |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Bayh |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Bingaman |
| III | OMDW | | | Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities | 5,000 | Cantwell |
| III | OMDW | | | Special Assistance to Local Education Agencies | 10,000 | Chambliss |
| III | OMDW | | | Special Assistance to Local Education Agencies | 10,000 | Isakson |
| III | OMAR-1 | | 80 | Mobile Corrosion Protection | 4,000 | Akaka |
| III | OMAR-1 | | 80 | Mobile Corrosion Protection | 4,000 | Schumer |
| III | OMAR-1 | | 80 | Mobile Corrosion Protection | 4,000 | Clinton |
| III | OMANG-1 | | 10 | Extended Cold Weather Clothing System | 4,000 | Reed |
| III | OMANG-1 | | 10 | Extended Cold Weather Clothing System | 4,000 | Carper |
| III | OMANG-1 | | 40 | National Guard Interoperability Upgrades | 1,300 | Webb |
| III | OMANG-1 | | 40 | National Guard Interoperability Upgrades | 1,300 | Warner |
| III | OMANG-1 | | 80 | Mobile Corrosion Protection | 4,000 | Akaka |
| III | OMANG-1 | | 80 | Mobile Corrosion Protection | 4,000 | Schumer |
| III | OMANG-1 | | 80 | Mobile Corrosion Protection | 4,000 | Clinton |
| III | OMANG-1 | | 130 | Operator Driving Simulator | 5,000 | Warner |
| III | OMANG-1 | | 130 | Operator Driving Simulator | 5,000 | Webb |
| III | OMANG-1 | | 130 | Operator Driving Simulator | 5,000 | Levin |
| III | OMAirNG-1 | | 10 | Controlled Humidity Protection | 6,000 | Graham |
| III | OMAirNG-1 | | 10 | Controlled Humidity Protection | 6,000 | Warner |
| III | OMAirNG-1 | | 10 | Controlled Humidity Protection | 6,000 | Webb |
| III | OMAirNG-1 | | 20 | Weapons Skills Trainer | 7,500 | Bill Nelson |
| III | OM Transfer | | 50 | Environmental Restoration Formerly Used Sites - Increased Funds | 20,000 | * |
| XIII | OM | Misc Appr | 190 | CTR Increased Funds | 100,000 | * |
| XIV | DHP RDTE | 0603115HP | 5 | Motor Vehicle Crash Study | 2,000 | Webb |
| XIV | DHP RDTE | 0603115HP | 5 | Motor Vehicle Crash Study | 2,000 | Warner |
| XIV | Counter-Drug | | | Project Athena | 7,500 | Reed |

| TITLE | ACCT | PE | LINE | DESCRIPTION | AMOUNT | MEMBER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | * indicates Committee initiative | |
| XIV | Counter-Drug | | | Surveillance Technology ACTD | 15,000 | * |
| XIV | OIG O&M | | 10 | OIG O&M Increased Funds | 10,000 | * |
| XIV | CAMD O&M | | | Chemical Demilitarization Program Increase | 24,000 | * |
| XIV | CAMD Proc | | | Chemical Demilitarization Program Increase | 12,000 | * |
| XV | OPN | | 122 | Navy MRAP | 21,000 | * |
| XV | OPAF | | 7 | Air Force MRAP | 430,000 | * |
| XV | PDW | | 65 | SOCOM MRAP | 124,000 | * |
| XXXI | NNSA | | | Nonproliferation | 101,000 | * |
| XXXI | NNSA | | | IAEA Fuel Bank | 50,000 | * |
| XXXI | NNSA | | | Weapons Dismantlement | 20,000 | * |
| XXXI | NNSA | | | NIF | 9,700 | * |
| XXXI | NNSA | | | Pantex Plant RTBF | 36,800 | * |
| XXXI | NNSA | | | Nuclear Weapons Incident Response | 10,000 | * |
| XXXI | NNSA | | | Safeguards and Security | 62,400 | * |
| XXXI | NNSA | | | Office of the Administrator | 5,000 | * |
| XXXI | DOE-EM | | | Savannah River Cleanup | 37,000 | * |
| XXXI | DOE-EM | | | Technology Development | 10,000 | * |
| XXXII | DNFSB | | | DNFSB | 5,000 | * |

## LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

### Departmental Recommendations

By letter dated February 6, 2007, the General Counsel of the Department of Defense forwarded to the President of the Senate proposed legislation "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes." The transmittal letter and proposed legislation were officially referred as Executive Communication 743 to the Committee on Armed Services on February 12, 2007.

Executive Communication 743 is available for review at the committee.

### Committee Action

The committee ordered reported a comprehensive original bill and a series of original bills for the Department of Defense, military construction and Department of Energy authorizations by voice vote. The committee vote to report the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 was by unanimous rollcall vote, 25–0.

The rollcall votes on motions and amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of the markup have been made public and are available at the committee.

### Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate

It was not possible to include the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate on this legislation because it was not available at the time the report was filed. It will be included in material presented during floor debate on the legislation.

### Regulatory Impact

Paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report on the regulatory impact of the bill be included in the report on the bill. The committee finds that there is no regulatory impact in the case of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2008.

### Changes in Existing Law

Pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law made by certain portions of the bill have not been shown in this section of the report because, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with showing such changes in order to expedite the business of the Senate and reduce the expenditure of funds.

○