Calendar No. 426

109TH CONGRESS
2nd Session

SENATE

REPORT
109–254

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

REPORT

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 2766]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

TOGETHER WITH

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

MAY 9, 2006.—Ordered to be printed

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

Calendar No. 426

109TH CONGRESS
2nd Session

SENATE

REPORT
109–254

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

R E P O R T

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 2766]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

TOGETHER WITH

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

MAY 9, 2006.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

27–434 WASHINGTON : 2006

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(109th Congress, 2nd Session)

JOHN WARNER, Virginia, *Chairman*

JOHN McCAIN, Arizona
JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma
PAT ROBERTS, Kansas
JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama
SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine
JOHN ENSIGN, Nevada
JAMES M. TALENT, Missouri
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia
LINDSEY O. GRAHAM, South Carolina
ELIZABETH DOLE, North Carolina
JOHN CORNYN, Texas
JOHN THUNE, South Dakota

CARL LEVIN, Michigan
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia
JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut
JACK REED, Rhode Island
DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
BILL NELSON, Florida
E. BENJAMIN NELSON, Nebraska
MARK DAYTON, Minnesota
EVAN BAYH, Indiana
HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, New York

CHARLES S. ABELL, *Staff Director*
RICHARD D. DEBOBES, *Democratic Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose of the Bill	1
Committee overview and recommendations	2
Explanation of funding summary	9
Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations	17
Title I—Procurement	17
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations	17
Explanation of tables	17
Subtitle B—Army Programs	19
Limitation on availability of funds for the Joint Network Node (sec. 111)	37
Comptroller General report on the contract for the Future Combat Systems program (sec. 112)	38
Reports on Army Modularity Initiative (sec. 113)	38
Budget Items—Army	40
Future Cargo Aircraft	40
Surface-launched advanced medium range air-to-air missile	40
M1A1 Abrams tank and M2A2 Bradley fighting vehicle upgrades	41
M113 Armored personnel carrier family of vehicles	41
M1028 120mm tank cartridge	42
M915 105mm Dual Purpose Improved Conventional Munition artillery cartridge	42
Rapid wall breaching kit	42
Ammunition peculiar equipment outloading module	42
Automated Tactical Ammunition Classification System	42
Corrosion protective covers	43
Insensitive munitions high-shear mixing system	43
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant	43
Modernization of forge equipment at Scranton Army Ammunition Plant	43
Radford Army Ammunition Plant upgrades	43
Defense advanced global positioning system receivers	44
Nonsystem training devices	44
Subtitle C—Navy Programs	44
CVN–21 class aircraft carrier procurement (sec. 121)	67
Construction of the first two vessels under the next-generation destroyer program (sec. 122)	68
Modification of limitation on total cost of procurement of CVN–77 aircraft carrier (sec. 123)	69
Budget Items—Navy	70
MH–60S and MH–60R helicopters	70
T–45TS Goshawk	70
CH–53 Integrated Mechanical Diagnostic System (IMDS)	71
Allegany Ballistics Laboratory facility restoration	71
Mk 110 57mm naval gun	71
Mk 295/Mk 296 ammunition for Mk 110 57mm naval gun	71
M67 hand grenade	71
M290 nuclear refueling facility	71
Procurement authority for LPD–17 class ship designated LPD–25	72
Advance procurement authority for LHA replacement (LHA(R)) ship designated LHA–7	73
Outfitting and post-delivery	73
Completion of prior year shipbuilding	74
Amphibious ship integrated bridge system	74
DDG–51 Arleigh Burke-class destroyer modernization program	74

Page

Title I—Procurement—Continued
Budget Items—Navy—Continued
High performance metal fiber brushes for shipboard motors and generators ... 75
Ship support items under $5.0 million ... 75
Electronics equipment items under $5.0 million ... 75
Sonobuoys ... 76
Joint service and explosive ordnance disposal improvised explosive device countermeasures ... 76
NULKA anti-ship missile decoy ... 76
Command support equipment ... 76
Combat Casualty Care Equipment Upgrade Program ... 77
Lightweight 155-millimeter towed howitzer ... 77
Modification kits ... 78
Laser integrated target engagement system ... 78
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs ... 78
Procurement of Joint Primary Aircraft Training System aircraft after fiscal year 2006 (sec. 141) ... 93
Prohibition on retirement of C–130E/H tactical airlift aircraft (sec. 142) ... 93
Limitation on retirement of KC–135E aircraft (sec. 143) ... 93
Limitation on retirement of B–52H bomber aircraft (sec. 144) ... 94
Retirement of B–52H bomber aircraft (sec. 145) ... 94
Prohibition on incremental funding and multiyear procurement of F–22A aircraft (sec. 146) ... 94
Budget Items—Air Force ... 95
Joint Strike Fighter ... 95
F–22A procurement ... 96
C–17A procurement ... 97
KC–135 tanker replacement ... 98
A/OA–10 modifications ... 98
C–5 aircraft avionics modernization program ... 99
Bomb insensitive munitions upgrade ... 99
Propulsion replacement program ... 99
Expanded intelligence support for reach-back operations ... 99
Self-deploying infrared streamer ... 100
Budget Items—Defense-wide ... 107
Army high performance computing research center ... 107
Mini gun ... 107
Time delayed firing device/sympathetic detonators ... 107
Persistent Predator operations and intelligence ... 108
Advanced lightweight grenade launcher ... 108
Special Operations Forces laser acquisition marker ... 108
Special Operations Command craft modifications ... 108
Joint threat warning system ... 109
Automatic Chemical Agent Detector and Alarm ... 109
Improved chemical agent monitor ... 109
Items of Special Interest ... 110
Cost control for certain helicopter acquisition programs ... 110
Deployable/mobile command and control programs ... 110
F–18 Hornet to Joint Strike Fighter transition ... 111
Fully funded bomber roadmap ... 112
Littoral Combat Ship ... 112
Maritime Prepositioning Force, Future ... 113
Ship systems commonality ... 115
Submarine force structure ... 115
T–38 replacement aircraft ... 116
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation ... 119
Explanation of tables ... 119
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ... 121
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations ... 121
Independent estimate of costs of the Future Combat Systems (sec. 211) ... 121
Funding of defense science and technology program (sec. 212) ... 122
Hypersonics development (sec. 213) ... 122
Trident sea-launched ballistic missiles (sec. 214) ... 123
Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs ... 124
Availability of research, development, test, and evaluation funds for fielding ballistic missile defense capabilities (sec. 231) ... 124

Page

Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued
Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs—Continued
Policy of the United States on priorities in the development, testing, and fielding of missile defense capabilities (sec. 232) 124
One-year extension of Comptroller General assessments of ballistic missile defense programs (sec. 233) 127
Submittal of plans for test and evaluation of the operational capability of the ballistic missile defense system (sec. 234) 127
Annual reports on transition of ballistic missile defense programs to the military departments (sec. 235) 127
Subtitle D—Other Matters 128
Extension of requirement for Global Research Watch Program (sec. 251) 128
Expansion and extension of authority to award prizes for advanced technology achievements (sec. 252) 128
Policies and practices on test and evaluation to address emerging acquisition approaches (sec. 253) 129
Development of the propulsion system for the Joint Strike Fighter (sec. 254) 129
Independent cost analyses for Joint Strike Fighter engine program (sec. 255) 130
Sense of the Senate on technology sharing of Joint Strike Fighter technology (sec. 256) 131
Budget Items—Army 132
Army basic research 145
PACE early career awards 145
Army materials technology 146
Advanced microelectronics manufacturing 146
Unmanned payload concepts 147
Army missile technology 147
Hypervelocity ground testing 147
Multifunctional robot platform 147
Combat vehicle and automotive technology 147
Weapons and munitions technology 148
Human factors engineering 148
Mapping and detection of unexploded ordnance 148
Warfighter technology 149
Army medical technology 149
Advanced aviation technology 149
Unmanned tactical combat vehicles 149
Nanotechnology manufacturing 150
Combat vehicle research 150
Command and control team training 150
Advanced simulated training 150
Missile recycling capability 151
Advanced electronic integration 151
Advanced fuel cell research 151
Advanced Hypersonic Weapon modeling and simulation 151
Army missile and space modeling and simulation technology 151
Distributed operational control center 152
HighSentinel airship 152
Low cost avionics 152
Protected test link 153
Standoff sensor for radionuclides and explosives 153
Tactical operations center hardware and software integration 153
Thermal protection system technology risk reduction 153
Translation devices 154
Advanced Hypersonic Weapon development 154
Architecture Analysis Program 155
Environmental quality technology demonstration and validation at the Defense Ammunition Center 155
Counter rocket, artillery, and mortar 155
Unmanned aerial vehicle anti-icing technology 156
RAND Arroyo Center 156
Automated communications support 156
Biometric identification device 156
Portable iris enrollment and recognition device 157
Biometrics technology 157

Page

Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued
Budget Items—Army—Continued
Army manufacturing technology 157
Budget Items—Navy 157
Navy university research 170
Thermal management systems 170
Force protection applied research 170
High power, lightweight battery research 170
Human factors and organizational design 171
Sea basing technologies 171
Information sharing technologies 171
Power projection advanced technology 171
Force protection advanced technology 171
Common picture advanced technology 172
Warfighter sustainment technology 172
APY–6 real-time precision targeting radar 173
Marine Corps advanced technology 173
Visual integrated bridge system 173
Electro-optic Passive ASW System 173
Surface Navy Integrated Undersea Tactical Technology 174
Shipboard system component development 174
Marine Corps ground combat and supporting arms systems 175
Project Athena 175
Directed energy and electric weapon systems 176
Towed array improvements 176
Submarine design 177
Ship self-defense 178
NULKA anti-ship missile decoy development 178
Chiropractic treatment outcomes study 178
Navy medical research 179
F136 Interchangeable Engine 179
Marine Corps communications systems 179
Polymer-based improvised explosive device detection tools 180
Expeditionary assault bridge 180
Environmental intelligence for riverine operations 181
Vessel integrity system 181
National Shipbuilding Research Program—Advanced Shipbuilding Enterprise 181
Detection and recovery of unexploded ordnance, Browns Island, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina 182
Budget Items—Air Force 182
Air Force basic research 195
Air Force materials research 195
Applied aerospace propulsion 195
Space technology 195
MASINT visualization tool 196
Air Force materials technologies 196
Aerospace propulsion and power technology 196
Radically Segmented Launch Vehicle 196
Thin film amorphous solar arrays 197
Massively parallel optical interconnects for battlespace information exchange 197
Transformational Satellite Communications 197
Satellite command and control consolidation 198
Space Radar 198
Increased funding for O2 diesel particulate emission reduction research 200
Space control test capabilities 200
Joint space intelligent decision support 200
Global awareness presentation system 201
RAND Project Air Force 201
Ballistic missile range safety technology 201
Global command and control development center 201
Single integrated space picture 202
National Security Space Office 202
Air Force industrial preparedness activities 202
Budget Items—Defense-wide 203
Force protection basic research 217

Page

Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued
Budget Items—Defense-wide—Continued
National Defense Education Program 217
Detection of biological agents in water 217
Organic light emitting receptor-based nanosensors 217
Superstructural particle evaluation 218
Medical free electron laser 218
Alternative delivery of recombinant protein vaccines 218
Chemical and biological smart materials 218
Escape mask 218
Multipurpose biodefense immunoarray 219
Mustard gas antidote 219
Next-generation chemical biological protective suit 219
Personal protection against infectious agents 219
Rapid identification of biological warfare agents 220
Verification and validation of chemical agent persistence models 220
Tactical technology 220
Biochemical materials 220
Modeling and simulation 221
Wearable hyperspectral imaging system 221
Radiation detection technology 221
Advanced aerospace systems 221
Next Generation Gas Chromatographic Mass Spectrometer 221
Joint advanced concept technology demonstration 222
Joint robotic autonomous systems 222
Advanced mobile gas-to-liquid fueler 222
Defense Logistics Agency research and technology demonstrations 222
Dendrimer enhanced water remediation research 223
Computer modernization technologies 223
Command, control, and communications systems 224
Portable explosive detection 224
Joint modeling, simulation, and experimentation 224
Advanced tactical airborne command, control, communications, computer, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance system 225
Advanced tactical laser 225
Flashlight soldier-to-soldier combat identification system 225
Small and medium caliber recoil mitigation technologies 226
Special Operations portable power source program 226
Anthrax and plague oral vaccine research and development 226
Airborne Infrared System 226
Corrosion prevention research 227
Playas command and control network 227
Militarily critical technologies support 228
Operationally responsive space payloads 228
DARPA management headquarters 228
Armed Forces medical and food research 228
High performance computational systems 229
Commercial airborne interferometric synthetic aperture radar imagery 229
Credibility assessment research 229
Combat sent wideband sensor upgrade 229
Castings for improved readiness 230
High performance defense manufacturing technology research and development 230
Helmet mount track system 230
Special Operations combat assault rifle 231
Wavelet packet modulation 231
Multi-spectral laboratory and analytical services center program 231
Special Operations wireless management and control project 232
Items of Special Interest 232
Airborne Laser 232
Air Force science, technology, test and evaluation 232
Future Combat Systems and current force interoperability 233
Information assurance progress report 234
Joint Tactical Radio System 235
Survey of science and engineering workforce shaping programs 235
Title III—Operation and Maintenance 237
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 237

Page

Title III—Operation and Maintenance—Continued
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations—Continued
Explanation of tables 237
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 272
Limitation on availability of funds for the Army Logistics Modernization Program (sec. 311) 272
Availability of funds for exhibits for the national museums of the Armed Forces (sec. 312) 272
Limitation on financial management improvement and audit initiatives within the Department of Defense (sec. 313) 273
Limitation on availability of operation and maintenance funds for the management headquarters of the Defense Information Systems Agency (sec. 314) 273
Subtitle C—Environmental Provisions 274
Response plan for remediation of military munitions (sec. 331) 274
Extension of authority to grant exemptions to certain requirements (sec. 332) 274
Research on effects of ocean disposal of munitions (sec. 333) 275
Clarification of multi-year authority to use base closure funds to fund cooperative agreements under Environmental Restoration Program (sec. 334) 276
Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for certain costs in connection with Moses Lake Wellfield Superfund Site, Moses Lake, Washington (sec. 335) 276
Subtitle D—Reports 277
Comptroller General report on readiness of the ground forces of the Army and the Marine Corps (sec. 351) 277
Subtitle E—Workplace and Depot Issues 278
Minimum capital investment levels for public depots serviced by working capital funds (sec. 361) 278
Permanent exclusion of certain contract expenditures from percentage limitations on the performance of depot-level maintenance (sec. 362) 279
Additional exception to prohibition on contractor performance of firefighting functions (sec. 363) 279
Temporary security guard services for certain work caused by realignment of military installations under the base closure laws (sec. 364) 279
Subtitle F—Other Matters 279
Recycling of military munitions (sec. 371) 279
Incentives clauses in chemical demilitarization contracts (sec. 372) 280
Extension of Department of Defense telecommunications benefit program (sec. 373) 281
Extension of availability of funds for commemoration of success of the Armed Forces in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom (sec. 374) 281
Budget Items—Other Defense Programs 282
Chronic pain management research 282
Defense Health Program unobligated balances and administrative efficiencies 282
Medical education and training on Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder 283
Pregnancy recovery education program for military women and military spouses 283
Primary care enhancement for early detection and treatment of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder 283
Robotic surgery for prostate cancer 284
Budget Items—Army 284
Battlefield mobility enhancers 284
UH–60 add on armor 284
Rapid Data Management System 284
Cognitive Air Defense Simulators 284
Army corrosion prevention and control 285
Blood bag transport modernization project 285
Quadruple specialty containers 285
Army Strategic Management System 285
Aviation and Missile Life Cycle Management Command Integrated Digital Environment pilot program 285
Military to civilian conversions 286

Page

Title III—Operation and Maintenance—Continued
Budget Items—Army—Continued
Working capital funds 287
Unobligated balances 288
Information assurance vulnerability alert cell 288
Connect and Join 288
Budget Items—Navy 289
Long arm high-intensity arc metal halide handheld searchlight 289
Man Overboard Identification safety system 289
Mark-45 gun system overhauls 289
Navy Marine Corps Intranet program management 289
Civilian personnel pay in excess of requirements 290
Budget Items—Marine Corps 290
Acclimate high performance undergarments 290
Cold Weather Layering System 290
Command Post-Large 291
Individual Water Purifier System 291
Portable tent lighting 291
Ultra-light Camouflage Net System 291
Marine Corps corrosion prevention and control 291
Budget Items—Air Force 292
Joint Modular Ground Targets and Urban Close Air Support site 292
F–16 supply chain management DMSMS program 292
Air Force space surveillance system 292
Consequence management 292
Interoperable communications 293
National capital region operational enhancements 293
National Security Space Institute 293
Tuition assistance 294
Budget Items—Defense-wide 294
Gamma Radiation Detection System 294
Information assurance scholarship program 294
Meals Ready to Eat war reserve stockpile 294
Increased funding for conservation buffer zones 295
Citizen-Soldier Support Program 295
Institute for national security information analysis 295
Budget Items—Army Reserve 296
Army Reserve budget justification materials 296
Military technicians pay in excess of requirements 296
Budget Items—Air Force Reserve 296
Air Force Reserve training, test and ferry flying hours 296
Budget Items—Army National Guard 297
Battlefield mobility enhancers 297
Operator driving simulator 297
Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams sustainment training and evaluation program 297
Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams upgrades 298
Budget Items—Air National Guard 298
Warrior skills and convoy trainer 298
Budget Items—Transfer Accounts 298
Funding for Formerly Used Defense Sites 298
Increased funding for clean up of unexploded ordnance at BRAC sites 299
Items of Special Interest 299
40 mm day/night training cartridge 299
Comptroller General study of the Defense Transportation Coordination Initiative 300
Defense Information System Network Access Transport Services 300
Defense Readiness Reporting System 301
Defense Travel System 301
Department of Defense foreign language training 302
Marine Aviation Training Transformation savings 303
Performance of certain work by federal government employees 303
Radio frequency identification report 303
Training Range Vegetation Encroachment 304
Title IV—Military Personnel Authorizations 305
Subtitle A—Active Forces 305
End strengths for active forces (sec. 401) 305

Page

Title IV—Military Personnel Authorizations—Continued
Subtitle A—Active Forces—Continued
Repeal of requirement for permanent end strength levels to support two major regional contingencies (sec. 402) 306
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces 307
End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411) 307
End strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the Reserves (sec. 412) 307
End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413) 308
Fiscal year 2007 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414) 308
Maximum number of Reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support (sec. 415) 308
Subtitle C—Authorizations of Appropriations 309
Military personnel (sec. 421) 309
Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 422) 309
Budget Items 309
Unobligated balances 309
Reserves cost avoidance 309
Title V—Military Personnel Policy 311
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy 311
Part I—Officer Personnel Policy Generally 311
Military status of officers serving in certain intelligence community positions (sec. 501) 311
Extension of temporary reduction of time-in-grade requirement for eligibility for promotion for certain active-duty list officers in grades of first lieutenant and lieutenant (junior grade) (sec. 502) 311
Extension of age limits for active-duty general and flag officers (sec. 503) 311
Modification of authorities on senior members of the Judge Advocate General's Corps (sec. 504) 312
Requirement for significant joint experience for officers appointed as Surgeon General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force (sec. 505) 312
Grade and exclusion from active-duty general and flag officer distribution and strength limitations of officer serving as Attending Physician to the Congress (sec. 506) 313
Discretionary separation and retirement of chief warrant officers, W–4, twice failing selection for promotion (sec. 507) 313
Increased mandatory retirement ages for Reserve officers (sec. 508) 313
Part II—Officer Promotion Policy 314
Promotions (sec. 515) 314
Consideration of adverse information by promotion selection boards in recommendations on officers to be promoted (sec. 516) 314
Expanded authority for removal from reports of selection boards of officers recommended for promotion to grades below general and flag grades (sec. 517) 314
Clarification of nondisclosure requirements applicable to promotion selection board proceedings (sec. 518) 315
Special selection board authorities (sec. 519) 315
Removal from promotion lists of officers returned to the President by the Senate (sec. 520) 315
Part III—Joint Officer Management Requirements 316
Modification and enhancement of general authorities on management of joint qualified officers (sec. 526) 316
Modification of promotion policy objectives for joint officers (sec. 527) 317
Applicability of joint duty assignment requirements limited to graduates of National Defense University schools (sec. 528) 317
Modification of definitions relating to jointness (sec. 529) 317
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Personnel Matters 318
Enhanced flexibility in the management of Reserve component personnel (sec. 531) 318
Expansion of activities authorized for Reserves under Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams (sec. 532) 319

Page

Title V—Military Personnel Policy—Continued
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Personnel Matters—Continued
Modification of authorities relating to the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves (sec. 533) 319
Pilot program on reintegration of members of the National Guard into civilian life after deployment (sec. 534) 319
Subtitle C—Military Justice and Related Matters 320
Applicability of Uniform Code of Military Justice to members of the Armed Forces ordered to active duty overseas in inactive duty for training status (sec. 551) 320
Subtitle D—Education and Training Matters 320
Detail of commissioned officers as students at medical schools (sec. 561) 320
Expansion of eligibility to provide Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps instruction (sec. 562) 321
Increase in maximum amount of repayment under education loan repayment for officers in specified health professions (sec. 563) 321
Increase in benefits under Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program (sec. 564) 321
Report on Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program (sec. 565) 321
Expansion of instruction available at the Naval Postgraduate School for enlisted members of the Armed Forces (sec. 566) 322
Modification of actions to address sexual harassment and sexual violence at the service academies (sec. 567) 322
Department of Defense policy on service academy and ROTC graduates seeking to participate in professional sports before completion of their active-duty service obligations (sec. 568) 322
Subtitle E—Defense Dependents Education Matters 323
Funding for assistance to local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 571) 323
Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 572) 323
Plan to assist local educational agencies experiencing growth in enrollment due to force structure changes, relocation of military units, or BRAC (sec. 573) 324
Pilot program on parent education to promote early childhood education for dependent children affected by military deployment or relocation of military units (sec. 574) 324
Subtitle F—Other Matters 325
Administration of oaths (sec. 581) 325
Military ID cards for retiree dependents who are permanently disabled (sec. 582) 325
Military voting matters (sec. 583) 325
Presentation of Medal of Honor Flag to primary next of kin of Medal of Honor recipients (sec. 584) 326
Modification of effective period of authority to present recognition items for recruitment and retention purposes (sec. 585) 326
Military severely injured center (sec. 586) 326
Items of Special Interest 327
Funding for the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command 327
Military medical recruiting 328
Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits 331
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 331
Fiscal year 2007 increase in military basic pay and reform of basic pay rates (sec. 601) 331
Increase in maximum rate of basic pay for general and flag officer grades (sec. 602) 331
Clarification of effective date of prohibition on compensation for correspondence courses (sec. 603) 331
One-year extension of prohibition against requiring certain injured members to pay for meals provided by military treatment facilities (sec. 604) 332
Additional housing allowance for Reserves on active duty in support of a contingency operation (sec. 605) 332
Extension of temporary continuation of housing allowance for dependents of members dying on active duty to spouses who are members of the uniformed services (sec. 606) 332

Page

Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits—Continued
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays 333
Extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for Reserve Forces (sec. 611) 333
Extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for certain health care professionals (sec. 612) 333
Extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613) 333
Extension of authorities relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays (sec. 614) 333
Increase in special pay for Selected Reserve health care professionals in critically short wartime specialties (sec. 615) 333
Expansion and enhancement of accession bonus authorities for certain officers in health care specialties (sec. 616) 334
Increase in nuclear career accession bonus for nuclear-qualified officers (sec. 617) 334
Modification of certain authorities applicable to the targeted shaping of the Armed Forces (sec. 618) 334
Extension of pilot program on contributions to Thrift Savings Plan for initial enlistees in the Army (sec. 619) 335
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances 335
Expansion of payment of replacement value of personal property damage during transport at Government expense (sec. 631) 335
Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits 336
Modification of Department of Defense contributions to Military Retirement Fund and Government contributions to Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund (sec. 641) 336
Repeal of requirement of reduction of SBP survivor annuities by dependency and indemnity compensation (sec. 642) 336
Effective date of paid-up coverage under Survivor Benefit Plan (sec. 643) 337
Expansion of conditions for direct payment of divisible retired pay (sec. 644) 337
Authority for cost of living adjustments of retired pay treated as divisible property (sec. 645) 337
Notice and copy to members of court orders on payment of retired pay (sec. 646) 338
Retention of assistive technology and devices by certain members of the Armed Forces after separation from service (sec. 647) 338
Subtitle E—Other Matters 338
Audit of pay accounts of members of the Army evacuated from a combat zone for inpatient care (sec. 661) 338
Item of Special Interest 339
Department of Defense child care services 339
Title VII—Health Care 341
Subtitle A—Benefits Matters 341
Improved procedures for cancer screening for women (sec. 701) 341
National mail-order pharmacy program (sec. 702) 341
Availability under TRICARE of anesthesia for children in connection with dental procedures for which dental anesthesia is inappropriate (sec. 703) 341
TRICARE coverage for forensic examinations following sexual assaults and domestic violence (sec. 704) 342
Prohibition on increase in fiscal year 2007 in enrollment fees for coverage under TRICARE Prime (sec. 705) 342
Limitation on fiscal year 2007 increase in premiums for coverage under TRICARE of members of Reserve components who commit to continued service in Selected Reserve after release from active duty (sec. 706) 342
Subtitle B—Planning, Programming, and Management 342
Treatment of TRICARE Retail Pharmacy Network under Federal procurement of pharmaceuticals (sec. 721) 342
Relationship between the TRICARE program and employer-sponsored group health care plans (sec. 722) 343
Enrollment in the TRICARE program (sec. 723) 343
Incentive payments for the provision of services under the TRICARE program in medically underserved areas (sec. 724) 343
Standardization of claims processing under TRICARE program and Medicare program (sec. 725) 344

Page

Title VII—Health Care —Continued
Subtitle B—Planning, Programming, and Management —Continued
Requirements for support of military treatment facilities by civilian contractors under TRICARE (sec. 726) 344
Uniform standards for access to health care services for wounded or injured servicemembers (sec. 727) 345
Disease and chronic care management (sec. 728) 345
Post-deployment health assessments for members of the Armed Forces returning from deployment in support of a contingency operation (sec. 729) 346
Subtitle C—Studies and Reports 346
Pilot projects on early diagnosis and treatment of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and other mental health conditions (sec. 741) 346
Annual reports on certain medical malpractice cases (sec. 742) 347
Comptroller General study on the Department of Defense pharmacy benefits program (sec. 743) 348
Comptroller General audits of Department of Defense health care costs and cost-saving measures (sec. 744) 348
Review of Department of Defense medical quality improvement program (sec. 745) 348
Subtitle D—Other Matters 349
Extension of limitation on conversion of military medical and dental positions to civilian medical and dental positions (sec. 761) 349
Items of Special Interest 349
Sustaining the military health care benefit 349
Basrah Children's Hospital, Iraq 350
Mental Health Self-Assessment Program 350
Services for autism 351
TRICARE customer service 351
Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters 353
Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management 353
Additional certification requirements for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 801) 353
Extension and enhancement of Defense Acquisition Challenge Program (sec. 802) 353
Baseline description and unit cost reports for major defense acquisition systems (sec. 803) 354
Major automated information system programs (sec. 804) 354
Adjustment of original baseline estimates for major defense acquisition program experiencing cost growth resulting from damage caused by hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma (sec. 805) 355
Internal controls for procurements on behalf of the Department of Defense by certain non-defense agencies (sec. 806) 356
Regulations on use of fixed price contracts in development programs (sec. 807) 356
Availability of funds for performance-based logistics contracts for weapons systems logistics support (sec. 808) 358
Quality control in procurement of ship critical safety items and related services (sec. 809) 359
Three-year extension of requirement for reports on commercial price trend analyses of the Department of Defense (sec. 810) 359
Pilot program on time-certain development in acquisition of major weapon systems (sec. 811) 359
Subtitle B—Defense Industrial Base Matters 360
Removal of hand and measuring tools from certain requirements (sec. 821) 360
Substitution of speciality metals with titanium and nickel under certain requirements (sec. 822) 360
Waiver authority for domestic source or content requirements (sec. 823) 360
Repeal of requirement for identification of essential military items and military system essential item breakout list (sec. 824) 361
Consistency with United States obligations under trade agreements (sec. 825) 361
Subtitle C—Defense Contractor Matters 361
Requirements for defense contractors relating to certain former Department of Defense officials (sec. 841) 361
Lead systems integrators (sec. 842) 361

Page

Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters —Continued
Subtitle C—Defense Contractor Matters —Continued
Linking of award and incentive fees to acquisition outcomes (sec. 843) ... 362
Prohibition on excessive pass-through charges (sec. 844) ... 363
Report on Department of Defense contracting with contractors or subcontractors employing members of the Selected Reserve (sec. 845) ... 364
Subtitle D—Program Manager Matters ... 364
Program Manager Matters (secs. 861–865) ... 364
Subtitle E—Other Matters ... 366
Clarification of authority to carry out certain prototype projects (sec. 871) ... 366
One-year extension of special temporary contract closeout authority (sec. 872) ... 366
One-year extension of inapplicability of certain laws to contracting with employers of persons with disabilities (sec. 873) ... 366
Items of Special Interest ... 367
Application and interpretation of the Berry amendment ... 367
Brand-name specifications ... 368
Clarification of rapid acquisition authority to respond to combat emergencies ... 369
Coal gasification report ... 369
Contracting with Federal Prison Industries ... 370
Past performance evaluations ... 370
Title IX—Department of Defense Organization and Management ... 373
Subtitle A—Duties and Functions of Department of Defense Officers and Organizations ... 373
United States Military Cancer Institute (sec. 901) ... 373
Senior acquisition executive for Special Operations within staff of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflicts (sec. 902) ... 373
Subtitle B—Space Activities ... 373
Establishment of operationally responsive space capabilities (sec. 911) ... 373
Extension of authority for pilot program on provision of space surveillance network services to non-United States Government entities (sec. 912) ... 374
Subtitle C—Other Matters ... 374
Department of Defense policy on unmanned systems (sec. 921) ... 374
Executive Schedule level IV for Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness (sec. 922) ... 375
Three-year extension of joint incentives program on sharing of health care resources by the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs (sec. 923) ... 376
Title X—General Provisions ... 377
Subtitle A—Financial Matters ... 377
Transfer authority (sec. 1001) ... 377
Authorization of supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2006 (sec. 1002) ... 377
Reduction in certain authorizations due to savings relating to lower inflation (sec. 1003) ... 377
Increase in fiscal year 2006 general transfer authority (sec. 1004) ... 378
United States contribution to NATO common-funded budgets in fiscal year 2007 (sec. 1005) ... 378
Modification of date of submittal of OMB/CBO report on scoring of outlays (sec. 1006) ... 378
Prohibition on parking of funds (sec. 1007) ... 378
Subtitle B—Naval Vessels ... 379
Repeal requirement for 12 operational aircraft carriers within the Navy (sec. 1011) ... 379
Approval of transfer of naval vessels to foreign nations by vessel class (sec. 1012) ... 380
Subtitle C—Counterdrug Matters ... 381
Extension of availability of funds for unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia (sec. 1021) ... 381

Page

Title X—General Provisions —Continued
Subtitle C—Counterdrug Matters—Continued
Extension of authority of Department of Defense to provide additional support for counterdrug activities of other governmental agencies (sec. 1022) 381
Extension and expansion of certain authorities to provide additional support for counterdrug activities (sec. 1023) 381
Subtitle D—Defense Intelligence and Related Matters 382
Two-year extension of authority to engage in commercial activities as security for intelligence collection activities (sec. 1031) 382
Annual report on intelligence oversight activities of the Department of Defense (sec. 1032) 382
Administration of pilot project on Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps (sec. 1033) 382
Improvement of authorities on the National Security Education Program (sec. 1034) 383
Subtitle E—Defense Against Terrorism and Related Security Matters 383
Enhancement of authority to pay monetary rewards for assistance in combating terrorism (sec. 1041) 383
Use of the Armed Forces in major public emergencies (sec. 1042) 383
Treatment under Freedom of Information Act of certain confidential information shared with State and local personnel (sec. 1043) 385
Subtitle F—Miscellaneous Authorities on Availability and Use of Funds .. 385
Acceptance and retention of reimbursement from non-Federal sources to defray Department of Defense costs of conferences (sec. 1051) 385
Minimum annual purchase amounts for airlift from carriers participating in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (sec. 1052) 386
Increased flexibility in the use of funds for Joint Staff exercises (sec. 1053) 386
Subtitle G—Report Matters 387
Report on clarification of prohibition on cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment or punishment (sec. 1061) 387
Reports on members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense serving in the Legislative Branch (sec. 1062) 387
Additional element in annual report on chemical and biological warfare defense (sec. 1063) 388
Report on Local Boards of Trustees of the Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1064) 388
Repeal of certain report requirements (sec. 1065) 388
Subtitle H—Technical and Conforming Amendments 389
Uniform definition of national security system for certain Department of Defense purposes (sec. 1071) 389
Conforming amendment relating to redesignation of Defense Communications Agency as Defense Information Systems Agency (sec. 1072) 389
Technical amendment (sec. 1073) 389
Subtitle I—Other Matters 389
National Foreign Language Coordination Council (sec. 1081) 389
Support of successor organizations of the disestablished Interagency Global Positioning System Executive Board (sec. 1082) 390
Sense of Congress on the Quadrennial Defense Review (sec. 1083) 390
Items of Special Interest 391
Developing a new staff structure for combatant command headquarters 391
Distributed decision support systems 391
Report on Special Operations Command UAV intelligence collection requirements 392
Title XI—Department of Defense Civilian Personnel Policy 393
Accrual of annual leave for members of the uniformed services on terminal leave performing dual employment (sec. 1101) 393
Strategy for improving the senior management, functional, and technical workforce of the Department of Defense (sec. 1102) 393
Authority to equalize allowances, benefits, and gratuities of personnel on official duty in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 1103) 394
Item of Special Interest 395
Highly qualified experts 395
Title XII—Matters Relating to Other Nations 397

Page

Title XII—Matters Relating to Other Nations—Continued
Subtitle A—General Matters 397
Expansion of humanitarian and civic assistance to include communications and information capacity (sec. 1201) 397
Modification of authorities relating to the Regional Defense Counterterrorism Fellowship Program (sec. 1202) 397
Logistic support of allied forces for combined operations (sec. 1203) 397
Exclusion of petroleum, oil, and lubricants from limitations on amount of liabilities the United States may accrue under acquisition and cross-servicing agreements (sec. 1204) 398
Temporary authority to use acquisition and cross-servicing agreements to loan significant military equipment to foreign forces in Iraq and Afghanistan for personnel protection and survivability (sec. 1205) 398
Modification of authorities relating to the building of the capacity of foreign military forces (sec. 1206) 399
Participation of the Department of Defense in multinational military centers of excellence (sec. 1207) 401
Distribution of education and training materials and information technology to enhance interoperability (sec. 1208) 401
Subtitle B—Report Matters 402
Report on increased role and participation of multinational partners in the United Nations Command in the Republic of Korea (sec. 1221) 402
Report on interagency operating procedures for stabilization and reconstruction operations (sec. 1222) 403
Title XIII—Cooperative Threat Reduction With States of the Former Soviet Union 405
Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds (sec. 1301) 405
Funding allocations (sec. 1302) 405
Extension of temporary authority to waive limitation on funding for chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia (sec. 1303) 405
Title XIV—Authorization for Increased Costs Due to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom 407
Overview 407
Summary table of authorization 407
Purpose (sec. 1401) 413
Army procurement (sec. 1402) 413
Marine Corps procurement (sec. 1403) 413
Air Force procurement (sec. 1404) 413
Operation and Maintenance (sec. 1405) 413
Defense Health Program (sec. 1406) 413
Military personnel (sec. 1407) 413
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1408) 413
Classified programs (sec. 1409) 413
Iraq Freedom Fund (sec. 1410) 413
Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1411) 414
Transfer authority (sec. 1412) 414
Availability of funds (sec. 1413) 414
Budget Items 414
UH–60M Black Hawk helicopters 414
CH–47F cargo helicopters 414
Patriot missile defense system 414
M1A1 Abrams integrated management and tank urbanization upgrade kits 415
High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles 415
Heavy expanded mobile tactical truck extended service program 416
Land mobile radios 416
Profiler 416
Assault Amphibious Vehicle/7A1 product improvement program 416
High mobility artillery rocket system re-supply system armor 417
Gunner protection kits 417
Family of explosive ordnance demolition equipment 417
Up-armored high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles 418
Abrams M1A1 Abrams Integrated Management program 418
Navy flying hour program 418
Aviation depot maintenance 418

Page

Title XIV—Authorization for Increased Costs Due to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom—Continued
Budget Items—Continued
Ship operations 419
Ship depot maintenance 419
Marine Corps depot maintenance funding 419
Joint improvised explosive device defeat defense fund 419
Division B—Military Construction Authorizations 421
Explanation of funding tables 421
Costs to implement the decisions of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment round 443
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment accounts authorized for appropriations in 2006 444
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment accounts 448
Short title (sec. 2001) 455
Title XXI—Army 457
Summary 457
Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101) 457
Family housing (sec. 2102) 457
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2103) 457
Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104) 457
Items of Special Interest 457
Planning and design, Army 457
Management of military programs in the United States Army Corps of Engineers 458
Title XXII—Navy 461
Summary 461
Land Acquisition, Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina 461
Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201) 462
Family housing (sec. 2202) 463
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203) 463
Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204) 463
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2006 projects (sec. 2205) 463
Title XXIII—Air Force 465
Summary 465
Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301) 465
Family housing (sec. 2302) 465
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303) 465
Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304) 466
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2006 project (sec. 2305) 466
Item of Special Interest 466
Change of project title at Cape Canaveral, Florida 466
Title XXIV—Defense Agencies 467
Summary 467
Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401) 468
Family housing (sec. 2402) 468
Energy conservation projects (sec. 2403) 468
Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2404) 468
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2006 projects (sec. 2405) 468
Title XXV—North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program 469
Summary 469
Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501) 469
Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502) 469
Title XXVI—Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities 471
Summary 471
Authorized Guard and Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601) 471
Item of Special Interest 471

Page

Title XXVI—Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities—Continued
Item of Special Interest—Continued
Planning and design, Air National Guard 471
Title XXVII—Expiration and Extension of Authorizations 473
Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2701) 473
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2004 projects (sec. 2702) 473
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2003 projects (sec. 2703) 473
Effective date (sec. 2704) 473
Title XXVIII—General Provisions 475
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes 475
Three-year extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects outside the United States (sec. 2801) 475
Authority to carry out military construction projects in connection with industrial facility investment program (sec. 2802) 475
Modification of notification requirements related to cost variation authority (sec. 2803) 476
Consideration of local comparability of floor areas in construction, acquisition, and improvement of military unaccompanied housing (sec. 2804) 476
Increase in thresholds for unspecified minor military construction projects (sec. 2805) 477
Inclusion of military transportation and support systems in energy savings programs (sec. 2806) 477
Repeal of authority to convey property at closed or realigned military installations to support military construction (sec. 2807) 477
Repeal of requirement to determine availability of suitable alternate housing for acquisition in lieu of construction of new family housing (sec. 2808) 478
Updating foreign currency fluctuation adjustment for certain military family housing leases in Korea (sec. 2809) 478
Pilot projects for acquisition or construction of military unaccompanied housing (sec. 2810) 479
Certification required for certain military construction projects (sec. 2811) 479
Modification of land acquisition authority, Perquimans County, North Carolina (sec. 2812) 480
Naming of research laboratory at Air Force Rome Research Site, Rome, New York, in honor of Sherwood L. Boehlert, a Member of the House of Representatives (sec. 2813) 480
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration 480
Consolidation of easement provisions (sec. 2821) 480
Authority to grant restrictive easements for conservation and environmental restoration purposes (sec. 2822) 480
Consolidation of provisions relating to transfers of real property within the Department of Defense and to other Federal agencies (sec. 2823) 481
Authority to use excess property as exchange under agreements to limit encroachments on military training, testing, and operations (sec. 2824) 481
Modification of utility system authority and related reporting requirements (sec. 2825) 481
Increase in authorized maximum lease term for certain structures and real property relating to structures in foreign countries (sec. 2826) 482
Modification of land transfer authority, Potomac Annex, District of Columbia (sec. 2827) 482
Subtitle C—Base Closure and Realignment 482
Defense Economic Adjustment Program: research and technical assistance (sec. 2831) 482
Extension of eligibility for community planning assistance related to certain military facilities not under Department of Defense jurisdiction (sec. 2832) 483

Page

Title XXVIII—General Provisions—Continued
Subtitle C—Base Closure and Realignment—Continued
Modification of deposit requirement in connection with lease proceeds received at military installations approved for closure or realignment after January 1, 2005 (sec. 2833) 483
Subtitle D—Land Conveyances 483
Land conveyance, Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Virginia (sec. 2841) 483
Modifications to land conveyance authority, Engineering Proving Ground, Fort Belvoir, Virginia (sec. 2842) 484
Land conveyance, Omaha, Nebraska (sec. 2843) 484
Items of Special Interest 484
Electronic access to data related to 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Round 484
Facilities for Headquarters, United States Southern Command 485
National Guard Training Site, Camp Atterbury, Indiana 486
Division C—Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations 489
Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs 489
Overview 489
Subtitle A—National Security Programs 512
National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101) 512
Defense environmental clean-up (sec. 3102) 515
Other defense activities (sec. 3103) 516
Defense nuclear waste disposal (sec. 3104) 517
Subtitle B—Other Matters 518
Notice and wait requirement applicable to certain third party financing arrangements (sec. 3111) 518
Utilization of international contributions to the Global Threat Reduction Initiative (sec. 3112) 518
Utilization of international contributions to the Second Line of Defense Core Program (sec. 3113) 519
Extension of Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (sec. 3114) 519
Two-year extension of authority for appointment of certain scientific, engineering, and technical personnel (sec. 3115) 519
Extension of deadline for transfer of lands to Los Alamos County, New Mexico, and of lands in trust for the Pueblo of San Ildefonso (sec. 3116) 520
Limitation on availability of funds for Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (sec. 3117) 520
Limitation on availability of funds for implementation of the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition Program (sec. 3118) 522
Limitation on availability of funds for construction of MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility (sec. 3119) 523
Technical correction related to authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 2006 (sec. 3120) 523
Items of Special Interest 524
The role of the Kansas City Plant in the nuclear weapons program 524
Transparency in budgeting for security requirements 524
Title XXXII—Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board 525
Authorization (sec. 3201) 525
Legislative Requirements 525
Departmental Recommendations 525
Committee Action 526
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate 526
Regulatory Impact 526
Changes in Existing Law 526
Additional Views of Senator John Cornyn 527
Additional Views of Senator Bill Nelson, Florida 528

109TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
109–254

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

MAY 9, 2006.—Ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany S. 2766]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would:

(1) authorize appropriations for (a) procurement, (b) research, development, test and evaluation, (c) operation and maintenance and the revolving and management funds of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2007;

(2) authorize the personnel end strengths for each military active duty component of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2007;

(3) authorize the personnel end strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2007;

(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 2007; and

(7) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2007.

Committee overview and recommendations

From Europe to the Middle East and from Asia to Africa, the presence of U.S. forces and their contributions to regional peace and security reassure our allies and deter our adversaries. Since 2001, U.S. armed forces have been engaged in the global war on terrorism. Today, there are over 250,000 uniformed personnel deployed or stationed in approximately 120 countries. U.S. military forces are involved in overseas deployments at an unprecedented rate.

Currently, the central battlegrounds in the war on terrorism are in Iraq and Afghanistan. For each of these countries, the road to peace, stability, and democracy has been marked by historical milestones, with elections that chose a permanent government, a referendum that adopted a permanent constitution, and progress in building security forces capable of protecting their nation's freedom. Behind the backdrop of these achievements, U.S. forces continue the difficult work of counterinsurgency, stabilization, and reconstruction. Beyond the borders of Iraq and Afghanistan, U.S. armed forces are engaged in a broad array of missions, ranging from counterinsurgency and counterterrorism training to keeping the peace, fighting terrorists, providing humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, and participating in civil-military operations.

The accomplishments in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the global war on terrorism are a tribute to the dedication and skills of our men and women in uniform who are willing to respond to the call to duty, and to the military leaders who lead them. The successes achieved have come at a great sacrifice to the members of the armed forces and their families and the countless civilians and contractors who support them. Tragically, many have been killed while serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, and many others have been wounded. A grateful nation remembers and honors their sacrifices.

While addressing current threats to our nation's security and planning for emerging threats, the military faces a number of challenges, including increasing health care costs, operational readiness and recruiting and retention, modernization and transformation of the armed forces during a time of war, and reforming the acquisition system. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 addresses these challenges, while continuing a tradition of providing the best training, equipment, and protection possible for the American warfighter.

In conjunction with the submission of the President's budget request, the Department of Defense released its Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) Report. This QDR is the second conducted by this administration and the first to be conducted in wartime. The QDR reflects a continuing shift from the predominately conventional warfare of the last century toward the irregular warfare of today and the projected disruptive warfare of the future. The QDR also reflects a process of change that has occurred since the terrorist at-

tacks against the United States on September 11, 2001, and has been accelerated by the lessons learned in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Department has promised to issue updates to its originally released report as additional assessments are completed.

This QDR is forward-looking, including recommendations on initiatives for the near and long term to provide the United States with the capabilities it needs to secure its freedom in the decades ahead. Some of these recommendations will be implemented in fiscal year 2007 and others in future years. The committee carefully reviewed all the Department's proposals and included some of them in this bill.

The committee believes that further explanation and analysis is needed on how the Department integrates threat assessments into its capabilities-based force structure planning; the assumptions and planning guidelines that informed the recommended capabilities necessary to meet future threats; and a more comprehensive risk assessment that describes the additional capabilities that would be needed to mitigate risks. The committee will undertake a careful review of the QDR in the months ahead, including a review of subsequent assessments completed by the Department.

To date, in the second session of the 109th Congress, the Committee on Armed Services has conducted 36 hearings and received numerous policy and operational briefings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 2007 and related defense issues. During the course of these deliberations, the committee identified seven priorities to guide its work on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007. These priorities include:

(1) providing our men and women in uniform with the resources, training, technology, equipment, and authorities they need to win the global war on terrorism, with a particular focus on supporting ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan;

(2) enhancing the ability of the Department to fulfill its homeland defense responsibilities by providing the resources, authorities, and equipment necessary for the Department to assist in protecting our nation against current and anticipated forms of attack;

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

(4) continuing the committee's commitment to improve the quality of life for those who serve—active, Reserve, National Guard, and retired—and their families; enhancing incentives to recruit and retain those who volunteer to serve in the armed forces; providing the best possible care and rehabilitation services for those who bear the wounds of combat; and ensuring generous support for the survivors of those military personnel killed in the defense of our nation;

(5) sustaining the readiness of our armed forces to conduct military operations against current and anticipated threats;

(6) supporting the Department's efforts to develop innovative, forward-looking capabilities necessary to modernize and transform the armed forces to successfully counter current and future threats, particularly by enhancing our technology in areas such as unmanned systems, personnel protection sys-

tems, and measures to counter improvised explosive devices; and

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

The President's budget for defense for fiscal year 2007 builds on the investments made in recent years by providing real increases in defense spending to combat terrorism and secure the homeland, to enhance the quality of life of our military personnel and their families, and to modernize and transform the U.S. armed forces to meet current and future threats.

In order to fund these priorities, the committee, following the Senate-passed budget resolution, recommended $467.7 billion in budget authority for defense programs for fiscal year 2007, an increase of $26.2 billion—or 4.1 percent in real terms—above the amount authorized by the Congress in fiscal year 2006. The committee authorized $85.7 billion in procurement funding, a $2.8 billion increase above the President's budget request; $74.2 billion in funding for research, development, test, and evaluation, a $1.0 billion increase over the requested level; and $112.0 billion for military personnel, a $1.3 billion increase over the requested level. The committee also recommended $50.0 billion in emergency supplemental funding for fiscal year 2007 for activities in support of operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the global war on terrorism.

To provide the Department with the resources it needs to win the global war on terrorism, the committee provided the following resources to U.S. forces:

(1) For ground forces, the committee authorized more than $33.0 billion for ground and aviation equipment, an increase of almost $1.0 billion, and $2.1 billion for the procurement of equipment needed for the global war on terrorism for the Army and Marine Corps in the bridge supplemental.

(2) For special operations forces, the committee added nearly $90.0 million, including $66.7 million to procure critical equipment to prosecute the global war on terrorism; and nearly $20.0 million for research, development, test, and evaluation programs.

(3) For the Navy and Marine Corps, the committee authorized $3.6 billion for vertical lift assets.

(4) For air forces, the committee set forth policy prohibiting the incremental funding of aircraft and provided full funding for the F–22A Raptor. The committee authorized an additional $1.4 billion for the procurement of 20 F–22A aircraft.

(5) For strategic airlift, the committee authorized $2.6 billion, including two additional C–17A aircraft, for total procurement of 14 C–17A aircraft.

The committee also provided the Department with important resources and authorities to enhance its ability to defend the homeland against man-made or natural disasters or missile attacks.

(1) In the areas of chemical and biological defense, and chemical weapons demilitarization, the committee added $71.0 million for chemical and biological agent detection, and the development and fielding of technology to counter the threat of chemical and biological weapons.

(2) To more effectively support local, state, and federal agencies in response to man-made or natural disasters, the committee authorized the Secretary of Defense to approve the deployment of Weapons of Mass Destruction–Civil Support Teams (WMD–CST) to Canada and Mexico, if requested; expanded the types of emergencies for which the Secretary of Defense may prepare or employ WMD–CST; and added $13.5 million for the development of a sustainable training program, and for equipment upgrades to ensure the standardization of equipment for all the teams. The committee also included a provision that would update the Insurrection Act to clarify the President's authority to use the armed forces, including the National Guard in federal service, to restore order and enforce federal laws in cases where, as a result of a terrorist attack, epidemic, or natural disaster, public order has broken down.

(3) To defend the United States, its deployed forces, and its allies against missile attack, the committee authorized $10.5 billion for ballistic missile defense, but shifted funds from long-term developmental efforts to support near-term capabilities.

As our forces undertake important missions abroad and at home, the committee placed high priority on force protection for U.S. deployed forces. The committee closely monitors force protection capabilities available to deployed forces, and remains actively engaged with the Department to ensure that all requirements to improve force protection are fully funded. Accordingly, the committee authorized over $1.0 billion for various programs to protect personnel, vehicles, and installations, including: an additional $950.5 million for force protection equipment, including $559.8 million for up-armored high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles; and $100.0 million for counter-IED engineer vehicles. The committee also authorized $2.1 billion for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund to facilitate the rapid development of new technology and tactics and the rapid deployment of equipment to counter improvised explosive devices (IED); and an additional $45.8 million for various projects to procure and develop IED countermeasures.

Investing in our uniformed personnel remains among the committee's highest priorities. To improve the quality of life of our armed forces—active, Reserve, National Guard, and retired—and their families, the committee authorized a 2.2 percent across-the-board pay raise for all military personnel and a mid-year targeted pay raise for mid-level non-commissioned officers and warrant officers.

Additionally, in the area of health care, the committee recognized that the Department faces the challenge of increasing health care costs, and recommended a number of health care reform steps. The committee remains concerned about the ability of the military health care system to identify and prevent post-traumatic stress disorder and other mental health conditions related to deployments, and approved expansion of pilot programs to address these needs for both active and reserve component members. Among the reforms authorized, the committee included a provision to prohibit the payment by employers of financial incentives to TRICARE-eligible retirees to encourage them to use TRICARE instead of the health insurance offered to other employees. While the committee has acted to greatly increase use of the more economical mail order pharmacy program, the committee also included a provision to clar-

ify that the Department's retail pharmacy program qualifies for federal pricing, as authorized in title 38, United States Code. However, the committee did not authorize requested increases in TRICARE enrollment fees in fiscal year 2007, and directed the Comptroller General to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the Department's health care costs and savings proposal.

Benefits and services available to family members are also important to their quality of life. The committee recognizes the sacrifices and hardships endured by family members. As such, the committee fully funded all of the benefits for family members included in the President's budget request, and extended the telecommunications benefit for deployed and hospitalized soldiers.

In addition, following the Senate-passed budget resolution, the committee included a provision to repeal the requirement for reduction of annuities received by surviving spouses under the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) by the amount of any dependency and indemnity compensation also received. Additionally, the committee accelerated the effective date for paid-up coverage under the SBP from October 1, 2008, to October 1, 2006.

To sustain the readiness of the armed forces to perform critical missions, the committee added funding to address shortfalls in a number of key readiness accounts. Over the past five years, U.S. ground forces have experienced high operational tempo due to combat operations and sustained overseas missions. In response, the committee authorized active-duty end strengths of 512,400 for the Army, 30,000 over the requested level; 340,700 for the Navy; 180,000 for the Marine Corps, 5,000 over the requested level; and 334,200 for the Air Force. The committee also authorized end strength for the Army National Guard at 350,000, providing that, in the event the National Guard is unable to recruit up to the 350,000 level, unused personnel funds may only be used to procure Army National Guard equipment. The committee supported a variety of incentives and bonuses for active duty and reserve components to ensure the Department can recruit and retain the highest-quality volunteer force.

In order to confront irregular warfare threats, the Department must modernize and transform the armed forces. Since 2001, the Department has undergone significant modernization and transformation even during a time of war. The committee supported the Department's transformational activities, including authorizing funds for the construction of eight ships, for a total of $12.1 billion; including a provision to promote coordinated joint development, procurement, and operation of unmanned systems; adding funds for the continued development of the Joint Strike Fighter interchangeable engine during fiscal year 2007; authorizing the budget request of $3.7 billion for the Army's Future Combat Systems program; and authorizing an increase of nearly $365.0 million over the President's budget request of $11.1 billion for science and technology programs.

The committee remains concerned about the size of the Navy's fleet. As a maritime nation, the strength of our economy, the face of our diplomacy, the course of our foreign policy, and the security of our nation are built upon the Navy's ability to maintain global presence and to exercise freedom of maneuver upon the seas. However, in the last 15 years, there has been a declining trend in ship-

building and a diminishing capacity in the shipbuilding industrial base. The fleet has been reduced to its smallest size since before World War II. The committee believes that prudent decisions must be made to reverse the current trend in the construction of warships, or risk our margin of naval superiority for the next generation.

To strengthen the shipbuilding program and the industrial base, the committee included provisions to:

(1) fund the construction of eight warships (one more than the President's request) and two new warship classes;

(2) implement a long-range plan for the procurement of three ships of the future aircraft carrier class-CVN–21, which will improve the affordability of the future aircraft carrier class by authorizing multiple ship material procurements and stable funding over four year increments;

(3) lay the groundwork to increase the submarine building rate to ensure continued undersea superiority; and

(4) increase investment in the National Shipbuilding Research Program.

To provide more flexible capabilities to the warfighter, the committee supported increased investment in unmanned systems. In the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001, the committee established initial requirements for the use of unmanned air and ground combat vehicles. Five years later, the time has come to build upon the commitment made by this committee. Accordingly, the committee included a provision directing the Secretary of Defense to develop a department-wide policy for development and operation of unmanned systems.

Increasingly, the committee has emphasized the importance of developing capabilities to plan and conduct coalition operations. Ten years ago, the committee expressed concerns regarding the lack of engine competition in the Joint Strike Fighter program. As a result, the committee included a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) that directed the Secretary of Defense to evaluate at least two propulsion concepts from competing engine companies. Recently, the committee held hearings to review the Department's unilateral proposal, despite legislative direction to maintain a two-engine program, to eliminate the development of the F136 alternate interchangeable engine from the Joint Strike Fighter program. The committee remains concerned that relying on one engine provider to perform multiple missions, for multiple services and multiple nations presents an unnecessary operational and financial risk to the United States. Accordingly, the committee authorized provisions adding $400.8 million for the continued development of the interchangeable engine during fiscal year 2007; and directing the Secretary of Defense to continue the development and sustainment of the Joint Strike Fighter program with two competitive propulsion systems throughout the life of the aircraft or enter into a one-time, firm-fixed-price contract for a single propulsion system throughout the life of the aircraft.

Finally, in the areas of acquisition and contract management, the committee took a number of steps over the last decade to improve the Department's acquisition and procurement of services, equipment, and weapons systems. Similarly, the Department completed

a significant review of the defense acquisition systems for major weapons programs, which will impact the Department's acquisition system. To continue the momentum of past efforts to improve the Department's acquisition system, the committee included provisions:

(1) requiring major automated information systems that breach cost, schedule, or performance goals to follow similar reporting requirements to other major defense acquisition programs;

(2) authorizing the Department to conduct a pilot program using time-certain development in the acquisition of major weapons systems;

(3) requiring better alignment of authority and tenure of program managers with desired acquisition outcomes;

(4) ensuring evaluation of contract performance is linked to acquisition outcomes and that award and incentive fees are used appropriately to incentivize excellent performance;

(5) establishing a preference for fixed-price contract for development programs; and

(6) establishing a senior acquisition executive for U.S. Special Operations Command.

In addition to the above priorities, the committee addressed the QDR priorities of strengthening interagency operations and providing greater flexibility in the United States Government's ability to partner directly with nations in fighting terrorism. Increasingly, operations have become more interagency and coalition in nature and will be for the forseeable future. In this regard, the United States Government must employ all instruments of national power to achieve peace and security in the troubled regions around the world. Accordingly, the committee:

(1) included a provision that would require the President to develop a plan to establish interagency operating procedures for federal agencies to plan and conduct stabilization and reconstruction operations;

(2) included a provision that would provide the heads of all executive branch agencies the same authorities the Secretary of State has with respect to providing allowances, benefits, and death gratuities for Foreign Service or civilian personnel serving in Iraq and Afghanistan;

(3) expanded authorities for geographic combatant commanders to train and equip foreign military forces, and to provide urgent humanitarian relief and reconstruction assistance to foreign nations;

(4) expanded authority to provide logistics support, supplies, and services to allies and coalition partners;

(5) expanded Department 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; and

(6) required a coordinated United States Government legal opinion on whether certain, specified interrogation techniques comply with the prohibition on cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment set out in the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005.

As the committee considers the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, much work remains to be done in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other locations to secure hard-won military successes and to preserve peace and freedom. To continue the momentum of the past five years in the global war on terrorism, the Congress and the executive branch must work together to build on the considerable strengths of our military and their record of success. To ensure the security of America, the U.S. armed forces must be sustained, modernized, and transformed. The committee believes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 sustains the advances made in recent years, and provides the necessary investments to prepare for the future.

Explanation of funding summary

The administration's budget authorization request for the national defense function of the federal budget for fiscal year 2007 was $505.4 billion, including a request for $50.0 billion in emergency supplemental spending for ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. According to the estimating procedures used by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the budget implication of the amount requested was $512.9 billion. The funding summary table that follows uses the budget authority as calculated by CBO.

The following table summarizes both the direct authorizations and equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 2007 defense programs. The columns relating to the authorization request do not include funding for the following items: military construction authorizations provided in prior years; and other portions of the defense budget that are not within the jurisdiction of this committee, or that do not require an annual authorization.

Funding for all programs in the national defense function is reflected in the columns related to the budget authority request and the total budget authority implication of the authorizations in this report.

The committee recommends funding for national defense programs totaling $517.7 billion in budget authority, including an authorization of $50.0 billion in emergency supplemental spending for ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. This funding is within the budget authority level for the national defense function recommended in the Senate version of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2007 (S. Con Res. 83), which was adopted by the Senate on March 16, 2006.

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2007

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorized	Budget Authority Implication Request	Budget Authority Implication Senate
DIVISION A					
Title I -- PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army	3,566,483	-109,154	3,457,329	3,566,483	3,457,329
Missile Procurement, Army	1,350,898	77,961	1,428,859	1,350,898	1,428,859
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	2,301,943	547,800	2,849,743	2,301,943	2,849,743
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,903,125	133,660	2,036,785	1,903,125	2,036,785
Other Procurement, Army	7,718,602	11,000	7,729,602	7,718,602	7,729,602
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	10,868,771	-164,616	10,704,155	10,868,771	10,704,155
Weapons Procurement, Navy	2,555,020	32,000	2,587,020	2,555,020	2,587,020
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and MC	789,943	20,000	809,943	789,943	809,943
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	10,578,553	1,480,000	12,058,553	10,578,553	12,058,553
Other Procurement, Navy	4,967,916	77,600	5,045,516	4,967,916	5,045,516
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,273,513	26,700	1,300,213	1,273,513	1,300,213
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	11,479,810	524,286	12,004,096	11,479,810	12,004,096
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	1,072,749	4,000	1,076,749	1,072,749	1,076,749
Missile Procurement, Air Force	4,204,145	20,000	4,224,145	4,204,145	4,224,145
Other Procurement, Air Force	15,408,086	26,500	15,434,586	15,408,086	15,434,586
Procurement, Defense-wide	2,861,461	119,037	2,980,498	2,861,461	2,980,498
Defense Production Act Purchases				18,484	18,484
Total Procurement	**82,901,018**	**2,826,774**	**85,727,792**	**82,919,502**	**85,746,276**
Title II -- RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	10,855,559	295,450	11,151,009	10,855,559	11,166,009
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	16,912,223	539,600	17,451,823	16,912,223	17,451,823
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, AF	24,396,767	4,090	24,400,857	24,396,767	24,400,857
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Def	20,809,939	169,000	20,978,939	20,809,939	20,978,939
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	181,520		181,520	181,520	181,520
Total RDT&E	**73,156,008**	**1,008,140**	**74,164,148**	**73,156,008**	**74,179,148**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2007

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorized	Budget Authority Implication Request	Budget Authority Implication Senate
Title III -- OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE & OTHER PROGRAMS					
Operation and Maintenance					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	24,902,380	-106,800	24,795,580	24,902,380	24,795,580
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	31,330,984	-200,200	31,130,784	31,330,984	31,130,784
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	3,878,962	26,300	3,905,262	3,878,962	3,905,262
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	31,342,307	-91,200	31,251,107	31,342,307	31,251,107
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	20,075,656	31,100	20,106,756	20,075,656	20,106,756
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	2,299,202	-159,500	2,139,702	2,299,202	2,139,702
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,288,764		1,288,764	1,288,764	1,288,764
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	211,911		211,911	211,911	211,911
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	2,723,800	-148,700	2,575,100	2,723,800	2,575,100
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	4,838,665	19,063	4,857,728	4,838,665	4,857,728
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	5,336,017	-17,300	5,318,717	5,336,017	5,318,717
Transfer Accounts	1,403,295	90,000	1,493,295	1,403,295	1,493,295
Miscellaneous Appropriations	457,053		457,053	457,053	457,053
Subtotal Operation and Maintenance	**130,088,996**	**-557,237**	**129,531,759**	**130,088,996**	**129,531,759**
Other Programs					
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Def	926,890		926,890	926,890	926,890
Defense Health Program	21,025,121	-109,800	20,915,321	21,025,121	20,915,321
Office of the Inspector General	216,297		216,297	216,297	216,297
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army	1,277,304		1,277,304	1,277,304	1,277,304
Subtotal Other Programs	**23,445,612**	**-109,800**	**23,335,812**	**23,445,612**	**23,335,812**
Revolving and Management Funds					
Def Working Capital Funds (A, N, AF, Def-wide)	161,998		161,998	161,998	161,998
Defense Working Capital Funds - DeCA	1,184,000		1,184,000	1,184,000	1,184,000

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2007

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorized	Budget Authority Implication Request	Budget Authority Implication Senate
National Defense Sealift Fund	1,071,932		1,071,932	1,071,932	1,071,932
Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund	18,500		18,500	18,500	18,500
Subtotal Revolving and Mgt Funds	**2,436,430**		**2,436,430**	**2,436,430**	**2,436,430**
Total O&M & Other Programs	**155,971,038**	**-667,037**	**155,304,001**	**155,971,038**	**155,304,001**
MILITARY PERSONNEL	**110,776,768**	**1,266,700**	**112,043,468**	**110,776,768**	**112,043,468**
Title X -- GENERAL PROVISIONS					
General Transfer Authority (non-additive)	[5,000,000]	[-1,000,000]	[4,000,000]		
Inflation Savings		-951,469	-951,469		-951,469
National Foreign Language Coordination Council		1,500	1,500		1,500
Subtotal General Provisions		**-949,969**	**-949,969**		**-949,969**
DIVISION B					
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION					
Military Construction, Army	2,059,762	120,999	2,180,761	2,059,762	2,180,761
Military Construction, Navy	1,162,038	106,801	1,268,839	1,162,038	1,268,839
Military Construction, Air Force	1,156,148	101,128	1,257,276	1,156,148	1,257,276
Military Construction, Defense-wide	1,208,198	-4,517	1,203,681	1,208,198	1,203,681
NATO Security Investment Program	220,985	-15,000	205,985	220,985	205,985
Base Realignment and Closure Account IV	191,220		191,220	191,220	191,220
Base Realignment and Closure Account 2005	5,626,223	-99,329	5,526,894	5,626,223	5,526,894
Military Construction, Army National Guard	473,197	50,834	524,031	473,197	644,031
Military Construction, Air National Guard	125,788	116,355	242,143	125,788	242,143
Military Construction, Army Reserve	166,487	23,330	189,817	166,487	189,817
Military Construction, Naval and MC Reserve	48,408		48,408	48,408	72,408
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	44,936		44,936	44,936	44,936

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2007

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorized	Budget Authority Implication Request	Budget Authority Implication Senate
Military Construction, Foreign Currency Fluctuations					
Chem Agents and Munitions Destruction	130,993	10,000	140,993	130,993	140,993
Subtotal Military Construction	**12,614,383**	**410,601**	**13,024,984**	**12,614,383**	**13,168,984**
FAMILY HOUSING					
Family Housing Construction, Army	1,271,820		1,271,820	1,271,820	1,271,820
Family Housing Support, Army					
Family Housing Construction, Navy and MC	814,197		814,197	814,197	814,197
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps		-10,601	-10,601		-10,601
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	1,938,209		1,938,209	1,938,209	1,938,209
Family Housing Support, Air Force					
Family Housing Construction, Defense-wide	57,314		57,314	57,314	57,314
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide					
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund	2,500		2,500	2,500	2,500
Subtotal Family Housing	**4,084,040**	**-10,601**	**4,073,439**	**4,084,040**	**4,073,439**
Prior Year Rescissions					
Total Mil Con and Family Housing	**16,698,423**	**400,000**	**17,098,423**	**16,698,423**	**17,242,423**
OTHER DoD MILITARY (Discretionary)					
Receipts from Travel and Purchase Card Refunds					51,000
Armed Forces Retirement Home Fund	54,846		54,846		
Disposal of DoD Real Property				15,000	15,000
Lease of DoD Real Property				12,000	12,000

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2007

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorized	Budget Authority Implication Request	Senate
Overseas Facility Investment Recovery				1,000	1,000
Total Other DoD Military Discretionary	**54,846**		**54,846**	**28,000**	**79,000**
Subfunction (051) Department of Defense Disc	**439,558,101**	**3,884,608**	**443,442,709**	**439,549,739**	**443,644,347**
OTHER DoD MILITARY (Mandatory)					
Concurrent Receipt Accrual Payment				2,369,000	2,369,000
Commissary Facililities, Defense					5,000
Restoration of Rocky Mountain Arsenal				9,000	6,000
Allied Contributions and Cooperation Account				600,000	600,000
Trust Funds - Department of Defense				247,000	235,000
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund					-50,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation				288,000	
Offsetting Receipts				-1,565,000	-1,239,000
SBP (Accelerate Paid Up Provision and Eliminate DIC Offset)		975,000	975,000		975,000
Total Other DoD Military Mandatory				**1,948,000**	**1,926,000**
Subfunction (051) DOD Mandatory		**975,000**	**975,000**	**1,948,000**	**2,901,000**
SUBFUNCTION (051) TOTAL DOD MIL	**439,558,101**	**4,859,608**	**444,417,709**	**441,497,739**	**446,545,347**
DIVISION C					
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)					
Energy Supply	6,079	-6,079		6,079	
National Nuclear Security Administration					
Weapons Activities	6,407,889	47,500	6,455,389	6,407,889	6,455,389
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,726,213		1,726,213	1,726,213	1,726,213

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2007

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorized	Budget Authority Implication Request	Budget Authority Implication Senate
Naval Reactors	795,133		795,133	795,133	795,133
Office of the Administrator	386,576	-30,000	356,576	386,576	356,576
Subtotal National Nuclear Security Admin	**9,315,811**	**17,500**	**9,333,311**	**9,315,811**	**9,333,311**
Environmental and Other Defense Activities					
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,390,312	40,000	5,430,312	5,390,312	5,430,312
Other Defense Activities	717,788	-93,258	624,530	717,788	624,530
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	388,080	-55,000	333,080	388,080	333,080
Subtotal Environ & Other Def Activities	**6,496,180**	**-108,258**	**6,387,922**	**6,496,180**	**6,387,922**
Subtotal Department of Energy	**15,818,070**	**-96,837**	**15,721,233**	**15,818,070**	**15,721,233**
OTHER ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (Discretionary)					
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	22,260		22,260	22,260	22,260
Corps of Engineers - Civil Works				130,000	130,000
Total Other Atomic Energy Def Disc	**22,260**		**22,260**	**152,260**	**152,260**
Subfunction (053) Atomic Energy Def Disc	**15,840,330**	**-96,837**	**15,743,493**	**15,970,330**	**15,873,493**
OTHER ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (Mandatory)					
Energy Employees Illness Compensation Fund				874,000	371,000
Energy Employees Compensation - Administration				162,000	146,000
NNSA Office of the Administrator				11,000	
Subfunction (053) Other Atomic Energy Def Mand				**1,047,000**	**517,000**
SUBFUNCTION (053) ATOMIC ENERGY	**15,840,330**	**-96,837**	**15,743,493**	**17,017,330**	**16,390,493**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2007

(Dollars in Thousands)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorized	Budget Authority Implication Request	Budget Authority Implication Senate
DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)					
Department of Homeland Security				1,275,100	1,275,100
Department of Justice - FBI Salaries and Expenses				2,307,994	2,307,994
Department of Trans - MARAD Maritime Security Program				154,000	154,000
Intelligence Community Management Account				634,811	634,811
National Science Foundation - Antarctic Research Activities				67,000	67,000
Selective Service System - Salaries and Expenses				24,255	24,255
Subfunction (054) Defense Related Activities Disc				**4,463,160**	**4,463,160**
OTHER DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES (Mandatory)					
CIA Retirement & Disability				251,000	251,000
Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund				43,000	32,000
Subfunction (054) Defense Related Activities Mand				**294,000**	**283,000**
SUBFUNCTION (054) TOTAL DEFENSE-RELATED ACTIVITIES				**4,757,160**	**4,746,160**
Total National Def Funct (050) Disc	**455,398,431**	**3,787,771**	**459,186,202**	**459,983,229**	**463,981,000**
Total National Def Funct (050) Mand		**975,000**	**975,000**	**3,289,000**	**3,701,000**
TOTAL NATIONAL DEF FUNCT (050)	**455,398,431**	**4,762,771**	**460,161,202**	**463,272,229**	**467,682,000**
Title XV: OIF/OEF 2006 Emergency Supplemental	**50,000,000**		**50,000,000**	**50,000,000**	**50,000,000**
TOTAL	**505,398,431**		**510,161,202**	**513,272,229**	**517,682,000**

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 2007 budget request for procurement programs, and indicate those programs for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense), without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in this report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

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

Title I -- PROCUREMENT	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorization
Aircraft Procurement, Army	**3,566,483**	**-109,154**	**3,457,329**
Missile Procurement, Army	**1,350,898**	**77,961**	**1,428,859**
Procurement of W&TCV, Army	**2,301,943**	**547,800**	**2,849,743**
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	**1,903,125**	**133,660**	**2,036,785**
Other Procurement, Army	**7,718,602**	**11,000**	**7,729,602**
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	**10,868,771**	**-164,616**	**10,704,155**
Weapons Procurement, Navy	**2,555,020**	**32,000**	**2,587,020**
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	**789,943**	**20,000**	**809,943**
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	**10,578,553**	**1,480,000**	**12,058,553**
Other Procurement, Navy	**4,967,916**	**77,600**	**5,045,516**
Procurement, Marine Corps	**1,273,513**	**26,700**	**1,300,213**
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	**11,479,810**	**524,286**	**12,004,096**
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	**1,072,749**	**4,000**	**1,076,749**
Missile Procurement, Air Force	**4,204,145**	**20,000**	**4,224,145**
Other Procurement, Air Force	**15,408,086**	**26,500**	**15,434,586**
Procurement, Defense-Wide	**2,861,461**	**119,037**	**2,980,498**
National Guard and Reserve Equipment			
Defense Production Act Purchases			
TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**82,901,018**	**2,826,774**	**85,727,792**

Subtitle B—Army Programs

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accoui	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Aircraft Procurement, Army						
		Aircraft						
		Fixed Wing						
2031	1	UTILITY F/W CARGO AIRCRAFT		109,154		-109,154		
		Future Cargo Aircraft ahead of need				[-109,154]		
2031	2	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT		4,060				4,060
		Rotary Wing						
2031	3	ARMED RECONNAISSANCE HELICOPTER	18	141,418			18	141,418
2031	4	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	39	198,677			39	198,677
2031	5	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	38	632,542			38	632,542
2031	5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-77,991				-77,991
2031	6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		185,845				185,845
2031	7	HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING						
		Modification of Aircraft						
2031	8	GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)		58,000				58,000
2031	9	ARL MODS (TIARA)		48,000				48,000
2031	10	AH-64 MODS		794,387				794,387
2031	10	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-18,746				-18,746
2031	11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		19,000				19,000
2031	12	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS		607,663				607,663
2031	12	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-24,358				-24,358
2031	13	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		36,740				36,740
2031	14	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS		9,953				9,953
2031	15	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS		364				364
2031	16	LONGBOW						
2031	16	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
2031	17	UH-60 MODS		30,891				30,891
2031	17	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
2031	18	KIOWA WARRIOR		43,654				43,654
2031	19	AIRBORNE AVIONICS		156,452				156,452
2031	20	GATM ROLLUP		31,666				31,666
		Spares and Repair Parts						
2031	21	SPARE PARTS (AIR)		9,446				9,446
		Support Equipment and Facilities						
		Ground Support Avionics						
2031	22	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT		27,920				27,920
2031	23	ASE INFRARED CM		305,631				305,631
		Other Support						
2031	24	AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL		40,220				40,220
2031	25	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,062				5,062
2031	26	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		64,683				64,683
2031	27	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS		35,346				35,346
2031	28	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		86,351				86,351
2031	29	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		2,100				2,100
2031	30	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET		2,353				2,353
2031	31	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS						
		Total - Aircraft Procurement, Army		**3,566,483**		**-109,154**		**3,457,329**

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accour	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Missile Procurement, Army						
		Other Missiles						
		Surface-to-Air Missile System						
2032	1	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY	108	489,067		25,000	108	514,067
		PAC-3 missiles				[25,000]		
2032	2	SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYSTEM SUMMARY		12,039		-12,039		
		SLAMRAAM procurement ahead of need				[-12,039]		
2032	3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		10,000		-10,000		
		SLAMRAAM procurement ahead of need				[-10,000]		
		Air-to-surface Missile System						
2032	4	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY						
		Anti-tank/Assault Missile System						
2032	5	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	300	104,782			300	104,782
2032	5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
2032	6	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	949	50,541			949	50,541
2032	6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-18,900				-18,900
2032	7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		32,700				32,700
2032	8	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	702	147,795			702	147,795
2032	9	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	3,762	20,926			3,762	20,926
2032	10	MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS						
2032	11	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (HIMAI	50	226,884			50	226,884
2032	12	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	43	60,502			43	60,502
		Modification of Missiles						
		Modifications						
2032	13	PATRIOT MODS		69,856		75,000		144,856
		Patriot configuration 3 initiative				[75,000]		
2032	14	JAVELIN MISSILE MODS		10,371				10,371

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
2032	15	ITAS/TOW MODS		84,350				84,350
2032	16	MLRS MODS		6,913				6,913
2032	17	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS		9,374				9,374
2032	18	HELLFIRE MODIFICATIONS						
		Spares and Repair Parts						
2032	19	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		25,794				25,794
		Support Equipment and Facilities						
2032	20	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		3,924				3,924
2032	21	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)		10				10
2032	22	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		3,970				3,970
		Total - Missile Procurement Army		**1,350,898**		**77,961**		**1,428,859**
		Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, A						
		Tracked Combat Vehicles						
2033	1	ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD		899				899
2033	2	BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT		284,966		238,800		523,766
		Bradley A3 conversion program				[238,800]		
2033	3	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)		4,721				4,721
2033	4	ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES		899				899
2033	5	STRYKER VEHICLE	100	795,978			100	795,978
		Modification of Tracked Combat Vehicles						
2033	6	CARRIER, MOD		22,969		139,000		161,969
		M113 recap				[139,000]		
2033	7	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)		32,028				32,028
2033	8	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, FIST VEHICLE						
2033	9	BFVS SERIES (MOD)		69,988				69,988

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
2033	10	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		28,714				28,714
2033	11	FAASV PIP TO FLEET						
2033	12	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)	12	36,494			12	36,494
2033	13	ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)		66,054				66,054
2033	14	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		364,899				364,899
2033	15	SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2	23	171,097		170,000	23	341,097
		M1A2 SEP				[170,000]		
		Support Equipment and Facilities						
2033	16	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV)		422				422
2033	17	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		11,685				11,685
		Weapons and Other Combat Vehicles						
2033	18	HOWITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM, M119	10	20,369			10	20,369
2033	19	INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY		32,339				32,339
2033	20	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62MM)	3,025	43,175			3,025	43,175
2033	21	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN (5.56MM)	8,600	36,614			8,600	36,614
2033	22	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN (40MM)	68	1,725			68	1,725
2033	23	MORTAR SYSTEMS						
2033	24	M16 RIFLE	2,950	1,844			2,950	1,844
2033	25	M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE	390	8,458			390	8,458
2033	26	XM110 SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM (SASS)		15,300				15,300
2033	27	M4 CARBINE	1,475	2,221			1,475	2,221
2033	28	SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM (MASS)						
2033	29	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION						
2033	30	HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T)	85	187,489			85	187,489
		Modification of Weapons and Other Combat Vehicles						
2033	31	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS		3,168				3,168
2033	32	M4 CARBINE MODS		30,871				30,871

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
2033	33	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS						
2033	34	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS		5,253				5,253
2033	35	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		5,293				5,293
2033	36	PHALANX MODS						
2033	37	HOWITZER, TOWED, 155MM, M198 (MODS)						
2033	38	M119 MODIFICATIONS		692				692
2033	39	M16 RIFLE MODS		1,012				1,012
2033	40	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		1,700				1,700
		Support Equipment and Facilities						
2033	41	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		507				507
2033	42	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		6,331				6,331
2033	43	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		3,019				3,019
2033	44	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		2,750				2,750
2033	45	REF SMALL ARMS						
2033	46	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
		Spares						
2033	47	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)						
		Total - Procurement of WTCV, Army		**2,301,943**		**547,800**		**2,849,743**
		Procurement of Ammunition, Army						
		Ammunition						
		Small/Medium Caliber Ammunition						
2034	1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		214,555				214,555
2034	2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		113,555				113,555
2034	3	CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES		3,848				3,848
2034	4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		125,112				125,112

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accour	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
2034	5	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES		101				101
2034	6	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		32,089				32,089
2034	7	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		19,431				19,431
2034	8	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		129,409				129,409
		Mortar Ammunition						
2034	9	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		13,046				13,046
2034	10	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		54,618				54,618
2034	11	CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ALL TYPES		66,506				66,506
		Tank Ammunition						
2034	12	CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES		19,584				19,584
2034	13	120MM TANK TRAINING, ALL TYPES		142,933				142,933
2034	14	CTG, TANK, 120MM TACTICAL, ALL TYPES		48,004		9,200		57,204
		M1028 120mm tank cartridge				[9,200]		
		Artillery Ammunition						
2034	15	CTG, ARTY, 75MM: ALL TYPES		2,297				2,297
2034	16	CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES		45,585		12,200		57,785
		M915 105mm DPICM (LAP) all types				[12,200]		
2034	17	CTG, ARTY, 155MM, ALL TYPES		124,099				124,099
2034	18	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982		22,971				22,971
2034	19	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS)		73,885				73,885
		Artillery Fuzes						
2034	20	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES		4,083				4,083
		Mines						
2034	21	MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES		396				396
2034	22	MINES (CONVENTIONAL), ALL TYPES		4,221				4,221
2034	23	MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES		4,897				4,897
2034	23	ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE ALTERNATIVES		85,879				85,879

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Rockets						
2034	25	SHOULDER FIRED ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		7,741				7,741
2034	26	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		136,670				136,670
		Other Ammunition						
2034	27	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		33,746		4,000		37,746
		Rapid wall breaching kit				[4,000]		
2034	28	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		54,162				54,162
2034	29	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		26,384				26,384
2034	30	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		10,791				10,791
		Miscellaneous						
2034	31	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES		3,407				3,407
2034	32	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES		30,089				30,089
2034	33	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES		2,628				2,628
2034	34	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		5,493				5,493
2034	35	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		10,306		15,000		25,306
		Ammunition peculiar equipment outloading module				[6,000]		
		Automated Tactical Ammunition Classification System				[5,000]		
		Corrosion protection covers				[4,000]		
2034	36	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)		9,552				9,552
2034	37	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES		101				101
		Ammunition Production Base Support						
		Production Base Support						
2034	38	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		116,175		93,260		209,435
		Insensitive Munitions High-shear Mixing System				[7,500]		
		Lake City Army Ammunition Plant				[18,200]		
		Modernization of forge equip at Scranton AAP				[4,000]		
		Radford AAP upgrades				[63,560]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
2034	39	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		3,064				3,064
2034	40	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES		4,743				4,743
2034	41	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMIL, ALL		94,201				94,201
2034	42	ARMS INITIATIVE		2,768				2,768
		Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Army		**1,903,125**		**133,660**		**2,036,785**
		Other Procurement, Army						
		Tactical and Support Vehicles						
		Tactical Vehicles						
2035	1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS		22,961				22,961
2035	2	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:		7,565				7,565
2035	3	SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS		11,676				11,676
2035	4	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)		582,613				582,613
2035	5	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)		695,121				695,121
2035	6	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP		29,286				29,286
2035	7	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)		353,198				353,198
2035	8	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)		155,491				155,491
2035	9	MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY						
2035	10	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916		31,202				31,202
2035	11	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SER'		220,416				220,416
2035	12	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM		34,823				34,823
2035	13	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		2,562				2,562
2035	14	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH)						
2035	15	TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL		1,725				1,725
		Non-tactical Vehicles						
2035	16	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN		609				609

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
2035	17	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		640				640
2035	18	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		3,486				3,486
		Communications and Electronics Equipment						
		Comm-Joint Communications						
2035	19	WIN - TACTICAL PROGRAM				100,000		100,000
		Increase WIN-T funding				[100,000]		
2035	20	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		4,805				4,805
		Comm-Satellite Communications						
2035	21	SECOMP-I		16,884				16,884
2035	22	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS		53,616				53,616
2035	23	SHF TERM		28,459				28,459
2035	24	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)		833				833
2035	25	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)		61,611		7,000		68,611
		Defense advanced GPS receivers				[7,000]		
2035	26	SMART-T (SPACE)		62,342				62,342
2035	27	SCAMP (SPACE)		954				954
2035	28	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS		16,803				16,803
2035	29	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)		9,113				9,113
		Comm-C3 System						
2035	30	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)		25,253				25,253
		Comm-Combat Communications						
2035	31	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)		4,890				4,890
2035	32	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM		1,302				1,302
2035	33	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		3,229				3,229
2035	34	SINCGARS FAMILY		116,523				116,523
2035	35	MULTI-PURPOSE INFO OPERATIONS SYSTEMS		10,460				10,460
2035	36	JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
2035	37	BRIDGE TO FUTURE NETWORKS		340,231		-100,000		240,231
		Joint network node reduction				[-100,000]		
2035	38	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING		5,181				5,181
2035	39	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT		27,599				27,599
2035	40	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRC		9,933				9,933
2035	41	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)		16,541				16,541
2035	42	RADIO, IMPROVED HF FAMILY		91,418				91,418
2035	43	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)		10,548				10,548
		Comm-Intelligence Communications						
2035	44	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,409				1,409
		Information Security						
2035	45	TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)		14,924				14,924
2035	46	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP		90,379				90,379
		Comm-Long Haul Communications						
2035	47	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION		14,432				14,432
2035	48	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		33,754				33,754
2035	49	ARMY DISN ROUTER						
2035	50	ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)		508				508
2035	51	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)		27,101				27,101
		Comm-Base Communications						
2035	52	INFORMATION SYSTEMS		19,553				19,553
2035	53	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)		5,726				5,726
2035	54	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGR/		279,579				279,579
2035	55	LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)						
2035	56	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM		32,711				32,711
		Elect Equip-Nat For Int Prog (NFIP)						
2035	57	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
2035	58	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
		Elect Equip-Tact Int Rel Act (TIARA)						
2035	59	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (MIP)		34,431				34,431
2035	60	JTT/CIBS-M (MIP)		985				985
2035	61	PROPHET GROUND (MIP)		96,532				96,532
2035	62	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL SYS (TUAS)MIP		100,295				100,295
2035	63	SMALL UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM (SUAS)		10,200				10,200
2035	64	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (MIP)		30,729				30,729
2035	65	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)						
2035	66	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION SYSTEM (MIP)						
2035	67	DCGS-A (MIP)		65,424				65,424
2035	68	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)		9,852				9,852
2035	69	TROJAN (MIP)		7,659				7,659
2035	70	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)		5,040				5,040
2035	71	CI HUMINT INFO MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CHIMS) MII		19,704				19,704
2035	72	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MIP)		29,739				29,739
		Elect Equip-Electronic Warfare (EW)						
2035	73	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR		16,326				16,326
2035	74	WARLOCK						
2035	75	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASU						
		Elect Equip-Tactical Surv. (TAC SURV)						
2035	76	SENTINEL MODS		15,125				15,125
2035	77	NIGHT VISION DEVICES		320,989				320,989
2035	78	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SY:		179,594				179,594
2035	79	LTWT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS)						
2035	80	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT		209,537				209,537
2035	81	RADIATION MONITORING SYSTEMS		4,393				4,393

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
2035	82	RAPID AEROSTAT INITIAL DEPLOYMENT						
2035	83	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP		802				802
2035	84	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MMS)		321				321
2035	85	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MVS)						
2035	86	ENHANCED PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE		7,441				7,441
2035	87	PROFILER		2,119				2,119
2035	88	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		19,249				19,249
2035	89	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)		160,060				160,060
2035	90	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER		50,160				50,160
2035	91	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32						
2035	92	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		38,971				38,971
2035	93	INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - MIP		3,510				3,510
2035	94	ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM						
		Elect Equip-Tactical C2 Systems						
2035	95	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS		57,707				57,707
2035	96	ADV FA TAC DATA SYS / EFF CTRL SYS		22,035				22,035
2035	97	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, AFATDS		5,434				5,434
2035	98	LIGHT WEIGHT TECHNICAL FIRE DIRECTION SYS		6,042				6,042
2035	99	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM		31,986				31,986
2035	100	FAAD C2		21,095				21,095
2035	101	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS		69,289				69,289
2035	102	FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE / LIGHTWEIGHT FED		9,305				9,305
2035	103	KNIGHT FAMILY		24,233				24,233
2035	104	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		2,022				2,022
2035	105	LOGTECH		97,235				97,235
2035	106	TC AIMS II		29,919				29,919
2035	107	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JNMS)		8,279				8,279

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
2035	108	TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER		11,355				11,355
2035	109	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)		77,023				77,023
2035	110	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)		121,808				121,808
2035	111	MOUNTED BATTLE COMMAND ON THE MOVE (MBCC		79,035				79,035
		Elect Equip - Automation						
2035	112	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM		78,403				78,403
2035	113	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION		21,636				21,636
2035	114	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		139,206				139,206
2035	115	CSS COMMUNICATIONS		15,861				15,861
2035	116	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)		28,675				28,675
		Elect Equip-Audio Visual Sys (A/V)						
2035	117	AFRTS		1,007				1,007
2035	118	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V)		6,754				6,754
2035	119	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)		1,671				1,671
		Elect Equip-Mods Tactical Sys/Eq						
2035	120	WEAPONIZATION OF UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM (U		15,161				15,161
		Elect Equip-Support						
2035	121	ITEMS UNDER $5M (SSE)		17,493				17,493
2035	122	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)		497				497
		Other Support Equipment						
		Chemical Defensive Equipment						
2035	123	CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION		38,312				38,312
2036	124	SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM)		4,079				4,079
		Bridging Equipment						
2035	125	TACTICAL BRIDGING		69,608				69,608
2035	126	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON		80,093				80,093

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Engineer (Non-construction) Equipment						
2035	127	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-F		52,829				52,829
2035	128	KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING						
2035	129	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM		197,675				197,675
2035	130	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)						
2035	131	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPM		37,269				37,269
2035	132	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT)		546				546
		Combat Service Support Equipment						
2035	133	HEATERS AND ECU'S		10,575				10,575
2035	134	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES						
2035	135	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT		9,298				9,298
2035	136	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)						
2035	137	DISMOUNTED BATTLE COMMAND SYSTEM (DBCS)		19,226				19,226
2035	138	MOUNTED WARRIOR						
2035	139	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT		36,874				36,874
2035	140	CARGO AERIAL DELIVERY PROGRAM		42,653				42,653
2035	141	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENG SPT)		5,552				5,552
2035	142	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CSS EQ)						
		Petroleum Equipment						
2035	143	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		1,293				1,293
2035	144	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER		67,867				67,867
		Water Equipment						
2035	145	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS		9,769				9,769
		Medical Equipment						
2035	146	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL		20,467				20,467
		Maintenance Equipment						
2035	147	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP)		54,732				54,732

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
2035	148	WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD		3,051				3,051
2035	149	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)						
		Construction Equipment						
2035	150	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)		2,902				2,902
2035	151	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING		1,049				1,049
2035	152	MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING		12,108				12,108
2035	153	LOADERS		13,023				13,023
2035	154	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR		2,475				2,475
2035	155	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED		4,799				4,799
2035	156	CRANES						
2035	157	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE)		47,846				47,846
2035	158	CONST EQUIP ESP		40,209				40,209
2035	159	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)		22,209				22,209
		Rail Float Containerization Equipment						
2035	160	SMALL TUG						
2035	161	LOGISTIC SUPPORT VESSEL (LSV)						
2035	162	HARBORMASTER COMMAND AND CONTROL CENTER		9,265				9,265
2035	163	CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS		8,974				8,974
2035	164	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)		2,536				2,536
		Generators						
2035	165	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP		69,468				69,468
		Material Handling Equipment						
2035	166	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)						
2035	167	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM		20,501				20,501
		Training Equipment						
2035	168	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS (CTC) SUPPORT		38,497				38,497

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
2035	169	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM		243,147		4,000		247,147
		Call-for-fire trainer				[4,000]		
2035	170	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER		16,920				16,920
2035	171	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER		80,555				80,555
		Test Measure and Dig Equipment (TMD)						
2035	172	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT		2,026				2,026
2035	173	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)		47,789				47,789
2035	174	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)		11,827				11,827
		Other Support Equipment						
2035	175	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		50,679				50,679
2035	176	IED DEFEAT EQUIPMENT						
2035	177	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		66,665				66,665
2035	178	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT		3,279				3,279
2035	179	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)		35,469				35,469
2035	180	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		2,997				2,997
2035	181	BUILDING, PRE-FAB, RELOCATABLE						
2035	182	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING		19,562				19,562
2035	183	MA8975		2,423				2,423
		Spares and Repair Parts						
		OPA2						
2035	184	INITIAL SPARES - C&E		31,271				31,271
		OPA3						
2035	185	INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP		2,202				2,202
2035	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		12,831				12,831
		Total - Other Procurement, Army		**7,718,602**		**11,000**		**7,729,602**

Limitation on availability of funds for the Joint Network Node (sec. 111)

The committee recommends a provision that would withhold 50 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated in section 101(5) for the procurement of the Joint Network Node until the Secretary of the Army provides a report, to the congressional defense committees, no later than March 15, 2007, on the Army's strategy for the convergence of the Joint Network Node, the Warfighter Information Network—Tactical, and the Mounted Battle Command On-the-Move communications programs. The required report will include program requirements, funding, program schedule, implementation plan and acquisition strategy.

The budget request included $7,718.6 million in Other Procurement, Army, including $178.0 million for the Joint Network Node, $79.0 million for the Mounted Battle Command on the Move (MBCOTM) system, but no funding for the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical (WIN–T) programs. The budget request also included $69.2 million in PE 64818A for Army Tactical Command and Control Hardware and Software, including $16.6 million for MBCOTM development, and $158.2 million in PE 63782A for WIN–T development.

The Joint Network Node (JNN) responds to a 2004 urgent needs statement from U.S. Central Command to provide communications capabilities better than the current Mobile Subscriber Equipment in Army units today. The requirement was met with commercial-off-the-shelf-based equipment using a sole source contract. The committee notes that the JNN is not a joint program and that the Army General Counsel has stated that JNN must be competitively procured. Further, the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation's Fiscal Year 2005 Annual Report, states that, "the Army continues to procure JNN as an interim satellite capability without conducting an Operational Test and Evaluation." The committee is concerned that the required operational test and evaluation has not been completed for the JNN.

The committee understands that the WIN–T program meets the same requirements as JNN but with greater capability. Moreover, WIN–T will provide a communications-on-the-move capability while the JNN will not. In September 2004, after competitively awarding two contracts for the Systems Development and Demonstration (SDD) 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. After funding the program in fiscal years 2005 and 2006, due to affordability concerns, the Army abruptly restructured the WIN–T program, delaying fielding until 2010. The committee believes this is an ill-advised decision. JNN and WIN–T are duplicative programs, with WIN–T providing on-the-move capabilities to Army commanders, a long-standing requirement. It has been estimated that the Army will require an additional $1.9 billion to field JNN to all Army units. It is the committee's understanding that the Army intends to replace JNN with WIN–T sometime in the future. The committee is concerned that the Army cannot afford to field both JNN and WIN–T.

The committee notes the conference report accompanying the fiscal year 2006 Department of Defense Appropriations Act contained

a requirement that the Army submit a plan, no later than January 15, 2006, for procuring evolutionary capability in its network communications packages. The Army is still evaluating the program and has not yet submitted the required report. The committee believes that the Army plans to restructure the WIN–T program to field WIN–T in 2008 and strongly supports the initiative to accelerate the WIN–T program.

The committee recommends a reduction of $100.0 million for JNN procurement and an increase of $100.0 million to restore WIN–T procurement in Other Procurement, Army. The committee expects the future procurement of JNN to be competitively awarded and that both JNN and WIN–T equipment should be procured using a firm fixed-price contract.

Comptroller General report on the contract for the Future Combat Systems program (sec. 112)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the participation and activities of the lead systems integrator in the Future Combat Systems (FCS) program under the contract of the Army for the FCS program. The report would provide a description of the responsibilities of the lead systems integrator and the Army under the FCS contract; an assessment of the manner in which the Army ensures that the lead systems integrator meets the goals of the FCS program; an identification of the mechanisms in place to ensure the protection of the interests of the United States in the FCS program; and an identification of the mechanisms in place to mitigate organizational conflicts of interest with respect to competition on FCS technologies and equipment under the subcontracts under the FCS program.

Section 212 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) directed the Secretary of the Army to procure the FCS through a contract under part 15 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, rather than through a transaction under section 2371 of title 10, United States Code. The committee congratulates the Army on completing the definitization of the FCS contract on March 29, 2006 and directs the Comptroller General to review the contract to assist the Congress and the Department understand the complexities of contracting for a system-of-systems contract with a lead systems integrator.

Reports on Army Modularity Initiative (sec. 113)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than March 15, 2007, on the manner in which the Army distinguishes costs under its modularity initiative from costs under its modernization and reset programs; a line item identification of the amount of modularity funded to date and the amount of modularity to be funded in future budgets; how modularity equipment will be allocated to the active and Reserve components; a plan for further testing and evaluation of modular designs; and a summary of any lessons learned to date from the modular brigades that have been established and deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan. The provision also requires that the Comptroller

General conduct an annual review of the modularity initiative on the progress the Army is making in the equipping of the active and Reserve components.

In 2004 the Army estimated modularity costs at $28.0 billion. In a report, "Preliminary Observations on Army Plans to Implement and Fund Modular Forces," dated March 16, 2005, the Government Accountability Office stated that "the costs associated with modularizing the entire Army are substantial, continuing to evolve, and likely to grow beyond current estimates. As of March 2005, the Army estimated it will need about $48 billion to fund modularity representing an increase of 71 percent from its earlier estimate of $28 billion in 2004." The estimate now stands at $52.5 billion. However, this estimate may not reflect all potential costs, such as for fully equipping the modular force as designed. The committee expects the Secretary of the Army to address in the report all costs required to achieve full operational capability for all modular units, including, but not limited to, amounts required for equipment, training, and permanent facilities and infrastructure to adequately support military personnel and their families. The committee believes that until the Army provides a better understanding of the requirements and costs associated with modularity, DOD will not be well positioned to weigh competing priorities and make informed decisions nor will the Congress have the information it needs to evaluate funding requests.

There is some question regarding the definition of the modularity initiative. The Army has stated that it required $5.0 billion per year over the fiscal years 2005–2011 for the modularity initiative. In a fiscal year 2006 Program Budget Decision Memorandum, the Department increased the Army's top line by $5.0 billion in each of the fiscal years 2007–2011 for modularity to be included in the President's budget request. DOD and the Army said they would use fiscal year 2005 and fiscal year 2006 supplemental appropriations to cover the requirement for those two years. Both the fiscal year 2006 enacted bridge supplemental and the fiscal year 2006 supplemental budget request included $5.0 billion. However, the fiscal year 2006 supplemental request was also expected to include $3.0 billion in additional funding for Abrams tanks and Bradley Fighting Vehicles required for modularity, but that request was dropped in the final stages of formulation before it was sent to Congress.

The fiscal year 2007 budget request proposed to restructure the Army National Guard to 28 brigade combat teams and 78 combat support brigades and to fund the Army National Guard to its current manning level of 333,000 rather than to its currently authorized end strength of 350,000. This proposal resulted in opposition from Congress, governors, the National Guard Association and the adjutants general. As a result, the Army has announced that it will maintain the National Guard at its 350,000 authorized end strength and will fund whatever manning level the National Guard can recruit to in fiscal year 2007. The Army also announced it will follow through with its plan to change the composition of the Army National Guard force structure to 28 brigade combat teams and 78 combat support brigades and commit $20.0 billion to National Guard equipment. This will put additional funding pressure on the Army as it modularizes the active and Reserve components. The

committee believes that an annual progress report is required to monitor the Army's progress in modularizing both the active and Reserve components.

Budget Items—Army

Future Cargo Aircraft

The budget request included $109.2 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA) for the procurement of three Future Cargo Aircraft (FCA). The FCA would support the intra-theater lift mission. However, the aircraft mix and the number of intra-theater aircraft assets required for this mission have yet to be determined and were not addressed in the recently completed Mobility Capabilities Study. In recent testimony, the Commander of the United States Transportation Command gave his support to the Department's Intra-Theater Lift Capability Study, Phases 1 and 2, to identify the right mix and number of intra-theater aircraft assets required. The Air Force is also interested in procuring a similar type of aircraft and is in the process of establishing a joint program office with the Army for a new intra-theater light cargo aircraft that will be known as the Joint Cargo Aircraft. The Air Force is only now beginning a series of functional analysis studies and an independent Air Force analysis of alternatives to define their requirement for the aircraft, and to consider which options will meet their requirements. Until these studies are complete, and have been presented to the congressional defense committees, the committee believes that it is premature to procure aircraft until the right mix and number of intra-theater aircraft assets have been determined.

The Committee notes that the recent Request for Proposals released by the Department of the Army for procurement of the Joint Cargo Aircraft includes maintenance and sustainment of this new weapon system and provides for no organic logistics capability. The Committee notes that 10 U.S.C. 2464 requires the Department to maintain a core logistics capability and that the department develop organic maintenance capability for most weapon systems not later than four years after initial operating capability for such weapon systems. The Army Request for Proposals does not address this issue. The Committee further notes that the Joint Cargo Aircraft is a joint Army-Air Force program and that Air Force Air Logistics Centers could be able to sustain this weapon system. The Committee expects that any Request for Proposals for the Joint Cargo Aircraft account for the requirements of 10 U.S.C. 2464. The committee recommends a decrease of $109.2 million in APA for the Future Cargo Aircraft.

Surface-launched advanced medium range air-to-air missile

The budget request included $12.0 million in Missile Procurement, Army, for the Surface-Launched Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (SLAMRAAM) and $10.0 million for advanced procurement funding for long-lead items. The committee understands that the SLAMRAAM Milestone C scheduled for September 2007 has been slipped one year to September 2008. Procurement funds will not be needed in fiscal year 2007. The committee rec-

ommends a decrease of $22.0 million in Missile Procurement, Army, for SLAMRAAM, for a total authorization of no funding.

M1A1 Abrams tank and M2A2 Bradley fighting vehicle upgrades

The budget request included $456.1 million in Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army. Of this amount, $285.0 million is for the upgrade of various Bradley Fighting Vehicles (BFV) variants and $171.1 million is for the conversion of M1A2 Abrams tanks into the M1A2 System Enhancement Package (SEP) Abrams tank configuration.

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2007 budget request for BFV upgrades and M1A2 SEP tanks creates production breaks in the BFV and M1A2 SEP production lines and reflects the Army's assumption that Army modularity could be funded in Defense supplemental requests for programs that should be funded in base budget requests. The Army's reliance on Defense supplemental requests reflects the Army's poor management of scarce resources and disregard for the impact the Army program has on the defense industrial base. Budget justification material submitted by the Army reflects an underfunded program for both BFV upgrades and M1A2 SEP conversions and causes breaks in production.

Programming and budgeting based on the assumption of Defense supplemental requests is inefficient and wastes taxpayer dollars. For instance, according to Army budget justification documents, in fiscal year 2005, the weapon system procurement unit cost for the M1A2 SEP was $4.6 million based on 124 M1A2 SEPs. In fiscal year 2007, the weapon system procurement unit cost is listed as $7.4 million based on 23 M1A2 SEPs.

Additional funding for the BFV upgrades and M1A2 Sep conversions has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $238.8 million for BFV upgrades and $170.0 million for M1A2 SEP tank conversions, in Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, for a total authorization of $523.8 million for BFV upgrades and $341.1 million for M1A2 SEPs.

The committee's recommendation increases funding for BFV upgrades and M1A2 SEP conversions to cover minimum sustainment rates for the production of these vehicles. The committee strongly encourages the Army to develop funded BFV and M1A2 SEP programs, based on a multiyear procurement strategy, for the fiscal year 2008 budget request. The Army should also consider requesting multiyear procurement authority to introduce price and production stability into these programs.

M113 Armored personnel carrier family of vehicles

The budget request included $23.0 million in Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, for the conversion of M113A2 Armored Personnel Carrier Family of Vehicles (FOV) to the M113A3 FOV configuration. The committee notes that the Army has a requirement to convert 310 M113A2s to support the Army's modularity initiative. Additional funding for the conversion of 310 M113A2s to the M113A3 configuration has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority

list. The committee recommends an increase of $139.0 million in Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, for additional M113A2 conversions, for a total authorization of $162.0 million.

M1028 120mm tank cartridge

The budget request included $0.9 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), for the M1028 120mm tank cartridge. The committee notes the utility of the M1028 in improving the M1A1 Main Battle Tank's urban warfare capability. The committee recommends an increase of $9.2 million in PAA for the M1028.

M915 105mm Dual Purpose Improved Conventional Munition artillery cartridge

The budget request included $45.6 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), for 105 mm artillery cartridges of all types, but included no funding for the M915 105 mm Dual Purpose Improved Conventional Munition (DPICM), Load, Assemble, and Pack (LAP) artillery cartridge. The committee is aware that the M915 is the only 105 mm DPICM cartridge, and that it is extremely important for light forces. The committee recommends an increase of $12.2 million in PAA to complete the LAP of the components already in the inventory.

Rapid wall breaching kit

The budget request included no funding in Procurement Ammunition, Army (PAA), for the rapid wall breaching kit. The committee notes that rapid wall breaching kits are one-man portable devices capable of creating man-sized holes in triple brick masonry or double reinforced concrete structural walls. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PAA for rapid wall breaching kits.

Ammunition peculiar equipment outloading module

The budget request included no funding for ammunition peculiar equipment outloading modules. The committee notes that a modern robotic-controlled strategic ammunition outloading module would be capable of supporting current readiness requirements, while increasing ammunition plant safety, security, and capacity. Army officials report that a design exists for modernizing current outloading capabilities with robotic-controlled technologies at ammunition plants. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army, for ammunition peculiar equipment outloading modules.

Automated Tactical Ammunition Classification System

The budget request included $10.3 million in Procurement Ammunition, Army (PAA), for ammunition peculiar equipment. The committee understands the logistical difficulties inherent in the large amounts of ammunition turned in by combat units leaving a combat theater, which must be inspected and reissued to new units. Previously, this inspection and processing activity has been done by hand, which is extremely manpower intensive. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PAA for addi-

tional development and procurement of a family of mobile Automated Tactical Ammunition Classification System units for near-term battlefield deployment.

Corrosion protective covers

The budget request included no funding to procure and evaluate corrosion protective covers for configurable loaded ammunition. The committee is aware that corrosion in harsh environments can cause damage to equipment as well as ammunition. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army, for corrosion protective covers to prevent corrosion of ammunition.

Insensitive munitions high-shear mixing system

The budget request included no funding for any upgrades at the Milan Army Ammunition Plant. After many years of neglect, upgrade of the munitions industrial facilities is critical, particularly given the increased usage rates caused by current operations. The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army, to demonstrate, validate, and implement an insensitive munitions high-shear mixing system at the Milan Army Ammunition Plant.

Lake City Army Ammunition Plant

The budget request included $116.2 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), for the provision of industrial facilities, including $35.0 million for the Small Caliber Ammunition Modernization Program at Lake City Army Ammunition Plant. The committee is aware that a significant investment in new equipment and facilities at Lake City Army Ammunition Plant is required to provide the quantities of small caliber ammunition necessary to support ongoing operations in the global war on terror. The committee recommends an increase of $18.2 million in PAA to continue the modernization of the Lake City Army Ammunition Plant.

Modernization of forge equipment at Scranton Army Ammunition Plant

The budget request included $116.2 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), for the provision of industrial facilities, but included no funding for modernization at the Scranton Army Ammunition Plant. The committee is aware that the newest piece of government-owned forge equipment at Scranton is at least 30 years old. Much of Scranton's equipment has exceeded its useful life and is beginning to experience failures. The government has historically modernized this type of equipment at 10-year intervals. The committee understand the importance of investing in the munitions industrial base, after many years of deferring critical modernization. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PAA for modernization of forge equipment at Scranton Army Ammunition Plant.

Radford Army Ammunition Plant upgrades

The budget request included $116.2 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), for the provision of industrial facilities,

including $56.2 million for operations and upgrades to the Radford Army Ammunition Plant. The committee recognizes that for many years, modernization of munition industrial facilities has not kept pace with the requirements of modern weapons systems and environmental regulations. Because of the interrelated work of these munitions plants, a disruption in one facility could cause disruptions in others, and thus cause a critical shortfall of munitions while our service members are engaged in combat operations.

The committee is aware that there is a backlog of critical modernization projects totaling $213.0 million at Radford Army Ammunition Plant, including a new steam plant, waste processing facilities to meet current environmental standards, and new explosives processing plants to improve efficiencies and reduce the risk of failure in a critical production area.

The committee recommends an increase of $63.56 million in PAA for the modernization of industrial facilities at the Radford Army Ammunition Plant, including $30.0 million to complete the new steam plant; $11.78 million to build new waste processing facilities and incinerators; $10.0 million to fund the first two phases of a modern nitroglycerine facility; and $11.8 million for Phase 2B of the upgrades to the nitrocellulose facility. The committee further directs the Army to develop a plan to complete the remaining $150.0 million in critical modernization projects at Radford over the next 3 years.

Defense advanced global positioning system receivers

The budget request included $61.6 million in other procurement, Army (OPA) for the procurement of Defense advanced global positioning system receivers (DAGR). DAGR provides a satellite-based navigation and timing system to enable warfighters to confirm their own locations for all phases of combat. The committee notes that emerging requirements associated with the global war on terrorism have led to a greater demand for DAGR than previously anticipated, and that DAGR has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in OPA to procure additional DAGRS.

Nonsystem training devices

The budget request included $243.1 million in Other Procurement, Army, for non-standard training devices, including $3.1 million for the Call for Fires Trainer (CFFT). The CFFT is a collective training system that provides a simulated battlefield for training forward observers at the institutional and unit level. The committee notes that the CFFT has proven to be a useful tool for soldiers preparing to deploy to the U.S. Central Command area of operations. Additional funding to accelerate CFFT fielding has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in Other Procurement, Army, for CFFT, for a total authorization of $247.1 million.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Aircraft Procurement, Navy						
		Combat Aircraft						
1506	1	AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP)						
1506	2	EA-18G	12	891,578			12	891,578
1506	2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-26,157				-26,157
1506	3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		39,753				39,753
1506	4	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	30	2,362,471			30	2,362,471
1506	4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-74,218				-74,218
1506	5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		52,954				52,954
1506	6	JSF ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		245,016		-245,016		
		Joint Strike Fighter production reduction				[-245,016]		
1506	7	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	14	1,371,125			14	1,371,125
1506	7	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-66,438				-66,438
1506	8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		194,080				194,080
1506	9	UH-1Y/AH-1Z	18	446,718			18	446,718
1506	10	MH-60S (MYP)	18	573,458	8	112,000	26	685,458
		MH-60S helicopters			[8]	[112,000]		
1506	10	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-115,300				-115,300
1506	11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		90,401				90,401
1506	12	MH-60R	25	911,854	1	28,000	26	939,854
		MH-60R helicopters			[1]	[28,000]		
1506	12	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-116,592				-116,592
1506	13	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		120,480				120,480
1506	14	E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	2	265,015			2	265,015
1506	14	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-61,443				-61,443
1506	15	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Airlift Aircraft						
1506	16	UC-35						
1506	17	C-40A						
1506	18	C-37						
		Trainer Aircraft						
1506	19	T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	12	376,361	-2	-64,000	10	312,361
		T-45TS			[-2]	[-64,000]		
1506	20	JPATS	21	146,068			21	146,068
		Other Aircraft						
1506	21	KC-130J	4	311,179			4	311,179
1506	21	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-58,000				-58,000
1506	22	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		45,737				45,737
1506	23	F-5	5	2,530			5	2,530
1506	24	VTUAV	4	37,570			4	37,570
		Modification of Aircraft						
1506	25	EA-6 SERIES		48,983				48,983
1506	26	AV-8 SERIES		20,506				20,506
1506	27	ADVERSARY		2,638				2,638
1506	28	F-18 SERIES		411,524				411,524
1506	29	H-46 SERIES		47,401				47,401
1506	30	AH-1W SERIES		19,760				19,760
1506	31	H-53 SERIES		28,252		4,400		32,652
		CH-53 Integrated Mechanical Diagnostic System accel				[4,400]		
1506	32	SH-60 SERIES		33,113				33,113
1506	33	H-1 SERIES		7,426				7,426
1506	34	EP-3 SERIES		56,797				56,797
1506	35	P-3 SERIES		204,606				204,606

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1506	36	S-3 SERIES		750				750
1506	37	E-2 SERIES		9,087				9,087
1506	38	TRAINER A/C SERIES		17,062				17,062
1506	39	C-2A		37,157				37,157
1506	40	C-130 SERIES		3,547				3,547
1506	41	FEWSG		625				625
1506	42	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		30,332				30,332
1506	43	E-6 SERIES		99,184				99,184
1506	44	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		40,190				40,190
1506	45	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		14,300				14,300
1506	46	T-45 SERIES		34,933				34,933
1506	47	POWER PLANT CHANGES		24,580				24,580
1506	48	JPATS SERIES		1,656				1,656
1506	49	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS		14,315				14,315
1506	50	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		35,886				35,886
1506	51	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		177,500				177,500
1506	52	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM		13,656				13,656
1506	53	ID SYSTEMS		11,148				11,148
1506	54	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		85,767				85,767
		Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts						
1506	55	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		812,689				812,689
		Aircraft Support Equipment and Facilities						
1506	56	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		426,673				426,673
1506	57	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		9,472				9,472
1506	58	WAR CONSUMABLES		34,916				34,916
1506	59	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		19,501				19,501
1506	60	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		64,968				64,968

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1506	61	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,671				1,671
1506	62	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
		Total - Aircraft Procurement, Navy		**10,868,771**		**-164,616**		**10,704,155**
		Weapons Procurement, Navy						
		Ballistic Missiles						
1507	1	TRIDENT II						
1507	1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
		Modification of Missiles						
1507	2	TRIDENT II MODS		957,637				957,637
		Support Equipment and Facilities						
1507	3	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		3,453				3,453
		Other Missiles						
		Strategic Missiles						
1507	4	TOMAHAWK	350	354,565			350	354,565
		Tactical Missiles						
1507	5	AMRAAM	150	98,651			150	98,651
1507	6	SIDEWINDER	174	40,380			174	40,380
1507	7	JSOW	397	125,551			397	125,551
1507	8	STANDARD MISSILE	75	139,672			75	139,672
1507	9	RAM	90	56,874			90	56,874
1507	10	HELLFIRE						
1507	11	AERIAL TARGETS		83,299				83,299
1507	12	DRONES AND DECOYS						
1507	13	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		8,990				8,990

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Modification of Missiles						
1507	14	ESSM	108	99,571			108	99,571
1507	15	STANDARD MISSILES MODS		54,644				54,644
		Support Equipment and Facilities						
1507	16	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		4,645		20,000		24,645
		Allegany Ballistics Laboratory facility restoration				[20,000]		
		Ordnance Support Equipment						
1507	17	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		29,534				29,534
		Torpedoes and Related Equipment						
		Torpedoes and Related Equip.						
1507	18	SSTD		5,856				5,856
1507	19	ASW TARGETS		25,034				25,034
		Mod of Torpedoes and Related Equipment						
1507	20	MK-46 TORPEDO MODS		96,505				96,505
1507	21	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS		61,528				61,528
1507	22	QUICKSTRIKE MINE		3,103				3,103
		Support Equipment						
1507	23	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		26,345				26,345
1507	24	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		13,288				13,288
		Destination Transportation						
1507	25	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		3,259				3,259
		Other Weapons						
		Guns and Gun Mounts						
1507	26	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		12,508				12,508
		Modification of Guns and Gun Mounts						
1507	27	CIWS MODS		151,194				151,194
1507	28	COAST GUARD WEAPONS		5,385				5,385

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1507	29	GUN MOUNT MODS		8,936		12,000		20,936
		Mk 110 57mm naval gun				[12,000]		
1507	30	PIONEER		7,056				7,056
1507	31	CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS		18,470				18,470
1507	32	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS		3,151				3,151
		Other						
1507	33	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
		Spares and Repair Parts						
1507	34	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		55,936				55,936
		Total - Weapons Procurement, Navy		**2,555,020**		**32,000**		**2,587,020**
		Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps						
		Proc Ammo, Navy						
		Navy Ammunition						
1508	1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		119,561				119,561
1508	2	JDAM	3,400	84,014			3,400	84,014
1508	3	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		15,473				15,473
1508	4	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		16,140				16,140
1508	5	PRACTICE BOMBS		44,573				44,573
1508	6	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		33,999				33,999
1508	7	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS		11,029				11,029
1508	8	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		72,935				72,935
1508	9	JATOS		4,643				4,643
1508	10	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION		24,547				24,547
1508	11	76MM GUN AMMUNITION						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1508	12	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION		5,729		10,000		15,729
		Mk295/ MK296 ammo for Mk110 57mm naval gun				[10,000]		
1508	13	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		21,772				21,772
1508	14	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		32,647				32,647
1508	15	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		9,189				9,189
1508	16	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,197				1,197
		Proc Ammo, MC						
		Marine Corps Ammunition						
1508	17	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES		24,365				24,365
1508	18	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES		14,814				14,814
1508	19	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		8,032				8,032
1508	20	.50 CALIBER		6,440				6,440
1508	21	40 MM, ALL TYPES		39,369				39,369
1508	22	60MM, ALL TYPES		2,947				2,947
1508	23	81MM, ALL TYPES		57,351				57,351
1508	24	120MM, ALL TYPES		32,858				32,858
1508	25	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		9,536				9,536
1508	26	9 MM ALL TYPES		4,197				4,197
1508	27	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		16,733		10,000		26,733
		M67 hand grenade				[10,000]		
1508	28	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		10,201				10,201
1508	29	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		35,514				35,514
1508	30	EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE		9,529				9,529
1508	31	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		8,282				8,282
1508	32	FUZE, ALL TYPES		565				565
1508	33	NON LETHALS		4,030				4,030
1508	34	AMMO MODERNIZATION		7,732				7,732

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1508	35	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION						
		Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps		**789,943**		**20,000**		**809,943**
		Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy						
		Other Warships						
1611	1	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM		552,502				552,502
1611	1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-552,502				-552,502
1611	2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		784,143		50,000		834,143
		CVN 21 class aircraft carrier program				[50,000]		
1611	3	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	1	2,613,135			1	2,613,135
1611	3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-837,663				-837,663
1611	4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		676,582				676,582
1611	5	SSGN CONVERSION						
1611	5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
1611	6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
1611	7	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS		954,495				954,495
1611	7	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
1611	8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		117,139		20,000		137,139
		M290 nuclear defueling facility				[20,000]		
1611	9	SSN ERO		3,975				3,975
1611	9	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-3,975				-3,975
1611	10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		22,078				22,078
1611	11	SSBN ERO	1	249,930			1	249,930
1611	11	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-60,908				-60,908
1611	12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		37,154				37,154

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1611	13	DD(X)	2	3,578,245			2	3,578,245
1611	13	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-1,010,134				-1,010,134
1611	14	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
1611	15	DDG-51		355,849				355,849
1611	15	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
1611	16	DDG MODERNIZATION PROGRAM						
1611	17	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	2	520,670			2	520,670
		Amphibious Ships						
1611	18	LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP						
1611	18	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
1611	19	LPD-17		3,469	1	1,582,492	1	1,585,961
		Restore LPD-17 full funding			[1]	[1,582,492]		
1611	19	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-3,469				-3,469
1611	20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		297,492		-297,492		
		Eliminate advance procurement				[-297,492]		
1611	21	LHA REPLACEMENT	1	1,433,560			1	1,433,560
1611	21	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-297,643				-297,643
1611	22	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				175,000		175,000
		LHA replacement LHA-R				[175,000]		
		Auxiliaries, Craft and Prior Yr Program Costs						
1611	23	SPECIAL PURPOSE						
1611	24	LCU(X)						
1611	25	OUTFITTING		410,643		-30,000		380,643
		Outfitting and post-delivery				[-30,000]		
1611	26	SERVICE CRAFT		45,245				45,245
1611	27	LCAC SLEP	6	110,692			6	110,692

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1611	28	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		577,849		-20,000		557,849
		Completion of prior year shipbuilding				[-20,000]		
1611	29	POWER UNIT ASSEMBLY FACILITY						
		Total - Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy		**10,578,553**		**1,480,000**		**12,058,553**
		Other Procurement, Navy						
		Ships Support Equipment						
		Ship Propulsion Equipment						
1810	1	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE		7,441				7,441
1810	2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE		16,182				16,182
		Navigation Equipment						
1810	3	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		31,039		4,000		35,039
		Amphib Integrated Bridge System				[4,000]		
		Underway Replenishment Equipment						
1810	4	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT		928				928
		Periscopes						
1810	5	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP		73,729				73,729
		Other Shipboard Equipment						
1810	6	DDG MOD		2,179		25,000		27,179
		DDG 51 Arleigh Burke class AEGIS modernization				[25,000]		
1810	7	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT		17,914				17,914
1810	8	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD		2,693				2,693
1810	9	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		27,889				27,889
1810	10	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		25,231		2,000		27,231
		High performance brush program				[2,000]		
1810	11	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		155,510				155,510

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accoui	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1810	12	SUBMARINE BATTERIES		33,814				33,814
1810	13	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		21,892				21,892
1810	14	DSSP EQUIPMENT		4,729				4,729
1810	15	CG MODERNIZATION		233,666				233,666
1810	16	LCAC		437				437
1810	17	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT		17,843				17,843
1810	18	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		172,775		9,000		181,775
		Advanced Control Monitoring System				[4,000]		
		CVN propeller replacement program				[3,000]		
		Canned lube pumps for LSD 41/49 class ships				[2,000]		
1810	19	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS		3,141				3,141
1810	20	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM		13,751				13,751
		Reactor Plant Equipment						
1810	21	REACTOR POWER UNITS		126,974				126,974
1810	22	REACTOR COMPONENTS		228,087				228,087
		Ocean Engineering						
1810	23	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT		6,287				6,287
		Small Boats						
1810	24	STANDARD BOATS		41,081				41,081
		Training Equipment						
1810	25	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT		3,887				3,887
		Production Facilities and Equipment						
1810	26	OPERATING FORCES IPE		53,648				53,648
		Other Ship Support						
1810	27	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS		109,571				109,571
1810	28	LCS MODULES		79,059				79,059

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Drug Interdiction Support						
1810	29	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
		Communications and Electronics Equipment						
		Ship Radars						
1810	30	RADAR SUPPORT						
		Ship Sonars						
1810	31	SPQ-9B RADAR		2,494				2,494
1810	32	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM		37,783				37,783
1810	33	SSN ACOUSTICS		284,896				284,896
1810	34	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		9,204				9,204
1810	35	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		12,524				12,524
		ASW Electronic Equipment						
1810	36	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM		20,227				20,227
1810	37	SSTD		8,404				8,404
1810	38	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		60,681				60,681
1810	39	SURTASS		4,688				4,688
1810	40	TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER		5,238				5,238
		Electronic Warfare Equipment						
1810	41	AN/SLQ-32		30,955				30,955
1810	42	INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS		5,032				5,032
		Reconnaissance Equipment						
1810	43	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT		70,782				70,782
		Submarine Surveillance Equipment						
1810	44	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG		83,114				83,114
		Other Ship Electronic Equipment						
1810	45	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM						
1810	46	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY		22,502				22,502

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1810	47	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT		52,508				52,508
1810	48	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NT(		35,311				35,311
1810	49	ATDLS		12,458				12,458
1810	50	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT		75,442				75,442
1810	51	SHALLOW WATER MCM		8,269				8,269
1810	52	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)		13,291				13,291
1810	53	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV		4,481				4,481
1810	54	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		3,838				3,838
		Training Equipment						
1810	55	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT		19,833				19,833
		Aviation Electronic Equipment						
1810	56	MATCALS		20,261				20,261
1810	57	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		7,476				7,476
1810	58	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM		18,005				18,005
1810	59	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM		27,575				27,575
1810	60	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,968				3,968
1810	61	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM		9,157				9,157
1810	62	FACSFAC		3,758				3,758
1810	63	ID SYSTEMS		28,567				28,567
1810	64	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)		8,316				8,316
		Other Shore Electronic Equipment						
1810	65	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT						
1810	66	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS		78,321				78,321
1810	67	RADIAC		10,373				10,373
1810	68	GPETE		7,086				7,086
1810	69	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY		4,283				4,283
1810	70	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION		5,710				5,710

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1810	71	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		22,489		4,200		26,689
		Thermal imaging systems				[4,200]		
		Shipboard Communications						
1810	72	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS						
1810	73	PORTABLE RADIOS		40,467				40,467
1810	74	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		209,123				209,123
1810	75	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M		12,574				12,574
		Submarine Communications						
1810	76	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT		666				666
1810	77	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT		87,900				87,900
		Satellite Communications						
1810	78	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS		12,291				12,291
		Shore Communications						
1810	79	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		2,788				2,788
1810	80	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS		1,145				1,145
1810	81	NSIPS						
1810	82	JEDMICS						
1810	83	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS		50,429				50,429
		Cryptographic Equipment						
1810	84	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		101,749				101,749
		Cryptologic Equipment						
1810	85	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		21,758				21,758
		Other Electronic Support						
1810	86	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT		41,133				41,133
		Drug Interdiction Support						
1810	87	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Aviation Support Equipment						
		Sonobuoys						
1810	88	SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES		66,943		8,000		74,943
		Sonobouys				[8,000]		
		Aircraft Support Equipment						
1810	89	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		56,226				56,226
1810	90	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		8,064				8,064
1810	91	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT		12,246				12,246
1810	92	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT		29,817				29,817
1810	93	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		14,905				14,905
1810	94	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		1,459				1,459
1810	95	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT		18,624				18,624
1810	96	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES		89,727				89,727
1810	97	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		27,369				27,369
1810	98	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		10,821				10,821
		Ordnance Support Equipment						
		Ship Gun System Equipment						
1810	99	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM		3,311				3,311
1810	100	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT		7,443				7,443
		Ship Missile System Equipment						
1810	101	HARPOON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		100				100
1810	102	NATO SEASPARROW		4,582				4,582
1810	103	RAM GMLS		9,987				9,987
1810	104	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM		56,668				56,668
1810	105	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		75,349				75,349
1810	106	SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
1810	107	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		61,185				61,185

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1810	108	SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIP						
1810	109	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS		6,557				6,557
		FBM Support Equipment						
1810	110	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP		111,127				111,127
		ASW Support Equipment						
1810	111	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS		92,876				92,876
1810	112	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,946				4,946
1810	113	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,642				4,642
1810	114	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,188				7,188
		Other Ordnance Support Equipment						
1810	115	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP		21,494		7,700		29,194
		Joint Service and EOD IED countermeasures				[7,700]		
1810	116	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,041				4,041
		Other Expendable Ordnance						
1810	117	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM		54,131		6,000		60,131
		MK53 (NULKA) Decoy System				[6,000]		
1810	118	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		11,243				11,243
1810	119	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		24,776				24,776
		Civil Engineering Support Equipment						
1810	120	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		2,184				2,184
1810	121	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		2,200				2,200
1810	122	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		25,441				25,441
1810	123	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		16,726				16,726
1810	124	TACTICAL VEHICLES		29,432				29,432
1810	125	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		86,604				86,604
1810	126	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		12,066				12,066
1810	127	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION		39,845				39,845

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1810	128	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES		1,317				1,317
		Supply Support Equipment						
1810	129	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		13,716				13,716
1810	130	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		12,080				12,080
1810	131	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		5,925				5,925
1810	132	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS		65,938				65,938
		Personnel and Command Support Equipment						
		Training Devices						
1810	133	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		18,222				18,222
		Command Support Equipment						
1810	134	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		58,576		7,600		66,176
		Man overboard identification program				[4,400]		
		Multi Climate Protection System				[3,200]		
1810	135	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		390				390
1810	136	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,590		4,100		9,690
		Combat casualty care equipment upgrade program				[4,100]		
1810	138	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		15,270				15,270
1810	139	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		10,685				10,685
1810	140	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		16,138				16,138
1810	141	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		166,302				166,302
1810	142	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		3,995				3,995
1810	143	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
1810	144	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
		Productivity Programs						
1810	145	JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT						
		Other						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1810	146	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
		Spares and Repair Parts						
1810	147	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		219,886				219,886
1810	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		8,841				8,841
		Total - Other Procurement, Navy		**4,967,916**		**77,600**		**5,045,516**
		Procurement, Marine Corps						
		Weapons and Combat Vehicles						
		Tracked Combat Vehicles						
1109	1	AAV7A1 PIP		12,481				12,481
1109	2	EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE	15	239,859			15	239,859
1109	2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-9,237				-9,237
1109	3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		25,582				25,582
1109	4	LAV PIP		25,990				25,990
1109	5	HIMARS						
1109	6	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (IRV)						
1109	7	MODIFICATION KITS (ARMOR AND FIRE SUPPORT)						
1109	8	M1A1 FIREPOWER ENHANCEMENTS		19,085				19,085
		Artillery and Other Weapons						
1109	9	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		7,361				7,361
1109	10	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	34	94,365	6	12,400	40	106,765
		Lightweight 155-millimeter towed howitzer			[6]	[12,400]		
1109	11	MODIFICATION KITS (INFANTRY WEAPONS)				5,000		5,000
		M2HB .50 caliber machine gun modification kits				[5,000]		
1109	12	MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM						
1109	13	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM	6	57,524			6	57,524

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1109	14	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLIC		8,959				8,959
		Weapons						
1109	15	MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM						
		Other Support						
1109	16	MODIFICATION KITS		8,968				8,968
1109	17	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		17,051				17,051
1109	18	OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR						
		Guided Missiles and Equipment						
		Guided Missiles						
1109	19	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE		3,894				3,894
1109	20	JAVELIN						
1109	21	HIMARS ROCKETS						
1109	22	COMPLEMENTARY LOW ALTITUDE WEAPON SYSTEM		3,155				3,155
		Other Support						
1109	23	MODIFICATION KITS		3,282				3,282
		Communications and Electronics Equipment						
		Command and Control Systems						
1109	24	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER		7,752				7,752
		Repair and Test Equipment						
1109	25	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		13,088				13,088
1109	26	AUTO TEST SYSTEMS						
1109	27	GENERAL PURPOSE TOOLS & TEST SYSTEMS						
1109	28	CALIBRATION FACILITIES						
		Other Support (Tel)						
1109	29	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		14,304				14,304
1109	30	MODIFICATION KITS		17,456				17,456

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Command and Control System (Non-tel)						
1109	31	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM						
1109	32	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		4,061				4,061
1109	33	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		41,056				41,056
1109	34	MAGTF CSSE & SE						
1109	35	MULTIPLE ROLE RADAR SYSTEM						
1109	36	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS						
		Repair and Equipment (Non-tel)						
1109	37	RADAR SYSTEMS		14,796				14,796
1109	38	RADAR SET AN/TPS-59						
1109	39	TRANSITION SWITCH MODULE						
		Intell/Comm Equipment (Non-tel)						
1109	40	TACTICAL REMOTE SENSOR SYSTEM						
1109	41	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		31,808				31,808
1109	42	SMALL UNIT REMOTE SCOUTING SYSTEM (SURSS)						
1109	43	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		26,040				26,040
1109	44	MOD KITS (INTEL)						
		Repair and Test Equipment (Non-tel)						
1109	45	VISUAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS (VIS)						
		Other Comm/Elec Equipment (Non-tel)						
1109	46	COMPLIMENTARY LOW ALTITUDE WEAPONS SYSTEM						
1109	47	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		13,675				13,675
		Other Support (Non-tel)						
1109	48	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		67,230				67,230
1109	49	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		19,747		9,300		29,047
		Laser Integrated Target Engagement System				[9,300]		
1109	50	RADIO SYSTEMS		53,521				53,521

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1109	51	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		49,190				49,190
1109	52	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		17,137				17,137
1109	53	MOD KITS MAGTF C41						
		Support Vehicles						
		Administrative Vehicles						
1109	54	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES		351				351
1109	55	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		12,035				12,035
		Tactical Vehicles						
1109	56	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	851	72,351			851	72,351
1109	57	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS						
1109	58	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT		656				656
1109	59	LIGHTWEIGHT PRIME MOVER		11				11
1109	60	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP		68,785				68,785
1109	61	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		12,664				12,664
		Other Support						
1109	62	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		2,869				2,869
		Engineer and Other Equipment						
1109	63	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		2,039				2,039
1109	64	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE						
1109	65	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		17,543				17,543
1109	66	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		4,064				4,064
1109	67	DEMOLITION SUPPORT SYSTEMS						
1109	68	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		9,999				9,999
1109	69	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		13,218				13,218
1109	70	EOD SYSTEMS		14,838				14,838
		Materials Handling Equipment						
1109	71	AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accour	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
1109	72	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		5,205				5,205
1109	73	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)		11,161				11,161
1109	74	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		17,031				17,031
1109	75	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		5,216				5,216
		General Property						
1109	76	FAMILY OF INCIDENT RESPONSE						
1109	77	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		3,224				3,224
1109	78	FAMILY OF EOD EQUIPMENT						
1109	79	TRAINING DEVICES		13,797				13,797
1109	80	CONTAINER FAMILY		3,011				3,011
1109	81	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		20,058				20,058
1109	82	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)		2,759				2,759
1109	83	BRIDGE BOATS						
1109	84	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN		5,148				5,148
		Other Support						
1109	85	MODIFICATION KITS						
1109	86	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		10,463				10,463
1109	87	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (M)						
		Spares and Repair Parts						
1109	88	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		35,837				35,837
		Total - Procurement, Marine Corps		**1,273,513**		**26,700**		**1,300,213**

CVN–21 class aircraft carrier procurement (sec. 121)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to incrementally fund procurement of CVN–21 class aircraft carriers over four year periods, commencing with CVN–78 procurement in fiscal year 2008. The budget request included $739.1 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN) for CVN–78 advance procurement and $45.1 million in SCN for CVN–79 advance procurement. The provision would also authorize advance procurement for CVN–80, commencing in fiscal year 2007.

In reviewing the budget request for fiscal year 2006, the committee received testimony from the Navy and industry that the low rate of shipbuilding was driving higher costs, which in turn further reduced shipbuilding rates, creating a downward spiral. The committee believes that stable ship requirements, increased funding in the shipbuilding budget, and increased flexibility for funding large capital ships are critical elements of any strategy to reverse this trend.

The Secretary of the Navy's fiscal year 2007 report to Congress on the long-range plan for the construction of naval vessels identifies a requirement to procure the CVN–21 class aircraft carriers at 4-year intervals, commencing in fiscal year 2008. The Navy originally planned to procure the first CVN–21 class aircraft carrier, CVN–78, in fiscal year 2006. Since then, the Navy has delayed procurement to 2008, which has delayed fielding this vital capability, while significantly increasing the aircraft carrier's procurement cost. The committee believes that procuring and delivering the CVN–21 class aircraft carriers over 4-year periods in accordance with the Navy's long-range plan is vital to the National Defense Strategy, and is vital to the affordability of these capital ships.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee has expressed concern with cost growth on the CVN–77 program, and has urged the Navy and the shipbuilder to identify opportunities to improve affordability of future aircraft carriers. Procurement delays, excess inflation, and material escalation have been reported as significant contributors to CVN–77 cost growth. The shipbuilder has proposed to achieve significant CVN–21 class program savings through a stable procurement plan, and through procurement of economic order quantity material for CVN–79 and CVN–80 in conjunction with CVN–78 procurement.

In view of the potential for significant program savings, the committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million in SCN for CVN–21 class advance procurement, and directs the Secretary of the Navy to review economic order quantity and long lead time material procurement for the CVN–21 class. The Secretary is to submit a report to the congressional defense committees with the fiscal year 2008 budget request, outlining the advance procurement requirements to potentially optimize economic order quantity savings and escalation avoidance (to include offsetting factors) for the first three vessels of the CVN–21 class. Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for advance procurement for CVN–79 and CVN–80, none of the funds are available for obligation prior to 30 days following receipt of the Secretary's report.

Construction of first two vessels under the next-generation destroyer program (sec. 122)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract to fund the detail design and construction of the first two next-generation destroyers, DD(X), in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN), with funding split over fiscal years 2007 and 2008.

The budget request included $2,568.0 million in SCN for the DD(X) program, which is in addition to $1,010.1 million prior year advance procurement and $3,004.0 million subsequent year full funding for the construction of two DD(X) destroyers. The Navy's report on the long-range plan for the construction of naval vessels identified a requirement to procure a total of seven DD(X) destroyers commencing in fiscal year 2007. Section 125 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) prohibited the Secretary of the Navy from acquiring these vessels through a winner-take-all competition strategy. Section 123 of that same Act established a cost limitation for the fifth vessel of the program.

The Navy's procurement strategy for the next generation destroyer program is to allocate dual lead ships and competitively award follow-on ships to both of the two shipyards which build surface combatants. The Navy is in the process of determining details of the acquisition strategy for the follow ship contracts. The committee agrees with the Navy's determination that competition is an underlying benefit of dual sourcing, and that it is critical to meeting the fifth ship cost limitation established for the next generation destroyer program.

The committee is equally concerned with the risk that the dual lead ship strategy adds to the program. The committee is aware that the Navy added $150.0 million to the second lead ship budget to account for this risk. Nevertheless, the Congressional Budget Office has cited a significantly higher cost estimate for the DD(X) lead ship(s) than currently included in the Navy's budget. It is therefore critical that, in preserving the ability to compete follow-on ships, the Navy does not unduly increase lead ship cost risk and total program cost risk.

The committee understands that the Navy intends to award lead ship contracts following approval by the Defense Acquisition Board (DAB), currently planned for January 2008. The committee urges the DAB to carefully weigh affordability and risk mitigation considerations in arriving at a decision to approve award of the lead ship contracts. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, 30 days prior to lead ship contract(s) award, on the Navy's competition strategy for DD(X) follow ship procurement. The report shall identify the range of possible outcomes for awarding follow-on ships, the Navy's estimated cost for the respective ships, the estimated cost benefit provided by competition, the basis for determining contract award, and the type of contract planned for the award. The report shall also address potential impact of follow-on ship awards on the lead ship costs or schedules, including an assessment of workload impacts at the respective shipyards.

Modification of limitation on total cost of procurement of CVN–77 aircraft carrier (sec. 123)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the limitation on the total cost of procurement for the CVN–77 aircraft carrier from $5.357 billion to $6.057 billion.

Section 122 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) imposed a $4.6 billion procurement cost cap for the CVN–77, and authorized the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the cap for certain categories of cost. In accordance with Section 122, the Secretary reported authorized annual cost increases, which incrementally raised the CVN–77 cost cap to $5.357 billion. The February 2005 report on CVN–77 Program Cost identified $0.7 billion cost increase beyond the Secretary's authority, requiring Congress to increase the cost cap.

The procurement cost increase to $6.057 billion, which equals the government's maximum contractual liability, is attributed to extraordinary escalation impacts, increased labor hours and overhead rates, and costs related to schedule delays. The fiscal year 2007 budget request included $348.4 million for CVN–77 cost growth, with the balance of additional funding to be included in future budget requests. The committee is aware that the Navy has taken a series of management actions to contain cost on CVN–77, including deferral of upgrades that are not required for safe system operation or certification; minimization of contract change orders; implementation of a joint Navy-shipbuilder Lean Six-Sigma program; and a schedule revision to enable a more efficient completion of CVN–77. The committee is concerned, however, that despite these management actions, the Navy is projecting CVN–77 cost to grow to the contract ceiling, in excess of 30 percent above the baseline cost cap.

The committee notes that the Secretary's report to Congress on the long-range plan for construction of naval vessels establishes cost estimates for future ship construction, which target improved performance based on a series of management actions similar to ongoing efforts to control CVN–77 cost. Visibility into cost performance while completing CVN–77 is necessary in order to assess the effectiveness of these management actions, and will assist in determining further actions necessary to improve affordability of the future force. Improved visibility into completion cost performance will also afford greater opportunity to deliver CVN–77 below the contract ceiling. Accordingly, the Secretary of the Navy is directed to submit a quarterly report to the congressional defense committees, beginning December 1, 2006, providing the following information regarding the CVN–77 ship construction contract:

(1) contract target cost;
(2) Program Manager's Estimate at Completion;
(3) contractor's Estimate at Completion;
(4) contract ceiling price;
(5) end of period actual costs; and
(6) percent progress.

Budget Items—Navy

MH–60S and MH–60R helicopters

The budget request included $458.2 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) for the procurement of 18 MH–60S Knight Hawk helicopters and $795.3 million for the procurement of 25 MH–60R Sea Hawk helicopters. The committee notes that the Navy reduced the number of MH–60 series helicopters from the Navy's fiscal year 2006 program plan. The Navy requires additional funding to acquire additional MH–60S for critical surface warfare capability coverage for Carrier and Expeditionary Strike Groups, and one additional MH–60R helicopters, allowing the initial MH–60R Carrier Strike Group squadron to deploy with full rotary wing capability in accordance with the Navy's Helicopter Concept of Operations. Additional funding for MH–60S and MH–60R helicopters has been included on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of $112.0 million in APN for eight additional MH–60S helicopters, for a total authorization of $570.2 million and an increase of $28.0 million in APN for one additional MH–60R helicopter, for a total authorization of $823.8 million.

T–45TS Goshawk

The budget request included $376.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) for the procurement of 12 T–45TS Goshawk training aircraft for the Navy. The future-years defense program indicates that the Navy intends to stop production with the fiscal year 2007 procurement. This would yield a total of 223 aircraft. The committee notes that the Navy's request for 12 T–45TS Goshawk training aircraft is nearly twice the number of aircraft requested in previous years. Moreover, the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list includes an additional six aircraft.

The committee is concerned that a premature close out of T–45TS production, particularly in one budget request, would be harmful for two reasons. First, the Navy's longstanding requirement was for 234 aircraft. Since that determination, significant changes have occurred in the annual training requirements for pilots, and empirical data has replaced planning assumptions. Training requirements have grown rather than diminished. Moreover, the Navy's "T–45 Strategic Planning Study, 2003–2035," identifies 239 trainers as the minimum number of aircraft needed to adequately support long-term pilot training requirements. For budgetary reasons, the requirement was reduced twice even as additional PTR requirements were added. The committee believes that, in order for the fleet to adequately support training requirements, the original requirement of 234 aircraft should remain the inventory objective. Second, the committee believes that the T–45TS, with requisite modifications, could serve as both the next-generation joint trainer and as a replacement for the Air Force T–38 trainer. The committee recommends a decrease of $64.0 million in APN for the procurement of a total of 10 T–45TS Goshawk training aircraft, and encourages the Navy to continue procurement to achieve at least the 234-aircraft inventory objective.

CH–53 Integrated Mechanical Diagnostic System (IMDS)

The budget request included $28.3 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) for the H–53 series helicopters, including $2.3 million for the Integrated Mechanical Diagnostic System (IMDS). The committee notes that IMDS enhances safety and reduces helicopter life cycle costs. Additional funding for IMDS has been included on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of $4.4 million in APN for IMDS, for a total authorization of $32.7 million.

Allegany Ballistics Laboratory facility restoration

The budget request included $4.6 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy (WPN) for various activities at government-owned, contractor operated weapons industrial facilities, but included no funding for facilities restoration at the Navy Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant, Allegany Ballistics Laboratory (ABL). Some of these facilities have exceeded their useful life and deteriorated beyond safe operations. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in WPN for the facilities restoration program at ABL.

Mk 110 57mm naval gun

The budget request included $8.9 million in Weapons Procurement (WPN), Navy for gun mount mods for in-service gun weapon systems, but included no funding for the Mk 110 57mm naval gun. The Mk 110 57mm naval gun is the newest gun system for surface ships and is planned for installation on the next generation destroyer, DD(X), the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS), the National Security Cutter, and the Offshore Patrol Cutter. A shore-based Mk 110 gun system for training, similar to other in-service gun training systems, is essential to ensure sailor proficiency in the safe operation and maintenance of shipboard Mk 110 gun systems. This is particularly true for new ship classes, which are designed for reduced manning and therefore less capable of supporting onboard training. The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million in WPN for procurement of a Mk 110 57mm naval gun for a shore-based training system.

Mk 295/Mk 296 ammunition for Mk 110 57mm naval gun

The budget request included no funding for Mark 295 or Mark 296 ammunition for the Mark 110 57mm naval gun. Currently, the Navy and the Coast Guard borrow these rounds in very limited quantities from other friendly governments. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in Procurement Ammunition Navy and Marine Corps for Mk 295/Mk 296 ammunition.

M67 hand grenade

The budget request included $3.0 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC), for M67 hand grenades. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PANMC for M67 hand grenades.

M290 nuclear refueling facility

The budget request included no funding for an M290 refueling facility. The committee is aware that the Navy is developing a more

efficient shipping system, the M290 container system, for spent fuel to support refueling and de-fueling U.S. Navy aircraft carriers at Northrop Grumman Newport News (NGNN). Implementation of a more efficient, secure, and improved process for disposal of fuel is necessary to support refueling of USS Nimitz (CVN–68) class aircraft carriers during their mid-life complex overhauls, and for defueling USS Enterprise (CVN–65).

The committee believes infrastructure investment in an M290 facility is needed to support the end-to-end process changes being implemented by the Navy to prepare this special material for ultimate packaging for long-term storage at a federal facility. The committee understands that a $40.0 million capital incentive would be required to offset the negative net present value for the M290 facility investment, and that the incentive could be funded over 2 years to align with NGNN capital commitments and expenditures. The remainder of the funding for the facility would be provided by NGNN. The committee further understands that having this facility will provide an estimated $25.0 million savings per refueling/defueling operation.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy to provide the first increment of government incentive to start construction of the M290 refueling facility in 2008.

Procurement authority for LPD–17 class ship designated LPD–25

The budget request included $297.5 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN) for LPD–25 advance procurement. The committee recommends an increase of $1,285.0 million in SCN for procurement of the LPD–17 class ship, designated as LPD–25. This would allow the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract for LPD–25 in fiscal year 2007, rather than fiscal year 2008 under the current Navy plan.

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 included LPD–25 procurement for fiscal year 2007 as the ninth ship of a twelve ship program. The budget request for fiscal year 2007 truncated the LPD–17 class to nine ships and delayed LPD–25 procurement to fiscal year 2008. The committee is aware that procurement of LPD–25 in fiscal year 2007 will save $113.1 million in LPD–25 procurement cost by avoiding construction delays, escalation impacts, and loss of learning. Further, procurement of LPD–25 in 2007 will result in delivering this vital warfighting capability to the fleet at the earliest schedule possible, helping to reduce existing Marine Corps lift capability shortfalls. Additional funding for the LPD–25 has been included on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list.

The committee is concerned that the Secretary of the Navy's report to Congress on the long-range plan for construction of naval vessels calls for a reduction of six Expeditionary Warfare ships. This reduced expeditionary force size, which also reduces the LPD–17 class to nine ships, does not meet the Navy's established 2.5 Marine Expeditionary Brigade (MEB) lift requirement. In testimony before the Seapower Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services in March 2006, the Marine Corps stated that,

"Limiting the LPD–17 production line to 9 ships places the Marine Corps at grave/significant risk by further decrementing the MEB equipment for the assault echelon." As the Navy continues to evolve future lift requirements and evaluates capabilities that will comprise the expeditionary strike and sea basing forces, the committee strongly encourages the Navy to include funds for LPD–26 in the fiscal year 2008 budget request as the most cost effective near-term means to satisfy projected lift requirements.

Advance procurement authority for LHA replacement (LHA(R)) ship designated LHA–7

The committee recommends an increase of $175.0 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN) for advance procurement of the second ship of the LHA replacement (LHA(R)) class, designated LHA–7. This would allow the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract for LHA–7 advance procurement in fiscal year 2007, rather than fiscal year 2009 under the current plan.

The Secretary of the Navy's fiscal year 2007 report on the long-range plan for the construction of naval vessels identifies a requirement to procure the LHA replacement ships at a stable rate of one ship every 3 years, commencing in 2007. In testimony before the Committee on Armed Services, the Secretary of the Navy emphasized his number one priority is to stabilize the shipbuilding program to achieve the program's critical affordability objectives. The committee understands that material cost increases and excess inflation have been notable factors in cost growth of prior year ship programs. Conversely, savings of approximately 15 percent have historically been achieved through the economic order quantity procurement of material for multiple ships of a class.

The Navy plans to procure significant material for LHA–6 in fiscal year 2007, and further plans advance procurement for LHA–7 in fiscal year 2009. In view of the significant potential material cost savings provided by combining material procurement for LHA–7 with LHA–6, the committee recommends an increase of $175.0 million in SCN for LHA–7.

Outfitting and post-delivery

The budget request included $409.0 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN) for outfitting and post-delivery. Outfitting and post-delivery is a centrally-managed account for all SCN-funded ship programs, which is requested annually based on projected vessel delivery schedules. The committee is aware that delays to ship delivery schedules, related to performance issues and Hurricane Katrina impacts, have resulted in outfitting and post-delivery funding being requested in advance of execution requirements in the fiscal year 2007 budget request. Further, the committee urges the Navy to ensure that cost increases to the execution of outfitting and post-delivery attributed to Hurricane Katrina are properly financed in accordance with the provisions of title IX of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–148).

The committee recommends a decrease of $30.0 million in SCN for outfitting and post-delivery.

Completion of prior year shipbuilding

The budget request included $577.8 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN) for completion of prior year shipbuilding programs. The committee is aware that delays to ship delivery schedules, related to performance issues and Hurricane Katrina impacts, has resulted in completion of prior year shipbuilding funding being requested in advance of execution requirements for the LPD–17 class. The committee recommends a decrease of $20.0 million in SCN for completion of prior year shipbuilding.

Amphibious ship integrated bridge system

The budget request included $31.0 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) for other navigation equipment, but included no funding for amphibious ship integrated bridge systems. The integrated bridge system (IBS) automatically collects, processes, integrates, and displays vital navigation sensor data on electronic charts to automatically and precisely control a ship's movement in accordance with an approved voyage plan. The committee is aware that the Navy directed all ships in the fleet to be equipped with an electronic chart display information system—Navy capability by the end of fiscal year 2009. Additional funding for IBS is necessary to accomplish amphibious ship installations in support of this requirement. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in OPN for amphibious ship integrated bridge system.

DDG–51 Arleigh Burke-class destroyer modernization program

The budget request included $2.2 million in the Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) for the DDG–51 modernization program. This program upgrades the DDG–51 class with key technologies developed for future ships, which provide improved warfighting capability and reduce operating and support cost. The Secretary of the Navy's fiscal year 2006 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 is essential to achieving this 35-year expected service life. Additionally, the upgrades planned for incorporation, which enable reduced crew size, improved maintainability, and improved commonality, are forecasted to provide savings of $712.0 million in operations and support for the 62–ship class.

Additional fiscal year 2007 DDG–51 modernization procurement funding is necessary to support planning, engineering, and initiate procurement activities in order to address backfit program issues, including configuration differences, mission life extension alterations, and initiatives to further reduce manpower requirements and costs in DDG–51 communications and combat systems operating spaces. The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in OPN for the DDG–51 modernization program.

High performance metal fiber brushes for shipboard motors and generators

The budget request included $25.2 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) for submarine support equipment, but included no funding for high performance metal brushes for shipboard motors and generators. Metal fiber brushes have demonstrated the capability to significantly enhance performance and reduce maintenance costs for motors and generators. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in OPN for completion of shore-based testing, development of ship alteration, and procurement of high performance metal fiber brushes.

Ship support items under $5.0 million

The budget request included $172.8 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) for ship support equipment items under $5.0 million, but included no funding for the advanced control monitoring system, CVN propeller replacement program, or LSD–41/49 class canned lube oil pumps.

The advance control monitoring system will update legacy, analog ship control systems with digital applications and sensors for improved ship control and ship system performance monitoring. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in OPN for the advanced control monitoring system.

The Navy has designed a generation III propeller for new and in-service aircraft carriers to meet the operational endurance and readiness requirements of today's fleet. Replacing eroded propellers with generation III propellers provides improved life cycle performance and significant cost savings by extending propeller service life to align with aircraft carrier drydock schedules. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for continued procurement and installation of generation III propellers.

The current mechanical shaft seal pumps on LSD–41/49 class amphibious ships experience high failure rates and increasing maintenance costs. The committee is aware that the Navy could realize a return on investment within 3 years through the installation of canned lube oil pumps on LSD–41/49 class ships. The committee also recommends an increase of $2.0 million in OPN for the procurement and installation of canned lube oil pumps to replace mechanical shaft seal pumps.

The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in OPN for ship support equipment items under $5.0 million, for a total authorization of $181.8 million.

Electronics equipment items under $5.0 million

The budget request included $22.5 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) for communications and electronics equipment items under $5.0 million, but included no funding for the Naval Expedition Combatant Command (NECC) thermal imaging system capability. The use of an electro-optical/infrared system on combatant craft reduces risk to combat personnel and provides a surveillance capability to special operators at night and in conditions of obscured or reduced visibility. The committee recommends an increase of $4.2 million in OPN for communications and electronics

equipment items under $5.0 million to outfit NECC riverine squadrons with thermal imaging systems.

Sonobuoys

The budget request included $66.9 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) for sonobuoy procurement. The Navy's current sonobuoy inventory and planned procurement for fiscal year 2007 fall short of the Navy's Non-Nuclear Ordnance Requirement (NNOR), which was established to support the National Military Strategy plus annual training requirements. Additional funding for multistatic search and localization sonobuoys is required to meet warfighting requirements. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in OPN for sonobuoy procurement.

Joint service and explosive ordnance disposal improvised explosive device countermeasures

The budget request included $21.5 in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN), for explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) equipment and $24.5 million in PE 63654N for joint service and explosive ordnance systems development. The Navy has an immediate need to procure EOD electronic countermeasures (ECM) that are used to protect Navy EOD technicians from radio-controlled improvised explosive devices (RCIED) initiation and detonation. The Navy also has a requirement for research and development of a common next-generation, counter-RCIED system for joint force protection. Additional funding for joint service and EOD improvised explosive device countermeasures has been included on the Chief of Naval Operations' fiscal year 2007 unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of $7.7 million in OPN for EOD ECM, for a total authorization of $29.2 million and an increase of $9.1 million in PE 63654N for the development of joint service counter-RCIED, for a total authorization of $33.6 million.

NULKA anti-ship missile decoy

The budget request included $54.1 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) for the procurement of eight NULKA anti-ship missile decoy systems and 79 NULKA decoys. The NULKA decoy is a quick reaction offboard electronic countermeasure to defeat advanced radar homing anti-ship missiles.

The committee is aware that the programmed procurement rate for NULKA decoys will not meet the Navy's inventory goal of filling 50 percent of available launcher tubes by fiscal year 2008. The committee further understands that the economic order quantity to meet the most efficient NULKA production is 96 decoys, and that increasing production to the most economic rate will save approximately $20,000 per decoy. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in OPN for the procurement of 17 additional NULKA decoys.

Command support equipment

The budget request included $58.6 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) for command support equipment, but included no funding for the Multi-Climate Protection System (MCPS), or for the Man Overboard Indicator (MOBI) System.

The MCPS is a modular ensemble that provides total performance by layering thermal protection and shell garments. The committee is aware that the MCPS was developed to support the Commander Naval Air System requirement for improved protective clothing for aircrew personnel, and that the Navy has outfitted approximately 25 percent of total aircrew personnel with this improved clothing system. The committee recommends an increase of $3.2 million in OPN to complete initial MCPS outfitting.

The MOBI system provides devices, which are worn by sailors aboard ship, to allow rescue forces to respond quickly in the event a sailor falls overboard. The committee is aware that the Naval Safety Center has recommended to the Naval Sea Systems Command that MOBI systems should be deployed throughout the fleet. The committee understands that 20 surface ships remain to be outfitted with the MOBI system, and that shipboard allowances limit the provision of personal transmitters to approximately one-third of crew members. The committee believes the MOBI system is an important system for shipboard safety. The committee recommends an increase of $4.4 million in OPN to complete surface ship MOBI system installations and increase personal transmitter shipboard allowances.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.6 million in OPN for command support equipment, for a total authorization of $66.2 million.

Combat Casualty Care Equipment Upgrade Program

The budget request included $5.6 million in Other Procurement, Navy (OPN) for Medical Support Equipment, but included no funding for the Combat Casualty Care Upgrade Equipment Program. This program provides improved emergency medical equipment for use by the Naval Expeditionary Combat Command to more quickly stabilize and evacuate casualties, leading to greater survival rates and improved recovery times. The upgrade program complies with Navy authorized medical allowance list (AMAL) to provide lightweight NATO-standardized litters and litter load carriage tools, lightweight combat medic bags, and onboard life-saving kits for tactical vehicles. The committee recommends an increase of $4.1 million in OPN for the Combat Casualty Care Equipment Upgrade Program.

Lightweight 155–millimeter towed howitzer

The budget request included $94.4 million in Procurement, Marine Corps, for the Lightweight 155–millimeter towed howitzer (LW–155 howitzer). The committee understands that a funding reduction in fiscal year 2006 reduced the number of Marine Corps' LW–155 howitzers below the Marine Corps' Acquisition Objective of 356 howitzers. Additional funding for the procurement of LW–155 howitzers has been included on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $12.4 million in Procurement, Marine Corps for six additional LW–155 howitzers, for a total authorization of $106.8 million.

Modification kits

The budget request included no funding in Procurement, Marine Corps, for modification kits for the M2HB .50 Caliber Machinegun. These kits would allow for the gun to have a quick change-barrel capability without conducting headspace and timing adjustments. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in Procurement, Marine Corps for M2HB .50 Caliber Machinegun modification kits, for a total authorization of $5.0 million.

Laser integrated target engagement system

The budget request included $19.7 million in Procurement, Marine Corps for command post systems, but no funding for the Laser Integrated Target Engagement System (LITES). LITES is a laser based target location, tracking, identification and designation system. The laser designator has potential to significantly reduce the battery weight and deliver twice the designations at twice the range compared to the current generation of laser designators. The committee recommends an increase of $9.3 million in Procurement, Marine Corps for the LITES, for a total authorization of $29.0 million.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Aircraft Procurement, Air Force						
		Combat Aircraft						
		Tactical Forces						
3010	1	F-35	5	988,109		-869,704	5	118,405
		Joint Strike Fighter production reduction				[-869,704]		
3010	1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-118,405				-118,405
3010	2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		145,310		-85,280		60,030
		Joint Strike Fighter production reduction				[-85,280]		
3010	3	F-22A		1,503,898	20	1,600,000	20	3,103,898
		Additional aircraft			[20]	[1600,000]		
3010	3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
3010	4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		477,404		-200,000		277,404
		Reduction				[-200,000]		
3010	5	F-15E						
3010	5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
3010	6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
		Airlift Aircraft						
		Tactical Airlift						
3010	7	C-17A (MYP)	12	3,306,394	2	-33,180	14	3,273,214
		Eliminate settlement fees				[-433,180]		
		Additional aircraft			[2]	[400,000]		
3010	7	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-670,202				-670,202
3010	8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				33,180		33,180
		Advance procurement for FY 2008				[33,180]		
3010	9	C-17 ICS						
		Other Airlift						
3010	10	C-40						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accoui	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	11	C-130J	9	806,974			9	806,974
3010	11	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-109,687				-109,687
3010	12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		90,000				90,000
3010	13	KC- X ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		36,130		-36,130		
		KC-135 aircraft replacement				[-36,130]		
3010	14	LIGHT CARGO AIRCRAFT		15,783				15,783
		Trainer Aircraft						
		UPT Trainers						
3010	15	DRUG INTERDICTION						
3010	16	INTRO TO FLIGHT/AIRMANSHIP PRG						
		Operational Trainers						
3010	17	JPATS	48	305,129			48	305,129
		Other Aircraft						
		Helicopters						
3010	18	V22 OSPREY	2	218,958			2	218,958
3010	18	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-10,385				-10,385
3010	19	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		34,390				34,390
		Mission Support Aircraft						
3010	20	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C		2,193				2,193
		Other Aircraft						
3010	21	TARGET DRONES		82,042				82,042
3010	22	C-37A						
3010	23	GLOBAL HAWK	6	493,417			6	493,417
3010	23	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-64,129				-64,129
3010	24	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		63,903				63,903
3010	25	PREDATOR UAV	26	229,095			26	229,095

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Modification of In-service Aircraft						
		Strategic Aircraft						
3010	26	B-2A		191,282				191,282
3010	27	B-1B		53,255				53,255
3010	28	B-52		70,147				70,147
3010	29	F-117		24,422				24,422
		Tactical Aircraft						
3010	30	A-10		107,432		83,400		190,832
		A/OA-10 modifications				[83,400]		
3010	31	F-15		92,901				92,901
3010	32	F-16		352,054				352,054
3010	33	F-22A		216,095				216,095
3010	34	T/AT-37						
		Airlift Aircraft						
3010	35	C-5		176,112		32,000		208,112
		C-5 avionics modernization program				[32,000]		
3010	35	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-19,734				-19,734
3010	36	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		66,700				66,700
3010	37	C-9						
3010	38	C-17A		251,404				251,404
3010	39	C-21		1,322				1,322
3010	40	C-32A		198				198
3010	41	C-37A		404				404
		Trainer Aircraft						
3010	42	GLIDER MODS		115				115
3010	43	T-6		6,164				6,164
3010	44	T-1		188				188

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
3010	45	T-38		143,701				143,701
3010	46	T-41 AIRCRAFT						
3010	47	T-43		2,139				2,139
		Other Aircraft						
3010	48	KC-10A (ATCA)		6,761				6,761
3010	49	C-12		929				929
3010	50	C-20 MODS		513				513
3010	51	VC-25A MOD		1,027				1,027
3010	52	C-40		198				198
3010	53	C-130		217,677				217,677
3010	54	C130J MODS		39,001				39,001
3010	55	C-135		83,541				83,541
3010	56	COMPASS CALL MODS		46,818				46,818
3010	57	C-29A MODS						
3010	58	DARP		89,796				89,796
3010	59	E-3		64,547				64,547
3010	60	E-4		5,640				5,640
3010	61	E-8		138,162				138,162
3010	62	H-1		40,421				40,421
3010	63	H-60		16,738				16,738
3010	64	GLOBAL HAWK MODS		11,309				11,309
3010	65	OTHER AIRCRAFT		43,733				43,733
3010	66	PREDATOR MODS		58,255				58,255
3010	67	CV-22 MODS		451				451
		Other Modifications						
3010	68	CLASSIFIED PROJECTS						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts						
3010	69	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		305,207				305,207
		Aircraft Support Equipment and Facilities						
		Common Support Equip						
3010	70	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		138,918				138,918
		Post Production Support						
3010	71	B-1		10,320				10,320
3010	72	B-2A		7,693				7,693
3010	73	B-2A		11,709				11,709
3010	74	B-52		8,081				8,081
3010	75	C-130						
3010	76	F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		10,741				10,741
3010	77	F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		12,245				12,245
		Industrial Preparedness						
3010	78	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		23,524				23,524
		War Consumables						
3010	79	WAR CONSUMABLES		25,438				25,438
		Other Production Charges						
3010	80	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		474,853				474,853
3010	81	DEPOT MODERNIZATION		1,370				1,370
		Classified Pgms						
3010	82	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
3010	83	CLASSIFIED ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
3010	84	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
		Other Production Charges SOF						
3010	85	CANCELLED ACCT ADJUSTMENTS						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		DARP						
3010	86	DARP		13,000				13,000
3010	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		8,572				8,572
		Total - Aircraft Procurement, Air Force		**11,479,810**		**524,286**		**12,004,096**
		Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force						
		Procurement of Ammo, Air Force						
		Rockets						
3011	1	ROCKETS		58,671				58,671
		Cartridges						
3011	2	CARTRIDGES		168,499				168,499
		Bombs						
3011	3	PRACTICE BOMBS		15,036				15,036
3011	4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		235,533		4,000		239,533
		Bomb insensitive munitions upgrade				[4,000]		
3011	5	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON	305	118,887			305	118,887
3011	6	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	7,261	175,013			7,261	175,013
3011	7	WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISPENSER	250	34,704			250	34,704
		Flare, IR MJU-7B						
3011	8	CAD/PAD		29,909				29,909
3011	9	EXPLOSIVE ORDINANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)		3,091				3,091
3011	10	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		4,705				4,705
3011	11	INITIAL SPARES						
3011	12	MODIFICATIONS		919				919
3011	13	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		4,083				4,083

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Fuzes						
3011	14	FLARES		161,958				161,958
3011	15	FUZES		56,777				56,777
		Weapons						
		Small Arms						
3011	16	SMALL ARMS		4,964				4,964
		Total - Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force		**1,072,749**		**4,000**		**1,076,749**
		Missile Procurement, Air Force						
		Ballistic Missiles						
		Missile Replacement Equipment-Ballistic						
3020	1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		34,344				34,344
		Other Missiles						
		Tactical						
3020	2	JASSM	234	187,165			234	187,165
3020	3	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON						
3020	4	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	195	43,834			195	43,834
3020	5	AMRAAM	215	135,869			215	135,869
3020	6	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	677	65,312			677	65,312
3020	7	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	1,343	99,062			1,343	99,062
		Industrial Facilities						
3020	8	INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION		2,236				2,236
		Modification of In-service Missiles						
		Class IV						
3020	9	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE		1,352				1,352
3020	10	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		833				833

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
3020	11	MM III MODIFICATIONS		691,657		20,000		711,657
		Propulsion replacement program				[20,000]		
3020	12	AGM-65D MAVERICK		246				246
3020	13	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE		9,708				9,708
		Spares and Repair Parts						
		Missiles and Repair Parts						
3020	14	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		50,602				50,602
		Other Support						
		Space Programs						
3020	15	ADVANCED EHF						
3020	15	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
3020	16	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
3020	17	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)	1	413,868			1	413,868
3020	17	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-50,217				-50,217
3020	18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		50,700				50,700
3020	19	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		10,085				10,085
3020	20	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)		139,182				139,182
3020	20	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-42,000				-42,000
3020	21	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		43,259				43,259
3020	22	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)		86,720				86,720
3020	23	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE)		38,391				38,391
3020	24	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM(SPACE)						
3020	25	TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS(SPACE)		31,126				31,126
3020	26	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	4	936,490			4	936,490
3020	27	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)		102,004				102,004
		Special Programs						
3020	28	CANCELLED ACCOUNTS						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
3020	29	DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM		214,262				214,262
3020	30	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
3020	31	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
3020	32	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
3020	33	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		131,362				131,362
3020	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		776,693				776,693
		Total - Missile Procurement, Air Force		**4,204,145**		**20,000**		**4,224,145**
		Other Procurement, Air Force						
		Vehicular Equipment						
		Passenger Carrying Vehicles						
3080	1	ARMORED VEHICLE	1	487			1	487
3080	2	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	153	14,373			153	14,373
		Cargo and Utility Vehicles						
3080	3	TRUCK, STAKE/PLATFORM						
3080	4	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X4						
3080	5	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X2						
3080	6	TRUCK, MAINT/UTILITY/DELIVERY VAN						
3080	7	TRUCK, CARRYALL						
3080	8	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		21,003				21,003
3080	9	HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)		4,072				4,072
3080	10	TRUCK, TRACTOR, OVER 5T						
3080	11	CAP VEHICLES		695				695
3080	12	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000						
		Special Purpose Vehicles						
3080	13	TRUCK TANK 1200 GAL						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
3080	14	TRUCK, TANK FUEL R-11						
3080	15	HMMWV, ARMORED		8,432				8,432
3080	16	TRUCK, REFUSE						
3080	17	HMWWV,UP-ARMORED		11,334				11,334
3080	18	TRACTOR A/C TOW MB-4						
3080	19	TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE						
3080	20	TRUCK HYDRANT FUEL						
3080	21	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M						
		Fire Fighting Equipment						
3080	22	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES		21,492				21,492
3080	23	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M						
		Materials Handling Equipment						
3080	24	TRUCK F/L 6000 LB						
3080	25	TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB						
3080	26	HALVERSEN LOADER		8,211				8,211
3080	27	ITEMS LESS THAT $2,000,000						
		Base Maintenance Support						
3080	28	LOADER, SCOOP						
3080	29	LOADER- SCOOP- W/BACKHOE						
3080	30	TRUCK, DUMP 5CY						
3080	31	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU		30,260				30,260
3080	32	CRANE 7-50 TON						
3080	33	MODIFICATIONS						
3080	34	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000(VEHICLES)		27,918				27,918
		Cancelled Account Adjustment						
3080	35	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Electronics and Telecommunications						
		Comm Security Equipment (COMSEC)						
3080	36	COMSEC EQUIPMENT		121,763				121,763
3080	37	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)		692				692
		Intelligence Programs						
3080	38	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		5,235				5,235
3080	39	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT		1,576		7,500		9,076
		Intelligence squadron equipment for reachback				[7,500]		
		Electronics Programs						
3080	40	TRAFFIC CONTROL/LANDING		6,241				6,241
3080	41	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM		53,761				53,761
3080	42	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVE		77,184				77,184
3080	43	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST		35,093				35,093
3080	44	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL		27,076				27,076
3080	45	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX		19,257				19,257
3080	46	TAC SIGINT SPT						
3080	47	DRUG INTERDICTION SPT		431				431
		Special Comm-Electronics Projects						
3080	48	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		120,406				120,406
3080	49	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS		13,877				13,877
3080	50	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL		10,060				10,060
3080	51	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM		41,382		15,000		56,382
		Air Force Space Command security upgrates				[15,000]		
3080	52	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES		35,382				35,382
3080	53	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM N		3,413				3,413
3080	54	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		4,657				4,657
3080	55	GCSS-AF FOS		31,994				31,994

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accour	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
3080	56	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM		23,586				23,586
3080	57	AIR OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)		25,183				25,183
		Air Force Communications						
3080	58	BASE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE		334,655				334,655
3080	59	USCENTCOM		32,558				32,558
3080	60	AUTOMATED TELECOMMUNICATIONS PGM						
		DISA Programs						
3080	61	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE		4,219				4,219
3080	62	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE		6,004				6,004
3080	63	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE		13,456				13,456
3080	64	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE		85,512				85,512
3080	65	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE		120,450				120,450
3080	66	MILSATCOM SPACE		75,846				75,846
3080	67	SPACE MODS SPACE		25,153				25,153
3080	68	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM		31,434				31,434
		Organization and Base						
3080	69	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		147,658				147,658
3080	70	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER		27,225				27,225
3080	71	RADIO EQUIPMENT		7,730				7,730
3080	72	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)		2,743				2,743
3080	73	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT		8,416				8,416
3080	74	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		135,169				135,169
3080	75	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000		3,795				3,795
		Modifications						
3080	76	COMM ELECT MODS		28,344				28,344

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accour	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Other Base Maintenance and Support Equip						
		Test Equipment						
3080	77	BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE						
3080	78	PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY PACKA						
3080	79	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M						
		Personal Safety and Rescue Equipment						
3080	80	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		19,304				19,304
3080	81	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M (SAFETY)				4,000		4,000
		Self-deploying infrared streamers				[4,000]		
		Depot Plant and Material Handling Equip						
3080	82	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		14,593				14,593
3080	83	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M (DEPOT)						
		Electrical Equipment						
3080	84	FLOODLIGHTS SET TYPE NF2D						
3080	85	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M (ELECTRICAL)						
		Base Support Equipment						
3080	86	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT		11,417				11,417
3080	87	MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT		16,377				16,377
3080	88	AIR BASE OPERABILITY		5,063				5,063
3080	89	PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
3080	90	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT		5,401				5,401
3080	91	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		26,043				26,043
3080	92	AIR CONDITIONERS						
3080	93	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M (BASE SUPPORT)		30,876				30,876
3080	94	PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
		Special Support Projects						
3080	95	TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQMT						

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
3080	96	DARP RC135		21,204				21,204
3080	97	DARP, MRIGS		195,723				195,723
3080	98	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
3080	99	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		467,601				467,601
3080	100	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.		15,171				15,171
3080	101	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
		Spares and Repair Parts						
3080	102	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		28,634				28,634
3080	103	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
3080	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		12,653,786				12,653,786
		Total - Other Procurement, Air Force		**15,408,086**		**26,500**		**15,434,586**

Procurement of Joint Primary Aircraft Training System aircraft after fiscal year 2006 (sec. 141)

The committee recommends a provision that would require any Joint Primary Aircraft Training System (JPATS) aircraft procured after fiscal year 2006 to be procured through a contract under part 15 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), relating to items by negotiated contract, rather than through a contract under part 12 of the FAR, relating to acquisition of commercial items.

The committee believes that the original decision to procure JPATS as a commercial item unnecessarily limited cost oversight by the government by denying the government access to certified cost or pricing data from the manufacturer. The committee believes that an agreement to change the terms and conditions of the existing JPATS contract from a commercial item contract to a standard defense contract is necessary to provide the government the oversight it needs to procure aircraft at a fair price. The Department of Defense Inspector General report, number D–2006–075, entitled "Acquisition of the Joint Primary Aircraft Training System," dated April 12, 2006, recommended that the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition discontinue the commercial item procurement strategy for the JPATS program and replace it with a strategy that would require the contractor to provide certified cost or pricing data and visibility into contractor cost and help the Government ensure prices negotiated and eventually paid are reasonable.

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

Prohibition on retirement of C–130E/H tactical airlift aircraft (sec. 142)

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 2007.

The committee believes it would be premature to retire any 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), Phases 1 and 2, identify the right mix and number of intra-theater airlift assets, and that the results of the assessment and the ITLCS study have been provided to the congressional defense committees.

Limitation on retirement of KC–135E aircraft (sec. 143)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to retire up to and including 29 KC–135E aircraft of the Air Force that do not have the Expanded Interim Repair and are currently removed from the flying schedule in fiscal year 2007. It is the intent of the committee to allow the Air Force to retire KC–135E aircraft in a manner consistent with the recommendations of the Air Force Fleet Viability Board, KC–135 Assessment Report, dated September 2005, including, but not limited to, the service completing a business case analysis for this mission area.

Limitation on retirement of B–52H bomber aircraft (sec. 144)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to retire up to and including 18 B–52H aircraft of the Air Force. The committee expects the remaining B–52H aircraft inventory to be maintained in a common aircraft configuration that includes the Electronic Countermeasure Improvement, the Avionics Mid-life Improvement, and the Combat Network Communication Technology modification efforts. The committee expects no further reduction in the B–52H total aircraft inventory, including the current inventory levels for combat coded Primary Mission Aircraft Inventory and Primary Training Aircraft Inventory. The committee is concerned that any further reduction in the B–52H total aircraft inventory will create unacceptable risk to our national security and may prevent our ability to strike the required conventional target set during times of war.

Retirement of B–52H bomber aircraft (sec. 145)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of any funds available to the Department of Defense from being obligated or expended for retiring or dismantling any of the 93 B–52H bomber aircraft in service in the Air Force as of June 1, 2006, until 30 days after the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the bomber force structure. The committee directs that the report shall be conducted by the Institute for Defense Analyses and provided to the Secretary of the Air Force for transmittal to Congress. The committee is troubled that the Air Force would reduce the B–52 bomber fleet without a comprehensive analysis of the bomber force structure similar to the last comprehensive long range bomber study, which was conducted in 1999.

Prohibition on incremental funding and multiyear procurement of F–22A aircraft (sec. 146)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from using incremental funding for the procurement of F–22A aircraft. In the past, the Congress has approved of incremental funding of certain space programs and a select number of shipbuilding programs. Notwithstanding assertions to the contrary, authorizing incremental funding for the F–22A would set a precedent for funding aircraft. The committee sees no justification for setting such a precedent in the case of the F–22A, where the Department of Defense has proposed incremental funding merely as a way of alleviating cash flow pressures on the overall Department.

Additionally, the provision would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from entering into a multiyear procurement of the F–22A. Subsections (a)(1) through (6) of section 2306b of title 10, United States Code establish the conditions for entering into a multiyear procurement contract. The statute requires that the use of such a contract will result in substantial savings of the total anticipated costs of carrying out the program through annual contracts. Although it would seem possible to achieve savings from implementing a multiyear procurement for the F–22A, the Air Force has not yet completed a thorough analysis of multiyear savings.

The statute also requires that the estimates of both the cost of the contract and the anticipated cost avoidance through the use of a multiyear contract are realistic. The fact that the Air Force had budgeted 24 F–22A aircraft in fiscal year 2006, but will only be able to buy 22 or 23 aircraft with available funds does not give confidence that anticipated costs are well understood. Although the Department of Defense and the Air Force have asked for the authority to pursue a multiyear procurement program, the Administration has not submitted any budget exhibits supporting a multiyear procurement strategy.

Budget Items—Air Force

Joint Strike Fighter

The budget request included $869.7 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) to purchase five Air Force aircraft in fiscal year 2007, $145.3 million in APAF to purchase long lead time materials for eight Air Force aircraft to be purchased in fiscal year 2008, and $245.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN) to purchase long lead time materials for eight Marine Corps aircraft to be purchased in fiscal year 2008.

The purpose of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program is to provide an affordable replacement strike fighter aircraft for major portions of the fleets of the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. The Air Force variant will be a conventional takeoff and landing aircraft (CTOL), the Navy variant will be aircraft carrier capable (CV), and the Marine Corps variant will be capable of short takeoff and vertical landing (STOVL). Central to the whole JSF program is achieving an affordable option for these modernization efforts. Commonality within this family of aircraft is crucial in keeping the overall tactical aviation modernization program affordable.

The committee strongly supports, and is committed to achieving, the objective of developing and deploying a technically superior and affordable fleet of Joint Strike Fighters that support the warfighter in performing a wide variety of missions, as well as meeting the United States Government's stated commitments to our international partners and allies.

The committee, however, is concerned that excessive concurrency between the development and procurement programs could hamper efforts to realize this objective in an effective and efficient manner. Recent testimony by a representative of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) indicated that,

> The JSF program expects to begin low-rate initial procurement in 2007 with less than 1 percent of the flight test program completed and no production representative prototypes built for the three JSF variants. Technologies and features critical to JSF's operational success, such as a low observable and highly common airframe, advanced mission systems, and maintenance prognostics systems, will not have been demonstrated in a flight test environment when production begins. Other key demonstrations that will have not been either started or only in the initial stages

before production begins include: (1) testing with fully integrated aircraft-mission systems and full software; (2) structural and fatigue testing of the airframe; and (3) shipboard testing of Navy and Marine Corps aircraft.

The committee has also learned that first flight of the first aircraft, a CTOL variant, has slipped several months, and building of the research and development aircraft is running three to five months behind schedule.

The overlap in testing and production is the result of a business case and acquisition strategy that has proven to be risky in past programs like F–22A, Comanche, and B–2A, which far exceeded the cost and delivery goals set at the start of their development programs. JSF has already increased its cost estimate and delayed deliveries through a lengthy replanning effort that added over $7.0 billion and 18 months to the development program. The committee believes that an evolutionary acquisition strategy to limit requirements for the aircraft's first increment of capabilities that can be achieved with proven technologies and available resources could significantly reduce the JSF program's cost and schedule risks. Such a strategy would allow the program to begin testing and low-rate production sooner and, ultimately, to deliver a useful product in sufficient quantities to the warfighter sooner. The Department of Defense's use of an evolutionary, knowledge-based approach is not unprecedented. The F–16 program successfully evolved capabilities over the span of 30 years, with an initial F–16 capability delivered to the warfighter about four years after development started.

Although the Department has scheduled the production of JSF aircraft to begin replacing legacy aircraft, the committee believes that the development and fielding of JSF variants should be event-driven and that more of the technologies should be matured and risk reduced to the point that the government and the contractor team can sign a fixed-price contract for each production lot of aircraft.

Therefore, the committee recommends a one-year delay in production and a reduction of $955.0 million from APAF for JSF (consisting of $869.7 million for JSF and $85.3 million from JSF advance procurement), and $245.0 million in APN.

F–22A procurement

The budget request included $1,981.3 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) as part of an incremental funding strategy that would lead to a production profile of 20 aircraft per year for a three-year multiyear procurement of 60 aircraft, beginning in fiscal year 2008. No complete F–22A aircraft were to be procured in fiscal year 2007. The budget request also included $200.0 million in F–22A advance procurement for economic order quantity (EOQ) items required for the F–22A multiyear procurement program.

The committee does not agree with the Department of Defense acquisition strategy to incrementally fund the F–22A. The committee sees no justification for setting a precedent for funding aircraft, as in the case of the F–22A, where the Department of De-

fense has proposed incremental funding merely as a way of alleviating cash flow pressures on the overall Department.

Additionally, the committee sees no justification for entering into a multiyear procurement of the aircraft. Subsections (a)(1) through (6) of section 2306b of title 10, United States Code establish the conditions for entering into a multiyear procurement contract. One of these conditions is that such a contract will result in substantial savings as compared to the total anticipated costs of carrying out the program through annual contracts. The committee believes that substantial savings are not possible under the proposed acquisition strategy. Although the Department of Defense and the Air Force have asked for the authority to pursue a multiyear procurement program, the Administration has not submitted any budget exhibits supporting a multiyear procurement strategy. Without a multiyear procurement program, the $200.0 million in EOQ funds are in excess and should be applied to the procurement of F–22A aircraft in fiscal year 2007.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $1,400.0 million in APAF for a total procurement of $3,381.3 million. The committee authorizes the Air Force to procure up to and including 20 F–22A aircraft in fiscal year 2007.

C–17A procurement

The budget request included $2,636.2 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), to complete the buy of 180 C–17A aircraft, including $433.2 million for line closure expenses. In addition, the fiscal year 2006 budget, as enacted, is $224.5 million for buying additional aircraft or for line closure expenses. Therefore, with the Air Force planned closure of the production line after the delivery of 180 aircraft, there would be available $657.7 million for line closure expenses.

The committee is concerned that premature closure of the C–17A production line would leave the Department of Defense with inadequate lift capabilities. While the Mobility Capabilities Study (MCS) identified that a fleet of 180 C–17As was adequate, that recommendation was based on many assumptions, some of which, only months after its completion, no longer hold true. There is a clear need for additional C–17As in order to meet inter- and intra-theater lift requirements.

In addition, the study assumed a standard usage rate, one significantly lower than what the Air Force has experienced over the past several years. In fact, the service is flying its transports in excess of 159 percent of planned usage rates, which is leading to premature aging of the fleet. Some of the older transports now fly with restrictions due to sustained high usage. For this reason, the committee believes that higher usage rates necessitate the production of additional aircraft to ensure the long-term adequacy of the fleet.

In the Senate report accompanying S. 1042 (S. Rept. 109–69) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, the committee requested a further determination by the Secretary of Defense on the adequacy of airlift capabilities for several reasons, including increased humanitarian usage, the return of 70,000 personnel to the United States due to the Base Relocation and Alignment Commission results, homeland security requirements, Special

Operations Command missions, requirements associated with the Army's Strategic Brigade Airdrop goal, and lift requirements for the Army's Stryker Brigades. The committee has yet to receive the Secretary's report. However, it would be difficult to conclude that these changes have not led to growth in our lift requirements.

In addition, the committee is further concerned that C–17A production is scheduled to cease well before the results of the C–5 modernization demonstration program in December 2008 are available. As a recent Department of Commerce analysis points out, the cost to restart production of the C–17A would exceed $5.0 billion and take 4 years before additional transports would become available. This conclusion is fully consistent with attempts in the early 1980s to restart the C–5 program, which was difficult, costly, and took years to restart. Additional funding for C–17A procurement has been included on the Air Force Chief of Staff's unfunded priorities list.

For these reasons, the committee recommends redirecting the $657.7 million planned for line closure to procure additional C–17A aircraft. The committee recommends $257.7 million in advance procurement (using the $224.5 million of fiscal year 2006 advance procurement with an additional $33.2 million transferred from the C–17A procurement line to the C–17A advance procurement line in fiscal year 2007), and applying the remaining $400.0 million to buy two additional C–17As.

KC–135 tanker replacement

The budget request included $36.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) to purchase long, lead time materials to support the first aircraft delivery of a replacement tanker for the KC–135 aircraft in fiscal year 2010, and $203.9 million in PE 41221F for non-recurring engineering, test development, and program office expenses. The KC–135 tanker replacement program had been under a Department of Defense-directed pause which has resulted in a program schedule slip that will cause the contract award for tanker replacement to occur in fiscal year 2008.

The committee recommends a decrease of $36.1 million in APAF, and a decrease of $199.0 million in PE 41221F for the KC–135 tanker replacement program to reflect the schedule slip.

A/OA–10 modifications

The budget request included $107.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) for modifications to the A/OA–10 aircraft. The modifications for the A/OA–10 include, but are not limited to, a communications and datalink upgrade, precision engagement upgrades, and a missile warning capability. A recent urgent needs request was established for an A/OA–10 robust, frequency-selectable, line-of-sight and beyond line-of-sight secure airborne communications and datalink capability that can be provided by the ARC–210 radio. The net effect of this improvement will be highly reliable, responsive air support of joint, coalition, and multi-national ground forces, and lower maintenance provided by materiel improvement. The precision engagement program upgrades include a digital stores management system, MIL–STD–1760 munitions bus, SNIPER/Litening targeting pod integration, improved hands-on-throttle-

and-stick (HOTAS) control, two new multifunctional color cockpit displays, an improved head-up display, and digital datalink. The precision engagement upgrades will permit the A/OA–10 to employ GPS-guided munitions such as the Joint Direct Attack Munition and the Wind Corrected Munitions Dispenser. The A/OA–10 aircraft also requires an extended duration, covert infrared countermeasures capability to protect the aircraft from infrared surface-to-air missile threats that abound in its typical operating envelope for ground attack. Accelerated procurement of A/OA–10 modifications is included as the number three priority on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priorities list.

The committee recommends an increase of $83.4 million in APAF to accelerate the A/OA–10 modification program.

C–5 aircraft avionics modernization program

The budget request included $223.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) for modifications to the C–5 aircraft, including $50.4 million to continue the C–5 avionics modernization program (AMP). AMP upgrades the C–5 cockpit by replacing unreliable cockpit avionics, installs communication, navigation, surveillance/air traffic management equipment capabilities that will improve air traffic management by taking advantage of optimum air routes. AMP also installs navigation safety equipment such as the traffic alert and collision avoidance system and the terrain awareness and warning system. To accelerate this program, the committee recommends an increase of $32.0 million in APAF for C–5 AMP.

Bomb insensitive munitions upgrade

The budget request included $41.9 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (PAAF), for Mk 84 bombs, but included no funding for facilitation of the insensitive munitions upgrade at the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PAAF for facilitation of the insensitive munitions upgrade at the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant for the Mk 84 bomb production line.

Propulsion replacement program

The budget request included $294.6 million in Missile Procurement Air Force (MPAF), for the Minuteman III propulsion replacement program. This program extends the life, maintains the performance, and improves reliability of the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile by remanufacturing all three solid rocket motor stages. Refurbishment of the motors is necessary to sustain the Minuteman III force through 2020.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in MPAF, line 11, for the propulsion replacement program to offset increased costs of ammonium perchlorate and attrition hardware.

Expanded intelligence support for reach-back operations

The demand for intelligence exploitation from Air Force high mission aircraft, such as Predator, Global Hawk, and U–2, is increasing. Advances in technology allow for this imagery and signals intelligence exploitation to be conducted by Air Force intelligence

organizations at home stationed in the United States rather than being forward deployed. Air National Guard (ANG) squadrons have successfully assumed portions of this mission set.

The committee recommends that this capability be expanded in the ANG. The committee also recommends an increase of $7.5 million in Other Procurement, Air Force, Intelligence Communications, to provide necessary communications equipment and unique intelligence workstations to enhance the mission capabilities of ANG intelligence squadrons and to expand the intelligence reach-back capabilities of the Department of Defense.

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 $4.0 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 $4.0 million in OPAF for the procurement of the self-deploying infrared streamer.

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Procurement, Defense-Wide						
		Major Equipment						
		Major Equipment, OSD/WHS						
300	1	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		84,861		22,337		107,198
		Army high performance computing research center				[22,337]		
		Major Equipment, NSA						
300	2	CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
300	3	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		12,133				12,133
300	4	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PGM	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
300	5	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE						
		Major Equipment, WHS						
300	6	WHS MOTOR VEHICLES	1	175			1	175
300	7	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		23,451				23,451
		Major Equipment, DISA						
300	8	INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
300	9	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		18,747				18,747
300	10	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM		6,247				6,247
300	11	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM		5,584				5,584
300	12	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,652				2,652
300	13	TELEPORT PROGRAM		50,280				50,280
300	14	GLOBAL INFORMATION GRID						
300	15	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		41,386				41,386
300	16	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)		26,952				26,952
300	17	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK (DISN)		29,870				29,870
300	18	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE		1,928				1,928
		Major Equipment, DIA						
300	19	INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
300	20	COMBATANT COMMAND INTELLIGENCE OPERATION	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
300	21	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO OSD COUNTER-NARCOT	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
300	22	DEFENSE HUMINT INTELLIGENCE (HUMINT) PROGRA	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
		Major Equipment, DLA						
300	23	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		8,694				8,694
		Major Equipment, DCAA						
300	24	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,520				1,520
		Major Equipment, TJS						
300	25	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		42,988				42,988
		Major Equipment, DHRA						
300	26	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		7,915				7,915
		National Geospatial Intelligence Agency						
300	27	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NGA	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
		Defense Threat Reduction Agency						
300	28	VEHICLES		180				180
300	29	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		15,698				15,698
		Defense Security Cooperation Agency						
300	30	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		507				507
		Major Equipment, AFIS						
300	31	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS		5,636				5,636
		Major Equipment, DODDE						
300	32	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS		1,522				1,522
		Major Equipment, DCMA						
300	33	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		3,257				3,257
		Major Equipment, DTSA						
300	34	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		421				421

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		Major Equipment, BTA						
300	35	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA		16,291				16,291
		Special Operations Command						
		Aviation Programs						
300	36	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT		86,758		13,900		100,658
		M134D-T mini gun				[13,900]		
300	37	SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS						
300	38	MC-130H AIR REFUELING SYSTEM		1,522				1,522
300	39	MH-47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM		59,812				59,812
300	40	MH-60 SOF MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		91,902				91,902
300	41	MC-130H, COMBAT TALON II		158,824				158,824
300	42	CV-22 SOF MOD	2	168,780			2	168,780
300	43	AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION		1,131				1,131
300	44	C-130 MODIFICATIONS		49,763				49,763
300	45	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT		1,143				1,143
		Shipbuilding						
300	46	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS)		12,629				12,629
300	47	MK8 MOD1 SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE		2,473				2,473
		Ammunition Programs						
300	48	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT		43,679				43,679
300	49	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION		13,604		7,500		21,104
		M153 time delayed firing device/sympathetic detonator				[7,500]		
		Other Procurement Programs						
300	50	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS		70,410				70,410
300	51	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		32,743		18,900		51,643
		Persistent Predator operations and intelligence				[13,400]		
		JTWS variants for network-centric advanced platforms				[5,500]		

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
300	52	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		105,788		18,200		123,988
		MK47 Mod 0 Striker40				[12,900]		
		Special Operations Forces laser acquisition marker (SOFLAM)				[5,300]		
300	53	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
300	54	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS		1,831				1,831
300	55	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES		9,608				9,608
300	56	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS		20,204		8,200		28,404
		SOCOM craft modifications				[8,200]		
300	57	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		5,302				5,302
300	58	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
300	59	TACTICAL VEHICLES		13,196				13,196
300	60	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATIONS SYSTEMS		12,841				12,841
300	61	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS						
300	62	MILCON COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT		3,090				3,090
300	63	UNMANNED VEHICLES		20,700				20,700
300	64	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM (GDIP)	[ ]	[ ]			[ ]	[ ]
300	65	SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT		2,655				2,655
300	66	DRUG INTERDICTION						
300	67	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		13,074				13,074
300	68	SPECIAL OPS MISSION PLANNING ENVIRONMENT						
300	69	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS		434,472				434,472
300	70	PSYOP EQUIPMENT		93,881				93,881
		Chemical/Biological Defense						
		CBDP						
300	71	INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION		86,157				86,157
300	72	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION		76,732				76,732
300	73	DECONTAMINATION		16,793				16,793

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
300	74	JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM		47,113				47,113
300	75	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION		43,508				43,508
300	76	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE		236,120		30,000		266,120
		M22 automatic chemical agent alarm (ACADA)				[20,000]		
		Improved chemical agent monitor (ICAM)				[10,000]		
300	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		414,328				414,328
		Total - Procurement, Defense-Wide		**2,861,461**		**119,037**		**2,980,498**

Title I - Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Accou	Line	Program Title	FY 2007 Request Qty	FY 2007 Request Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
		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						
	6	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT						
		Total - National Guard & Reserve Equipment						
		Defense Production Act Purchases						
360	1	DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES						
		Total - Defense Production Act Purchases						
		TOTAL PROCUREMENT		**82,901,018**		**2,826,774**		**85,727,792**

Budget Items—Defense-wide

Army high performance computing research center

The budget request included $84.9 million in Procurement, Defense-wide for major equipment, including $51.2 million for the High Performance Computing (HPC) Modernization Program (HPCMP). Department of Defense (DOD) supercomputing requirements for support of the research, development, test and evaluation community are collected and validated annually. Current projections show that the deployed capability in fiscal year 2007 will meet less than half of the validated requirement. The addition of supercomputers at the Army HPC research center will help the Department meet a high percentage of the requirement. The committee recommends an increase of $22.3 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, for a total authorization of $73.5 million for the Army HPC research center.

Mini gun

The budget request included $86.8 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Rotary Wing Upgrades and Sustainment, but included no funding for the procurement of the M134 mini gun.

The M134 mini gun is a six barrel Gatling gun that has proven itself as a workhorse for the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment (160th SOAR) due to its long service life and reliable rate of fire. The M134 mini gun is one of the highest priorities of the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of $13.9 million in PDW, for SOF Rotary Wing Upgrades and Sustainment, to support the procurement of 279 additional mini guns to ensure the 160th SOAR has a common weapon system capable of operating on direct-current power, while also offering a weight savings and improved reliability.

Time delayed firing device/sympathetic detonators

The budget request included $13.6 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Ordnance Acquisition, including $2.7 million for time delayed firing device/sympathetic detonators (TDFD/SYDET), but included insufficient funding to fully replenish the inventory or provide sufficient munitions to train new operators as directed by the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review Report.

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

The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million in PDW, for SOF Ordnance Acquisition, to procure an additional 5,500 TDFD/SYDET units for SOF operators and trainers.

Persistent Predator operations and intelligence

The budget request included $32.7 million for Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Intelligence Systems, but included no funding for Persistent Predator operations and intelligence.

The U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) requires the capability to find, fix, and finish time-sensitive, high-value targets. These targets can often only be developed with patient, persistent collection, and require rapid, decisive action during the brief periods in which they present themselves. Persistent Predator operations and intelligence is the highest priority for the Commander, USSOCOM, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of $13.4 million in PDW, for SOF Intelligence Systems, to procure a mobile Predator operations center and distributed common ground system to conduct dynamic retasking of Predator assets to support SOF ground forces.

Advanced lightweight grenade launcher

The budget request included no funding in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Small Arms and Weapons, for continued procurement of the Advanced Lightweight Grenade Launcher (ALGL).

The ALGL system provides a much improved capability over the Mark 19 grenade launcher it replaced. The ALGL is a lightweight 40MM grenade launching system with day and night fire control and air bursting 40MM ammunition. This capability provides SOF elements the ability to address targets in defilade position, and enables first burst hit capability on point targets up to 1,500 meters. ALGL is one of the highest priorities for the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of $12.9 million in PDW, for SOF Small Arms and Weapons, to procure an additional 86 ALGL systems with fire control capability.

Special Operations Forces laser acquisition marker

The budget request included $105.8 million for Procurement, Defense-wide, for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Small Arms Weapons, and $1.4 million for the night vision sight subcomponent of the Special Operations Forces Laser Acquisition Marker (SOFLAM).

The use of an invisible, coded laser that can only be detected by a targeted missile provides SOF elements with a stand off capability to engage targets, and ensures friendly delivery aircraft spend minimal time in enemy airspace. SOFLAM is one of the highest priorities for the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.3 million in PDW, for Small Arms Weapons, to procure twelve SOFLAM for tactical air controllers to mark and laze targets for the delivery of laser guided munitions.

Special Operations Command craft modifications

The budget request included $20.2 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Combatant Craft Systems, including $2.5 million for craft modifications, but

included insufficient funding to fully upgrade the high speed assault craft inventory.

The committee notes that the craft modifications will accelerate technology insertion, including the high performance diesel engine propulsion system, the integrated onboard ground operating system, and the integrated bridge system. The craft modifications are one of the highest priorities of the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.2 million in PDW, for SOF Combatant Craft Systems, to fully upgrade the high speed assault craft currently used by Naval Special Warfare Command in the execution of their mission to conduct interdiction at sea, as well as insertion and extraction of combat force to or from shore based targets.

Joint threat warning system

The budget request included $4.5 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Intelligence Systems Development, for continued procurement of the Joint Threat Warning System (JTWS), but the amount requested will only equip a small portion of special operations forces with this much-improved threat warning capability for ground, air, and maritime forces.

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

The committee recommends am increase of $5.5 million in PDW, for SOF Intelligence Systems Development, to procure additional JTWS variants that will allow operators increased situational awareness.

Automatic Chemical Agent Detector and Alarm

The budget request included $236.1 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 Automatic Chemical Agent Detector and Alarm (ACADA). The committee notes that a number of Army National Guard units are deployed in support of military operations. These units must have the best possible defense against chemical threats. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PDW to meet procurement shortfalls in fielding ACADA systems.

Improved chemical agent monitor

The budget request included $236.1 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for contamination avoidance equipment, but included no funding for the Improved Chemical Agent Monitor

(ICAM). ICAM is a hand-held, soldier operated, post-attack device that provides a means of quickly detecting the presence of nerve and blister 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 equipment to detect the presence of chemical threats.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PDW, for ICAM, to increase the Army National Guard's contamination avoidance capabilities.

Items of Special Interest

Cost control for certain helicopter acquisition programs

The Department of Defense, including the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps are all buying helicopters for filling various missions. Two of these programs have generated concern because of recent developments. The Marine Corps has been developing upgrades and replacements for its existing fleet of attack (AH–1) and utility (UH–1) helicopters. These programs, which are being conducted by the same manufacturer, 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. Since the Marine Corps' MV–22, Special Operations Command's CV–22, the Air Force's VH–71, and the Army's Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter (ARH) programs will all be acquired in whole or in part from the same contractor, the committee believes that Department-wide attention should be focused on the corrective actions that are being proposed for restructuring the AH–1 and UH–1 programs.

Therefore, the committee strongly urges the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD (AT&L)) to conduct a thorough review of the cost control and cost accounting procedures for helicopter acquisition programs of the various helicopter prime contractors, not just the contractor involved in the AH–1 and UH–1 programs. We need to be sure that we are getting fair value for the billions of dollars that the taxpayer will be investing in the various helicopter acquisition programs in the current plan.

The committee will reserve judgment on the plan to restructure the UH–1 and AH–1 programs until the Department completes its review.

Deployable/mobile command and control programs

The committee notes that there are many efforts underway in the Department of Defense and military services to develop and field battle management command and control systems. While the committee supports ongoing efforts to improve command and control (C2) capabilities, we are nonetheless concerned that many of

these systems are being developed as service-centric solutions rather than as joint solutions. As a result, there is likely to be unnecessary duplication of effort and cost inefficiencies and, more importantly, there is the potential that systems will lack the necessary interoperability to operate effectively in a joint military operation.

The committee also notes that Joint Forces Command (JFCOM), in coordination with the Department of the Navy, is developing and fielding the first increment of the Deployable Joint Command and Control (DJC2) system with some success. However, with efforts underway to pursue further increments of DJC2 capability, it has become apparent that a number of service-specific solutions to the problem of deployable C2 have recently begun that may duplicate DJC2. In addition, the services have several efforts underway to develop various mobile C2 systems. These systems are intended to provide commanders with battle management and situational awareness capabilities while on the move. For example, the Army is developing the Mounted Battle Command On-The-Move (MBCOTM) system and the Marine Corps is developing the Command and Control On-The-Move Network Digital Over-the-Horizon Relay (CONDOR) system. Additionally, JFCOM is designing a Command and Control on the Move (C2OTM) system under limited acquisition authority. While each service will argue that they need a service-unique deployable C2 solution to meet service-specific requirements, a common solution set of equipment that could meet the needs of multiple services may be preferable, especially given the funding pressures the Department is experiencing. The committee believes that there are efficiencies to be gained from merging the services' deployable and mobile C2 initiatives.

As a first step in identifying the extent to which there is a problem with the military services continuing to pursue service-specific C2 solutions at the expense of joint solutions, the committee directs the Comptroller General to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, no later than March 15, 2007, reviewing current and planned programs within the Department to develop deployable and mobile C2 systems. The report will include an assessment of the requirements, costs, and schedules of these programs and whether joint development approaches are warranted.

F–18 Hornet to Joint Strike Fighter transition

The committee is concerned that the Navy will confront a sizeable gap in aircraft inventory as older F/A–18A–D Hornets retire before the aircraft carrier variant of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) is available. F/A–18A–D aircraft were originally designed for a service life of 6,000 flight hours, and after an initial engineering study, that limit was raised to 8,000 flight hours. It would take additional service life extensions to reach 12,000 flight hours to ensure a smooth transition to JSF with no inventory shortfall.

The magnitude of the problem, and the procurement cost to avoid a shortfall in the carrier air wing force structure, is entirely dependent on when the Navy determines that its F/A–18A/Cs are at the end of their service life. An ongoing Service Life Assessment Program (SLAP) II study, to be completed in December 2007, will determine the maximum service life of the aircraft. Early projections from the SLAP II study indicate that aircraft service life may

be approved beyond 8,000 flight hours. However, the Navy has acknowledged that, even if 10,000 flight hours were achievable, the inventory shortfall would be 50 aircraft. If any of the assumptions used in the Navy's analysis change or prove to be overly optimistic, the inventory gap will grow dramatically.

The committee understands that an acquisition decision is not required this fiscal year. However, small steps taken now could prevent the requirement for major and expensive program changes in 2010. Accordingly, the committee recommends that the Navy consider buying additional F/A–18E/Fs to mitigate the known shortfall, while allowing the Navy to transition to the JSF as soon as feasible. In addition, the committee directs the Navy to report the preliminary findings of the SLAP II study to the congressional defense committees no later than June 15, 2007.

Fully funded bomber roadmap

The Secretary of the Air Force shall provide a bomber roadmap to the congressional defense committees within 120 days of enactment of this Act. The roadmap will outline a plan for long-range strike bombers with specific details of upgrade plans for legacy bombers and a schedule for development of the new long-range strike bomber. The roadmap shall include the amount of funding that would be needed to implement the roadmap through fiscal year 2020.

Littoral Combat Ship

The Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) is a small, fast Navy surface combatant with modular weapon systems, designed to fill critical capability gaps for warfighting in the littorals. The Navy plans to procure a total of 55 LCS vessels, plus approximately 90 mission modules for mine warfare, anti-submarine warfare, and anti-surface warfare capability. The Navy has emphasized the criticality of littoral capability, modularity, and low acquisition cost as the compelling attributes for procuring this new class of small combatants. The Navy's estimate for LCS procurement was $220.0 million, with average unit cost for mission modules estimated at $70.0 million. The Navy's acquisition strategy was to procure 4 flight 0 ships, pause procurement in fiscal year 2008 while evaluating system performance, and then proceed with introduction of a flight 1 design for follow-on ship competition.

The Navy awarded two LCS flight 0 prime contracts, with research and development (R&D) funding in fiscal years 2005 and 2006. Congress appropriated two additional flight 0 ships in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN) in fiscal year 2006, budgeted at the Navy's estimated $220.0 million unit cost. Additionally, in view of concerns with cost growth on shipbuilding programs, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) established a $220.0 million cost cap for the fifth and sixth ships of the LCS program. That cost cap is subject to authorized adjustments for inflation, outfitting, statutory changes, and technology insertion approved by the Secretary of the Navy.

The fiscal year 2007 budget request included $521.0 million for the fifth and sixth ships of the LCS class, and identified that the Navy's $220.0 million estimate for LCS unit cost was exclusive of

contract change orders, planning and engineering services, program management support, and other costs not included in the ship construction contract. In total, the Congressional Research Service estimates that these adjustments would increase the average unit procurement cost of follow-on LCS ships about 33 percent, to approximately $298.0 million. With lead ship construction less than 50 percent complete, it is premature to refine these estimates based on actual construction cost return data. The Navy has also advised that it has revised its acquisition strategy and intends to continue procurement of the two flight 0 versions at least through the planned procurement of the fifteenth LCS in fiscal year 2009.

The construction of lead LCS vessels at two shipyards inherently adds cost risk, which will persist until these ships near completion in 2007 and 2008. The emphasis on cost control would dictate that the Navy pursue competition, commonality, and the results of learning curves to the extent practical in the procurement of this 55 ship class.

The committee views LCS as an important component of the Navy's strategy for conducting the global war on terror, and has supported the Navy's approach to rapidly field this capability. The design and construction of LCS in parallel with development of the mission modules requires heightened management of program risk to ensure affordable, full mission capability of the LCS program. However, the committee is concerned that the affordability appeal of the LCS program is being overtaken by apparent cost growth, and that the rapid ramp up in LCS procurement will compound the issue. The stated emphasis on affordability is obscured by the absence of a clear acquisition strategy to guide strategic program decisions. Additionally, it is unclear that the Navy has assessed the added cost for training, maintenance, configuration management, planning and engineering, and supply support for the two flight 0 ship classes. Further, by virtue of budgeting the costs for procuring the flight 0 LCS vessels in three different appropriations, total costs for the program's start are difficult to discern.

In view of these concerns, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report on the LCS program, no later than December 1, 2006 to the congressional defense committees. The report shall outline the Navy's acquisition strategy for the program, including the competition plan, the flight strategy, and the cost containment strategy for the program; contain a clear representation of all R&D and procurement costs for the total program; and assess the added life cycle costs associated with operation and support for two dissimilar flight 0 LCS designs.

Maritime Prepositioning Force, Future

The Navy's long-range plan for future force structure includes $14.5 billion for the development and construction of Maritime Prepositioning Force (Future) (MPF(F)) ships and related enabling technologies in support of sea basing. The budget request included $127.7 million in PE 63236N and PE 48042N for the purpose of developing concepts of operation and enabling technologies for the Sea Base. The first MPF(F) ships are planned for procurement in fiscal year 2009, with the Sea Base initial operating capability in 2016.

The Senate report accompanying S. 1042 (S. Rept. 109–69) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 identified concerns regarding whether the future concept of sea basing is technically feasible and fiscally prudent. The committee understands that sea basing fundamentally comprises a range of capabilities stretching across prepositioning, sealift, expeditionary force, and aircraft carrier operations all of which are employed by the fleet today when called to put forces ashore. The future Sea Base envisioned by the Navy would include MPF(F) squadrons capable of supporting brigade-size assault forces, with automated warehousing and selective offload capability, heavy seas ship-to-ship cargo transfer capability, mobile landing platforms, and ship-to-shore connectors. Further, the MPF(F) squadron could sustain the force ashore for extended periods without reliance on access to other nations' ports or bases.

The large investment required by the MPF(F) sea basing capabilities requires careful assessment regarding the concept of operations for the MPF(F) squadrons. Specific access-denial scenarios, which would dictate employing the MPF(F) ships, need to be understood against the backdrop of the full spectrum of inter-service and inter-agency alternatives for establishing a point of departure for ground forces. To the extent that MPF(F) ships are maintained in a ready status, similar to their prepositioning counterparts, the timeline for deploying the MPF(F) ships and the crewing concept for their operations become important factors in scenario planning for the Sea Base. Similarly, an understanding of capstone requirements for probability of raid annihilation and other force defense requirements for the Sea Base is critical, since the MPF(F) ships will potentially embark a brigade-size force, yet they lack the self-defense features of expeditionary warships.

Technical challenges confronting the development of the critical enabling technologies for sea basing need to be assessed, and the risks need to be sufficiently understood to be able to warrant near-term decisions regarding further investment in MPF(F) ship procurement. The committee believes it is important to ensure that these technologies can reliably support the movement of supplies and equipment in heavy seas, at a rate that will sustain a ground force engaged in combat, before large investments are made in MPF(F) ships.

The Navy faces significant financial challenges as it proceeds to build the 313-ship fleet defined by the future force structure plan. In weighing the investment in MPF(F) capability, the committee needs to have clear insight to the full benefit the Navy intends to derive from this concept, an appreciation that the sea basing mission is not better achieved by other measures, and full confidence that the development efforts in question are achievable in the timeframe planned and budgeted. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees with the fiscal year 2008 budget request, addressing: (1) the Sea Base concept of operations for the MPF(F) ships, including timelines that detail force deployment and underway operations in defense planning scenarios; (2) Sea Base capstone requirements that address defense of the MPF(F) ships against swarming boats, diesel submarine threats, or high density

anti-ship cruise missile raids; (3) MPF(F) key performance parameters; (4) MPF(F) crewing concepts, and assessment of related cost and operational considerations; (5) refined ship cost estimates and total program costs, including development and procurement for connectors and other capabilities required by the Sea Base; (6) the management plan, including consideration for assignment as a Major Defense Acquisition Program, for overseeing end-to-end development and integration of this joint system-of-systems; and (7) a program roadmap that outlines the development, test, and integration plan for the enabling technologies with the MPF(F) platforms.

Ship systems commonality

Navy vessels require common capabilities such as communications, surveillance, self-defense, damage control, combat systems, weapon deployment, propulsion, computing capability, and electrical power generation and distribution. In some cases, ship programs have developed their own solutions for some of these common capabilities. This approach has resulted in a number of different systems performing similar functions. The concept of a family of ships, which applies investments made on one ship class to other ship classes, could avoid redundant research and development while reducing supply and training pipelines. The direct cost savings associated with this approach are readily apparent. The effect of the absence on competitive pressure on the incumbent vendor in terms of cost and technology innovations is less clear.

The modular and open architecture approach to designing and integrating subsystems, which can be assembled as required to meet the specific missions, could reduce design and integration costs for Navy ships. The Navy might be in a position to apply this concept to a number of currently planned ship classes. The committee believes that the Navy should explicitly consider whether having such an approach for the design, integration, installation, and life cycle support for common systems for future ships would provide better value for the government.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, with the fiscal year 2008 budget request, on the analysis of costs and benefits of implementing a plan to maximize commonality in the design, integration, and installation of systems into new ships and existing ships.

Submarine force structure

The Secretary of the Navy submitted a report to Congress on the long-range plan for construction of naval vessels with the fiscal year 2007 budget request. This plan reflects the determination by the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) that the National Defense Strategy requires a fleet of 313 ships, including 48 attack submarines, to meet the threat in future years. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services, the Navy witnesses described the level of 48 attack submarines as the minimum level necessary to support both wartime and peacetime requirements.

The Navy also indicated that, with currently planned construction, attack submarine forces drop below 48 submarines for 15 years. The future-years defense program (FYDP) supports building only one attack submarine per year through fiscal year 2011, with sufficient advance procurement during the FYDP to support increasing the production rate to two boats per year in fiscal year 2012. The Navy's leadership has stated that they need to get the price of *Virginia*-class attack submarines to a level of $2.0 billion per boat before increasing the build rate. The committee completely agrees with the Navy's affordability focus, but simultaneously views the most important step to improve affordability is to increase the production rate of the *Virginia*-class to more than one boat per year.

The committee understands that the Navy is trying to modernize in a constrained fiscal environment. However, the committee does not understand the continuing delays in increasing the construction rate. By the Navy's own assessment: (1) submarines perform a uniquely Navy mission; (2) the minimum requirement is to have 48 attack submarines; (3) submarine force levels will fall below 48 during the next decade and remain there for 15 years; (4) the Navy needs to achieve cost reductions in attack submarine construction in order to increase production rates without impinging on other priority shipbuilding programs; and (5) there are potential technology insertion opportunities that might help reduce costs and permit the Navy to increase the production rate.

Having said that, the Navy's and industry's plan for achieving the $2.0 billion per boat cost goal requires greater definition. The Navy has referred to efforts to develop a number of improvements for the *Virginia*-class that target cost reductions. The committee is concerned, however, that without more specific plans with defined goals and benchmarks, the Navy will get to the end of the FYDP and not necessarily be any closer to achieving real cost reductions in this program. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit with the fiscal year 2008 budget request a detailed plan for developing cost reduction measures with defined goals and benchmarks for the *Virginia*-class production program.

T–38 replacement aircraft

The committee believes that the T–45, with requisite modifications, could serve as both the next-generation joint trainer and as a replacement for the Air Force T–38 trainer. The committee notes that the service plans to spend $1.5 billion over the future-years defense program to maintain the T–38 fleet at a cost per flying hour that is double that of the T–45, and that the cost of developing a different replacement trainer and training system for the T–38 would cost an estimated $2.0 billion.

In addition, the 2005 RAND study, entitled "Assessing the Impact of Future Operations on Trainer Aircraft Requirements," states that the "current T–38 fleet averages almost 14,000 flying hours per airframe, which is almost twice the original design service life," and that if no replacement aircraft is programmed and the T–38 is operated as late as 2040, the Air Force could be training a sizable portion of its new pilots in airframes that are almost 80 years old.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a study that would determine the suitability of the T–45 and Korean built KT–50 training aircraft to replace the T–38. Given that all three trainers possess excellent capabilities, the study should focus on cost of procurement, operating costs, the availability of a complete training system, and developmental costs. In addition, if the Secretary determines that sustainment of the current trainer is the most cost-effective course of action, the study should explain how large, long-term sustainment expenditures are justified when readily available replacements are immediately available, and funds to develop a joint follow-on trainer will not become available for the foreseeable future. The Secretary of the Air Force should submit a report on the results of the study to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2007.

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 2007 budget request for research, development, test and evaluation programs, and indicate those programs for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense), without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in this report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

(Dollars in Thousands)

Title II -- RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	10,855,559	295,450	11,151,009
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	16,912,223	539,600	17,451,823
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	24,396,767	4,090	24,400,857
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	20,809,939	169,000	20,978,939
Operational Test & Evaluation	181,520		181,520
TOTAL RDT&E	73,156,008	1,008,140	74,164,148

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

Independent estimate of costs of the Future Combat Systems (sec. 211)

The committee recommends a provision that would withhold $500.0 million from the amount of funds authorized to be appropriated for the development of the Future Combat Systems (FCS) until the Secretary of Defense submits a report of an independent cost estimate for FCS. The provision requires that the independent cost estimate be conducted by a federally funded research and development center and include the research, development, test and evaluation, and procurement costs for the system development and demonstration phase of the core FCS program; the FCS technologies to be incorporated into the equipment of the current force of the Army; the installation kits for the incorporation of the FCS technologies into the current force equipment; the systems treated as the complementary systems for the FCS program; science and technology programs that support the FCS program and any pass-through charges anticipated to be assessed by the lead systems integrator of the FCS and its major sub-contractors.

Section 211 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) required the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD (AT&L)) to submit a program cost estimate to the Congress prior to the FCS Milestone B update required by the acquisition decision memorandum that approved the FCS program entry into Milestone B. This report requirement was in response to the restructure of the FCS program to include costs of transferring FCS technology to the current force programs of the Army, and to restore several FCS platforms into the program. However, the report was never delivered because the Milestone B update was postponed.

Section 213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) required the USD (AT&L) to submit the results of an independent cost estimate, prepared by the cost analysis improvement group (CAIG) of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, with respect to the Future Combat Systems program. While the CAIG independent cost estimate may provide insights into the cost of the FCS program, the committee believes that the Army may be underestimating FCS costs.

The Government Accountability Office highlighted in testimony before the Subcommittee on AirLand of the Committee on Armed Services,

> The total cost for the FCS program, now estimated at $160.7 billion (then year dollars), has climbed 76 percent from the Army's first estimate. Because uncertainties remain regarding FCS's requirements and the Army faces significant challenges in technology and design maturity, we believe the Army's latest cost estimate still lacks a firm knowledge base. Furthermore, this latest estimate does not include complementary programs that are essential for

FCS to perform as intended, or all of the necessary funding for FCS spin-outs.

The committee believes that an independent cost estimate will provide the committee additional assurance as to the fidelity of the Army's own cost estimate and a better understanding of the factors that have driven up the costs of the FCS program.

Funding of defense science and technology program (sec. 212)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the funding objective for science and technology (S&T) programs, as required by section 212 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65), to fiscal year 2012, and require the submission of two reports if the Department of Defense fails to meet the outlined funding objective in any single fiscal year budget request. The first required report would be submitted with the budget request in the following year and would provide a detailed, prioritized list of high-quality, military relevant, unfunded opportunities in defense science and technology. The second report would be submitted within 6 months of the current budget request and would contain a classified and unclassified analysis and evaluation of international research and technology capabilities that threaten U.S. global leadership in key areas described by the Joint Warfighting Science and Technology Plan, the Defense Technology Area Plan, and the Basic Research Plan.

The committee continues to support stable funding for Department S&T programs, which have a demonstrated history of supporting the warfighter and exploring innovative solutions to current challenges and to emerging and projected threats. Section 212 provided a modest funding objective for S&T of 2 percent growth over inflation from budget request to budget request. The committee commends the Department for supporting long-term research efforts, which have grown in rough parallel to the defense budget, but believes strict adherence to simple investment targets is necessary to ensure consistent and stable funding over time. The reports required by this section, if funding objectives are not reached, would inform the Department and Congress on the potential consequences of such decisions and would provide valuable information to Congress on priority areas that would benefit from additional resources.

Hypersonics development (sec. 213)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a joint technology office (JTO) to coordinate, integrate, and manage hypersonics research, development, and demonstration programs and budgets. Under the provision, the JTO would: provide for integration of all department hypersonics programs; coordinate Department of Defense hypersonics programs with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA); and maintain approval and certification authority for hypersonics system demonstration programs. The provision would further require the JTO to work with the joint staff and NASA to develop a roadmap for a joint hypersonics research program to meet short-, mid-, and long-term goals consistent with De-

partment missions and requirements and with clear acquisition transition plans. The roadmap would be submitted to Congress with the fiscal year 2008 budget request.

The committee has followed with great interest the development of hypersonic technologies over the past several years and believes that successful development of the capability holds tremendous potential for high-speed strike, global reach and space access missions. However, significant challenges remain.

The committee is concerned that Department hypersonics research programs are not integrated or even coordinated, either internally or with NASA efforts, especially since the cancellation of the X–43A project. The committee notes that some Navy hypersonics research programs, conducted with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), will be completed in fiscal year 2007, yet a transition path has not been identified. Further, it is not clear how the Navy RATTLRS program complements parallel approaches to high-speed strike missions. DARPA planned to initiate a new hypersonics effort in fiscal year 2007 for a "transatmospheric" vehicle to "further mature, integrate and flight-demonstrate propulsion technologies developed by the high speed reusable demonstration and Falcon programs." DARPA programs also lack a clear transition path or tangible service transition support. Finally, the Air Force plans to conduct a first-flight demonstration of the X–51A Scramjet in fiscal year 2009, yet the Office of the Air Force Director of Test and Evaluation (T&E), which conducts annual surveys on future T&E requirements, indicates that no program office has reported a need for hypersonics testing facilities. The Army has indicated similar concern with insufficient links between hypersonics research efforts and service requirements. The committee also recognizes that the operational community views maturity of the technology and prospects for near-term transition with some skepticism.

The activities required by the recommended provision are designed to ensure the Department pursues a joint, integrated hypersonics program to achieve the long-term vision of a reconfigurable, combined-cycle aircraft that would provide the nation with meaningful operational capabilities, including strategic reconnaissance, global strike, and rapid access to space.

Trident sea-launched ballistic missiles (sec. 214)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit $95.0 million of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the Conventional Trident Modification (CTM) program from being obligated or expended in support of the program until the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, submits a report to the congressional defense committees.

The report would address a wide range of issues associated with the Navy proposal to modify twenty-four Trident D–5 ballistic missiles, which currently carry nuclear warheads, to each carry four conventional kinetic warheads. Under the proposal, two modified D–5 missiles with conventional kinetic warheads would be deployed on each of the Ohio Class Trident ballistic missile submarines.

The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to include in the report a joint statement on

how to ensure that the use of a conventional D–5 missile will not result in an intentional, inadvertent, mistaken or accidental reciprocal or responsive launch of a nuclear strike by another country.

The provision would permit the Navy to use up to $32.0 million of the funds authorized in PE 0604327N, for Advanced Conventional Strike Capability. The committee further directs the Navy to use the $32.0 million only for research and development on technologies in support of the conventional D–5 modification, but not to support procurement or deployment activities in support of the conventional Trident modification program. In addition, up to $20.0 million of the funds authorized for the CTM program may be used to conduct the required study.

Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs

Availability of research, development, test, and evaluation funds for fielding ballistic missile defense capabilities (sec. 231)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the use of funds, authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2008, for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Missile Defense Agency, for the development and fielding of ballistic missile defense capabilities.

Policy of the United States on priorities in the development, testing, and fielding of missile defense capabilities (sec. 232)

The committee recommends a provision that would make it the policy of the United States to accord a priority within the missile defense program to the development, testing, fielding, and improvement of effective near-term missile defense capabilities, including ground-based interceptors, sea-based interceptors, additional Patriot PAC–3 units, the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system, and sensors based on land, sea, and in space that support these interceptor systems.

Over the last two years, Congress has advised the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to focus its efforts on those missile defense systems in which heavy investments already have been made and which are now just starting to provide a measure of protection for the United States and its deployed forces. Accordingly, the committee believes that rigorous and successful development, testing, and fielding of operational systems in sufficient numbers to counter the threat must take priority over the development of the next generation of missile defense systems.

The committee notes that in its fiscal year 2007 Budget Estimate Overview, the MDA states that it "worked within its fiscal controls across the future years defense program to weigh alternatives and balance the approaches to a layered defense." The committee believes the MDA, in pursuing a balanced investment approach, has funded longer-term efforts to the detriment of the successful development, testing, and fielding of the current generation of missile defense systems. For example, the MDA is requesting funds for only a single intercept test of the ground-based midcourse defense (GMD) system in 2007. This would appear to be a high-risk ap-

proach given the importance of this program for the defense of the United States against long-range ballistic missile attack. The MDA also reduced the number of ground- and sea-based interceptor missile deliveries over the future-years defense program in order to invest more in development upgrades to these and other systems. While evolutionary improvements to the current systems are prudent and should continue, the committee believes additional funding is necessary to restore missile inventory to levels previously thought necessary by the Department of Defense to counter the threat.

While reducing the funding necessary both for critical near-term testing and for increasing the inventory of interceptor missiles, the Missile Defense Agency plans to spend approximately $9.0 billion between fiscal years 2006 and 2015 to develop the Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI). In a prepared statement to the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services, the Director of the MDA stated that the KEI is a boost-phase effort that "could be used as part of an affordable, competitive next-generation upgrade for our mid-course or even terminal interceptors."

The committee does not believe the Department of Defense should make such a large investment in "a next generation upgrade" until the current generation of missile defense systems has been successfully tested and fielded in numbers sufficient to address the near-term threat. Continued research and development of the critical technologies related to KEI is warranted, but at a much lower level, and as a hedge against the failure of the lead boost-phase missile defense candidate, the Airborne Laser.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request for missile defense programs.

Ground-based Midcourse Ballistic Missile Defense

The budget request included $2.4 billion in PE 63882C for the Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) Midcourse Defense Segment to cover continued development, ground and flight testing, fielding, and support for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system. The committee recommends an increase of $200.0 million in PE 63882C, specifically to enhance the GMD testing program and to enable the GMD system to perform concurrent test and operations (i.e., permit testing, maintenance, and training activities to continue, while simultaneously allowing the combatant commander to maintain readiness to execute missile defense operations in an emergency). The committee directs that $115.0 million be used for an additional integrated intercept test of the GMD system in 2007; $60.0 million be used to accelerate capabilities that would enable concurrent test and operations of the GMD system; and $25.0 million be allocated for long-lead purchases for six ground-based interceptor test missiles in fiscal years 2008 and 2009. The committee expects the MDA to adjust its spending over fiscal years 2008–2011 to complete the tasks directed above.

The committee directs the Director of the MDA to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2007. The report should detail the efforts that would need to be taken and funding required to maintain continued production of the Boost Vehicle Plus (BV+) interceptor, and make an assessment

of the risk of inadequate GBI availability using the Orbital Boost Vehicle (OBV).

Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense

The budget request included $1.0 billion in PE 63892C, for the sea-based Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) system. The Aegis BMD is intended to provide protection against short- and medium-range ballistic missiles. The committee recommends an increase of $100.0 million in PE 63892C to restore the delivery of SM–3 interceptors to 120 by the end of fiscal year 2011, and to increase the overall effectiveness of the Aegis BMD system capability against longer-range threats. Of the increased amount, the committee directs $70.0 million be applied toward procuring 24 additional SM–3 block 1B missiles over fiscal years 2008 to 2011, and $30.0 million be used to accelerate SM–3 and Aegis weapon system integration to take full advantage of missile and weapons systems capabilities, including the BMD signal processor and two-color seeker. MDA is expected to budget for the completion of these tasks over fiscal years 2008 to 2011.

Patriot missile defense system

The budget request included $489.1 million in Missile Procurement, Army (MPA), for 108 Patriot PAC–3 missiles; and $70.0 million for Patriot modifications. The Patriot ballistic missile defense system demonstrated its worth during Operation Iraqi Freedom by intercepting all nine Iraqi short-range ballistic missiles that were engaged by Patriot. The committee notes that the predominant foreign ballistic missile threat to United States forces is from short-range ballistic missiles, and that the Patriot is designed to defend against such ballistic missile threats. The committee recommends an increase of $75.0 million in MPA to support the upgrade of Patriot battalions to the configuration–3 capability. This upgrade would significantly extend the defensive range and capability of over 2,000 Patriot PAC–2 missiles now in the inventory. Additional funding for these Patriot PAC–3 upgrades has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list. The committee also recommends an increase of $25.0 million in MPA for purchases of 8 additional PAC–3 missiles in fiscal year 2007, in response to calls from combatant commanders for more Patriot missiles to counter the threat.

Kinetic Energy Interceptor

The budget request included $405.5 million in PE 63886C, for Ballistic Missile Defense System Interceptors, for continued development of the Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI). The request is almost double the amount appropriated for KEI in fiscal year 2006, and begins a sharp rise in projected KEI spending that amounts to $4.6 billion between fiscal years 2007 and 2011. As noted above, the committee believes this level of effort is too high for a boost phase risk-reduction effort and next generation missile defense system. The committee recommends a decrease of $200.0 million in PE 63886C for the KEI program. The committee believes these funds are more urgently required for an additional flight intercept test of the GMD system in fiscal year 2007 and to help increase the num-

ber of SM–3 missile deliveries starting in fiscal year 2008. The committee directs that remaining funds be used to mature those critical technologies necessary to demonstrate the viability of the KEI design.

Ballistic missile defense reductions

The budget request included $506.8 million in PE 63889C, for Ballistic Missile Defense Products; 473.0 million in PE 63890C, for Ballistic Missile Defense System Core; and $374.5 million in PE 63891C, for MDA Special Programs. The committee recommends a decrease of $40.0 million in PE 63889C, for Ballistic Missile Defense Products; a decrease of $40.0 million in PE 63890C, for Ballistic Missile Defense System Core; and a decrease of $20.0 million in PE 63891C, for MDA Special Programs, to offset the additional funding necessary for the GMD and Aegis BMD programs. The Director of the MDA may take these reductions in funding from among the program elements mentioned above, at his discretion.

One-year extension of Comptroller General assessments of ballistic missile defense programs (sec. 233)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend until fiscal year 2008 the requirement for the Comptroller General to provide an assessment of the extent to which the Missile Defense Agency achieved the goals established for that fiscal year for each ballistic missile defense program of the Department of Defense.

Submittal of plans for test and evaluation of the operational capability of the ballistic missile defense system (sec. 234)

The committee recommends a provision that would require each plan approved by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to test and evaluate the operational capability of the ballistic missile defense system, as required by section 234(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 10 U.S.C. 2431 note), to be submitted to the congressional defense committees within 30 days of such approval.

Annual reports on transition of ballistic missile defense programs to the military departments (sec. 235)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than March 1 of 2007, and annually thereafter through 2013, on the plans of the Department of Defense for the transition of missile defense programs from the Missile Defense Agency to the military departments. Each report required would cover the period of the future-years defense program for the year in which the report is submitted. Each report would include: which missile defense programs are, or are not, planned for transition; the schedule for each transition; a description of the status of the transition plans and agreements; an identification of the entity responsible for funding each program to be transitioned; a description of the funds that will be used for each such program; and an explanation of the num-

ber of systems planned to be procured for each program to be transitioned, and a procurement schedule.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Extension of requirement for Global Research Watch Program (sec. 251)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the requirement for the development of a Global Research Watch database until September 30, 2011. The committee commends the Director of Defense Research and Engineering (DDRE) for development of the Global Technology Knowledge Base program as a response to the Global Research Watch mandate under section 241 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). The pilot database informs Department of Defense decision makers on the capabilities of the international community in areas of defense science and technology. The committee directs the DDRE to aggressively work to include international capabilities analyses from the military departments and defense agencies in the program as directed in the original statute, section 2365 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee also notes that coordinating the efforts of the Global Research Watch program with the Militarily Critical Technologies Program would provide the Department with an additional source of data on international research capabilities and their relationships to critical defense technologies and systems. Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends a transfer of $2.0 million from Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide to PE 65110D8Z for critical technology support to provide for more timely updates to the Militarily Critical Technologies List and the Defense Science and Technology List. The committee urges the DDRE to consider establishing a domestic version of the technology knowledge base to inform industrial base policy decisions. The committee notes that this knowledge base should be developed through a collaboration of the Department technology development and industrial policy communities and should utilize input from defense industry.

Finally, the committee notes that the international community may have capabilities, research, and technologies that could be useful in the Department's efforts to combat improvised explosive devices (IEDs). The committee directs the Director of the Joint IED Defeat Office (JIEDDO) to work with the DDRE to undertake an international survey of research and technology that would be supportive of the combating IED mission. The committee directs the Director of JIEDDO and the DDRE to report to Congress on the results of the survey to include a description of any current or planned international cooperative technology development programs in this area and an accounting of funding available for such activities. This report should be transmitted to Congress not later than January 31, 2007.

Expansion and extension of authority to award prizes for advanced technology achievements (sec. 252)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority to award prizes for advanced technology achievements to

September 30, 2011. The provision would also elevate the authority to the Director of Defense Research and Engineering (DDRE), which would allow for its use by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency or other components under the DDRE. The provision would further expand the authority to include the military departments, and would update reporting requirements under section 257 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) on the use of the authority to include information relevant to the military departments and to ensure proper oversight of the program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to budget for anticipated costs to execute the prize competitions and to clearly identify those funds in annual budget justification materials.

Policies and practices on test and evaluation to address emerging acquisition approaches (sec. 253)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (OTE) and the Director of the Defense Test Resource Management Center, to review and revise policies and practices on test and evaluation in light of emerging approaches to acquisition. The provision would require consideration of rapid, time-certain and traditional acquisition timeframes in review of current test and evaluation regulations to ensure adequate and timely testing is conducted.

The committee notes that robust analysis of technology maturity levels combined with early planning for developmental and operational testing contribute to successful acquisition programs. The committee further notes that rapid fielding initiatives, which have proven successful in providing critically needed equipment and capabilities to the warfighter, may contain lessons learned for the test and evaluation process. The committee believes it is necessary to update policies to ensure adequate test and evaluation in the development of acquisition programs, in planning for testing facility requirements, and in defining test and evaluation processes for the growing variety of acquisition and deployment strategies.

Finally, the committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense to nominate a permanent Director of Operational Test and Evaluation as soon as possible. The committee notes that this position has been vacant since February 15, 2005. This congressionally-mandated, presidentially-nominated, and Senate-confirmed position plays a key role in ensuring the operational effectiveness of our weapons systems in combat. The Director supports efforts to reform acquisition processes and effectively and efficiently develop and deploy major, complex systems like the Future Combat Systems, Advanced Seal Delivery System, and Joint Strike Fighter, in a manner that is operationally effective, on budget, and within planned schedules.

Development of the propulsion system for the Joint Strike Fighter (sec. 254)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to continue the development and sustainment

of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program with two competitive propulsion systems throughout the life cycle of the aircraft, or enter into a one-time firm-fixed-price contract for a selected propulsion system for the life cycle of the aircraft following the initial service release of the JSF F135 propulsion system in fiscal year 2008.

During the 1970's and early 1980's, Pratt & Whitney was the sole source provider of engines for the F–14, F–15, and F–16 aircraft. Because of persistent engine problems that resulted in the loss of aircraft and degraded readiness, Congress directed the Department of Defense to develop and produce an engine to compete with Pratt & Whitney engines on these aircraft. The benefits that resulted from this competition included improved performance, reduced risk, increased readiness, lower cost of ownership, improved contractor responsiveness to customer needs, and over $4.0 billion of cost savings. Congress once again directed the Department to provide for an engine competition for the JSF in 1996 out of concerns for a lack of competition expressed in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (P.L. 104–106). Congress has consistently supported a competitive engine program for the Joint Strike Fighter for the past 10 years.

The JSF program is the largest acquisition program, in terms of funding, in Department of Defense history. Total JSF deliveries may well exceed 4,000 aircraft worldwide, with a resultant level of propulsion business in the tens of billions of dollars. The committee is concerned that relying on a sole engine supplier for a single-engine aircraft to do multiple missions for multiple services and multiple nations presents an unnecessary operational and financial risk to our nation.

The committee is also concerned that the Department's analysis provided to the committee, as justification for the termination of the F136 interchangeable engine, accounted for only 30 percent of the engine costs over the life cycle of the aircraft and failed to comply with the Department's policy on economic analysis that would have required the inclusion of the total life cycle cost. If the Department had conducted a full life cycle analysis, the committee believes that the results of the analysis would show significant cost savings that could be achieved through a competitive engine strategy. The committee believes that through the enduring value of competition, sufficient savings will be generated from a series of competitive engine procurements over the life cycle of the aircraft that will more than offset the cost of completing the F136 engine development. In order to ensure that the Congress has the complete picture of the full life cycle costs, the committee has recommended another provision described elsewhere in this report that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General to conduct independent life cycle cost analyses addressing this issue.

Independent cost analyses for Joint Strike Fighter engine program (sec. 255)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense, a federally-funded research and development center (FFRDC) chosen by the Secretary, and the Comptroller General to conduct independent life cycle cost analyses of the develop-

ment and sustainment of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program with two competitive propulsion systems throughout the life cycle of the aircraft, versus terminating the alternate engine development and proceeding with only one engine.

The provision would also require that the Comptroller and the FFRDC certify that they had access to sufficient information upon which to make informed judgments on the life cycle costs of the two alternatives.

As noted elsewhere in this report, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense analysis provided as justification for the termination of the F136 interchangeable engine did not account for all of the costs over the life cycle of the aircraft.

Sense of the Senate on technology sharing of Joint Strike Fighter technology (sec. 256)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense should share technology with respect to the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) between the United States Government and the Government of the United Kingdom.

The committee recognizes the importance of the strong political and military alliance between the United States and the United Kingdom. The committee places a high premium on ensuring that U.S. and U.K. armed forces can operate together seamlessly in ongoing and future combined operations.

The committee is concerned that existing U.S. regulations and procedures governing U.S.-U.K. technology sharing may unnecessarily impede information-sharing and military interoperability to the detriment of achieving our common security interests in ongoing and future operations. With the increasing complexity of technology and its growing importance to combat power, the ability to share information and technology in general between the United States and the United Kingdom is increasingly important. Anecdotal evidence suggests that existing impediments are unnecessarily complicating the planning, coordination, and execution of combined military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The committee notes that technology sharing is a two-way street. The United Kingdom has made important contributions to a variety of U.S. military capabilities ranging from improvised explosive device (IED) detection technology to aircraft propulsion system technology. The committee believes such contributions from allies could become increasingly important given the many demands on the U.S. defense budget and the technological challenges we can expect to face on the battlefield of the future.

The committee is concerned that, until the issue of technology sharing between the United States and the United Kingdom is resolved, the potential for full cooperation could be undermined, to the detriment of both countries. It is reasonable for the United States and the United Kingdom to seek a degree of operational sovereignty to ensure successful operation of the JSF by its military services, including the ability to maintain, repair, and upgrade the fleet to meet the future needs of U.S. and U.K. armed forces. It is also reasonable for both nations to protect the most sensitive tech-

nologies. Resolving the tensions between these two reasonable tenets is the dilemma.

With these considerations in mind, the committee strongly recommends that the President enter into a bilateral agreement with the United Kingdom to provide for the sharing of defense technology between our two governments in order to facilitate closer defense cooperation between the United States and the United Kingdom. Such an agreement should: (1) promote greater interoperability in the conduct of current and future military operations; (2) establish a vehicle and set policy for greater and easier sharing between the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom of both classified and unclassified goods, technologies, and services; (3) drive greater bilateral, interagency, and industry coordination at the strategic, planning, resource, and execution levels; and (4) be consistent with the national security interests of both nations.

Budget Items—Army

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
			RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY			
2040	0601101A	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	19,402		19,402
2040	0601102A	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	137,568	14,100	151,668
			Advanced ground reliability research		[1,000]	
			Document exploitation		[4,000]	
			Integrated nanosensor technologies for NBC detection applications		[1,000]	
			Dynamic landscape support program		[2,000]	
			Nanomaterials for ISR		[3,000]	
			Organic semiconductor modeling and simulation research		[2,100]	
			Early career awards		[1,000]	
2040	0601103A	3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	68,545	2,000	70,545
			Low temperature vehicle performance research		[2,000]	
2040	0601104A	4	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	86,416	7,250	93,666
			Information assurance		[1,000]	
			Integrated systems in sensing, imaging and communications research		[1,000]	
			Nanotubes composite materials research		[2,000]	
			Development of slow rotor concepts		[2,000]	
			SOUTHCOM regional analyses		[1,000]	
			Transparent nanocomposite armor		[250]	
2040	0601105A	5	FORCE HEALTH PROTECTION			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2040	0602105A	6	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	18,822	5,400	24,222
			Thermoplastic composite body armor		[1,000]	
			Future affordable multi-utility materials		[1,600]	
			Simulations of improvised explosive devices		[500]	
			Control system for the laser powder deposition manufacturing process		[300]	
			Munition shape charge control research		[2,000]	
2040	0602120A	7	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	38,428	4,500	42,928
			Advanced microelectronics manufacturing		[3,000]	
			Lighter-than-air unmanned vehicle with scalable payload capabilities		[1,500]	
2040	0602122A	8	TRACTOR HIP	8,466		8,466
2040	0602211A	9	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	32,804		32,804
2040	0602270A	10	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	19,218		19,218
2040	0602303A	11	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	59,439	6,000	65,439
			Hypervelocity ground testing		[3,500]	
			Unmanned air systems technology		[2,500]	
2040	0602307A	12	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	19,430		19,430
2040	0602308A	13	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	16,181	3,000	19,181
			Surveillance and targeting robot platform		[3,000]	
2040	0602601A	14	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	59,304	2,500	61,804
			Advanced electrical drive		[2,500]	
2040	0602618A	15	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	52,221		52,221
2040	0602622A	16	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	2,212		2,212
2040	0602623A	17	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	6,247		6,247

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2040	0602624A	18	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	35,344	10,000	45,344
			Transition of active coatings technology		[2,000]	
			Parts-on-demand		[3,000]	
			UGV weaponization		[2,500]	
			Rarefaction wave gun		[2,500]	
2040	0602705A	19	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	42,175		42,175
2040	0602709A	20	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	23,907		23,907
2040	0602712A	21	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	22,088		22,088
2040	0602716A	22	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	18,858	2,500	21,358
			Team performance and optimization research		[2,500]	
2040	0602720A	23	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	17,923	5,000	22,923
			Mapping and detection of UXO		[5,000]	
2040	0602782A	24	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	21,193		21,193
2040	0602783A	25	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	3,844		3,844
2040	0602784A	26	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	50,098		50,098
2040	0602785A	27	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	16,200		16,200
2040	0602786A	28	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	25,436	3,500	28,936
			Ballistic tent inserts		[2,000]	
			Biosecurity research for soldier food safety		[1,500]	
2040	0602787A	29	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	75,407	5,500	80,907
			Advanced bioengineering for enhancement of solider survivability		[2,000]	
			Blast protection research		[1,000]	
			Protein hydrogel treatment		[2,500]	
2040	0603001A	30	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	45,666		45,666

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2040	0603002A	31	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	50,757	23,500	74,257
			Advanced lower limb prosthesis		[2,000]	
			Applied emergency hypothermia		[3,000]	
			Fibrinogen bandage improvements		[3,000]	
			Integrated clinical information systems		[2,000]	
			Medical imaging		[1,000]	
			Tissue engineering research		[2,000]	
			Diagnosis and treatment of post traumatic stress disorder		[2,000]	
			Soldier treatment and regeneration research		[3,500]	
			Surgical Safety System		[2,000]	
			Robotic tele-surgery research		[3,000]	
2040	0603003A	32	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	64,654	16,500	81,154
			Excalibur		[14,000]	
			Quick Materiel Express Delivery System		[2,500]	
2040	0603004A	33	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	74,717	2,000	76,717
			Nanotechnology manufacturing		[2,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2040	0603005A	34	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOG	109,952	35,000	144,952
			Advanced thermal management controls		[2,000]	
			Anti-ballistic windshield armor		[3,000]	
			Armored composite cab program		[3,000]	
			Compressible Magneto-Rheological (CMR) fluids		[1,000]	
			Logistical fuel processors		[1,500]	
			Fuel cell ground support equipment demonstration		[3,000]	
			Next generation nontactical vehicle propulsion		[3,000]	
			Segmented band track		[1,500]	
			Solid oxide fuel cell materials and manufacturing		[2,000]	
			Tactical vehicle design tools		[2,000]	
			Power electronics systems research		[3,000]	
			Unmanned ground vehicle initiative		[10,000]	
2040	0603006A	35	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNC	10,851		10,851
2040	0603007A	36	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOL	6,794	2,000	8,794
			Adaptive command and control team training		[2,000]	
2040	0603008A	37	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	44,022		44,022
2040	0603009A	38	TRACTOR HIKE	9,324		9,324
2040	0603015A	39	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	18,296	6,000	24,296
			Joint Fires and Effects Training System		[6,000]	
2040	0603020A	40	TRACTOR ROSE	5,183		5,183
2040	0603100A	41	IED DEFEAT TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
2040	0603103A	42	EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	10,376	2,000	12,376
			Missile recycling capability		[2,000]	
2040	0603105A	43	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	7,042		7,042

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2040	0603125A	44	COMBATING TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,497		7,497
2040	0603238A	45	GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE/AIR DEFENSE/PRECISION STRIKE TECH	12,995		12,995
2040	0603270A	46	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	18,612		18,612
2040	0603313A	47	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	42,127		42,127
2040	0603322A	48	TRACTOR CAGE	19,192		19,192
2040	0603606A	49	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,554		25,554
2040	0603607A	50	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	7,202		7,202
2040	0603710A	51	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	44,307		44,307
2040	0603728A	52	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	14,089		14,089
2040	0603734A	53	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	7,848		7,848
2040	0603772A	54	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECH	64,604	3,000	67,604
			Hand-held phraselator translation technology		[3,000]	
2040	0603024A	55	UNIQUE ITEM IDENTIFICATION (UID)	1,520		1,520
2040	0603305A	56	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION(NON SPACE)	11,233	51,000	62,233
			Advanced hypersonic weapon mod & sim		[11,000]	
			Distributed ops control center		[5,000]	
			Missile & space model and simulation technology		[4,000]	
			Future TOC hardware		[5,000]	
			Protected test link		[2,000]	
			Thermal protection systems for hypersonics		[3,000]	
			Low cost avionics		[2,000]	
			Advanced fuel cell research		[2,000]	
			High Sentinel airship		[2,000]	
			Advanced electronics integration		[5,000]	
			Standoff sensor for radionuclide identification		[10,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2040	0603308A	57	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (SPACE)	11,771	20,000	31,771
			Advanced hypersonic weapon		[20,000]	
2040	0603327A	58	AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	143,417	3,000	146,417
			ASMD architecture analysis program		[3,000]	
2040	0603619A	59	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV	8,439		8,439
2040	0603627A	60	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV	10,714		10,714
2040	0603639A	61	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION			
2040	0603653A	62	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	5,415		5,415
2040	0603747A	63	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	2,778		2,778
2040	0603766A	64	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV	20,077		20,077
2040	0603774A	65	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	5,337		5,337
2040	0603779A	66	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	5,166	5,000	10,166
			Demonstration and validation		[5,000]	
2040	0603782A	67	WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL	158,157		158,157
2040	0603790A	68	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,946		4,946
2040	0603801A	69	AVIATION - ADV DEV	6,542		6,542
2040	0603802A	70	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ADV DEV			
2040	0603804A	71	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV	13,216		13,216
2040	0603805A	72	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION A	8,645		8,645
2040	0603807A	73	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	11,973		11,973
2040	0603827A	74	SOLDIER SYSTEMS - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	10,605		10,605
2040	0603850A	75	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	1,135		1,135
2040	0603856A	76	SCAMP BLOCK II			
2040	0603869A	77	MEDIUM EXTENDED AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM (MEADS) CONCEPTS			
2040	0604201A	78	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	61,946		61,946

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2040	0604220A	79	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE OH-58D	132,781		132,781
2040	0604270A	80	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	41,655		41,655
2040	0604280A	81	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	832,259		832,259
2040	0604321A	82	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	7,074		7,074
2040	0604328A	83	TRACTOR CAGE	16,057		16,057
2040	0604329A	84	COMMON MISSILE			
2040	0604601A	85	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	31,748		31,748
2040	0604604A	86	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	1,925		1,925
2040	0604609A	87	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-SDD	5,297		5,297
2040	0604611A	88	JAVELIN			
2040	0604622A	89	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,960		3,960
2040	0604633A	90	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	4,527		4,527
2040	0604642A	91	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES			
2040	0604645A	92	ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-SDD	3,310,477		3,310,477
2040	0604646A	93	NON-LINE OF SIGHT LAUNCH SYSTEM	322,880		322,880
2041	0604647A	94	NON-LINE OF SIGHT CANNON	112,237		112,237
2040	0604710A	95	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - SDD	38,821		38,821
2040	0604713A	96	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	3,017		3,017
2040	0604715A	97	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - SDD	121,553		121,553
2040	0604716A	98	TERRAIN INFORMATION - SDD			
2040	0604726A	99	INTEGRATED METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT SYSTEM			
2040	0604741A	100	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - SDD	21,757	25,500	47,257
			Counter Rocket, Artillery and Mortar (C-RAM) System		[25,500]	
2040	0604742A	101	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	40,006		40,006
2040	0604746A	102	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	8,136		8,136

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2040	0604760A	103	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - SDD	19,596		19,596
2040	0604766A	104	TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS - SDD			
2040	0604768A	105	ARMY TACTICAL MISSILE SYSTEM (ATACMS)			
2040	0604778A	106	POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (SPACE)			
2040	0604780A	107	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	39,901		39,901
2040	0604783A	108	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	5,187		5,187
2040	0604801A	109	AVIATION - SDD			
2040	0604802A	110	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - SDD	130,581		130,581
2040	0604804A	111	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - SDD	40,301		40,301
2040	0604805A	112	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - SDD	10,783		10,783
2040	0604807A	113	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPME	14,509		14,509
2040	0604808A	114	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - SDD	118,078		118,078
2040	0604814A	115	ARTILLERY MUNITIONS	102,554		102,554
2040	0604817A	116	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	39		39
2040	0604818A	117	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTW	69,172		69,172
2040	0604819A	118	LOSAT			
2040	0604820A	119	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	2,527		2,527
2040	0604822A	120	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS)	61,194		61,194
2040	0604823A	121	FIREFINDER	70,151		70,151
2040	0604827A	122	SOLDIER SYSTEMS - WARRIOR DEM/VAL	27,498		27,498
2040	0604854A	123	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS	1,650		1,650
2040	0604865A	124	PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION			
2040	0604869A	125	PATRIOT/MEADS COMBINED AGGREGATE PROGRAM (CAP)	329,583		329,583
2040	0604870A	126	NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL MONITORING SENSOR NETWORK	7,428		7,428
2040	0605013A	127	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	70,185		70,185
2040	0604256A	128	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	21,180		21,180

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2040	0604258A	129	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	10,928	2,000	12,928
			Prototype Electro-Expulsive Ice Protection System		[2,000]	
2040	0604759A	130	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	64,953		64,953
2040	0605103A	131	RAND ARROYO CENTER	20,171	2,500	22,671
			Analytical and technical support		[2,500]	
2040	0605301A	132	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	178,891		178,891
2040	0605326A	133	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	21,626	7,200	28,826
			Biometric ID device		[4,000]	
			Automated communications support		[3,200]	
2040	0605502A	134	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
2040	0605601A	135	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	389,840		389,840
2040	0605602A	136	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	74,066		74,066
2040	0605604A	137	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	40,780		40,780
2040	0605605A	138	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	16,622		16,622
2040	0605606A	139	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	4,580		4,580
2040	0605702A	140	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	8,571		8,571
2040	0605706A	141	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	16,526		16,526
2040	0605709A	142	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	4,993		4,993
2040	0605712A	143	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	80,057		80,057
2040	0605716A	144	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	60,129		60,129
2040	0605718A	145	SIMULATION & MODELING FOR ACQ, RQTS, & TNG (SMART)	5,441		5,441
2040	0605737A	146	DEFENSE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRAINING RESEARCH			
2040	0605801A	147	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	72,214		72,214
2040	0605803A	148	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	34,834		34,834
2040	0605805A	149	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	18,726		18,726

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2040	0605857A	150	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	4,418		4,418
2040	0605898A	151	MANAGEMENT HQ - R&D	14,092		14,092
2040	0909999A	152	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
2040	0603778A	153	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	74,506		74,506
2040	0603820A	154	WEAPONS CAPABILITY MODIFICATIONS UAV	16,532		16,532
2040	0102419A	155	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	264,491		264,491
2040	0203726A	156	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	17,394		17,394
2040	0203735A	157	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	12,741		12,741
2040	0203740A	158	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	37,976		37,976
2040	0203744A	159	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	301,739		301,739
2040	0203752A	160	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	860		860
2040	0203758A	161	DIGITIZATION	13,373		13,373
2040	0203759A	162	FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2)	26,375		26,375
2040	0203801A	163	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	10,770		10,770
2040	0203802A	164	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	19,706		19,706
2040	0203806A	165	TRACTOR RUT			
2040	0203808A	166	TRACTOR CARD	7,242		7,242
2040	0208010A	167	JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	5,804		5,804
2040	0208053A	168	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	15,044		15,044
2040	0208058A	169	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	20,397		20,397
2040	0301359A	170	SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
2040	0301555A	171	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]		[ ]
2040	0301556A	172	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
2040	0303028A	173	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	3,170	3,500	6,670
			Portable iris enrollment and recognition device		[3,500]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2040	0303140A	174	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	23,828	3,000	26,828
			Retinal/iris multimodal biometrics technology		[3,000]	
2040	0303141A	175	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	55,272		55,272
2040	0303142A	176	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	41,336		41,336
2040	0303150A	177	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	12,200		12,200
2040	0303158A	178	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	4,057		4,057
2040	0305204A	179	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	114,087		114,087
2040	0305206A	180	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	12		12
2040	0305208A	181	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	120,562		120,562
2040	0702239A	182	AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,031		1,031
2040	0708045A	183	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	68,075	11,500	79,575
			Adv modeling technology for large structure titanium machining		[2,000]	
			Manufacturing systems demonstration		[3,000]	
			Super Pulse Laser System development		[3,500]	
			Packaging and interconnect technologies		[3,000]	
2040	1001018A	184	NATO JOINT STARS	688		688
2040	XXXXXXX	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,700		3,700
			Total, RDT&E Army	**10,855,559**	**295,450**	**11,151,009**

Army basic research

The budget request included $137.6 million in PE 61102A, for defense research sciences; $68.5 million in PE 61103A, for university research initiatives; and $86.4 million in PE 61104A, for university and industry research centers. Through these basic research accounts, the Army supports fundamental military science at universities and innovative partnerships between academia and industry through Collaborative Technology Alliances.

Ongoing work in the areas of modeling and simulation, materials and composites, nanotechnology, biotechnology, energy and power, and dynamic terrain analysis complement a new focus on network and information sciences. The committee recommends an increase of $9.1 million in PE 61102A for expansion of work in key areas, including $1.0 million for advanced ground reliability research; $2.1 for organic semiconductor modeling and simulation research; $2.0 million for a dynamic landscape support program; $1.0 million for integrated nanosensor technologies for nuclear, chemical, and biological detection applications; and $3.0 million for the development of nanotechnologies to enhance intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities to tag, track, and locate enemy forces or weapons. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 61103A for low temperature vehicle performance research.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.25 million in PE 61104A for acceleration of defense university research, including $1.0 million for information assurance research; $1.0 million for integrated systems sensing, imaging, and communications research; $2.0 million for nanotubes composite materials research; $2.0 million for development of slow rotor concepts; $1.0 million for analyses of regional, political, social and economic issues affecting U.S. Southern Command's area of responsibility; and $250,000 for transparent nanocomposite armor.

The committee is aware of the Department of Defense's requirement to triage large quantities of documents in foreign languages to provide prompt support to analytical and targeting efforts in support of the global war on terrorism. This capability is required at all echelons from tactical to strategic. The quantity and quality of document exploitation (DOCEX) can be enhanced by continued technological development in the Harmony DOCEX Suite, which is currently fielded. Technologies to improve the exploitation of paper documents as well as electronic media, to include live web sites, have been identified. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 61102A for the continued development, integration, and fielding of enhanced document exploitation systems.

PACE early career awards

The budget request included $137.6 million in PE 61102A, $366.6 million in PE 61153N, and $250.2 million in PE 61102F for Army, Navy, and Air Force defense research sciences activities. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in each of the three program elements: PE 61102A, PE 61153N, and PE 61102F for the establishment of additional early career awards under the Protecting America's Competitive Edge (PACE) program to support service research efforts.

The committee notes that the recent National Research Council (NRC) report, entitled "Assessment of Department of Defense Basic Research," recommended that "the Department of Defense should, through its funding and policies for university research, encourage increased participation by younger researchers as principal investigators." The NRC endorsed this idea in their report, entitled "Rising Above the Gathering Storm," which recommended that "the Federal Government should establish a program to provide 200 new research grants each year at $500,000 each, payable over 5 years, to support the work of outstanding early-career researchers." The committee notes that it is essential to replenish the research community with young, innovative scientists and engineers working in defense research areas in order to support the development of future military capabilities. The committee further notes that the Department established a number of activities to support early career researchers, including the Navy's Young Investigator Program and the Presidential Early Career Awards for Science and Engineering. The Department estimates it will support 130 early career awards with funding available in the current budget request.

Although the details of the execution shall be established by the Secretary of Defense, the committee recommends that these awards be available for researchers not more than 5 years removed from their doctorate or other terminal degree or professional qualification, and that they should be structured to provide for stable funding support for individuals for a period of 5 years. The committee directs the Secretary to report to the congressional defense committees on the execution of these funds, including their coordination with other Department activities in supporting early career scientists and engineers, no later than May 1, 2007.

Army materials technology

The budget request included $18.8 million in PE 62105A, for materials technology. Army programs under this account aim to provide lightweight and affordable materials and structures to enable revolutionary survivability and lethality technologies along with improved performance and durability for Army systems and cost-effective manufacturing processes. To accelerate work in selected areas of particular relevance to current threats, the committee recommends an increase of $5.4 million in PE 62105A, including $1.0 million for flexible, lightweight thermoplastic composite body armor; $1.6 million for future affordable multi-utility materials; $500,000 for simulations of improvised explosive devices; $300,000 for a control system for the laser powder deposition manufacturing process; and $2.0 million for munition shape charge control research.

Advanced microelectronics manufacturing

The budget request included $38.4 million in PE 62120A, for sensors and electronic survivability. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62120A for the development of advanced capabilities for low-volume manufacturing of flexible electronics, whose defense applications could include flexible displays, lightweight, miniaturized sensors, and portable power systems. The

committee notes that this type of effort is consistent with the Defense Science Board's recommendation in its recent report, entitled "High Performance Microchip Supply," to develop technology and equipment for production of low-volume microelectronics to meet unique Department of Defense needs.

Unmanned payload concepts

The budget request included $38.4 million in PE 62120A, for sensors and electronic survivability. Asymmetric threats and unpredictable battlefields increase the importance of flexible response and logistics options. The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 62120A for acceleration of concept demonstration on a remote-operated, lighter-than-air unmanned vehicle with scalable payload capabilities.

Army missile technology

The budget request included $59.4 million in PE 62303A, for applied research on missile technology. The committee endorses the Army's efforts to develop unmanned air systems as an integral part of Future Combat Systems (FCS). The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62303A for the development and demonstration of unmanned air systems technologies as part of FCS. The committee notes that such programs should be consistent with the Department's unmanned systems policy as required elsewhere in this report.

Hypervelocity ground testing

The budget request included $59.4 million in PE 62303A, for missile technology. As the Department of Defense develops hypersonic systems for global and rapid strike missions, availability of domestic, full-scale ground test facilities would mitigate costs and risks associated with these complex systems. The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 62303A for hypervelocity ground testing.

Multifunctional robot platform

The budget request included $16.2 million in PE 62308A, for advanced concepts and simulations. Robotic platforms continue to excel in the performance of dangerous missions. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62308A for rapid integration of optical technology and advanced acoustic detection and direction finding hardware into the Robot Enhanced Detection Outpost With Lasers platform.

Combat vehicle and automotive technology

The budget request included $59.3 million in PE 62601A, for combat vehicle and automotive technology. Component technologies explored under this account support the Army's current and future combat and tactical vehicle fleets. To promote more fuel efficient engines, the committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62601A for development of advanced electric drives designed to result in easily replaceable, quiet, robust engines with greater power density and torque.

Weapons and munitions technology

The budget request included $35.3 million in PE 62624A, for weapons and munitions technology. Army applied research efforts under this account improve the lethality, survivability, and affordability of current and future force equipment and weapons. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62624A, including $2.0 million to transition the active coatings technology program for use on Army helicopters; $2.5 million for continued rarefaction wave gun research; $3.0 million for expansion of the domestic capability to produce a wider variety of parts-on-demand for unmanned systems; and $2.5 million for integration of Army remote weapons systems armaments on the dual track, Ripsaw, unmanned ground vehicle.

Human factors engineering

The budget request included $18.9 million in PE 62716A, for applied research on human factors engineering technology. As noted elsewhere in this report, the committee supports development of integrated and interoperable unmanned systems that can work seamlessly with manned systems. Army applied research on autonomous robots that work together to solve problems holds promise for missions that do not require a man in the loop as well as for improved manned-unmanned collaborations. The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62716A for team performance and optimization research and expanded complex research, modeling, and simulation of cognition and team dynamics.

Mapping and detection of unexploded ordnance

The budget request included $17.9 million in PE 62720A, for environmental quality technology, but included no funding for mapping and detection of unexploded ordnance. The committee notes that the problem of detecting and removing unexploded ordnance from Department of Defense facilities closed or realigned under rounds of base closure and realignment (BRAC), former used defense sites, and at active installations, including operational ranges, is an enormous and technically complex task. The current estimate of the cost to complete the clean up of unexploded ordnance at all of the Department's installations, formerly used defense sites, and BRAC sites is $20.1 billion.

Development of the technology to more rapidly and efficiently detect and discriminate unexploded ordnance from other waste is ongoing and has the potential to significantly reduce the overall cost of unexploded ordnance detection and clean up. This project would continue work begun in fiscal year 2005 to improve the ability of ground penetrating radar to detect unexploded ordnance at greater depths in highly magnetic soil, while reducing the number of false alarms. While the focus of the effort would be on ground penetrating radar systems, all detection technologies, which may have an application, would be investigated. Due to the geological characteristics of highly magnetic soil, the committee believes that application of multiple technologies and fusion of their outputs may be needed to improve detection and reduce the number of false alarms. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62720A for mapping and detection of unexploded ordnance.

Warfighter technology

The budget request included $25.4 million in PE 62786A, for warfighter technology. Army applied research under this account concentrates on soldier survivability and performance, including improved deployable, temporary housing, and food safety. The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 62786A for advances in both of these soldier safety areas, including $2.0 million for advanced materials research on ballistic tent inserts and $1.5 million for biosecurity research for soldier food safety.

Army medical technology

The budget request included $75.4 million in PE 62787A, for medical technology and $50.8 million in PE 63002A, for medical advanced technology. Research under these two accounts has yielded numerous advances in combat casualty care and battlefield trauma medicine. The committee continues to place a priority on advances in military-specific medical treatments, wound characterization, and understanding of weapons impacts. The committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million, in PE 62787A, including $2.0 million for advanced bioengineering for enhancement of solider survivability; $1.0 million for blast protection research; and $2.5 million for acceleration of pilot clinical studies on protein hydrogel treatments. The committee further recommends an increase of $23.5 million in PE 63002A, including $2.0 million for rapid development of advanced, neurally-controlled lower limb prostheses; $3.0 million for applied emergency hypothermia; $3.0 million for fibrinogen bandage improvements; $2.0 million for integrated clinical information systems in support of the Armed-forces Health Longitudinal Technology Application; $1.0 million to promote interoperability standards for medical imaging; $3.0 million for robotic tele-surgery research; $2.0 million for tissue engineering research; $2.0 million for early diagnosis and treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder; $3.5 million for soldier treatment and regeneration research; and $2.0 million for surgical safety systems designed to improve remote patient care in hostile environments.

Advanced aviation technology

The budget request included $64.7 million in PE 63003A, for aviation advanced technology. Army aviation technology programs focus on maturing and demonstrating manned and unmanned rotary wing vehicle technologies in support of the current and future force. To explore expanded capabilities in the areas of unmanned systems, specifically designed for logistics and supply support, the committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 63003A for a quick materiel express delivery system.

Unmanned tactical combat vehicles

The budget request included $64.7 million in PE 63003A, for aviation advanced technology, but included no funding for a tactical unmanned combat aerial vehicle (UCAV) designed specifically for flexible launch and rapid response. The committee believes that the development of a survivable turbine-electric hybrid, vertical take-off and landing tactical class UCAV could introduce a self-contained, rapid response, precision strike capability for use by the

tactical commander. The committee recommends an increase of $14.0 million in PE 63003A for design and fabrication of the first Excalibur tactical UCAV system.

Nanotechnology manufacturing

The budget request included $74.7 million in PE 63004A, for weapons and munitions advanced technology. Research efforts on manufacturing processes for composite structures and new materials developed at the nano-scale for weapons, munitions, and fire control applications will ensure these multifunctional materials are also produced efficiently. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63004A for nanotechnology manufacturing.

Combat vehicle research

The budget request included $110.0 million in PE 63005A, for combat vehicle and automotive advanced technology. Under this account, the Army pursues survivability and mobility, communications, energy and power, and autonomous technology improvements for manned and unmanned ground systems. The committee recommends an increase of $35.0 million in PE 63005A for acceleration of research in all of these areas, including $2.0 million for advanced thermal management controls; $3.0 million for further testing and refinement of anti-ballistic windshield armor; $3.0 million for the composite armored cab program; $1.0 million for application of compressible magneto-rheological fluids for shock absorbers and suspension systems to increase tactical vehicle off-road mobility; $1.5 million for development of logistical fuel processors; $3.0 million for a phase III pilot demonstration of fuel cell powered ground support equipment; $3.0 million for next generation non-tactical vehicle propulsion; $1.5 million for maturation of a domestic production source for the segmented band track; $2.0 million for solid oxide fuel cell materials and manufacturing; $2.0 million for tactical vehicle design tools; $3.0 million for power electronics systems research; and $10.0 million for unmanned ground vehicle prototype research to promote near-term transition of robotic ground vehicle technologies.

Command and control team training

The budget request included $6.8 million in PE 63007A, for manpower, personnel, and training advanced technology. Realistic training repeatedly receives credit for saving the lives of warfighters who face current and evolving threats. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63007A for expansion of the successful advanced command and control team training program to division staffs.

Advanced simulated training

The budget request included $18.3 million in PE 63015A, for next generation training and simulation systems. The committee commends the Army for its innovative approach to providing up-to-date and realistic training environments. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63015A for completion of the initial joint fires and effects training module.

Missile recycling capability

The budget request included $10.4 million in PE 63103A, for explosives demilitarization technology. The Army estimates that 600,000 outdated missiles at ammunition storage sites and plants across the country and overseas need to be recycled over the next 10 to 15 years. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63103A for the continued development of technologies to disassemble missiles, and process and recover energetic materials for potential reuse.

Advanced electronic integration

The budget request included $11.2 million in PE 63305A, for Army missile defense systems integration, but included no funding for advanced electronic integration.

The committee believes it is necessary to advance the state-of-the-art in space and missile defense system electronics by reducing the size, weight, and cost of electronic circuit cards and components, wire harnesses, and electronic cabling. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63305A to be used to procure the special test-bed equipment and pay research personnel to conduct advanced electronic integration.

Advanced fuel cell research

The budget request included $11.2 million in PE 63305A, for Army missile defense systems integration, but included no funding for advanced fuel cell research.

The committee notes that alternative sources of power for space and missile defense propulsion is an ongoing high priority requirement for the Department of Defense. Fuel cells and the associated hydrogen production capability may provide more efficient and long endurance propulsion and energy systems for space and air breathing platforms. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63305A for continued research, design, and testing for advanced fuel cells.

Advanced Hypersonic Weapon modeling and simulation

The budget request included $11.2 million in PE 63305A, for Army missile defense systems integration, but included no funding for modeling and simulation efforts in support of the Advanced Hypersonic weapon (AHW).

The committee is aware that the AHW is a candidate for the Department of Defense requirement for high-volume prompt global strike. Flight testing is necessary to validate the design and development of AHW. The committee believes a risk reduction effort to provide pre-flight verification through hardware-in-the-loop simulations would benefit this and other hypersonic development programs.

The committee recommends an increase of $11.0 million in PE 63305A for AHW modeling and simulation.

Army missile and space modeling and simulation technology

The budget request included $11.2 million in PE 63305A, for Army system integration (non space), but included no funding for interactive modeling and simulation management capabilities.

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

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63305A to support continued development of interactive modeling and simulation management capabilities of the Army Space and Missile Defense Command.

Distributed operational control center

The budget request included $11.2 million in PE 63305A, for Army missile defense systems integration, but included no funding for the distributed operational control center (DOCC).

The DOCC is envisioned to be a large network operations center for sensor research and development. The DOCC will provide fiber-optic connectivity with the Reagan Test Site, permitting remote operations for sensor and flight tests as well as other research and development efforts currently centered at the Army's Space and Missile Defense Command.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63305A for DOCC hardware procurement, network integration, and operations control software development to support the consolidation of range and space surveillance functions.

HighSentinel airship

The budget request included $11.2 million in PE 63305A, for Army missile defense systems integration, but included no funding for the HighSentinel airship.

The committee understands that there is an operational requirement and mission need statement for multi-theater target tracking capabilities. The HighSentinel airship is intended to meet this requirement by carrying a communications or surveillance payload for up to 2 weeks of operations in support of the warfighter throughout the theater of operations. The airship would have a limited logistics support infrastructure and could be launched in-theater without the use of a hangar. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63305A to be used to design a high altitude airship to carry tactical communications or surveillance payloads for the warfighter.

Low cost avionics

The budget request included $11.2 million in PE 63305A, for Army missile defense systems integration, but included no funding for the development of low cost avionics. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63305A to support the research, design, and testing of avionics subsystems interfaces that incorporate standards utilizing a commercial, open architecture, as is done in the commercial marketplace. This would permit more timely upgrade of existing systems and lower operating costs caused by obsolete systems and subcomponents.

Protected test link

The budget request included $11.2 million in PE 63305A, for Army missile defense systems integration, but included no funding for the protected test link.

The Army Space and Missile Defense Center and Missile Defense Agency Modeling and Simulation Center of Excellence requires the capability for hardware-in-the-loop testing for ballistic missile defense system-level ground tests. A protected test link would enable each of the numerous missile defense system elements to participate in a systems-level test by providing physical as well as electronic protection measures for all test linkages. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63305A for the development of a protected test link.

Standoff sensor for radionuclides and explosives

The budget request included $11.2 million in PE 63305A, for Army missile defense systems integration, but included no funding for standoff sensors to detect radionuclides or other explosive devices.

The committee is aware that the defeat of improvised explosive devices is the number one priority of the entire Department of Defense. Likewise, detecting explosive devices containing nuclear materials remains a top priority. The committee supports a robust multidisciplinary research effort to solve the problems posed by the remote detection of radiological and explosive agents. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63305A to continue and broaden the research effort to develop standoff, real-time sensors for radiological and explosive devices.

Tactical operations center hardware and software integration

The budget request included $11.2 million in PE 63305A, for Army missile defense systems integration, but included no funding for future tactical operations center (TOC) hardware and software integration.

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense must continue to build upon ongoing activities to fully integrate space capabilities into airborne, land, and maritime assets to form a full force integrated battle management, communications, and surveillance architecture to synchronize planning and control of assets within the joint battlefield and provide situational awareness of the battlefield for the warfighters. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63305A for TOC hardware and software activities to integrate space, air, ground, and maritime situational awareness for the warfighter.

Thermal protection system technology risk reduction

The budget request included $11.2 million in PE 63305A for Army missile defense systems integration, but included no funding for thermal protection system (TPS) risk reduction efforts.

Thermal protection is a key enabling technology to permit hypersonic vehicles to travel great distances within the earth's atmosphere without overheating due to friction. Solving the TPS

problem is essential for the development of hypersonic flight in support of many mission areas, including prompt global strike.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63305A for developmental, test, and manufacturing design risk reduction efforts in the area of thermal protection.

Translation devices

The budget request included $64.6 million in PE 63772A, for advanced tactical computer science and sensor technology and $90.0 million in PE 62236N, for warfighter sustainment applied research. The committee notes that the Army and Marine Corps are currently considering a variety of approaches to the development of handheld translation technologies. This technology has been successfully used in Iraq and Afghanistan by assisting soldiers, marines, and special operators in their daily interactions with native populations. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63772A for the continued development of more capable, handheld translation technology and $2.0 million in PE 62236N for the development of translation devices that can support bi-directional translations of speech, text, and other information in multiple languages.

Advanced Hypersonic Weapon development

The budget request included $11.8 million in PE 63308A, for Army Missile Defense Systems Integration, but included no funding for Advanced Hypersonic Weapon (AHW) risk reduction efforts.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense Quadrennial Defense Review Report of 2006 highlights the need for "prompt and high-volume global strike" capability to deter aggression and provide a broader range of conventional options to the President, if deterrence fails. In March 2006, the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command (USSTRATCOM), testified before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services that in situations where U.S. general purpose forces are not in a position to respond rapidly to dangerous threats to the United States, the President may require USSTRATCOM to interdict such fleeting targets at global range. The Department of Defense is conducting an analysis of alternatives for prompt global strike capabilities in the near, mid, and long term. One alternative option for prompt, conventional long-range strike is to employ advanced technologies such as hypersonic vehicles that can travel thousands of miles in the upper atmosphere in under 60 minutes.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 63308A to support a flight test demonstration program for the AHW. The committee is aware that hypersonic research is being conducted throughout the Department for efforts that go beyond prompt global strike. Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense establish a joint technology office to coordinate, integrate, and manage hypersonic research. Activities related to the development of the AHW should be consistent with the approach adopted by this new joint technology office for hypersonic development so that the AHW could be considered by the Department as a candidate for a joint technology capability demonstration.

Architecture Analysis Program

The budget request included $143.4 million in PE 63327A, for Air and missile defense system engineering, but included no funding for the Air, Space, and Missile Defense Architecture Analysis Program (A3P).

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

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63327A for A3P to support air, space, and missile defense modeling and simulation.

Environmental quality technology demonstration and validation at the Defense Ammunition Center

The budget request included $5.2 million in PE 63779A for environmental quality technology demonstration and validation, but included no funding for the Defense Ammunition Center to provide dedicated oversight for critical environmental, explosives safety, and munitions surveillance research and development for the Department of Defense's conventional ammunition stocks, tactical missiles, and explosives. The committee notes that the Department has a stockpile of over 3.5 million tons of conventional ammunition, over one million tactical missiles, and strategic missiles with over 100 million pounds of energetic materials. The committee believes a focused program to identify challenges in managing this rapidly aging stockpile and respond to emerging explosives is needed.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63779A to establish a separate project for the Defense Ammunition Center to provide the Department with dedicated oversight and response for the stockpile of conventional ammunition, tactical missiles, and explosives to support readiness.

Counter rocket, artillery, and mortar

The budget request included $21.8 million in PE 64741A, for the Air Defense Command, Control and Intelligence—engineering development, but no funding for the Counter Rocket, Artillery, and Mortar (C–RAM) system. The committee understands that the Commander, Multinational Forces-Iraq, submitted an operational needs statement for the C–RAM system in June 2005. Congress approved $13.1 million in the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006 for C–RAM development. The committee believes the C–RAM development should be accelerated to support MNF–I requirements. Additional funding for C–RAM development has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $25.5 million in PE 64741A for C–RAM development, for a total authorization of $47.3 million.

Unmanned aerial vehicle anti-icing technology

The budget request included $10.9 million in PE 64258A, for target systems development. The Department of Defense consistently lists all weather capability as a priority for operation of unmanned systems. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 64258A for icing and wind tunnel testing of the prototype electro-expulsive ice protection system.

RAND Arroyo Center

The budget request included $20.2 million in PE 65103A, for the RAND Arroyo Center. The committee notes that RAND studies and analyses have supported Army missions by conducting analytic research on major policy concerns, attempting to assist the Army in improving effectiveness and efficiency, and providing short-term assistance on urgent problems. The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 65103A to sustain RAND analytical support to the Army.

Automated communications support

The budget request included $21.6 million in PE 65326A, for Concept Experimentation Program, but included no funding for further development of an automated communications recognition and translation capability.

Intelligence support to time-sensitive targeting is a critical component in the global war on terrorism. The Department of Defense requires the capability to quickly and efficiently process volumes of foreign language communications audio traffic and then exploit the intelligence content. The ability to separate and prioritize audio messages is crucial. Currently, it is neither economically feasible nor possible to recruit, train, and field sufficient linguists to meet this demand. The development of an automated system to assist in the exploitation of the intelligence value of foreign language audio messages could mitigate this shortfall in the war against terrorism, as well as more conventional threats, and threats to uniformed personnel. This capability could also have applicablity to the Department of Homeland Defense and law enforcement agencies.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.2 million in PE 65326A for the development of the capability to search, translate, and mine foreign language audio messages.

Biometric identification device

The budget included $21.6 million in PE 65326A, for Concept Experimentation Program, but included no funding for further development of a rugged, portable, and easy-to-operate 10-print fingerprint scanner device.

The requirement for biometric tools at the tactical level to support the war on terrorism is increasing.

Such a device would have applicability across the Department of Defense. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 65326A for the development of a biometric identification device for use with tactical forces.

Portable iris enrollment and recognition device

The budget request included $3.2 million in PE 33028A, for security and intelligence activities, but included no funding for the continued research of the portable iris enrollment and recognition (PIER) technology development.

The committee notes the need for the continued enhancement of biometric capabilities and the development of items such as the PIER device. The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 33028A for the continued development of a multi-modal portable biometric platform consistent with the development and integration goals of the Department of Defense for biometric identification systems.

Biometrics technology

The budget request included $23.8 million in PE 33140A, for the Information Systems Security Program, including $14.5 million for Army biometrics research and development. The committee believes that deployment of biometrics technologies is critical for successful operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as in support of homeland defense missions. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 33140A for the continued development of retinal/iris multimodal biometrics technology which is consistent with the development, deployment, and integration goals of the Department of Defense for biometric identification systems.

Army manufacturing technology

The budget request included $68.1 million in PE 78045A, for Army end-item industrial preparedness. The committee notes that the recent Defense Science Board study on the manufacturing technology program recommended that the Department of Defense increase investment in the program to a level equal to 1 percent of the total Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation budget. Consistent with this recommendation, the committee is authorizing a number of funding increases to manufacturing technology programs of the services and the Defense Logistics Agency. The committee recommends an increase of $8.5 million in PE 78045A, including $3.0 million for manufacturing systems demonstrations to develop efficient, agile manufacturing cells to better support warfighter needs for critical machined parts; $2.0 million for large structure titanium machining processes; and $3.5 million for super pulse laser system development.

The committee also notes that the recent report by the National Research Council, entitled "Linkages: Manufacturing Trends in Electronic Interconnection Technology," found that the Department of Defense will have increasing difficulty in acquiring the printed circuit boards it requires to produce future weapons systems and to sustain legacy systems. The Council recommended that the Department expand its role in fostering new printed circuit board design and manufacturing technology. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 78045A for the development of novel packaging and interconnect technologies to advance printed circuit board technology.

Budget Items—Navy

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
			RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY			
1319	0601103N	1	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	73,322	5,500	78,822
			Multifunctional materials for Navy structures		[1,500]	
			Neurotechnology research		[2,000]	
			Smart, remote sensing systems using nanotechnology		[2,000]	
1319	0601152N	2	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	15,916		15,916
1319	0601153N	3	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	366,649	3,000	369,649
			Early career awards		[1,000]	
			Software reliability		[2,000]	
1319	0602114N	4	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	84,914	2,000	86,914
			Thermal management systems		[2,000]	
1319	0602123N	5	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	123,443	18,000	141,443
			Advanced simulation tools for aircraft structures		[2,000]	
			Real-time wide band acoustic processor for fiber sensors		[2,500]	
			Mark V technology demonstrator		[5,000]	
			Nano-magnetic materials for propulsion and energy systems		[2,500]	
			Undersea perimeter security integrated defense environment (UPSIDE)		[2,000]	
			Small watercraft propulsion demonstrator		[4,000]	
1319	0602131M	6	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	37,741	1,900	39,641
			High power zinc-air battery		[1,900]	
1319	0602233N	7	HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY			
1319	0602234N	8	MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY			
1319	0602235N	9	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	68,352	-2,000	66,352
			Human factors and organizational design		[-2,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1319	0602236N	10	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	89,964	-5,000	84,964
			Bi-directional translator		[2,000]	
			Sea basing technologies		[-7,000]	
1319	0602271N	11	RF SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	42,619		42,619
1319	0602435N	12	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	48,718		48,718
1319	0602651M	13	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	6,036		6,036
1319	0602747N	14	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	83,435		83,435
1319	0602782N	15	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	53,435		53,435
1319	0603114N	16	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	76,806	-8,000	68,806
			Information processing technologies for mobile targeting		[2,000]	
			Reduce growth due to lack of transition path		[-10,000]	
1319	0603123N	17	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	61,504	17,000	78,504
			Navy manufacturing and repair cell		[5,000]	
			Completion of advanced ship service fuel cell power plant		[4,000]	
			Wide-band gap semiconductor materials research		[8,000]	
1319	0603235N	18	COMMON PICTURE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	61,725	5,000	66,725
			Improved shipboard combat information center		[3,000]	
			Rail sensor testbed		[2,000]	
1319	0603236N	19	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	82,035	17,000	99,035
			Advanced composite materials research		[5,000]	
			Vertical lift center of excellence		[4,000]	
			Defense systems modernization and sustainment initiative		[8,000]	
1319	0603271N	20	RF SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	45,317	2,000	47,317
			APY-6 real-time precision targeting radar		[2,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1319	0603640M	21	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	59,170	21,000	80,170
			Expeditionary water purification		[3,000]	
			Advanced technology demonstrations		[12,000]	
			Advanced tactical vehicle		[6,000]	
1319	0603651M	22	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,405		1,405
1319	0603727N	23	NAVY TECHNICAL INFORMATION PRESENTATION SYSTEM			
1319	0603729N	24	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	17,982		17,982
1319	0603747N	25	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	35,055		35,055
1319	0603757N	26	JOINT WARFARE EXPERIMENTS			
1319	0603758N	27	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	41,308		41,308
1319	0603782N	28	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOC	21,326	2,000	23,326
			Augmented reality visualization of the common operational picture		[2,000]	
1319	0603158N	29	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	1,001		1,001
1319	0603207N	30	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	31,778		31,778
1319	0603216N	31	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	6,177		6,177
1319	0603237N	32	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	16,383		16,383
1319	0603254N	33	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	16,782	6,700	23,482
			Electro-optic Passive ASW System		[6,700]	
1319	0603261N	34	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	3,959		3,959
1319	0603382N	35	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	12,398		12,398
1319	0603502N	36	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	130,265	2,000	132,265
			Surface Navy integrated undersea tactical technology		[2,000]	
1319	0603506N	37	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	40,627		40,627
1319	0603512N	38	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	153,894		153,894

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1319	0603513N	39	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	14,135	14,000	28,135
			Smart valve		[2,500]	
			Gas Turbine Electric Start System technology upgrade		[5,500]	
			High temp superconductor AC synchronous propulsion motor		[6,000]	
1319	0603525N	40	PILOT FISH	134,550		134,550
1319	0603527N	41	RETRACT LARCH	87,180		87,180
1319	0603536N	42	RETRACT JUNIPER	38,462		38,462
1319	0603542N	43	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	1,901		1,901
1319	0603553N	44	SURFACE ASW	38,696		38,696
1319	0603559N	45	SSGN CONVERSION	25,953		25,953
1319	0603561N	46	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	140,432	10,000	150,432
			Next strategic missile submarine		[10,000]	
1319	0603562N	47	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	10,357		10,357
1319	0603563N	48	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	21,549		21,549
1319	0603564N	49	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	21,314		21,314
1319	0603570N	50	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	174,648		174,648
1319	0603573N	51	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS			
1319	0603576N	52	CHALK EAGLE	139,017		139,017
1319	0603581N	53	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	319,671		319,671
1319	0603582N	54	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	62,095		62,095
1319	0603609N	55	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	22,385		22,385
1319	0603611M	56	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	188,306		188,306
1319	0603612M	57	USMC MINE COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	3,777		3,777

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1319	0603635M	58	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	503	4,000	4,503
			Moldable fabric armor		[2,000]	
			Urban operations laboratory		[2,000]	
1319	0603654N	59	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	24,467	9,100	33,567
			Joint service and EOD IED countermeasures R&D		[9,100]	
1319	0603658N	60	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	53,406		53,406
1319	0603713N	61	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	16,324		16,324
1319	0603721N	62	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	20,271		20,271
1319	0603724N	63	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	1,600		1,600
1319	0603725N	64	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	4,194		4,194
1319	0603734N	65	CHALK CORAL	28,578		28,578
1319	0603739N	66	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	6,306		6,306
1319	0603746N	67	RETRACT MAPLE	344,912		344,912
1319	0603748N	68	LINK PLUMERIA	80,662		80,662
1319	0603751N	69	RETRACT ELM	64,133		64,133
1319	0603755N	70	SHIP SELF DEFENSE	8,897		8,897
1319	0603764N	71	LINK EVERGREEN	55,051		55,051
1319	0603787N	72	SPECIAL PROCESSES	47,180		47,180
1319	0603790N	73	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,784		9,784
1319	0603795N	74	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	18,571		18,571
1319	0603851M	75	NONLETHAL WEAPONS	44,815		44,815
1319	0603857N	76	ALL SERVICE COMBAT IDENTIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM (A:			
1319	0603860N	77	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	41,242		41,242
1319	0603879N	78	SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP) SYSTEM ENGINEER (S	50,282		50,282

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1319	0603889N	79	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS		6,500	6,500
			Project Athena		[6,500]	
NEW	0603925N	79a	Directed Energy Research		50,000	50,000
1320	0604272N	80	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (T	20,527		20,527
1319	0604327N	81	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS	77,000		77,000
1319	0604707N	82	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENG	43,909		43,909
1319	0604787N	83	JOINT WARFARE TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMS			
1319	0604212N	84	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	86,197		86,197
1319	0604214N	85	AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	13,878		13,878
1319	0604215N	86	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	112,257		112,257
1319	0604216N	87	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	19,259		19,259
1319	0604218N	88	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	5,578		5,578
1319	0604221N	89	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	16,139		16,139
1319	0604230N	90	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	2,203		2,203
1319	0604231N	91	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	74,225		74,225
1319	0604234N	92	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	497,842		497,842
1319	0604245N	93	H-1 UPGRADES	7,844		7,844
1319	0604261N	94	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	36,764		36,764
1319	0604262N	95	V-22A	268,461		268,461
1319	0604264N	96	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	12,434		12,434
1319	0604269N	97	EA-18	372,363		372,363
1319	0604270N	98	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	39,842		39,842
1319	0604273N	99	VHXX EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	682,597		682,597
1319	0604280N	100	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM - NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	1,153		1,153
1319	0604300N	101	SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	817,528		817,528

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1319	0604307N	102	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	190,059		190,059
1319	0604311N	103	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	5,960		5,960
1319	0604312N	104	TRI-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE			
1319	0604329N	105	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	10,021		10,021
1319	0604366N	106	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	186,144		186,144
1319	0604373N	107	AIRBORNE MCM	56,145		56,145
1319	0604378N	108	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL - COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS I	14,792		14,792
1319	0604503N	109	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	94,839	10,000	104,839
			Twin line thinline towed array		[10,000]	
1319	0604504N	110	AIR CONTROL	4,603		4,603
1319	0604507N	111	ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR			
1319	0604512N	112	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	33,392		33,392
1319	0604518N	113	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	6,708		6,708
1319	0604558N	114	NEW DESIGN SSN	169,580	65,000	234,580
			Virginia class affordable design		[65,000]	
1319	0604561N	115	SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	3,260		3,260
1319	0604562N	116	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	51,656		51,656
1319	0604567N	117	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	72,055		72,055
1319	0604574N	118	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES			
1319	0604601N	119	MINE DEVELOPMENT	5,631		5,631
1319	0604603N	120	UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS			
1319	0604610N	121	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	40,540		40,540
1319	0604654N	122	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	10,026		10,026
1319	0604703N	123	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	8,754		8,754
1319	0604721N	124	BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTENSION SYSTEM			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1319	0604727N	125	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	27,524		27,524
1319	0604755N	126	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	10,050	4,000	14,050
			Autonomous unmanned surface vessel		[4,000]	
1319	0604756N	127	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	46,390		46,390
1319	0604757N	128	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	11,513	6,000	17,513
			MK 53 (NULKA) Decoy System		[6,000]	
1319	0604761N	129	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	4,865		4,865
1319	0604771N	130	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	7,663	2,500	10,163
			Non-invasive vectored vaccine research		[2,000]	
			Chiropractic treatment study		[500]	
1319	0604777N	131	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	47,070		47,070
1319	0604784N	132	DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	58,273		58,273
1319	0604800N	133	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	2,030,979	200,400	2,231,379
			Joint Strike Fighter alternate engine development		[200,400]	
1319	0604910N	134	SMART CARD			
1319	0605013M	135	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,326		13,326
1319	0605013N	136	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	88,323		88,323
1319	0605172N	137	MULTINATIONAL INFORMATION SHARING (MNIS)	20,856		20,856
1319	0605212N	138	CH-53X RDTE	362,672		362,672
1319	0605500N	139	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	1,131,655		1,131,655
1319	0304785N	140	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	23,526		23,526
1319	0604256N	141	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	23,668		23,668
1319	0604258N	142	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	45,666		45,666
1319	0604759N	143	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	39,750		39,750
1319	0605152N	144	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	7,093		7,093

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1319	0605154N	145	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	48,900		48,900
1319	0605155N	146	FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	2,595		2,595
1319	0605502N	147	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
1319	0605804N	148	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	670		670
1319	0605853N	149	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	47,213		47,213
1319	0605856N	150	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,347		3,347
1319	0605861N	151	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	67,328		67,328
1319	0605862N	152	RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	1,243		1,243
1319	0605863N	153	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	83,140		83,140
1319	0605864N	154	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	328,276		328,276
1319	0605865N	155	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	11,532		11,532
1319	0605866N	156	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	2,904		2,904
1319	0605867N	157	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	20,073		20,073
1319	0605873M	158	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	25,343	5,000	30,343
			Detection and recovery of UXO		[5,000]	
1319	0305885N	159	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	1,004		1,004
1319	0804758N	160	SERVICE SUPPORT TO JFCOM, JNTC	5,202		5,202
1319	0909999N	161	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
1319	0603660N	162	ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	[ ]		[ ]
1319	0604227N	163	HARPOON MODIFICATIONS	36,284		36,284
1319	0604402N	164	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMPO	239,163		239,163
1319	0101221N	165	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	124,522		124,522
1319	0101224N	166	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	42,869		42,869
1319	0101226N	167	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	2,131		2,131
1319	0101402N	168	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	37,464		37,464

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1319	0203761N	169	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	39,285		39,285
1319	0204136N	170	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	31,098		31,098
1319	0204152N	171	E-2 SQUADRONS	1,540		1,540
1319	0204163N	172	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	27,189		27,189
1319	0204229N	173	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TM	18,635		18,635
1319	0204311N	174	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	30,740		30,740
1319	0204413N	175	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAF	1,812		1,812
1319	0204571N	176	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	17,857		17,857
1319	0204574N	177	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,425		1,425
1319	0204575N	178	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	20,673		20,673
1319	0205601N	179	HARM IMPROVEMENT	99,208		99,208
1319	0205604N	180	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	41,967		41,967
1319	0205620N	181	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	9,417		9,417
1319	0205632N	182	MK-48 ADCAP	24,988		24,988
1319	0205633N	183	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	71,612		71,612
1319	0205658N	184	NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	3,376		3,376
1319	0205675N	185	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	69,350		69,350
1319	0206313M	186	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	218,460	32,000	250,460
			AN/TPS-59 low earth orbit (LEOS) acceleration		[5,000]	
			Battlefield Management System software development		[2,000]	
			Counter-radio controlled IED development		[25,000]	
1319	0206623M	187	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEM	47,592	8,500	56,092
			Ultrasonic consolidation technology		[4,500]	
			Polymer-based IED detection tools		[4,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1319	0206624M	188	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	17,524	9,000	26,524
			Expeditionary assault bridge development		[9,000]	
1319	0207161N	189	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	7,946		7,946
1319	0207163N	190	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	6,705		6,705
1319	0208058N	191	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	14,163		14,163
1319	0301303N	192	MARITIME INTELLIGENCE	[ ]	5,500	5,500
			Vessel Integrity System		[1,000]	
			Surf Eagle environmental intelligence		[4,500]	
1319	0301323N	193	COLLECTION MANAGEMENT	[ ]		[ ]
1319	0303217N	194	TECHNICAL RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEILLANCE	[ ]		[ ]
1319	0303109N	195	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	748,662		748,662
1319	0303140N	196	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	23,037		23,037
1319	0303158N	197	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	5,073		5,073
1319	0305149N	198	COBRA JUDY	135,372		135,372
1319	0305160N	199	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METO(	7,307		7,307
1319	0305188N	200	JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)			
1319	0305192N	201	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	6,793		6,793
1319	0305204N	202	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	115,950		115,950
1319	0305205N	203	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	26,357		26,357
1319	0305206N	204	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	35,038		35,038
1319	0305207N	205	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	22,815		22,815
1319	0305208N	206	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	16,587		16,587
1319	0307207N	207	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS)	17,182		17,182
1319	0308601N	208	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	7,503		7,503
1319	0702207N	209	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	2,960		2,960

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1319	0702239N	210	AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,375		1,375
1319	0708011N	211	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	55,048		55,048
1319	0708730N	212	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)		10,000	10,000
			National shipbuilding research program-adv shipbuilding enterprise		[10,000]	
1319	XXXXXXX	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,181,325		1,181,325
			Total, RDT&E Navy	**16,912,223**	**539,600**	**17,451,823**

Navy university research

The budget request included $73.3 million in PE 61103N, for university research initiatives and $366.6 million in PE 61153N, for defense research sciences. Navy basic research programs explore innovation and discovery in areas that pose challenges in the maritime battlefield such as corrosion; fire-retardant, impact resistant materials and structures; neuroscience and biorobotics; electronic sensors and energy sciences; and information assurance. The committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million in PE 61103N for university basic defense research, including $1.5 million for multifunctional materials for Navy structures; $2.0 million for neurotechnology research; and $2.0 million for smart, remote sensing systems using nanotechnology. The committee also recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 61153N, for software reliability.

Thermal management systems

The budget request included $84.9 million in PE 62114N, for applied research on power projection technologies. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62114N for the development of new thermal management systems with the capability to cool high power density electronics. Electronics in future military systems with highly, complex microelectronics, high processing speeds, and higher power operation require advanced thermal management systems to optimize their performance. The development of thermal management technologies are highlighted in a number of Defense Technology Objectives, including those related to the development of advanced radio frequency electronics technologies to support naval missions such as surveillance, weapons control, electronic warfare, communications, and identification of "friend or foe."

Force protection applied research

The budget request included $123.4 million in PE 62123N, for force protection applied research. Naval warfighting capabilities supported by this program include maintaining platform and force mobility through stealth, area and self-defense, structural toughness, and reconfigurability. The committee recommends an increase of $18.0 million in PE 62123N for targeted development and transition activities, including $2.0 million for advanced simulation tools for aircraft structures; $2.5 million for development of a real-time wideband acoustic processor for fiber sensors; $5.0 million for final outfitting and completion of the Mark V technology demonstrator; $2.5 million for nano-magnetic materials for propulsion and energy systems; $4.0 million for thermal design, system qualification, and power integration on the small watercraft propulsion demonstrator; and $2.0 million for the undersea perimeter security integrated defense environment.

High power, lightweight battery research

The budget request included $37.7 million in PE 62131M, for Marine Corps landing force technology. Growing energy and power needs of the dismounted warrior must be met with advanced, reliable, high-power, batteries that are significantly lighter and smaller. The committee notes that the Department of Defense's research

enterprise explores various approaches to solving energy and power challenges for the dismounted soldier, including solid oxide fuel cell systems pursued by Special Operations Command.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.9 million in PE 62131M for prototype research on a high power, small, lightweight zinc-air battery specifically to scale down larger batteries for operation of smaller devices without losing power density.

Human factors and organizational design

The budget request included $68.4 million in PE 62235N, for common picture applied research. The committee recommends a decrease of $2.0 million in PE 62235N for programs in social science based-computational models and human performance research that are duplicative of efforts in other services and agencies.

Sea basing technologies

The budget request included $90.0 million in PE 62236N, for applied research on warfighter sustainment technologies. The committee recommends a decrease of $7.0 million in PE 62236N to limit the number of demonstrators developed under the sea basing concept until it is better defined and has established transition paths to acquisition programs.

Information sharing technologies

The budget request included $76.8 million in PE 63114N, for power projection advanced technology. Recent operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have highlighted the importance of time critical strikes on high-value mobile targets in complex environments. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63114N for the development of communications and information processing technologies that assist in the surveillance, targeting, and engagement of mobile targets.

Power projection advanced technology

The budget request included $76.8 million in PE 63114N, for power projection advanced technology research programs. The committee recommends a decrease of $10.0 million in PE 63114N to limit growth of programs with no defined transition pathway to Navy acquisition programs. The committee recommends limiting funding of hypersonics programs until completion and implementation of a Department-wide strategy for hypersonics technology development and demonstration.

Force protection advanced technology

The budget request included $61.5 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 com-

mittee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63123N for the development of a transportable manufacturing and repair cell.

The budget request included no funding for completion of advanced ship service fuel cell (SSFC) power plant design. The Navy has invested over $30.0 million in design and development of advanced prototype fuel cell demonstration systems for shipboard application. Additional funding will enable performance characterization, including endurance and latent defect testing at the DD(X) land-based engineering site to demonstrate compatibility with DD(X) integrated power system architecture. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63123N for the continued development of a SSFC.

The budget included no funding for the continued 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 $8.0 million in PE 63123N for the continued development of wide band gap semiconductor substrate material.

The committee recommends a total authorization of $78.5 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology.

Common picture advanced technology

The budget request included $61.7 million in PE 63235N, for common picture advanced technology. Processing large quantities of information from a variety of sensors and assets into actionable information requires assistance and some degree of automation. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63235N to promote transition of research in processing of sensor data, including $3.0 million for near-term development of an improved shipboard command information center; and $2.0 million for the rail sensor testbed.

Warfighter sustainment technology

The budget request included $82.0 million in PE 63236N for the development of warfighter sustainment advanced technology, but included no funding for advanced composites material research, the Defense Systems Modernization and Sustainment Initiative, or the Vertical Lift Center of Excellence.

The Marine Corps has a need for a new generation of armored, light-weight, long-life ground vehicles for use in a variety of adverse conditions. The Advanced Composite Materials Research project would apply the structural benefits of composites, including bio-mimetics, to develop increased survivability, improved safety design, and self-diagnostic structural features for military ground vehicles. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63236N for advanced composite materials research.

The Defense Systems Modernization and Sustainment Initiative is a research program focused on improving the modernization, readiness, and sustainment of defense systems by developing processes and tools to track the status and future health of defense systems; to detect, diagnose and repair material aging failures; and to provide decision systems for use in determining when and how to upgrade these systems. The committee recommends an increase of

$8.0 million for the Defense Systems Modernization and Sustainment Initiative.

The Vertical Lift Center of Excellence at Naval Aviation Depot, Cherry Point, provides for science and technology insertion into a dedicated activity to identify, demonstrate, validate, and assist in implementing improved maintenance products, procedures, and processes into depot operations. The result of these efforts is increased readiness by improving maintenance operations and decreasing maintenance cycle times for rotary wing aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million for the Vertical Lift Center of Excellence.

The committee recommends a total authorization of $99.0 million in PE 63236N.

APY–6 real-time precision targeting radar

The budget request included $45.3 million in PE 63271N, for radio frequency systems advanced technology. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63271N for continued demonstrations and development of the APY, real-time precision targeting radar to support unmanned air vehicle mission requirements.

Marine Corps advanced technology

The budget request included $59.2 million in PE 63640M, for Marine Corps advanced technology demonstrations. The committee recognizes the work and dedication of the Office of Naval Research and the Marine Corps Warfighting Lab in meeting the short and long term needs of expeditionary force, particularly in the areas of body armor; information, surveillance, and reconnaissance; and chemical, biological, and radiological detection and warning. The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63640M for Marine Corps technology demonstrations, including $12.0 million for the core advanced technology program to focus on the areas noted above; and $3.0 million for expeditionary water purification.

The committee further recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63640M for design and development of advanced combat tactical vehicle prototypes that optimize system mobility, survivability, and lethality.

Visual integrated bridge system

The budget request included $21.3 million in PE 63782N, for mine and expeditionary warfare advanced development. Navy evaluations of the Augmented Reality Visualization of the Common Operational Picture (ARVCOP) on numerous platforms demonstrated utility of the system for improved safety, navigation, and battlespace awareness. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63782N to promote transition of the system to the fleet.

Electro-optic Passive ASW System

The budget request included $9.9 million in PE 63254N for the Electro-optic Passive ASW System (EPAS). EPAS is a 15-inch turret-based suite of electro-optic and magnetic anomaly detection sensors with the potential to provide a 24-hour air ASW capability for

fixed wing, helicopter, and unmanned aircraft system ASW platforms. Additional EPAS turret systems and real-time detection, classification, and false alarm mitigation capabilities are required for realistic system operational assessment in a multi-platform fleet environment before transitioning to a follow-on acquisition program. The committee recommends an increase of $6.7 million in PE 63254N for development of the Electro-optic Passive ASW System.

Surface Navy Integrated Undersea Tactical Technology

The budget request included $130.3 million in PE 63502N for surface and shallow water mine countermeasures, but included no funding for the Surface Navy Integrated Undersea Tactical Technology (SNIUTT) program. SNIUTT would provide surface ship mine countermeasures sonar operators with the simulated training necessary to recognize mine-like contacts. SNIUTT would expand the mine recognition training technologies and scenario generation capabilities successfully demonstrated in airborne mine countermeasure to all Navy mine-hunting sonars. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63502N for SNIUTT.

Shipboard system component development

The budget request included $14.1 million in PE 63513N for shipboard system component development, including $7.1 million for the development of integrated power systems, but included no funding for the high temperature superconductor alternating current (HTS-AC) synchronous marine propulsion motor development, Smart Valve development, or for gas turbine electric start system technology upgrade.

A 36.5 megawatt prototype HTS-AC synchronous propulsion motor will be delivered to the Navy in fiscal year 2006. Design of a fully militarized motor, specifically for DD(X), will commence in 2006. Additional funding is required in fiscal year 2007 to support full power testing of the prototype motor, and to complete the preliminary design for militarization of the HTS-AC motor for potential application to a future surface combatant. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63513N for the continued development of the HTS-AC synchronous marine propulsion motor.

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, quick response; and includes self-diagnostic capability for preventive, condition-based maintenance. Increased service life and improved functional design with Smart Valves result in reduced maintenance and reduced life cycle cost. The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 63513N to complete development of a prototype Smart Valve.

The gas turbine electric start system technology upgrade would expand the application of electric starters to naval gas turbine engines for potential use on the Navy's CG–47 class, DDG–51 class,

and future naval ships. Electric start technology would greatly simplify gas turbine start system design, resulting in increased reliability and reduced procurement and support costs. The committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million in PE 63513N to develop and qualify an electric start system for naval gas turbine engines.

The committee recommends a total authorization of $28.1 million in PE 63513N for shipboard system component development.

Marine Corps ground combat and supporting arms systems

The budget request included $503,000 in PE 63635M, for the development of Marine Corps ground combat and supporting arms systems, but no funding for moldable fabric armor or the Unit Operations Laboratory.

Moldable fabric armor is made from a highly engineered polypropylene tape yarn which exhibits high impact resistence at a very light weight. The committee believes that moldable fabric armor has the potential to provide an alternative to the current integrated body armor worn by Marines and soldiers, who often carry almost 100 pounds of equipment when deployed in combat situations.

Nonlethal weapon development initiatives aim to minimize collateral damage to infrastructure and personnel, while neutralizing facilities and the threats that might be posed to these facilities and the personnel that occupy them. An urban operations laboratory will provide assessment and analysis of the affects of non-lethal technologies to ensure minimum environmental and collateral damage when used in urban activities. The committee believes that the Marine Corps must have a broad range of responses to contain and manage emerging threats before, during, and after conflict, and with minimum collateral damage.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for moldable fabric armor development and $2.0 million for an urban operations laboratory in PE 62635M, for a total authorization of $4.5 million.

Project Athena

The budget request included $2.5 million in PE 63889N, for Project Athena. Project Athena is a situational awareness system that provides a common operational picture (COP) to national, regional, and local users. It fuses real-time downlinks from surveillance sensors, multiple data bases, and other sources of intelligence reporting into a COP that can be tailored to multiple security levels, including unclassified. Project Athena is capable of providing a COP to the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Coast Guard, first responders, and allied nations in a more 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 is being used at the Joint Interagency Task Force South in Florida and jointly with the Colombian Navy.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.5 million to PE 63889N for the further integration of databases and sensors, and

additional operational tests with interagency, first responders, and allied nations.

Directed energy and electric weapon systems

The budget request included $41.7 million funding in PE 61153N, PE 62114N, and PE 63114N, for directed energy technology and continued development of an electromagnetic rail gun (EMRG). Progress with these developments, in conjunction with the Navy's programmed introduction of ship integrated power systems, has established a foundation for fielding shipboard directed energy and electric weapon systems.

The Chief of Naval Operations has noted that the EMRG would provide an extremely long range and persistent volume of fire, significantly improving naval gunfire support for forces ashore. In view of research by other, non-allied nations involving similar technology, it is vital that the Navy maintains its edge in this critical area. The committee is aware that the Navy has moved forward with the establishment of the Directed Energy Technology Office and the Directed Energy Weapons Program Office to manage directed energy weapons research, development, integration, and acquisition for the Navy. The committee agrees with the Navy's increased emphasis on this critical future capability, including the construction of the Electromagnetic Research and Engineering Facility and the new 64 megajoule railgun facility at the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC), Dahlgren. The committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million in PE 63925N to accelerate development of directed energy and electric weapon systems, including:

(1) an increase of $13.4 million to outfit the Electromagnetic Research and Engineering Facility to conduct high lethality laser and high power Radio Frequency (RF)/microwave research;

(2) an increase of $8.6 million for electromagnetic railgun research in advanced material development for bore life engineering, projectile design, and power system requirements;

(3) an increase of $15.0 million for RF energy application to counter Improvised Explosive Devices, including Terahertz system development, solid state heat capacity laser analysis and test, and high power microwave technology application; and

(4) an increase of $13.0 million for high energy laser development in conjunction with ship self-protection and laser guided energy development and application to lethal and non-lethal ship weapon systems.

Towed array improvements

The budget request included $94.8 million in PE 64503N for Submarine Systems Equipment Development, including $5.7 million for affordable towed array technology development. Twin line, thinline towed array capability is a key technology for long-range passive detection against quiet diesel submarines in the littorals. Leveraging current TB–33 array baseline technology development by adding twin line, thinline capability would enhance performance and affordability. Advance processor technologies are required to solve the need for greater processing capability, while decreasing

internal heat load on the submarine. Array/array handling system design improvements are necessary to increase component reliability. Additional funding to accelerate investment in twin line, thinline towed array capability has been included on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 64503N for the development of affordable towed array construction, improved towed array/array handler reliability, and for the development and testing of advance processing technologies, including the field programmable gate arrays for application to the twin line, thinline towed array system.

Submarine design

The budget request included $169.6 million in PE 64558N for the continuing development of the Virginia-class submarine, and $140.4 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 the Virginia-class and future submarine concepts.

The budget request included $20.0 million for affordability design, but included no funding for concept formulation for the next generation strategic submarine platform. Similarly, the budget request included no funding to continue development of a family of systems and capabilities, the focus of which is to spirally incorporate capabilities needed to enhance undersea superiority of the Virginia-class. The committee believes that continued investment in these capabilities is needed to meet the future threat. However, the most important measure to increase operational capability of the Virginia-class is to increase the program's building rate as soon as practical. The committee is concerned that the Navy's proposed shipbuilding program is insufficient to meet the submarine force structure requirements outlined in the Secretary of the Navy's report on the long-range plan for the construction of naval vessels. The committee urges the Navy to mitigate this shortfall by moving toward a production goal of two submarines per year beginning in 2010. The committee is aware that the Chief of Naval Operations has established an affordability threshhold as a criterion for increasing the submarine procurement rate, and recognizes that initiatives to add critical capabilities to the Virginia-class need to be accomplished in a manner that supports the established affordability objectives.

The committee recommends an increase of $65.0 million in PE 64558N to support cost reduction initiatives for the Virginia-class design and construction. This additional funding is to include the design and development, leading to affordable integration of the following capabilities into the Virginia-class:

(1) Multi-Mission Module;

(2) Large Aperture Bow Array;

(3) spiral Alpha for the Virginia-class Warfare Management System;

(4) Common Open Architecture Weapon System Components;

(5) Submarine Network-centric Capability Technology Insertion; and

(6) Submarine Command & Control Systems Advanced Technology Insertion.

The committee is further concerned that, for the first time in more than 50 years, the United States is not actively engaged in the design of a new class of nuclear submarine. The current Navy schedule to initiate the next generation submarine platform design causes a significant gap in the design and engineering industrial workload such that the industrial base will not likely be able to preserve the critical skills and capabilities needed for this effort. Testimony by industry and Navy experts before the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services emphasized the criticality of maintaining a viable submarine design industrial base to avoid the severe delays and cost overruns experienced by other navies, whose design base atrophied during lengthy periods between new design efforts. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63561N to initiate concept formulation on the next generation submarine platform, including alternate design approaches, integration of future weapons systems, and mission capabilities.

Ship self-defense

The budget request included $10.1 million in PE 64755N for ship self-defense, but included no funding for continued development of the autonomous unmanned surface vehicle (AUSV). The AUSV is being developed as a concept demonstrator for hydrographic survey, and for potential antiterrorism force protection missions in defense of harbors and coastal facilities. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64755N for the continued development of the AUSV.

NULKA anti-ship missile decoy development

The budget request included $11.5 million in PE 64757N for development of soft kill technologies for ship self-defense, and $1.0 million for the continuing development of the NULKA decoy. NULKA is an offboard, active decoy designed to counter a wide variety of present and future radar-guided anti-ship missiles. Continued development of NULKA is necessary to counter anti-ship missiles, which may migrate to other frequency bands or use dual mode seekers. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 64757N for the continued development of the NULKA decoy.

Chiropractic treatment outcomes study

The budget request included $7.7 million in PE 64771N, for medical development. Section 702 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) directed the Department of Defense to develop a plan to provide chiropractic health care services and benefits to active-duty personnel as a permanent part of the Defense Health Program. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to commission a study by a federally-funded research and development center to assess progress of the program and the efficacy and application of chiropractic health care services in reducing musculoskeletal disabilities among active-duty personnel. The study should include: an evalua-

tion of the effectiveness of the care provided to military personnel including pilots and infantrymen; development of metrics for measurement of appropriate chiropractic treatment outcomes; and identification of any additional requirements for research. The committee recommends an increase of $500,000 in PE 64771N to conduct the required study. The results of the study should be reviewed by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, and submitted to the congressional defense committees with any comments not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

Navy medical research

The budget request included $7.7 million in PE 64771N, for medical development. Navy medical research programs focus on vaccines and treatments specific to the needs of the sailor and support efforts to address the threat posed by biological weapons and naturally occurring illnesses in areas of military operation. Enhanced vaccine distribution techniques and more efficient delivery of treatments would further reduce logistical and personnel requirements, while increasing protection. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 64771N for non-invasive vectored vaccine research to produce a consistent, highly immunogenic, and easily manufactured and administered vaccine.

F136 Interchangeable Engine

The budget request included $1,999.0 million in PE 64800F and $2,031.0 million in PE 64800N for the continued development of the Joint Strike Fighter, but included no funding for the development of the F136 interchangeable engine. The committee believes supporting competitive propulsion systems would help reduce operational risk and lead to higher confidence of achieving more affordable life cycle costs. The committee expects that the Secretary of Defense, along with the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force, will remain committed to the development and sustainment of competitive propulsion systems for the Joint Strike Fighter.

The committee recommends an increase of $200.4 million in PE 64800F and an increase of $200.4 million in PE 64800N for the continued development of the F136 interchangeable engine.

Marine Corps communications systems

The budget request included $218.5 million in PE 26313M, for the development of Marine Corps communications systems, including $8.6 million for AN/TPS–59(V)3 Radar System sustainment but no funding for the battlefield management system (BMS) or counter remote controlled improvised explosives device (RCIED) electronic warfare countermeasure systems.

The AN/TPS–59(V)3 Radar System provides the only long-range, three dimensional surveillance radar in the Marine Corps inventory. Since September 2001, TPS–59 radars have been deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee believes that capability improvement efforts need to be undertaken to accelerate the development of the Low Earth Orbit Satellite (LEOS) capability. Additional funding for

LEOS development has been included on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list.

The committee understands that the Marine Corps' tank and track vehicles do not have an on-board situational awareness capability. The BMS is an off-the-shelf situational awareness capability that can be integrated into the Joint Battle Command Platform. Additional funding for the development of software interfaces for the BMS has been included on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list.

The committee supports initiatives that address the development of remote controlled improvised explosives device (RCIED) electronic warfare countermeasures. The committee understands that additional funding is required to develop and test the next generation of High Powered Vehicle Mounted Countermeasure Systems, single antenna development and testing, as well as, platform integration and testing. Additional funding for the development RCIED countermeasures has been included on the Commandant of the Marine Corps's fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 for LEOS development, $2.0 million for BMS interface software development, and $25.0 million for counter-RCIED development in PE 26313M, for a total authorization of $250.5 million.

Polymer-based improvised explosive device detection tools

The budget request included $47.6 million in PE 26623M, for the development of Marine Corps ground combat and supporting arms systems, but no funding for amplifying fluorescent polymer-based improvised explosive device detection tools (FIDO XT) or the Sense and Respond Support System.

The committee understands that the FIDO XT has been under development over the last three years and has made significant progress in the development of a system which mimics the action of dogs trained to detect explosive materials. This technology has proven to be successful in laboratory and field environments but requires additional work for integration into robotic vehicles.

The committee understands that the Marine Corps is entering the third year of a four-year 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 $4.0 million for FIDO XT development and integration and $4.5 million for the LAV Sense and Respond System, for a total authorization of $56.1 million in PE 26623M.

Expeditionary assault bridge

The budget request included $16.3 million in PE 26624M, for the development of Marine Corps service support equipment, including $750,000 for the development of the Expeditionary Assault Bridge. Lessons learned from Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) proved the current Armored Vehicle Launched Bridge (AVLB) system, based on a M–60 tank chassis, cannot keep pace with maneuver forces and is difficult to maintain, with further degradation anticipated due to a shortage of M–60 spare parts. The committee believes that

development of the EAB, based on a modern M–1 chassis, should be accelerated to provide Marine forces with a dependable assault gap-crossing capability that is able to keep pace with current forces. Additional funding for EAB development has been included on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 26624M for EAB development, for a total authorization of $25.3 million.

Environmental intelligence for riverine operations

The budget request included funding in PE 31303N, for Maritime Intelligence to support continued analysis, tool kit development, and the environmental intelligence necessary to support naval riverine capabilities.

The 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review Report identified a requirement to provide a Navy riverine capability for river patrol, interdiction, and tactical troop movement on inland waterways. The demand for intelligence on inland waterways in the "long war" against terrorists worldwide is increasing. The committee is aware that Naval Oceanographic Office and Naval Research Lab at Stennis Space Center, Mississippi have a proven capability in the field of environmental intelligence.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million in PE 31303N, Maritime Intelligence, to improve and broaden the capability to fuse, store, and share meterological, oceanographic, and environmental intelligence in support of special operations, counterproliferation, counterterrorism, force protection, drug interdiction, and expeditionary operations in coastal and riverine areas.

Vessel integrity system

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 31303N, Maritime Intelligence, for the acquisition of a vessel integrity system (VIS) to complement and enhance current capabilities to monitor and track ocean going vessels worldwide, provide cargo information, provide data on cargo and port history, and estimate future tracks and possible port calls. The committee believes that VIS could enhance security of U.S. maritime borders and increase the capability of other U.S. maritime intelligence programs.

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 new processes and techniques that reduce the cost of building and repairing ships. Annual Navy funding, which is matched and exceeded by industry investment, has achieved savings and cost avoidance for the Navy, a positive return on investment, and a high research-to-implementation transition rate. The committee believes that continuation of the NSRP-ASE provides a vital contribution towards achieving the overarching objective of improving the affordability of naval warship construction and maintaining a healthy, innovative shipbuilding industrial base. The committee recommends an in-

crease of $10.0 million in PE 78730N to support NSRP-ASE efforts, including:

(1) establishing a comprehensive national program for development and training of a skilled shipbuilding production and engineering workforce;

(2) establishing a concept for a national supply chain that will enable leveraging buying power across product lines in an effort to reduce the high cost of material in ship construction;

(3) exploring secondary and commercial markets for private shipbuilders to broaden the business base and share the overhead applied to naval shipbuilding; and

(4) developing and deploying an industry-wide architecture for computer interoperability.

Detection and recovery of unexploded ordnance, Browns Island, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina

The budget request included $25.3 million in PE 65873M for Marine Corps Program-wide Support, but included no funding for the detection and recovery of unexploded ordnance at Browns Island, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. The committee notes that developing and testing technologies that focus on wide area detection and discrimination of unexploded ordnance followed by precise removal efforts from environmentally-sensitive areas would provide benefits to long-term unexploded ordnance removal efforts throughout the Department of Defense. The committee believes that effective detection and discrimination of unexploded ordnance over a wide area would help identify where recovery efforts should be focused and would significantly reduce the cost of unexploded ordnance removal and environmental remediation.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 65873M to complete the recovery of unexploded ordnance begun in fiscal year 2006 in the vicinity of Browns Island, a former bombing range at Camp Lejeune.

Budget Items—Air Force

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
			RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE			
3600	0601102F	1	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	250,232	3,000	253,232
			Basic hypersonics air flow research		[2,000]	
			Early career awards		[1,000]	
3600	0601103F	2	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	107,571	5,500	113,071
			High assurance software engineering		[2,000]	
			Secure grids for network centric operations		[2,000]	
			Enterprise service secure grid research		[1,500]	
3600	0601108F	3	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	12,403		12,403
3600	0602015F	4	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT			
3600	0602102F	5	MATERIALS	111,073	9,000	120,073
			Advanced materials development		[2,000]	
			Blast resistant barrier research		[3,000]	
			Domestic source of high modulus carbon fibers		[1,500]	
			Complex composite structures research		[2,500]	
3600	0602201F	6	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	112,751		112,751
3600	0602202F	7	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	92,991		92,991
3600	0602203F	8	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	170,885	5,000	175,885
			High energy laser research		[2,000]	
			Scramjet technology		[3,000]	
3600	0602204F	9	AEROSPACE SENSORS	117,553		117,553
3600	0602500F	10	MULTI-DISCIPLINARY SPACE TECHNOLOGY			
3600	0602601F	11	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	85,594	290	85,884
			Shield rocket payloads		[290]	
3600	0602602F	12	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	62,105		62,105

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3600	0602605F	13	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	48,422		48,422
3600	0602702F	14	COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	119,267	1,500	120,767
			MASINT visualization tools		[1,500]	
3600	0602805F	15	DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM			
3600	0602890F	16	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	50,166		50,166
3600	0207170F	17	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	2,287		2,287
3600	0603112F	18	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	48,901	6,000	54,901
			Inspection techniques to detect fatigue related damage on aircraft components		[3,000]	
			Metals Affordability Initiative		[3,000]	
3600	0603203F	19	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	55,150		55,150
3600	0603211F	20	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	27,424		27,424
3600	0603216F	21	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	115,546	12,500	128,046
			Certification of flexible JP8 military fuel		[2,000]	
			Turbine engine supersonic cruise missile engine		[6,000]	
			Bi-polar wafer-cell, nickel-metal hyrdide battery research		[2,000]	
			Versatile affordable advanced turbine engine		[2,500]	
3600	0603231F	22	CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	32,156		32,156
3600	0603270F	23	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	24,436		24,436
3600	0603311F	24	BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY			
3600	0603400F	25	JOINT UNMANNED COMBAT AIR SYSTEMS (J-UCAS) ADVANCED			
3600	0603401F	26	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	68,026	20,000	88,026
			Radically segmented launch vehicle		[4,000]	
			Thin film amorphous solar arrays		[16,000]	
3600	0603444F	27	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	6,074		6,074
3600	0603500F	28	MULTI-DISCIPLINARY ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT SPACE TECH			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3600	0603601F	29	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	19,658		19,658
3600	0603605F	30	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	51,336		51,336
3600	0603723F	31	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY			
3600	0603789F	32	C3I ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	35,785	4,800	40,585
			Massively parallel optical interconnects for battlespace information		[4,800]	
3600	0603801F	33	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	316,605		316,605
3600	0603850F	34	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE			
3600	0603924F	35	HIGH ENERGY LASER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	3,713		3,713
3600	0207418F	36	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	26		26
3600	0207423F	37	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS			
3600	0401840F	38	AMC COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM			
3600	0804757F	39	JOINT NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER			
3600	0603260F	40	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,776		4,776
3600	0603287F	41	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	298		298
3600	0603421F	42	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III	315,314		315,314
3600	0603430F	43	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	633,258		633,258
3600	0603432F	44	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	35,685		35,685
3600	0603438F	45	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	27,076		27,076
3600	0603742F	46	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	26,517		26,517
3600	0603790F	47	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,095		4,095
3600	0603791F	48	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	593		593
3600	0603845F	49	TRANSFORMATIONAL SATCOM (TSAT)	867,102	-70,000	797,102
			Transformational satellite communications		[-70,000]	
3600	0603850F	50	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	20,592		20,592
3600	0603851F	51	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE	45,538		45,538

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3600	0603854F	52	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SYSTEM RDT&E (SPACE)	37,672	8,500	46,172
			Satellite command and control consolidation		[8,500]	
3600	0603858F	53	SPACE RADAR	266,401	-66,400	200,001
			Space radar		[-66,400]	
3600	0603859F	54	POLLUTION PREVENTION	2,853	1,500	4,353
			O2 diesel particulate emission reduction research		[1,500]	
3600	0603860F	55	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	10,011		10,011
3600	0604015F	56	NEXT GENERATION BOMBER	25,598		25,598
3600	0604327F	57	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS			
3600	0604400F	58	JOINT UNMANNED COMBAT AIR SYSTEMS (J-UCAS) ADVANCED			
3600	0604855F	59	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE LAUNCH			
3600	0604856F	60	COMMON AERO VEHICLE (CAV)	33,386		33,386
3600	0604857F	61	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE	35,625		35,625
3600	0207423F	62	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS			
3601	0305178F	63	NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL S	349,311		349,311
3600	0603840F	64	GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE (GBS)	23,599		23,599
3600	0604012F	65	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	2,792		2,792
3600	0604222F	66	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	14,895		14,895
3600	0604226F	67	B-1B	130,546		130,546
3600	0604233F	68	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	3,703		3,703
3600	0604239F	69	F-22			
3600	0604240F	70	B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	224,177		224,177
3600	0604261F	71	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SYSTEMS	254,310		254,310
3600	0604270F	72	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	87,784		87,784
3600	0604280F	73	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3600	0604287F	74	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	93		93
3600	0604329F	75	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	104,080		104,080
3600	0604421F	76	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	47,292	8,000	55,292
			Space control test capabilities		[8,000]	
3600	0604425F	77	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	121,157	4,000	125,157
			Joint space intelligent decision support		[4,000]	
3600	0604429F	78	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	12,421		12,421
3600	0604441F	79	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	668,902		668,902
3600	0604443F	80	ALTERNATIVE INFRARED SPACE SYSTEM (AIRSS)	102,962		102,962
3600	0604479F	81	MILSTAR LDR/MDR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE) (H)			
3600	0604600F	82	MUNITIONS DISPENSER DEVELOPMENT			
3600	0604602F	83	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	5,039		5,039
3600	0604604F	84	SUBMUNITIONS	5,759		5,759
3600	0604617F	85	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	10,095		10,095
3600	0604618F	86	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	15,450		15,450
3600	0604706F	87	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	12,370		12,370
3600	0604735F	88	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	14,363		14,363
3600	0604740F	89	INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)	167	4,000	4,167
			Global Awareness Presentation System		[4,000]	
3600	0604750F	90	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,426		1,426
3600	0604762F	91	COMMON LOW OBSERVABLES VERIFICATION SYSTEM (CLOVER			
3600	0604800F	92	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	1,999,068	200,400	2,199,468
			Joint Strike Fighter alternate engine development		[200,400]	
3600	0604851F	93	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE			
3600	0604853F	94	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)	18,513		18,513
3600	0605011F	95	RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT	25,490		25,490

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3600	0605807F	96	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	2,388		2,388
3600	0207434F	97	LINK-16 SUPPORT AND SUSTAINMENT	172,625		172,625
3600	0207443F	98	FAMILY OF INTEROPERABLE OPERATIONAL PICTURES (FIOP)			
3600	0207450F	99	E-10 SQUADRONS	390,896		390,896
3600	0207451F	100	SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP)	40,124		40,124
3600	0207701F	101	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	32,243		32,243
3600	0305176F	102	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR			
3600	0401318F	103	CV-22	26,601		26,601
3600	0604256F	104	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	38,131		38,131
3600	0604759F	105	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	58,506		58,506
3600	0605101F	106	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	25,211	4,500	29,711
			Analytical and technical support		[4,500]	
3600	0605306F	107	RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY			
3600	0605502F	108	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH			
3600	0605712F	109	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	34,802		34,802
3600	0605807F	110	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	740,134		740,134
3600	0605860F	111	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	14,704	13,000	27,704
			Ballistic missile range safety tech		[13,000]	
3600	0605864F	112	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	46,310		46,310
3600	0605976F	113	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION - TEST AND E'	54,683		54,683
3600	0605978F	114	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT - TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	25,579		25,579
3600	0804731F	115	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	305		305
3600	0909900F	116	FINANCING FOR EXPIRED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
3600	0909980F	117	JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT			
3600	1001004F	118	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,911		3,911

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3600	0605024F	119	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	8,014		8,014
3600	0605798F	120	ANALYSIS SUPPORT GROUP	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0101113F	121	B-52 SQUADRONS	71,379		71,379
3600	0101120F	122	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	6,983		6,983
3600	0101122F	123	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	3,736		3,736
3600	0101313F	124	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM - USSTRATCOM	27,285	5,000	32,285
			Global command & control devel center		[5,000]	
3600	0101314F	125	NIGHT FIST - USSTRATCOM	5,162		5,162
3600	0101815F	126	ADVANCED STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	22,423		22,423
3600	0102326F	127	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATI	14,853		14,853
3600	0203761F	128	WARFIGHTER RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS (WRAP) RAPID TRA	30,584		30,584
3600	0207131F	129	A-10 SQUADRONS	80,771		80,771
3600	0207133F	130	F-16 SQUADRONS	148,373		148,373
3600	0207134F	131	F-15E SQUADRONS	125,062		125,062
3600	0207136F	132	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	515		515
3600	0207138F	133	F/A-22 SQUADRONS	584,290		584,290
3600	0207141F	134	F-117A SQUADRONS	14,093		14,093
3600	0207161F	135	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	8,850		8,850
3600	0207163F	136	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	43,417		43,417
3600	0207224F	137	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY			
3600	0207247F	138	AF TENCAP	11,202		11,202
3600	0207248F	139	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM	530,038		530,038
3600	0207253F	140	COMPASS CALL	4,469		4,469
3600	0207268F	141	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	154,319		154,319
3600	0207277F	142	CSAF INNOVATION PROGRAM	1,612		1,612

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3600	0207325F	143	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	40,881		40,881
3600	0207410F	144	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	87,483		87,483
3600	0207412F	145	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	8,798		8,798
3600	0207417F	146	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	165,820		165,820
3600	0207418F	147	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	2,286		2,286
3600	0207423F	148	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	53,093		53,093
3600	0207424F	149	EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM			
3600	0207433F	150	ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY	313,251		313,251
3600	0207438F	151	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	31,835		31,835
3600	0207445F	152	FIGHTER TACTICAL DATA LINK	113,388		113,388
3600	0207446F	153	BOMBER TACTICAL DATA LINK	168,168		168,168
3600	0207448F	154	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	4,338		4,338
3600	0207449F	155	COMMAND AND CONTROL (C2) CONSTELLATION	44,027		44,027
3600	0207581F	156	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTAI	152,696		152,696
3600	0207590F	157	SEEK EAGLE	16,426		16,426
3600	0207591F	158	ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION	437,057		437,057
3600	0207601F	159	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	23,470		23,470
3600	0207605F	160	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	6,595		6,595
3600	0207697F	161	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	6,138		6,138
3600	0208006F	162	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	146,396		146,396
3600	0208021F	163	INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	24,758		24,758
3600	0301310F	164	NATIONAL AIR INTELLIGENCE CENTER	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0301314F	165	COBRA BALL	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0301315F	166	MISSILE AND SPACE TECHNICAL COLLECTION	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0301324F	167	FOREST GREEN	[ ]		[ ]

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3600	0301386F	168	GDIP COLLECTION MANAGEMENT	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0302015F	169	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	283		283
3600	0303131F	170	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWO	64,109		64,109
3600	0303140F	171	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	183,523		183,523
3600	0303141F	172	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	19,895		19,895
3600	0303150F	173	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,348		3,348
3600	0303158F	174	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	5,818		5,818
3600	0303601F	175	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	271,562		271,562
3600	0304111F	176	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0304260F	177	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	117,834		117,834
3600	0304311F	178	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0304346F	179	IMAGERY DERIVED MASINT	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0304347F	180	OVERHEAD NON-IMAGING INFRARED	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0305099F	181	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	6,620		6,620
3600	0305110F	182	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	19,907		19,907
3600	0305111F	183	WEATHER SERVICE	34,899		34,899
3600	0305114F	184	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (AT			
3600	0305116F	185	AERIAL TARGETS	5,203		5,203
3600	0305124F	186	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0305128F	187	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	509		509
3600	0305142F	188	APPLIED TECHNOLOGY AND INTEGRATION	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0305148F	189	MEASUREMENT AND SIGNATURE INTELLIGENCE (MASINT) SYS			
3600	0305159F	190	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0305160F	191	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (SPACE)	969		969
3600	0305164F	192	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (S	131,083		131,083

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3600	0305165F	193	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTRO	177,792		177,792
3600	0305172F	194	COMBINED ADVANCED APPLICATIONS	[ ]		[ ]
3600	0305173F	195	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	4,675		4,675
3600	0305174F	196	SPACE WARFARE CENTER	726		726
3600	0305182F	197	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	38,044		38,044
3600	0305193F	198	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO)	3,813		3,813
3600	0305202F	199	DRAGON U-2			
3600	0305206F	200	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	52,824		52,824
3600	0305207F	201	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	10,132		10,132
3600	0305208F	202	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	120,777		120,777
3600	0305219F	203	PREDATOR UAV (JMIP)	61,466		61,466
3600	0305220F	204	GLOBAL HAWK UAV	247,665		247,665
3600	0305221F	205	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGET (TIARA)	8,499		8,499
3600	0305887F	206	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION WARFARE	5,163		5,163
3600	0305906F	207	NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM	50,908	5,000	55,908
			Single integrated space picture		[5,000]	
3600	0305910F	208	SPACETRACK (SPACE)			
3600	0305913F	209	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	60,281		60,281
3600	0305917F	210	SPACE ARCHITECT			
3600	0305924F	211	NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE OFFICE	13,437	5,000	18,437
			National security space office		[5,000]	
3600	0305940F	212	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	31,401		31,401
3600	0307141F	213	NASS, IO TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION & TOOL DEV	15,449		15,449
3600	0308699F	214	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	2,999		2,999
3600	0401115F	215	C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	248,283		248,283

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3600	0401119F	216	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	150,209		150,209
3600	0401130F	217	C-17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	173,781		173,781
3600	0401132F	218	C-130J PROGRAM	40,542		40,542
3600	0401133F	219	AEROMEDICAL EVACUATION			
3600	0401134F	220	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	34,916		34,916
3600	0401218F	221	KC-135S	1,126		1,126
3600	0401219F	222	KC-10S	4,781		4,781
3600	0401221F	223	KC-135 TANKER REPLACEMENT	203,932	-199,000	4,932
			KC-135 aircraft replacement		[-199,000]	
3600	0401839F	224	AIR MOBILITY TACTICAL DATA LINK	32,099		32,099
3600	0408011F	225	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	1,024		1,024
3600	0702207F	226	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,457		1,457
3600	0702239F	227	AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			
3600	0702806F	228	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	17,706		17,706
3600	0708011F	229	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	36,673	10,000	46,673
			Advanced prototyping of nanomaterials		[8,000]	
			Rapid manufacturing and repair of composites for high temp apps		[2,000]	
3600	0708012F	230	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
3600	0708610F	231	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	166,338		166,338
3600	0708611F	232	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	10,596	3,000	13,596
			Aircraft sustainment and availability tools		[3,000]	
3600	0804757F	233	JOINT NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER	3,073		3,073
3600	0808716F	234	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	113		113
3600	0901202F	235	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	992		992
3600	0901218F	236	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	7,779		7,779

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3600	0901220F	237	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	18,262		18,262
3600	0901538F	238	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPM	27,541		27,541
3600	XXXXXXX	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	7,196,154		7,196,154
			Total, RDT&E Air Force	**24,396,767**	**4,090**	**24,400,857**

Air Force basic research

The budget request included $250.2 million in PE 61102F, for defense research sciences and $107.6 million in PE 61103F, for university research initiatives. Air Force fundamental and university research focuses on defense-related technical challenges in a wide range of scientific and engineering disciplines are important to maintaining U.S. military technology superiority. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 61102F for improved measurements and simulation of hypersonic air flows.

As noted elsewhere in this report, the committee is concerned with deficiencies in cyber and national security information assurance capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million in PE 61103F for information assurance-focused research, including $2.0 million for high assurance software engineering; $1.5 million for secure grid research; and $2.0 million for secure grids for network-centric operations.

Air Force materials research

The budget request included $111.1 million in PE 62102F, for materials research. The committee recommends an increase of $6.5 million in PE 62102F for research and development on materials, composites, and structural designs to protect personnel and equipment from threats such as explosives and fires, including $3.0 million for blast resistant barrier research; $2.0 million for expansion of advanced materials development and corresponding manufacturing trials; and $1.5 million for development of a domestic source for production of high modulus carbon fibers.

The committee continues to monitor with great interest developments in materials and composites with space and unmanned systems applications. The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62102F for acceleration of research on complex composites and structures for manned and unmanned air vehicles and expects these efforts to meet objectives for joint unmanned systems outlined elsewhere in this report.

Applied aerospace propulsion

The budget request included $170.9 million in PE 62203F, for applied research in aerospace propulsion. The committee notes that hypersonic technologies have the potential to enable the development of new military capabilities in time of a critical strike, as demonstrated by the Air Force X–51 program. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62203F to pursue alternate propulsion flow path efforts on the X–51 flight test bed.

The committee further recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62203F for high energy laser research to demonstrate a capability to inspect the internal condition of military hardware with significant potential savings in maintenance of critical components.

Space technology

The budget request included $85.6 million in PE 62601F, for space technology. Programs supported under this account focus on improving satellite payload capabilities and developing technologies for protection of U.S. space assets. The committee recommends an increase of $290,000 in PE 62601F for a project to shield rocket

payloads with particular emphasis on solving low frequency noise insulation challenges.

MASINT visualization tool

The budget request included $119.3 million in PE 62702F, for command, control, and communications. Measurement and signals intelligence (MASINT) enables identification of obscured and hidden targets, but must be integrated into user friendly information processors and architectures. The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 62702F to accelerate development of MASINT visualization tools.

Air Force materials technologies

The budget request included $48.9 million in PE 63112F, for advanced materials for weapon systems. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63112F to continue the development of inspection techniques to detect fatigue related damage on aircraft components. These techniques can support the extension of aircraft service life and improve operational readiness of assets and are consistent with the Defense Technology Objective of developing systems for nondestructive evaluation for system health management.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63112F for research on specialty aerospace metals as part of the Metals Affordability Initiative. This type of research could lead to cheaper and higher performance aerospace metals and alloys, which will contribute significantly to future military capabilities.

Aerospace propulsion and power technology

The budget request included $115.5 million in PE 63216F, for aerospace propulsion and power technology. The committee recommends an increase of $12.5 million in PE 63216F to accelerate development and transition of engine and fuel conversion technologies and to scale battery technology for system level charges and low temperature reliability. Of this amount, the committee recommends $2.0 million for certification of the flexible JP8 military fuel; $6.0 million for the turbine engine supersonic cruise missile; $2.5 million for the versatile affordable advanced turbine engine; and $2.0 million for bipolar wafer-cell, nickel-metal hydride aircraft battery research.

Radically Segmented Launch Vehicle

The budget request included $68.0 million in PE 63401F, for advanced spacecraft technology, but included no funding for the Radically Segmented Launch Vehicle (RSLV).

The RSLV program addresses a broad range of Department of Defense mission requirements for low-cost, routine, and responsive space launch. Currently, the program development and risk reduction for responsive space launch is jointly performed by the Air Force, the National Air and Space Administration, and the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency. The committee is supportive of efforts to acquire an operationally responsive space capability to support the warfighter.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63401F to perform engineering development, prototype hardware fabrication, and ground testing of the RSLV.

Thin film amorphous solar arrays

The budget request included $68.0 million in PE 63401F, for Advanced Spacecraft Technology, but included no funding for thin film amorphous solar arrays.

The committee is aware of the need to reduce the cost of satellite launches, which is driven to a large extent by the weight of satellite payloads. The committee believes research on thin film amorphous solar arrays has the potential to produce solar arrays that are significantly less expensive, lighter, and more efficient than current solar arrays.

The committee recommends an increase of $16.0 million in PE 63401F for thin film amorphous solar array research and development.

Massively parallel optical interconnects for battlespace information exchange

The budget request included $35.8 million in PE 63789F, Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence Advanced Development, but included no funding for development of massively parallel optical interconnects (MPOI) for avionic systems. Recent advances in this technology offer potential to significantly enhance sensor and signals processing of unmanned and manned aircraft. This technology can significantly increase the communications capacity of the air fleet by replacing electronic technology with optical networking technology.

The two major aspects to the on-board networking infrastructure of unmanned air vehicles include: (1) command and control; and (2) payload-related data exchange. The MPOI technology offers a unified and efficient solution to both demands by reducing space, weight, and power consumption, while increasing data rates to the multi-gigabit level.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.8 million in PE 63789F to develop the MPOI primarily for insertion into manned and unmanned aircraft.

Transformational Satellite Communications

The budget request included $867.0 million in PE 63845F, for the Transformational Satellite Communications (TSAT) program. While supporting the TSAT satellite program as a key enabler of the Department of Defense's future communication architecture, Congress has, for the past 4 years, reduced funding for TSAT due to concerns over technological maturity and an overly aggressive development schedule. The committee is therefore gratified that Air Force leadership has restructured the TSAT program to follow an incremental development approach, supported by realistic cost estimates, that may serve to lower program risk and provide the first block of capability to the warfighter as soon as possible. The committee notes that both the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and the independent TSAT Program Review Group have acknowledged that the restructured TSAT program incorporates many of

the lessons learned from the troubled history of space acquisition efforts.

While remaining fully supportive of the TSAT program, the committee notes that the budget request for fiscal year 2007 represents a 100 percent increase over last year's appropriated amount of $429.0 million. The GAO does not believe the contractors associated with the space segment of the TSAT program will be able to increase development activities to the requested fiscal year 2007 budget level. The committee therefore recommends a decrease of $70.0 million, or 8 percent, in PE 63845F, for TSAT, due to unexecutable growth in the program budget.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2007, explaining what actions the Air Force has taken to address the remaining concerns of the TSAT Program Review Group and GAO, including: (1) the need to significantly refine requirements so that program content can be matched to budget constraints, and how the Department plans to control requirements to prevent problems associated with "requirements creep"; (2) the need to adequately staff the TSAT program office with experienced space acquisition professionals; (3) the status of refining key performance parameters so they provide specificity and validation metrics; (4) the implications for other programs, such as Space Radar and Future Combat System, of a less capable initial block of TSAT satellites; and (5) the last date by which the fourth Advanced Extremely High Frequency satellite could be put on contract without a production break.

Satellite command and control consolidation

The budget request included $37.7 million in PE 63854F, for Wideband gap filler system, but included no funding for satellite command and control consolidation. The committee is aware that all military satellite communications systems need to be connected into a single consolidated command and control system to provide standardized operations. While the current generation of satellites have transitioned to Command and Control System-Consolidated, the Advanced Extremely High Frequency and Wideband gapfiller satellites have yet to do so. The committee recommends an increase of $8.5 million in PE 63854F to complete the development and integration of the satellite control system with the new satellites to ensure the warfighter receives increased communications capabilities as soon as possible.

Space Radar

The budget request includes $266.4 million in PE 63858F for Space Radar (SR).

SR is a constellation of surveillance and reconnaissance satellites being developed by the Air Force to find, identify, track, and monitor moving or stationary targets under all weather conditions and in darkness. Although the committee supports the development of this important military and intelligence capability, it remains concerned about the wisdom and affordability of starting a new, expensive space acquisition program when so many current space programs remain in difficulty. This concern is compounded by the in-

ability of the Air Force to identify the scope of the SR architecture, or provide a reasonable range of cost estimates for the objective system. The committee is aware that the SR program is undergoing restructure, and may benefit from the incremental, block approach chosen for the Transformational Satellite Communications (TSAT) program. While the committee would welcome such an approach, it does not believe it is prudent to move beyond technology development and concept definition activities until the Air Force provides the committee further definition of the progam.

In the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), the Congress expressed the view that the affordability of a space-based radar program would be dependent on the development of a single radar satellite system to meet both military and intelligence community needs and the integration of a space radar into an architecture consisting of other intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities. The committee is aware that in 2005 the then-Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Secretary of Defense signed a letter to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget stating their intent to pursue joint development of a single space radar capability for the nation, and to develop an approach for sharing costs starting in fiscal year 2008. The committee, however, has not yet seen a solid cost-share agreement between the Department of Defense and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence to jointly fund the SR program, nor has the committee identified funding for such activities in the intelligence community budget. The committee remains concerned about the inability to resolve this impasse and believes two systems are not affordable.

The committee recommends a decrease of $66.4 million in PE 63858F for the SR program, and recommends that remaining funds be directed toward technology development, system engineering, and concept definition that assumes a single SR system that will meet joint requirements and employ a joint concept of operations with the intelligence community.

The committee directs the Secretary, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by January 30, 2007, containing the following elements: (1) a description of the respective roles and missions of the intelligence community and the Department with respect to the development of the SR program; (2) the process by which the intelligence community and the Department coordinate joint development efforts and requirements definition; (3) the plans for achieving a cost-share agreement between the intelligence community and the Department for the development and acquisition of a space radar capability; and (4) a commitment from the Secretary and the Director of National Intelligence that the SR program will be a single system responsive to the requirements of each organization.

The committee further directs the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2007, addressing the following: (1) the scope of the SR architecture, including the system's interactions with other ground and air-based platforms providing similar capability as well as interactions with TSAT or alternative systems for processing and transmitting SR

data to other military applications; (2) the block, or incremental approach, that will be pursued by the SR acquisition program, including key technologies that will be included in blocks 1 and 2 as well as their corresponding levels of sophistication and maturity at the time of program initiation; (3) the extent to which blocks 1 and 2 will meet objective requirements for the SR program and which requirements will need to be delayed as a result; and (4) the schedule for meeting a realistic launch date and potential risks to that schedule.

Increased funding for O2 diesel particulate emission reduction research

The budget request included $2.9 million in PE 63859F for pollution prevention, but included no funding for O2 diesel particulate emission reduction research. The committee notes that the Energy Policy Act of 2005 strengthens the requirement that federal vehicle fleets use alternative fuels in those vehicles capable of using such fuels and requires ongoing assessment of renewable energy resources. The committee believes that research on O2 diesel to date shows demonstrated emissions benefits with regards to carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, particulate matter, and visible smoke that meets or exceeds the levels achieved by the 20 percent biodiesel blend currently used in Department of Defense vehicles. The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63859F to continue O2 diesel particulate emission reduction research.

Space control test capabilities

The budget request included $47.3 million in PE 64421F, for Air Force counterspace systems.

The "National Space Policy" of September 1996 specifies that the United States will develop, operate, and maintain space control capabilities to ensure freedom of action in space and, if directed, deny such freedom of action to adversaries. The committee recognizes that continuing development by the Army Aviation and Missile Research, Development and Engineering Center of software applications used to integrate offensive and defensive space control systems into a single system-of-systems simulated testbed could contribute to near-term capabilities for space control and situational awareness.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 64421F for the ground-based simulated testbed for space control assets.

Joint space intelligent decision support

The budget request included $121.2 million in PE 64425F, for space situational awareness systems, but included no funding for joint space intelligent decision support.

The committee is aware that timely space situational awareness and decision support to Air Force and joint operators is essential for successful space operations. The Army currently has an effort underway to develop this technology for space support. The Air Force effort would complete research conducted by the Army and provide production software code to support global users who are connected via the secure Internet. The committee recommends an

increase of $4.0 million in PE 64425F for completion of joint space intelligent decision support software development to provide space operators situational awareness.

Global awareness presentation system

The budget request included $0.2 million in PE 64740F, for integrated command and control applications. Information integration and exchange among the tactical, operational, and strategic levels of U.S. Strategic Command is essential to successful mission assignments in information operations; global intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR); integrated missile defense; and space and global strike. Global Battlespace View (GBV) supports operations centers and fielded units with a seamless information exchange environment. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64740F for the global awareness presentation system, which provides a visually fused ISR situational awareness and collection capability for the GBV.

RAND Project Air Force

The budget request included $25.2 million in PE 65101F, for RAND Project Air Force. The committee notes that RAND studies and analyses have supported Air Force planning and operations, particularly in acquisition planning and analyses, tanker recapitalization, and assessments of international threats and capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million in PE 65101F to sustain RAND analytical support for the Air Force.

Ballistic missile range safety technology

The budget request included $14.7 million in PE 65860F, for the rocket systems launch program, but included no funding for ballistic missile range safety technology (BMRST).

The committee is aware that BMRST is a global positioning system based launch range safety system that has the potential to provide significant technical and reliability advantages and cost savings over current radar systems. The committee notes that several launch ranges have requested BMRST systems for local range certification as well as down-range reentry support.

The committee recommends an increase of $13.0 million in PE 65860F to support expanded BMRST system capability, critical certification, and testing requirements.

Global command and control development center

The budget request included $27.3 million in PE 11313F, for Strategic War Planning System, but included no funding for the global command and control development center.

The U.S. Strategic Command is assigned multiple global missions, including space and global strike; integrated missile defense; integrated information operations, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; global command and control; and combatting weapons of mass destruction. Command and control for these missions requires a robust global Internet-like capability to provide the right information to the right people at the right time. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 11313F for the establishment of a global command and control development center.

Single integrated space picture

The budget request included $51.0 million in PE 35906F for threat warning and attack assessment, but included no funding for the single integrated space picture.

In March 2006, the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command testified before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services that "we must improve space situational awareness and protection." Accordingly, the committee supports efforts to enable military commanders to understand the status of adversary and friendly space forces. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 35906F for the combatant commanders command and control system integrated space picture.

National Security Space Office

The budget request included $13.4 million in PE 35924F, for the National Security Space Office (NSSO). The "National Space Policy" signed in 1996 directs the Secretary of Defense and the then-Director of Central Intelligence to "ensure that defense and intelligence space activities are closely coordinated," and "that space architectures are integrated to the maximum extent feasible." The committee strongly endorses this direction and believes that a coherent, effective, and efficient national security space enterprise is in the best interests of the United States. The committee is aware that the Director of National Intelligence has decided not to provide intelligence community funding and support for the collaborative, enterprise-level activities of the NSSO. The committee believes this position is short-sighted and will have serious implications for the nation's future space capabilities.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 35924F for enterprise-level system engineering, architecture work, and strategy and planning efforts for national security space capabilities. The committee also urges the Director of National Intelligence to reconsider his decision to withdraw support for these important collaborative efforts.

Air Force industrial preparedness activities

The budget request included $36.7 million in PE 78011F, for Air Force industrial preparedness activities and $10.6 million in PE 78611F, for support systems development. The committee notes that the Defense Science Board highlighted the role that the Department of Defense manufacturing technology programs play in reducing the cost of weapons systems and improving the acquisition process. Air Force manufacturing technology programs in propulsion, electronics, and munitions systems have enabled billions of dollars in cost avoidance. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 78011F, including $8.0 million for the development of advanced prototyping of nanomaterials and $2.0 million for rapid manufacturing and repair of composite components for high temperature applications. The committee also recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 78611F for aircraft sustainment and availability tools to improve readiness through automated tracking of aircraft maintenance and mission records.

The committee commends Air Force efforts to develop and utilize Manufacturing Readiness Levels as a tool to accelerate technology

transition and the acquisition process through the analysis and reduction of manufacturing risk in weapon systems and other programs.

Budget Items—Defense-wide

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
			RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE			
0400	0601000BR	1	DTRA UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BASIC RESEARCH	5,000		5,000
0400	0601101E	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	150,690	3,000	153,690
			Next -generation protective gear for small arms threats		[3,000]	
0400	0601111D8Z	3	GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RE:			
0400	0601114D8Z	4	DEFENSE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETIT	9,532		9,532
0400	0601120D8Z	5	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	19,532		19,532
0400	0601384BP	6	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	99,182	9,700	108,882
			Detection of biological agents in water		[1,500]	
			Organic light emitting receptor based nanosensors		[2,000]	
			Next -generation protective gear for chem bio defense		[3,000]	
			Superstructural particle evaluation and characterization with targeted reaction analysis		[3,200]	
0400	0602000D8Z	7	INSENSITIVE MUNITIONS - EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT	10,447		10,447
0400	0602227D8Z	8	MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER (MFEL)	10,255	10,000	20,255
			Program increase (MFEL)		[10,000]	
0400	0602228D8Z	9	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) S(	14,423		14,423
0400	0602234D8Z	10	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	28,975		28,975
0400	0602303E	11	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	242,852		242,852
0400	0602304E	12	COGNITIVE COMPUTING SYSTEMS	220,085		220,085
0400	0602383E	13	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	112,242		112,242

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0400	0602384BP	14	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	280,422	25,600	306,022
			Alternative delivery methods for recombinant protein vaccines		[5,100]	
			Chemical agent fate evaporation model verification and validation		[2,000]	
			Multi-purpose biodefense immunoarray		[1,500]	
			Mustard gas antidote research consortium (STIMAL)		[3,000]	
			CB smart materials		[4,000]	
			Rapid identification of biological warfare agents		[1,000]	
			Next-generation chem-bio protection suit		[4,000]	
			Escape mask		[4,000]	
			Personal protection against infectious agents		[1,000]	
0400	0602702E	15	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	383,680	-10,000	373,680
			Automated battle management		[-6,000]	
			HEDLight		[-2,000]	
			TETURAN		[-2,000]	
0400	0602715E	16	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	297,277	-5,000	292,277
			Biochemical materials		[-5,000]	
0400	0602716BR	17	WMD DEFEAT TECHNOLOGY	213,152		213,152
0400	0602716E	18	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	246,978		246,978
0400	0602717BR	19	WMD DEFENSE TECHNOLOGIES	105,021	5,000	110,021
			Modeling and simulation		[5,000]	
0400	0602787D8Z	20	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY			
0400	1160401BB	21	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,698	3,600	16,298
			Wearable Hyperspectral Imaging System		[3,600]	
0400	1160407BB	22	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,293		2,293
0400	0603002D8Z	23	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0400	0603121D8Z	24	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	30,575		30,575
0400	0603122D8Z	25	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	65,768		65,768
0400	0603160BR	26	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES - PROLIFERATION PREVI	104,582	4,000	108,582
			Glass Scintillation fiber radiation detectors		[2,000]	
			Radiation portal monitor		[2,000]	
0400	0603175C	27	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	206,676		206,676
0400	0603225D8Z	28	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	16,862		16,862
0400	0603286E	29	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	115,829	-16,300	99,529
			Heavy fuel engine		[-4,000]	
			Cormorant		[-4,000]	
			Global range transatmospheric vehicle		[-5,300]	
			Reduction in new starts		[-3,000]	
0400	0603287E	30	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	254,913		254,913
0400	0603384BP	31	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED	207,114	2,000	209,114
			Next-generation gas chromatographic mass spectrometer		[2,000]	
0400	0603400D8Z	32	JOINT UNMANNED COMBAT AIR SYSTEMS (J-UCAS) ADVANCED			
0400	0603618D8Z	33	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	9,400		9,400
0400	0603648D8Z	34	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	35,553	2,200	37,753
			Large data joint capability technology demonstration		[2,200]	
0400	0603711D8Z	35	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM/AUTONOMOUS SYSTEMS	7,700	3,000	10,700
			Versatile, Modular, Diesel Hybrid Unmanned System		[3,000]	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0400	0603712S	36	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	23,437	35,900	59,337
			Vehicle fuel cell program		[7,000]	
			Embedded passives test bed		[4,000]	
			Emergency power source development		[1,700]	
			Comprehensive and integrated strategy for hydrogen		[3,000]	
			New England manufacturing supply chain		[3,000]	
			Aging systems and sustainment technologies		[4,200]	
			Advanced mobile gas-to-liquid fueler		[5,000]	
			Solid hydrogen storage systems		[8,000]	
0400	0603713S	37	DISTRIBUTION PROCESS OWNER TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	15,215		15,215
0400	0603716D8Z	38	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	67,149	2,000	69,149
			Dendrimer enhanced water remediation research		[2,000]	
0400	0603720S	39	MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPC			
0400	0603727D8Z	40	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	10,641		10,641
0400	0603739E	41	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	248,627		248,627
0400	0603750D8Z	42	ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	158,334	2,000	160,334
			Masking shunt		[2,000]	
0400	0603755D8Z	43	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	175,313	2,000	177,313
			Simulation center upgrades		[2,000]	
0400	0603760E	44	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	232,489	-7,800	224,689
			PANDA		[-5,000]	
			XG		[-2,800]	
0400	0603764E	45	LAND WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	48,975		48,975
0400	0603765E	46	CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	151,598		151,598
0400	0603766E	47	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	174,276		174,276

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0400	0603767E	48	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	205,519		205,519
0400	0603768E	49	GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	157,367		157,367
0400	0603769SE	50	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPM	14,918		14,918
0400	0603781D8Z	51	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	26,594		26,594
0400	0603805S	52	DUAL USE TECHNOLOGY			
0400	0603826D8Z	53	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	107,782	3,500	111,282
			Portable explosive screening and countermeasures		[3,500]	
0400	0603828D8Z	54	JOINT EXPERIMENTATION	115,684	10,000	125,684
			Joint modeling, simulation and experimentation		[10,000]	
0400	0603832D8Z	55	JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	36,179		36,179
0400	0603941D8Z	56	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	39,939		39,939
0400	0603942D8Z	57	TECHNOLOGY LINK	6,822		6,822
0400	0605160D8Z	58	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT			
0400	1160402BB	59	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMEN	80,402	-6,800	73,602
			Small and medium caliber recoil mitigation technologies		[3,000]	
			Advanced tactical laser		[-20,000]	
			Special operations portable power source program		[5,000]	
			Flashlight Soldier to Soldier Combat Identification System (FSCIS)		[2,000]	
			Advanced tactical airborne C4ISR systems (ATACS)		[3,200]	
0400	0603161D8Z	60	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPME	33,890		33,890
0400	0603228D8Z	61	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT			
0400	0603527D8Z	62	RETRACT LARCH	22,383		22,383
0400	0603709D8Z	63	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	12,210		12,210
0400	0603714D8Z	64	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	18,820		18,820
0400	0603851D8Z	65	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROG	28,841		28,841

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0400	0603879C	66	ADVANCED CONCEPTS, EVALUATIONS AND SYSTEMS			
0400	0603881C	67	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	1,038,310		1,038,310
0400	0603882C	68	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	2,876,972	200,000	3,076,972
			Ground-Based Midcourse Defense System		[200,000]	
0400	0603883C	69	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE BOOST DEFENSE SEGMENT	631,616		631,616
0400	0603884BP	70	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	73,111	4,000	77,111
			Oral anthrax/plague vaccine		[4,000]	
0400	0603884C	71	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	514,510	5,000	519,510
			Airborne Infrared Surveillance System		[5,000]	
0400	0603886C	72	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM INTERCEPTOR	405,508	-200,000	205,508
			BMD System interceptor		[-200,000]	
0400	0603888C	73	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST & TARGETS	591,911		591,911
0400	0603889C	74	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PRODUCTS	506,840	-40,000	466,840
			BMD products		[-40,000]	
0400	0603890C	75	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS CORE	473,077	-40,000	433,077
			BMD core		[-40,000]	
0400	0603891C	76	SPECIAL PROGRAMS - MDA	374,532	-20,000	354,532
			Special programs -- MDA		[-20,000]	
0400	0603892C	77	AEGIS BMD	1,031,874	100,000	1,131,874
			Aegis BMD		[100,000]	
0400	0603893C	78	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	390,585		390,585
0400	0603894C	79	MULTIPLE KILL VEHICLE	164,975		164,975
0400	0603920D8Z	80	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	14,489		14,489
0400	0603923D8Z	81	COALITION WARFARE	5,878		5,878

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0400	0604016D8Z	82	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	4,966	2,000	6,966
			Corrosion prevention research		[2,000]	
0400	0604400D8Z	83	JOINT UNMANNED COMBAT AIR SYSTEMS (J-UCAS) ADVANCED			
0400	0604648D8Z	84	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	3,047		3,047
0400	0604722D8Z	85	JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION COMMAND (JSIC)	20,755		20,755
0400	0604828D8Z	86	JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM	16,782		16,782
0400	0605017D8Z	87	REDUCTION OF TOTAL OWNERSHIP COST	25,289		25,289
0400	0303191D8Z	88	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	3,672		3,672
0400	0604051D8Z	89	DEFENSE ACQUISITION CHALLENGE PROGRAM (DACP)	29,500		29,500
0400	0604161D8Z	90	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPME	9,277		9,277
0400	0604384BP	91	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	212,072		212,072
0400	0604618D8Z	92	MANPADS DEFENSE PROGRAM			
0400	0604709D8Z	93	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	6,004		6,004
0400	0604764K	94	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	9,392		9,392
0400	0604771D8Z	95	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	8,177		8,177
0400	0605013BL	96	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,005		11,005
0400	0605015BL	97	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT-STANDARD PROC			
0400	0605016D8Z	98	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS			
0400	0605018SE	99	DEFENSE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM			
0400	0605019D8Z	100	ACQUISITION DOMAIN			
0400	0605020BTA	101	BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY R&D ACTIVITIES	140,245		140,245
0400	0605140D8Z	102	TRUSTED FOUNDRY	42,522		42,522
0400	0605648D8Z	103	DEFENSE ACQUISITION EXECUTIVE (DAE) PILOT PROGRAM	6,015		6,015
0400	0303129K	104	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	11,202		11,202
0400	0303140K	105	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0400	0303141K	106	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	18,556		18,556
0400	0303158K	107	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)	47,031		47,031
0400	0305840K	108	ELECTRONIC COMMERCE			
0400	0305840S	109	ELECTRONIC COMMERCE			
0400	0901200D8Z	110	BMMP DOMAIN MANAGEMENT AND SYSTEMS INTEGRATION			
0400	0603704D8Z	111	SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT			
0400	0603757D8Z	112	TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (T2)	72,897	5,000	77,897
			Command and control network		[5,000]	
0400	0603858D8Z	113	UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE DETECTION AND CLEARANCE			
0400	0604140D8Z	114	CAPITAL ASSET MANAGEMENT SYSTEM-MILITARY EQUIPMENT			
0400	0604774D8Z	115	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	10,322		10,322
0400	0604875D8Z	116	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	9,390		9,390
0400	0604940D8Z	117	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMEN	130,290		130,290
0400	0604943D8Z	118	THERMAL VICAR	7,492		7,492
0400	0605100D8Z	119	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	10,600		10,600
0400	0605104D8Z	120	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	30,339		30,339
0400	0605110BR	121	CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT			
0400	0605110D8Z	122	USD(A&T)--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	2,029	2,000	4,029
			Militarily critical technologies program (Transfer from OMDW 260)		[2,000]	
0400	0605114D8Z	123	BLACK LIGHT			
0400	0605117D8Z	124	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	38,253		38,253
0400	0605123D8Z	125	INTERAGENCY EXPORT LICENSE AUTOMATION			
0400	0605124D8Z	126	DEFENSE TRAVEL SYSTEM			
0400	0605126J	127	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	52,486		52,486
0400	0605128D8Z	128	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)			

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0400	0605130D8Z	129	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	31,995		31,995
0400	0605161D8Z	130	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	4,285		4,285
0400	0605170D8Z	131	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	10,990		10,990
0400	0605200D8Z	132	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	5,637		5,637
0400	0605384BP	133	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	80,134		80,134
0400	0605502BR	134	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH			
0400	0605502C	135	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH - MDA			
0400	0605502D8Z	136	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0400	0605502E	137	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0400	0605790D8Z	138	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH/CHALLENGE ADMIN.	2,073		2,073
0400	0605798S	139	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	5,577		5,577
0400	0605799D8Z	140	FORCE TRANSFORMATION DIRECTORATE	20,404	25,000	45,404
			Operationally responsive space		[20,000]	
			Airborne reconnaissance sensor for ORS		[5,000]	
0400	0605801KA	141	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	51,929		51,929
0400	0605803SE	142	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUA	9,348		9,348
0400	0605804D8Z	143	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	9,203		9,203
0400	0605898E	144	MANAGEMENT HQ - R&D	50,951	-5,000	45,951
			Management headquarters		[-5,000]	
0400	0301555G	145	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0301556G	146	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0303169D8Z	147	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RAPID ACQUISITION	5,090		5,090
0400	0305193D8Z	148	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO)	14,128		14,128
0400	0305193G	149	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) (J	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0901585C	150	PENTAGON RESERVATION	15,586		15,586
0400	0901598C	151	MANAGEMENT HQ - MDA	87,389		87,389

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0400	0901598D8W	152	IT SOFTWARE DEV INITIATIVES	1,412		1,412
0400	0604130V	153	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR SECURITY (DISS)	35,439		35,439
0400	0605127T	154	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE (PFP) INFORMATION MANAGEMENT S	1,521		1,521
0400	0607384BP	155	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEM	7,035		7,035
0400	0607828D8Z	156	JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	66,906		66,906
0400	0204571J	157	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	7,686		7,686
0400	0208043J	158	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,662		1,662
0400	0208045K	159	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	84,313		84,313
0400	0208052J	160	JOINT ANALYTICAL MODEL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			
0400	0301011G	161	CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0301301L	162	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	[ ]	6,500	6,500
			High performance computational systems		[2,000]	
			Armed Forces medical and food research		[4,500]	
0400	0301318BB	163	HUMINT (CONTROLLED)	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0301398L	164	MANAGEMENT HQ - GDIP	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0301555BB	165	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0301556BB	166	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0302016K	167	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	721		721
0400	0302019K	168	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRA'	34,007		34,007
0400	0303126K	169	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS - DCS	1,523		1,523
0400	0303131K	170	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWO	7,691		7,691
0400	0303135G	171	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	14,240		14,240
0400	0303136G	172	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	38,257		38,257
0400	0303140D8Z	173	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	14,856		14,856
0400	0303140G	174	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	404,337		404,337

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0400	0303148K	175	DISA MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	1,224		1,224
0400	0303149J	176	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	3,556		3,556
0400	0303149K	177	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	6,551		6,551
0400	0303150K	178	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	59,681		59,681
0400	0303153K	179	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	12,448		12,448
0400	0303165K	180	DEFENSE COLLABORATION TOOL SUITE (DCTS)			
0400	0303170K	181	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	28,630		28,630
0400	0303610K	182	TELEPORT PROGRAM	14,424		14,424
0400	0304210BB	183	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	11,302		11,302
0400	0304345BQ	184	NATIONAL GEOSPACIAL - INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (NGP)	[ ]		
0400	0305102BQ	185	DEFENSE GEOSPACIAL - INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	[ ]	10,000	10,000
			Commercial airborne IFSAR mapping for NGIA		[10,000]	
0400	0305125D8Z	186	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	12,422		12,422
0400	0305127BZ	187	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	[ ]	2,000	2,000
			Credibility Assessment Research Initiative		[2,000]	
0400	0305146BZ	188	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	20,791		20,791
0400	0305183L	189	DEFENSE HUMAN INTELLIGENCE (HUMINT) PROGRAM (DHIP)	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305193L	190	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) (JI	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305199D8Z	191	NET CENTRICITY	8,746		8,746
0400	0305202G	192	DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305206G	193	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	[ ]	6,000	6,000
			Combat Sent wideband sensor upgrade program		[6,000]	
0400	0305207G	194	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305208BQ	195	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305208G	196	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	[ ]		[ ]

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0400	0305208K	197	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	7,451		7,451
0400	0305208L	198	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305880L	199	COMBATANT COMMAND INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305883L	200	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET (HDBT) INTEL SUPPORT	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305884L	201	INTELLIGENCE PLANNING AND REVIEW ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305885G	202	TACTICAL CRYPOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES	[ ]		
0400	0305889G	203	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0305889L	204	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0307141G	205	NASS, IO TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION AND TOOL DEV	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0307207G	206	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS)	[ ]		[ ]
0400	0708011S	207	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	18,748	8,000	26,748
			Castings for improved readiness		[3,000]	
			High performance defense manufacturing tech R&D		[5,000]	
0400	0708012S	208	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	2,912		2,912
0400	0902298J	209	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS)	3,090		3,090
0400	1001018D8Z	210	NATO JOINT STARS	41,670		41,670
0400	1160279BB	211	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH/SMALL BUS TECH TR			
0400	1160403BB	212	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AVIATION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELC	83,704		83,704
0400	1160404BB	213	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	45,241	10,900	56,141
			Wavelet packet modulation		[4,400]	
			Special operations combat assault rifle (scar)		[4,100]	
			Helmet Mount Track System		[2,400]	
0400	1160405BB	214	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	29,011	10,000	39,011
			Wireless management and control project		[4,000]	
			Multi-spectral laboratory and analytical services center		[6,000]	
0400	1160408BB	215	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	99,010		99,010

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Acct	Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0400	1160421BB	216	SPECIAL OPERATIONS CV-22 DEVELOPMENT			
0400	1160425BB	217	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AIRCRAFT DEFENSIVE SYSTEMS	7,850		7,850
0400	1160426BB	218	OPERATIONS ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS) DEVI	32,452		32,452
0400	1160427BB	219	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS (MTPS)	1,782		1,782
0400	1160428BB	220	UNMANNED VEHICLES (UV)	1,521		1,521
0400	XXXXXXX	999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,312,490		3,312,490
			Total, RDT&E Defense-Wide	**20,809,939**	**169,000**	**20,978,939**
			OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE			
0460	0603941D8Z	1	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY			
0460	0604940D8Z	2	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMEN			
0460	0605118D8Z	3	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION			
0460	0605118OTE	4	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	50,161		50,161
0460	0605131D8Z	5	LIVE FIRE TESTING			
0460	0605131OTE	6	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	11,245		11,245
0460	0605804D8Z	7	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION			
0460	0605814OTE	8	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	120,114		120,114
			Total, Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	**181,520**		**181,520**
			TOTAL RDT&E	**73,156,008**	**1,008,140**	**74,164,148**

Force protection basic research

The budget request included $150.7 million in PE 61101E, for defense research sciences and $99.2 million in PE 61328BP, for the chemical and biological defense basic research program. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 61101E and $3.0 million in PE 61384BP to expand research programs focused on development of next generation protective gear to counter small-arms threats and chemical-biological threats to service members, respectively.

National Defense Education Program

The budget request included $19.5 million in PE 61102D8Z, for the National Defense Education Program (NDEP). The committee commends the Department of Defense for supporting this targeted and timely program, but notes that the request includes funds for activities that are not authorized including institutional scholarships, fellowships, and traineeships. Of the amount requested in PE 61102D8Z, the committee authorizes $17.0 million specifically for Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation scholarships and $2.5 million for other NDEP activities; but authorizes no funding for institutional scholarships, fellowships, and traineeships. The committee recommends that the Department provide information on the need for this activity along with a request for legislative authority to conduct it.

Detection of biological agents in water

The budget request included $99.1 million in PE 61384BP, for chemical and biological defense basic research. The committee notes that the ability to detect the introduction of manmade or natural toxins into inland or coastal waterways is an important component of the overall force protection of U.S. forces. The committee commends the Department of Defense for supporting the advanced technology development of data fusion technologies and mathematical modeling to predict and counter the detection of biological agents in water. The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 61384BP to support the demonstration of selected near real-time sensors on buoys, submerged fixtures, and potable water pump stations.

Organic light emitting receptor-based nanosensors

The budget request included $99.2 million in PE 61384BP, for chemical and biological defense basic research, but included no funding for the research and development of organic light emitting receptor-based nanosensors.

The committee supports the Department of Defense's efforts to develop low-cost and lightweight nanosensors for the rapid detection of toxins and the rapid display of alerts for the presence of toxins.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 61384BP for the development of nanosensors that are capable of simultaneously generating optical and photo acoustic signals upon interaction with target toxins.

Superstructural particle evaluation

The budget request included $99.2 million in PE 61384BP, for chemical and biological defense basic research. Basic science challenges continue to plague efforts to develop comprehensive methods for countering threats posed by chemical and biological warfare agents. The committee commends the Department of Defense for supporting basic research to address both the chemical and biological threat. The committee recommends an increase of $3.2 million in PE 61384BP to accelerate promising work in superstructural particle evaluation and characterization with targeted reaction analysis. This program will allow investigations of real-time, microscale responses of cells and microbes to the influence of a variety of chemical species, including chemical warfare agents, toxins, or potential protective or therapeutic substances.

Medical free electron laser

The budget request included $10.3 million in PE 62227D8Z, for the medical free electron laser program. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62227D8Z to continue research efforts that utilize free electron lasers to address critical military medical requirements.

Alternative delivery of recombinant protein vaccines

The budget request included $280.4 million in PE 62384BP, for chemical and biological defense applied research. The committee commends the Department of Defense for supporting research to address the need for new vaccine delivery devices and powder vaccine technologies to improve the performance of biodefense vaccines and reduce the logistical challenges in delivering those vaccines. The committee recommends an increase of $5.1 million in PE 62384BP to accelerate promising work on vaccine-device combinations. This program will facilitate the rapid deployment in minimally invasive delivery formats, provide superior protection, and in some cases, improve the stability for stockpiled vaccines.

Chemical and biological smart materials

The budget request included $280.4 million in PE 62384BP, for chemical and biological defense applied research, but included no funding for the research and development of chemical and biological smart materials to enhance individual and collective protection.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has identified warfighter protection capability shortfalls in several research areas to include individual and collective protection. The committee recognizes the importance of the development of technologies for the improvement of chemical and biological agent individual protection ensembles. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62384BP for the research and development of chemical and biological smart materials to address this shortfall.

Escape mask

The budget request included $280.4 million in PE 62384BP, for chemical and biological defense applied research, but included no funding for the research and development of escape masks or hoods. The committee notes the importance of the development of

escape masks and respirators with a capability to protect individuals from carbon monoxide. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62384BP for the development of escape mask capability shortfalls.

Multipurpose biodefense immunoarray

The budget request included $280.4 million in PE 62384BP, for chemical and biological defense applied research, but included no funding for the research and development of multipurpose biodefense immunoarray technology.

The committee notes that protein microarrays have the potential to screen hundreds of proteins simultaneously for reactivity with serum antibodies.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 62384BP, for the continued development of microarray diagnostics, which could determine previous exposure to biological agents; assess the effectiveness of vaccine immunizations; and determine the potential of new vaccines to elicit an immune response.

Mustard gas antidote

The budget request included $30.7 million in PE 62384BP, for medical chemical defense applied research. This program emphasizes the prevention of chemical casualties and addresses capability gaps in the area of prophylaxes for chemical warfare agents. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62384BP for mustard gas antidote research. The committee commends the Department of Defense for current research focused on a mustard gas antidote using signal transduction inhibition antioxidant liposomes (STIMAL), and notes that STIMAL research has demonstrated the potential to substantially reduce the effects of a range of chemical agents.

Next-generation chemical biological protective suit

The budget request included $280.4 million in PE 62384BP, for chemical and biological defense applied research, but included no funding for the research and development of the next-generation chemical and biological protective suit.

The committee notes the importance of the development of a next-generation, self-decontaminating chemical and biological protective suit for U.S forces to reduce the physiological and logistical burden of protective clothing. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62384BP for the development of self-decontaminating materials to address this shortfall.

Personal protection against infectious agents

The budget request included $280.4 million in PE 62384BP, for chemical and biological defense applied research, but included no funding for collaborative research and development related to personal protective masks and anti-microbial filters that protect against exposure to infectious agents and diseases. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 62384BP for research and development to improve the respiratory protection for individual protection ensembles from emerging infectious agents and diseases.

Rapid identification of biological warfare agents

The budget request included $280.4 million in PE 62384BP, for chemical and biological defense applied research. The committee commends the efforts of the Department of Defense to develop the Joint Biological Standoff Detection System (JBSDS) as the first stand-off early warning biological detection system capable of providing near real time, early warning detection of biological warfare agents.

The committee notes the importance of the development of technologies for the rapid detection of biological agents such as anthrax and ricin that could be weaponized and employed against U.S. forces. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 62384BP for the research and development of an early warning, biological detection system capable of providing near real time detection of the biological agents most likely to be weaponized and employed against U.S. forces.

Verification and validation of chemical agent persistence models

The budget request included $280.4 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 notes 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 persistent models will help protect U.S. military forces and equipment, and permit those forces to operate effectively in a chemically contaminated environment.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62384BP, for verification and validation of chemical agent persistence models to ensure U.S. forces are capable of operating effectively in a chemically contaminated environment.

Tactical technology

The budget request included $383.7 million in PE 62702E, for applied research on tactical technology. The committee notes that the request represents an increase of nearly $40.0 million over current funding levels. The committee recommends a decrease of $10.0 million in PE 62702E, including: $2.0 million for the HEDLight program, which is not currently a high priority for the Navy; $2.0 million to delay the Tethered Urban Airborne Node new start program; and $6.0 million for research on automated battle management systems. It is unclear how this effort is coordinated with the major, Department-wide effort to develop a Joint Battle Management Command and Control roadmap.

Biochemical materials

The budget request included $297.3 million in PE 62715E, for materials and biological technology. The committee recommends a decrease of $5.0 million in PE 62715E to limit growth in biochemical materials research programs. The committee notes that

some of these activities are more appropriately performed at civilian agencies.

Modeling and simulation

The budget request included $105.0 million in PE 62717BR, for weapons of mass destruction (WMD) defense technologies. Detailed and comprehensive characterization of catastrophic attacks and disasters is critical to crisis and logistical planning. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62717BR for development of a comprehensive national incident characterization and management system.

Wearable hyperspectral imaging system

The budget request included $12.7 million in PE 116401BB for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Technology Development. The committee notes the need to integrate technologies currently under development into a low cost, wearable, hyperspectral imaging system to assist SOF elements with the detection of improvised explosive devices, target location, and target identification. The committee recommends an increase of $3.6 million in PE 116401BB, for the development of wearable hyperspectral imaging technology for SOF elements.

Radiation detection technology

The budget request included $8.7 million in PE 63160BR, for proliferation prevention and defeat radiation detection technology. The committee notes the importance of developing higher quality, more cost-effective nuclear radiation detectors to enhance the ability to detect and identify hazardous materials that pose a proliferation threat. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63160BR for procuring glass scintillation fiber radiation detectors and developing new portable applications, including backpack detectors, panels for aircraft, and detectors included in clothing systems. The committee further recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63160BR for the development of a state-of-the-art radiation portal monitor using High Purity Germanium technology, which will enable the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to replace lower resolution technology at defense installations with better performing nuclear detection equipment with greater sensitivity.

Advanced aerospace systems

The budget request included $115.8 million in PE 63286E, for advanced aerospace systems research. The committee recommends a decrease of $16.3 million in PE 63286E, including: $5.3 million for efforts to develop a global range transatmospheric vehicle that is not consistent with current service acquisition plans or goals; $4.0 million for the development of a heavy fuel engine for the A160, which lacks a transition pathway to Army Future Combat Systems; $4.0 million for the Cormorant air vehicle program; and a general decrease of $3.0 million to new start efforts in the account.

Next Generation Gas Chromatographic Mass Spectrometer

The budget request included $207.1 million in PE 63384BP, for chemical and biological defense advanced research. The Weapons of

Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams (WMD-CST) currently use commercial, off-the-shelf (COTS) Gas Chromatographic Mass Spectrometers (GCMS) to identify threats posed by chemical warfare agents. The committee commends the Department of Defense for supporting the advanced technology development of next generation COTS GCMS. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63384BP to continue the development, modification, test, and evaluation of next generation COTS GCMS products. This program will allow WMD-CST the ability to refresh their inventory with a technically superior GCMS capability.

Joint advanced concept technology demonstration

The budget request included $35.6 million in PE 63648D8Z, for joint capability technology demonstrations. The Department of Defense initiated this new technology transition program in the fiscal year 2006 budget request to update the successful advanced concepts technology demonstrations to more closely align with the Joint Capabilities Interoperability Development System (JCIDS) and to enhance the participation of the combatant commanders through the JCIDS process. The committee recommends an increase of $2.2 million in PE 63648D8Z to accelerate transition of the large data image visualization capability that will assist the joint warfighter and the intelligence community in processing increasing volumes of data in real time.

Joint robotic autonomous systems

The budget request included $7.7 million in PE 63711D8Z, for joint robotics program/autonomous systems, but included no funding for development of a versatile, modular, diesel hybrid unmanned system capable of delivering multiple payloads in the 2000–4000 pound range. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63711D8Z to modify existing capabilities for additional unmanned logistics support missions.

Advanced mobile gas-to-liquid fueler

The budget request included $23.4 million in PE 63712S, for generic logistics research and development technology demonstrations. Adequate, reliable, and cost-effective fuel supplies are important for military operations in changing or hostile environments. Alternative fuel systems offer possible long-term solutions in reducing the logistical footprint of deployed forces, if successfully configured to meet military requirements. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63712S for continued development of mobile gas-to-liquid fuelers to demonstrate innovations in converting biomass to synthetic diesel fuel.

Defense Logistics Agency research and technology demonstrations

The budget request included $23.4 million in PE 63712S, for generic logistics research and development technology demonstrations. The committee notes that the Department of Defense is the largest single user of energy in the United States. Energy and power represent significant and growing burdens on the Department budget. The Defense Logistics Agency recently reported that

hydrogen as a fuel may become a viable option for the Department, if remaining technical and logistical challenges can be solved. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63712S to create a comprehensive and integrated strategy and to plan for the appropriate use and acquisition of hydrogen fuel.

The committee further notes that the use of solid hydrogen storage materials for portable, vehicle, and stationary fuel cell applications shows promise in addressing safety, cost, and performance issues related to fuel cell systems. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63712S for research on and technology demonstrations of solid hydrogen storage systems that can support military requirements and technology development goals. The committee further recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63712S for the continuation of the vehicle fuel cell program to accelerate the development and deployment of fuel cell technologies in military vehicles through advanced research and demonstration programs.

The committee also recommends an increase of $12.9 million in PE 63712S, including $3.0 million to support the manufacturing supply chain and for increased involvement of small- and medium-sized firms in meeting defense surge production requirements; $4.0 million for the embedded passives test bed program; $4.2 million for aging systems sustainment and enabling technologies; and $1.7 million for the development of an emergency power source to meet National Guard requirements.

Dendrimer enhanced water remediation research

The budget request included $67.1 million in PE 63716D8Z, for the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, but included no funding for dendrimer enhanced water remediation research. The committee notes that research has shown that dendrimers have remarkable capacity to retain a variety of metal and organic molecules, making them ideal materials for water remediation. This project would demonstrate the feasibility of dendrimers in reusable cartridges for point-of-use water filtration units. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63716D8Z for dendrimer enhanced water remediation research.

Computer modernization technologies

The budget request included $158.3 million in PE 63750D8Z, for advanced concepts technology demonstrations and $175.3 million in PE 63755D8Z for the high performance computing modernization program.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63750D8Z for the continued development of masking shunt cybersecurity techniques and technologies to increase the security of military networks and information systems against enemy information operations. The Joint Chiefs of Staff's Coalition Warrior Interoperability Demonstration Joint Management Office recommended further development and procurement of this technology after successful demonstration.

The committee further recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE63755D8Z for upgrades to the Space and Missile Defense Command simulation center to meet increasing computational de-

mands. The center supports high performance computing modernization efforts to accelerate the development and transition of advanced defense technologies into warfighting capabilities through supercomputing and computational modeling, including supporting the development of armor systems, weather forecasting models, and test and evaluation.

Command, control, and communications systems

The budget request included $232.5 million in PE 63760E, for command, control, and communications systems. The committee recommends a decrease of $2.8 million in PE 63760E for the Next Generation (XG) program. The XG communications technology had been planned for a fiscal year 2007 transition to the Army in the Joint Tactical Radio Systems (JTRS) clusters. The committee notes that the JTRS program is undergoing significant technical reevaluation and program restructuring, so transition of this and other technologies appears problematic. The committee further recommends a decrease of $5.0 million in PE 63760E to better align the budget with proposed activities of the Predictive Analysis for Naval Deployment Activities program.

Portable explosive detection

The budget request included $107.8 million in PE 63826D8Z, for quick reaction special projects. The committee notes that advances in capabilities to detect trace amounts of explosive materials support efforts to prevent attacks using bombs and improvised explosive devices. The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 63826D8Z for rapid testing, training, and logistics support for a low-cost, portable, easy-to-operate explosive screening and countermeasure system.

Joint modeling, simulation, and experimentation

The budget request included $115.7 million in PE 63828D8Z, for joint experimentation, modeling, and simulation technologies, but included no funding for joint effects-based modeling and simulation that effectively incorporates political, economic, infrastructure, information, societal, and diplomatic factors, as well as coalition warfare, at the tactical level of operations.

The 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) Report noted that the Department of Defense must "shift its emphasis from Department-centric approaches toward interagency solutions" to incorporate all elements of national power. Cooperation across the Federal Government is essential and can be facilitated efficiently by enhanced modeling, simulation, and experimentation. Similarly, the Report identified that the ability of the United States and its allies to work together to influence the global environment is fundamental to defeating terrorist networks.

The committee believes that the Department must develop a world-class experimentation, modeling, and simulation capability that is joint, interagency, and coalition at the tactical level of operation. This is especially important since Cold War era distinctions between tactical and strategic have been increasingly obscured. The committee also believes that joint modeling, simulation, and

experimentation would be most effectively conducted at Joint Forces Command.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63828D8Z, for Joint Experimentation, to further develop joint, interagency, and coalition modeling, simulation, and experimentation.

Advanced tactical airborne command, control, communications, computer, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance system

The budget request included $80.4 million in PE 116402BB for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Advanced Technology Development, but included no funding for a SOF stand-off, airborne, modular advanced tactical airborne command, control, communications, computer, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (C4ISR) system.

The committee notes SOF elements require a C–130-based, roll-on, C4ISR system to respond to current and emerging asymmetrical warfare threats. The committee recommends an increase of $3.2 million in PE 116402BB for the further development of a roll-on C4ISR sensor and communications suite to enhance the intelligence gathering capabilities and command and control relay capability of SOF elements engaged in the global war on terror.

Advanced tactical laser

The budget request included $80.4 million in PE 116402BB, for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Advanced Technology Development, including $45.0 million for the advanced tactical laser (ATL) program.

The ATL Advance Concepts Technology Demonstration (ACTD) is a long-standing effort to weaponize directed energy technology into an existing tactical platform. While a potentially promising concept, the program has faced formidable challenges, including the absence of a technology transition plan.

The committee recommends a decrease of $20.0 million in PE 116402BB, while the technical challenges associated with ATL are addressed and an effective transition plan for this technology is developed and implemented.

Flashlight soldier-to-soldier combat identification system

The budget request included $80.4 million in PE 116402BB for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Advanced Technology Development, but included no funding to develop new capabilities to address the identification of friendly forces for SOF elements in a ground combat environment.

The committee commends the Department of Defense's efforts to develop technologies to assist in the prevention and ultimate elimination of friendly fire incidents on changing and complex battlefields. Flashlight soldier-to-soldier combat identification system (FSCIS) is a friend-or-foe combat identification system that employs focused radio frequency beams to identify the presence of friendly units in an area of impending combat.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 116402BB, for SOF Advanced Technology Development, for the development of FSCIS technology.

Small and medium caliber recoil mitigation technologies

The budget request included $80.4 million in PE 116402BB for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Advanced Technology Development, but included no funding for SOF small and medium caliber recoil mitigation technology.

The committee notes that the current small and medium caliber weapons in use today by SOF elements possess recoil technologies more than 50 years old. The committee further notes that recoil management is at the core of reducing small arms weight, while improving lethality and reliability.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 116402BB for the further development of advanced prototypes of small and medium caliber weapons to improve SOF lethality in close-quarter and urban combat environments.

Special Operations portable power source program

The budget request included $80.4 million in PE 116402BB for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Advanced Technology Development, but included no funding to develop solid oxide fuel cell systems.

The committee notes such systems are designed to significantly reduce the weight burden of batteries for SOF operators, and that a reduction in battery weight will have a direct impact on increasing the capability of SOF elements and their equipment. The committee further notes that the Department of Defense is exploring various approaches to solving energy and power challenges for dismounted forces, including lightweight zinc-air batteries for the Marine Corps.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 116402BB for SOF, Advanced Technology Development, for the SOF portable power source.

Anthrax and plague oral vaccine research and development

The budget request included $73.1 million in PE 63884BP, for advanced technology development specific to medical bio-defense. The committee supports the Department of Defense's efforts under this account to develop and test safe and effective prophylaxes and therapeutics for pre- and post-exposure to biological threats and agents. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63884BP for the development of a single-dose oral vaccine that can protect against multiple biological warfare agents, including anthrax and plague. This effort parallels the Department's plague vaccine development program and may provide superior protection against pneumonic plague.

Airborne Infrared System

The budget request included $514.5 million in PE 63884C, for ballistic missile defense sensors, but included no funding for the Airborne Infrared System (AIRS).

AIRS is a system of infrared and visible sensors that can track ballistic missiles and their warheads in all phases of flight. The committee believes that such a system, if and when deployed, could provide important test, operational, and technical intelligence capabilities in support of ballistic missile defense.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63884C for AIRS research and development. This increase will allow the Missile Defense Agency to proceed with final engineering development and "in-line" demonstrations of system connectivity, a closed loop fire control system, and prototype design for integration on manned or unmanned vehicles.

Corrosion prevention research

The budget request included $5.0 million in PE 64016D8Z, for the Department of Defense corrosion program. Established by the committee in section 1067 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), this program is developing a comprehensive capability to prevent and mitigate corrosion and its effects on Department weapon systems and infrastructure, which some estimates indicate cost the Department over $20.0 billion annually.

The committee is concerned that corrosion prevention and control is not effectively incorporated into existing accredited undergraduate engineering curricula resulting in continued development of new designs that do not utilize existing corrosion data and corrosion resistant technologies and materials. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, working through the Department of Defense Corrosion Executive and the Department of Defense Corrosion Policy and Oversight Office, to commission a study by the National Academy of Sciences to assess undergraduate corrosion education in engineering programs and develop recommendations for curricula that could enhance the corrosion-based skill and knowledge base of graduating engineers. The study should build on the congressionally-mandated report, entitled the "2001 Corrosion Costs and Preventive Strategies in the United States." The results of the study should be transmitted to the congressional defense committees not later than April 1, 2008.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 64016D8Z to support efforts to reduce corrosion costs to the military through improved corrosion education and training and application of corrosion prevention and control technologies. Not more than $0.8 million of the funds provided should be available for the required study.

Playas command and control network

The budget request included no funding for a command and control network at the training, research, development, test and evaluation complex at Playas, New Mexico. The development of a comprehensive command and control network at this facility was initiated in 2005. This network includes video and network monitoring equipment to control, communicate, observe, and record training taking place at the facility. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63757D8Z for a command and control network at Playas, New Mexico.

Militarily critical technologies support

The budget request included $2.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for specific analytical capabilities to enhance the militarily critical technologies program. The committee recommends a transfer of $2.0 million from OMDW to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation in PE 65110D8Z for critical technology support, which conducts the technical analysis to support timely updates to the militarily critical technologies list.

Operationally responsive space payloads

The budget request included $20.4 million in PE 65799D8Z, for the Office of Force Transformation (OFT) in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. One of the activities, for which funding is requested, includes the critical design of a standardized bus for tactical satellite operations and the development of operationally responsive payloads in support of the warfighter. The committee notes that the Department of Defense has requested insufficient funding for fiscal year 2007 to continue development of a modular, standard bus, develop responsive payloads, and complete the experimentation necessary to demonstrate tactical satellite capabilities.

The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in PE 65799D8Z for development of operationally responsive space capabilities. Of this amount, $20.0 million is for payloads, satellite busses, integration, command and control, and joint warfighter experimentation; and $5.0 million is to support adapting existing airborne reconnaissance sensor capabilities for use in response space missions.

DARPA management headquarters

The budget request included $51.0 million in PE 65898E, for the management headquarters overhead account for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). The committee notes that this account has risen 58 percent between fiscal years 2000 and 2007. The committee understands that some of these costs are due to additional security measures installed in the last few years, but believes that DARPA should continue to strive to limit overhead expenditures so that more funding is available to support high-risk, high-payoff research efforts. The committee recommends a decrease of $5.0 million in PE 65898E for research overhead costs.

Armed Forces medical and food research

The committee believes that the funding requested in PE 31301L, for General Defense Intelligence Program (GDIP), and in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), is insufficient for medical intelligence research and development.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million in PE 31301L, for GDIP, and $2.2 million in OMDW to develop capabilities to conduct threat and vulnerability analysis of medical and food processing and handling systems in a laboratory environment using biological and chemical threat agents.

High performance computational systems

The budget request included no funding for the General Defense Intelligence Program to continue the evaluation of computing technologies required for the performance of next generation analysis, modeling, and simulation tasks. Continued research and analysis in this field will lead to more effective data fusion from distributed sensor networks for use in combat situations and urban environments.

The committee is aware that the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) established a laboratory for high performance computational systems at the University of Alabama in Huntsville in 2005. It was funded at $1.6 million in fiscal year 2006. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 31301L for the continuation and expansion of a laboratory for high performance computational systems to support the DIA.

Commercial airborne interferometric synthetic aperture radar imagery

Commercial airborne interferometric synthetic aperture radar (IFSAR) imagery provides imagery and elevation data used for mapping. Commercial IFSAR imagery is used regularly by the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) to update maps and conduct intelligence analysis. The technology was designed for broad area collection and is especially well-suited for regions of the world with frequent cloud cover, such as Colombia, Indonesia, and the Phillippines. It is also used to support coalition and allied countries. The use of commercial IFSAR imagery will assist NGA in its mapping requirements and permit collection platforms to satisfy other imagery requirements.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 35102BQ, for Defense Geospatial Program, to further the use of commercial IFSAR imagery for map updates, intelligence analysis, and to support coalition and allied nations.

Credibility assessment research

The demand for polygraph examinations, employment screening, and access control in the Department of Defense has increased in recent years. The committee is aware of research conducted at Boise State University which demonstrated that automated polygraph tests conducted in the context of an employment interview can be significantly more accurate than those conducted by a human examiner. The university has also begun work a Computerized Port of Entry Screening System to meet the critical need for rapid and easy credibility assessment at ports of entry.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 35127BZ, for Foreign Counterintelligence Activities, to allow for continued research and initial laboratory validation of a fully standardized, machine-administered, scientifically-based polygraph test.

Combat sent wideband sensor upgrade

The proliferation of wideband threat radars drives the requirement for continued advancements in wideband signal detection, measurement, and identification.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 35206G, for Airborne Reconnaissance Systems, for the Combat Sent wideband sensor upgrade program to ensure the United States maintains the ability to process threat radars and effectively track the proliferation of potentially hostile radar equipment. The desired goal is to have software reprogrammable systems that will support rapid and cost-effective upgrades as threat radars continue to evolve.

Castings for improved readiness

The budget request included $18.7 million in PE 78011S for industrial preparedness programs of the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA). The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 78011S to support castings for improved readiness program, aimed at bringing castings expertise into defense supply centers; reducing backorder times for critical cast and forged parts; developing new manufacturing processes for the defense industrial base, and establishing a data exchange system to coordinate castings information and ensure timely parts availability.

High performance defense manufacturing technology research and development

The budget request included $18.7 million in PE 78011S, for industrial preparedness activities. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 78011S to enable the Joint Defense Manufacturing Technology Panel to execute activities mandated in sections 241 through 245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). The committee notes that this legislation has been supported by the Defense Science Board (DSB) in its recent report, entitled "The Manufacturing Technology Program: A key to Affordably Equipping the Future Force." The DSB report stated that "the task force supports the intent of the proposed amendment drafted by the Senate Armed Services Committee to enhance manufacturing technology strategies ..., which calls for public-private partnership incentives, industry roadmaps for new manufacturing and technology processes, test beds for technology transition, and other cooperative programs."

The committee endorses the DSB recommendation to establish an additional Defense-wide program element ("D line") to execute "multi-Service, multi-platform" manufacturing technology initiatives. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to create a Defense-wide program element, managed by the Joint Defense Manufacturing Technology Panel for execution of the High Performance Defense Manufacturing Technology Research and Development program, and to transfer the additional authorized funds above from PE 78011S into the new line for this purpose.

Helmet mount track system

The budget request included $45.2 million in PE 116404BB for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Tactical Systems Development, but included no funding to develop new capabilities for the helmet mount track system.

The helmet mount track system has enhanced features that allows the operator to modify the position of their night vision gog-

gles, which can lower the operator's profile, reduces the weight placed on the operator's neck eliminating the cantilever effect that otherwise causes operator injuries, and enhances the operator's combat identification capability.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.4 million in PE 116404BB for the development of the helmet mount track system for SOF elements.

Special Operations combat assault rifle

The budget request included $45.2 million in PE 116404BB for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Tactical Systems Development, but included no funding for the Special Operations Combat Assault Rifle (SCAR).

The committee notes that the SCAR is a multipurpose weapon that integrates an enhanced grenade launcher module and will replace five different individual weapons currently used by SOF elements, which will vastly reduce the logistics and maintenance support effort. The committee further notes that the rifle's operating system and external configuration are based on an open architecture design, which will permit the system to accommodate future improvements in ammunition and accessories. The SCAR is characterized by unprecedented lethality, effectiveness, modularity, and dependability.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.1 million in PE 116404BB for SOF Tactical Systems Development for development of the SCAR.

Wavelet packet modulation

The budget request included $45.2 million in PE 116404BB for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Tactical Systems Development, but included no funding for Wavelet Packet Modulation (WPM). SOF operate in a global environment where their presence and communications must remain undetected. WPM technology surveys the signal environment to adequately disburse communications so that it is nearly impossible to detect the signal or waveform. The committee recommends an increase of $4.4 million in PE 116404BB for the continued development of WPM technology for communications and networked threat warning sensor systems.

Multi-spectral laboratory and analytical services center program

The budget request included $29.0 million in PE 116405BB, for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Intelligence Systems Development, but included no funding for multi-spectral sensors. The committee notes the urgent need for next generation, multi-spectral sensors to support the warfighter, specifically in the areas of stand-off biometric collection. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 116405BB, for the development of sensors for SOF elements to effectively integrate stand-off biometric capabilities.

Special Operations wireless management and control project

The budget request included $29.0 million in PE 116405BB for Special Operations Forces (SOF), Intelligence Systems Development, but included no funding to develop new capabilities for the Joint Threat Warning System (JTWS) as threats evolve.

The special operations wireless management and control project will develop capabilities that can be integrated into the JTWS that will provide special operations forces the tactical capabilities to maintain situational awareness of the wireless communications being used by potential adversaries.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 116405BB for the development and integration of a wireless management and control capability for the JTWS.

Items of Special Interest

Airborne Laser

The budget request contained $632.0 million in PE 63883C, for Ballistic Missile Defense Boost Defense Segment. The committee is encouraged with the recent technical progress the Airborne Laser (ABL) program has demonstrated over the previous two years, including first flight, firing of the high energy laser modules in ground tests, and flight testing of the aircraft with the beam control/fire control system installed. The committee further notes that these technical challenges were accomplished on the current schedule and within the current budget.

The committee notes the decision by the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to defer the procurement of a second ABL aircraft two years later than proposed in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2006 for purposes of assessing the results of a lethal shoot-down demonstration planned for late 2008. The committee further notes that a mature ABL platform, the primary boost phase ballistic missile defense capability, may not be ready for deployment until late next decade. Therefore, the Committee believes that if the planned shoot-down demonstration is fully successful, MDA should be prepared, consistent with its knowledge-based acquisition approach, to continue development, design, and testing of the ABL system in an effort to provide this transformational war fighting capability to the military commanders and war fighters.

The committee directs the Missile Defense Agency to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2007 to provide a detailed explanation of its plan for the future of the ABL program, including testing, development, design, and funding in the future-years defense program.

Air Force science, technology, test and evaluation

The committee notes that the Air Force budget request for science and technology programs is $2.1 billion, an increase of over $150.0 million compared to the fiscal year 2006 budget request. In times of limited budgetary resources and increasing near-term demands, the committee commends the Air Force for committing to continued stable support of the critical Air Force research and technology enterprise. These well-managed and well-focused efforts are

creating the capabilities that will shape the Air Force of the future and enable it to meet the threats of the 21st century. The Air Force appreciation of the vital role of science and technology in supporting Air Force missions and the resources required for quality research efforts extends to the inclusion of science and technology on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priorities list.

The committee further commends Air Force efforts to leverage the technical skills resident in its science and technology enterprise to address pressing problems in weapon systems development and acquisition. The committee notes that the Air Force has begun a program to utilize assessment and analysis of manufacturing readiness levels to reduce risk in acquisition programs. The committee also notes that efforts led by the Air Force science and technology community to support the service acquisition executive with more disciplined systems engineering in the pre-acquisition planning phases will further strengthen the transition process resulting in acquisition programs with the latest technology and more mature technical planning and credibility.

The committee notes that these activities are in contrast to Air Force disinvestment in vital test and evaluation (T&E) activities. In the fiscal year 2007 budget request, the Air Force has reduced T&E activities by nearly $400.0 million over the future-years defense program, relative to projected budgets for this activity presented to Congress with the fiscal year 2006 budget request. The committee notes that T&E activities support the acquisition process by reducing technical risk and protect the warfighter by developing technologies that are reliable, safe, and operationally effective. The committee believes that the proposed reduction in T&E funding could result in delayed and more expensive acquisition programs, and even potentially in the deployment of unproven or ineffective technologies to the warfighters.

Future Combat Systems and current force interoperability

The Future Combat Systems (FCS) program includes four "spin-out" technologies, that will introduce FCS technologies and systems into the current force. These fielding spin-outs are currently planned to occur in 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014 to an experimental brigade and then two years later to the rest of the Army. The first spin-out of FCS technology in 2008 is to emphasize improved munitions and sensors connected in an initial version of the FCS network. FCS network capabilities will include a pre-engineering design module of Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) radio and a wideband networking waveform. While the Army's focus is on FCS networking capabilities, the committee is concerned that funding constraints may limit the spin-out of FCS technologies to the current force, especially those capabilities that will enable FCS-equipped brigade combat teams (BCT) to interoperate with current force BCT. There is little doubt that current force systems will be in the inventory for decades while the Army fields FCS-equipped BCTs. There is also doubt that future Army budgets will be able to afford FCS, modularity, and reset. The Army should be exploring affordable alternatives to ensure that FCS-equipped and current force BCTs are interoperable.

The committee believes that the Force XXI Battle Command Brigade and Below (FBCB2) program may provide the backbone for an architecture that could meet FCS-equipped and current force BCTs interoperability requirements. The committee also believes that the Army's FCS spin-out plan can provide the basis to develop, test, and field affordable alternatives. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2007, on the Army's strategy to ensure that FCS-equipped and current force BCTs can achieve affordable interoperability.

Information assurance progress report

The committee commends the Department of Defense for recent efforts to focus high-level attention on the importance of information assurance (IA) for classified systems and for critical Department networks and data. New directives and guidance issued by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and the U.S. Strategic Command in late 2005 and early 2006 have reportedly resulted in improvements to IA compliance, awareness, and accountability. Although these recent steps to improve information security and assurance are encouraging, the committee remains concerned about the vulnerability of the cyber infrastructure and the number of deficiencies that have not yet been addressed.

In a September 2005 report, the Department Inspector General determined that "DoD cannot be assured that it has a complete inventory of major information systems. Without a complete inventory of DoD major information systems, answers to questions from OMB or Congress on major information systems may not be accurate and information assurance is at risk because there is little assurance that all systems are adequately protected."

The Department has issued numerous strategies, policies, directives, and implementation guidance documents designed to ensure protection of information systems, networks, and communications. As noted above and in other reports and audits, progress has been slow.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress no later than March 1, 2007, on progress in addressing identified deficiencies and continued vulnerabilities in IA. The report should address timely implementation of identified network and information systems security gaps, which continue to result in unreliable critical information systems and unknown large quantities of information lost or unsecured. The report should include schedules for, and details of, Department progress in the following areas:

(1) development of a complete, comprehensive, enterprise-wide inventory of information systems;

(2) implementation of standards for interoperable, joint communications;

(3) plans to incorporate IA as a critical operational training objective in every major joint exercise;

(4) maturation of tactics, techniques, and procedures for information intrusion detect, react, and restore missions; and plans for strengthening forensic capabilities;

(5) development of information system and network failure response and continuity plans that keep pace with the pace of technology development;

(6) implementation of firewalls or intrusion detection systems in all deployed units;

(7) definition and identification of positions with significant security responsibilities;

(8) development of training and certification requirements for information technology security professionals, including tracking and monitoring of training progress;

(9) determination of appropriate penalties for noncompliance with IA directives and guidance;

(10) standardization of a working definition of "system" for purposes of management oversight;

(11) establishment of relationships between Department IA components and IA components in other federal departments and agencies;

(12) establishment of mechanisms to utilitize industry technology, expertise, and knowledge to address long-term Department needs and capability to confront specific threats and events;

(13) allocation of resources to support science and technology developments specific to national security IA requirements; analysis of international capabilities in IA; and

(14) other relevant Department IA activities and efforts.

The committee expects that the required report should focus attention on incomplete tasks and place a priority on timely implementation of completion of these tasks.

Joint Tactical Radio System

In the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–148), the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) budget request was reduced $334.3 million due to program delays. In response to the urging of Congress, the Department of Defense established a JTRS Joint Program Executive Office (JPEO), and the program was restructured. On March 31, 2006, the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology (USD(AT&L)) signed the JTRS Acquisition Decision Memorandum which reflected the restructured program.

The committee understands the complex nature of the JTRS program and the related difficulties of working within the consensus-driven Overarching Integrated Program Team management structure. The committee understands that the USD(AT&L) and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs have agreed to use the JTRS program as a pilot for a new acquisition governance model. The committee strongly encourages the Department to implement this pilot model now.

Survey of science and engineering workforce shaping programs

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to conduct a survey of programs designed to educate, train, and recruit scientists and engineers for Department of Defense laboratories and components. The report

should outline the historical and current program budgets; targeted populations; program structures and management; and program results. The programs to be considered as part of the technical workforce shaping survey include: teacher education and mentoring; curriculum development; prize competitions; K–12 outreach; scholarships, fellowships, traineeships, and internships; and coordination with service academies and academic institutions specific to education and workforce development and recruitment activities. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics should submit a report on the results of the survey to the congressional defense committees in conjunction with the March 2007 strategic human capital plan for civilian employees of the Department.

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 2007 budget request for operation and maintenance programs, and indicate those programs for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense), without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in this report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Title III -- OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE & OTHER PROGRAMS			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
Operation and Maintenance, Army	24,902,380	-106,800	24,795,580
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	31,330,984	-200,200	31,130,784
Operation and Maintenance, MC	3,878,962	26,300	3,905,262
Operation and Maintenance, AF	31,342,307	-91,200	31,251,107
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	20,075,656	31,100	20,106,756
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	2,299,202	-159,500	2,139,702
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,288,764		1,288,764
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	211,911		211,911
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	2,723,800	-148,700	2,575,100
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	4,838,665	19,063	4,857,728
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	5,336,017	-17,300	5,318,717
Transfer Accounts	1,403,295	90,000	1,493,295
Miscellaneous Appropriations	457,053		457,053
SUBTOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	**130,088,996**	**-557,237**	**129,531,759**

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
OTHER PROGRAMS			
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
Defense Health Program, O&M	20,498,163	-116,300	20,381,863
Pregnancy recovery education for military women		[1,000]	
Primary care early intervention		[2,000]	
Unobligated balances		[-140,300]	
Pediatric dental anesthesia		[5,000]	
Improved cancer screening for women		[3,000]	
Increased education and training for PTSD		[5,000]	
Incentive payments in rural areas		[8,000]	
Defense Health Program, RDTE	130,603	5,000	135,603
Chronic pain management			
Defense Health Program, Procurement	396,355	1,500	397,855
Robotic surgery for prostate cancer			
Subtotal Defense Health Program	**21,025,121**	**-109,800**	**20,915,321**
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES			
Drug Enforcement and Policy Support	926,890		926,890
Subtotal Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities	**926,890**		**926,890**

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
Office of the Inspector General, O&M	214,897		214,897
Office of the Inspector General, RDTE			
Office of the Inspector General, Procurement	1,400		1,400
Subtotal Office of the Inspection General	**216,297**		**216,297**
CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION			
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, O&M	1,046,290		1,046,290
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, RDTE	231,014		231,014
Subtotal Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction	**1,277,304**		**1,277,304**
SUBTOTAL OTHER PROGRAMS	**23,445,612**	**-109,800**	**23,335,812**
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS			
Defense Working Capital Funds	161,998		161,998
Defense Working Capital Funds - DeCA	1,184,000		1,184,000
National Defense Sealift Fund	1,071,932		1,071,932
Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund	18,500		18,500
SUBTOTAL REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS	**2,436,430**		**2,436,430**
TOTAL O&M AND OTHER PROGRAMS	**155,971,038**	**-667,037**	**155,304,001**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		Operation and Maintenance, Army			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		LAND FORCES			
2020a	010	DIVISIONS	992,281	3,000	995,281
		UH-60 AoA armor		[3,000]	
2020a	020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	430,556		430,556
2020a	030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	388,518	6,800	395,318
		Battlefield mobility enhancers (M-Gators)		[6,800]	
2020a	040	EAC SUPPORT FORCES	884,236		884,236
2020a	050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,189,294	2,800	1,192,094
		Rapid Data Management System		[2,800]	
		LAND FORCES READINESS			
2020a	060	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,971,662	3,000	1,974,662
		Cognitive air defense simulators (CADS)		[3,000]	
2020a	070	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	571,894	22,200	594,094
		Corrosion prevention and control		[5,200]	
		Blood bag transport modernization project		[17,000]	
2020a	080	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	974,354		974,354
		LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
2020a	090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	5,235,492		5,235,492
2020a	100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	1,810,774		1,810,774
2020a	110	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	252,976		252,976

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2020a	120	UNIFIED COMMANDS	108,594		108,594
2020a	130	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	219,469		219,469
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**15,030,100**	**37,800**	**15,067,900**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
		MOBILITY OPERATIONS			
2020a	140	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	197,583	6,000	203,583
		Quadruple specialty containers		[6,000]	
2020a	150	ARMY PREPOSITIONING STOCKS	66,594		66,594
2020a	160	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	4,700		4,700
		TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**268,877**	**6,000**	**274,877**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING			
2020a	170	OFFICER ACQUISITION	112,359		112,359
2020a	180	RECRUIT TRAINING	38,480		38,480
2020a	190	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	45,827		45,827
2020a	200	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	273,430		273,430
		BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING			
2020a	210	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	524,645		524,645

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2020a	220	FLIGHT TRAINING	637,726		637,726
2020a	230	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	115,231		115,231
2020a	240	TRAINING SUPPORT	661,743		661,743
		RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING			
2020a	250	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	516,857		516,857
2020a	260	EXAMINING	130,238		130,238
2020a	270	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	273,188		273,188
2020a	280	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	136,568		136,568
2020a	290	JUNIOR ROTC	148,215		148,215
		TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**3,614,507**		**3,614,507**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SECURITY PROGRAMS			
2020a	300	SECURITY PROGRAMS	782,719		782,719
		LOGISTICS OPERATIONS			
2020a	310	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	451,070		451,070
2020a	320	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	453,386		453,386
2020a	330	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	415,582		415,582
2020a	340	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	308,552		308,552

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
2020a	350	ADMINISTRATION	701,834	3,000	704,834
		Strategic Management System (non-add)		[30,000]	
		Integrated digital environment pilot program		[3,000]	
2020a	360	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	957,811		957,811
2020a	370	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	276,963		276,963
2020a	380	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	200,993		200,993
2020a	390	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	833,850		833,850
2020a	400	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	203,144		203,144
2020a	410	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	48,934		48,934
		SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS			
2020a	420	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS	310,277		310,277
2020a	430	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	43,781		43,781
		JUDGMENT FUND			
2020a	440	JUDGMENT FUND			
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**5,988,896**	**3,000**	**5,991,896**
		Information assurance vulnerability alert cell		3,000	3,000
		Military to civilian conversions		-50,000	-50,000
		Unobligated balances		-67,600	-67,600
		WCF excess balances		-50,000	-50,000
		Post traumatic stress disorder pilot projects		10,000	10,000

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		Connect and join		1,000	1,000
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Army	**24,902,380**	**-106,800**	**24,795,580**
		Operation and Maintenance, Navy			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS			
1804n	010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	3,587,750		3,587,750
1804n	020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	863,788		863,788
1804n	030	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	56,502		56,502
1804n	040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	121,303	5,000	126,303
		Long arm high-intensity arc metal halide handheld searchlights		[5,000]	
1804n	050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	485,830		485,830
1804n	060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	902,864		902,864
1804n	070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	144,243		144,243
		SHIP OPERATIONS			
1804n	080	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	3,166,923	3,900	3,170,823
		Man overboard safety systems install and maintenance		[3,900]	
1804n	090	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	645,040		645,040
1804n	100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	3,722,690		3,722,690
1804n	110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	979,341		979,341

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT			
1804n	120	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	318,105		318,105
1804n	130	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	52,039		52,039
1804n	140	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	164,454		164,454
1804n	150	WARFARE TACTICS	356,815		356,815
1804n	160	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	267,193		267,193
1804n	170	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,073,662		1,073,662
1804n	180	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	170,116		170,116
1804n	190	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,855		3,855
		WEAPONS SUPPORT			
1804n	200	CRUISE MISSILE	132,602		132,602
1804n	210	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	946,811		946,811
1804n	220	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	115,230		115,230
1804n	230	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	433,856	25,000	458,856
		Mk45 Mod 5" gun depot overhauls		[25,000]	
1804n	240	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	300,901		300,901
		WORKING CAPITAL FUND SUPPORT			
1804n	250	NWCF SUPPORT			
		BASE SUPPORT			
1804n	260	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	713,421		713,421
1804n	270	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,201,313		1,201,313
1804n	280	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	3,470,443		3,470,443

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**24,397,090**	**33,900**	**24,430,990**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
		READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES			
1804n	290	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	545,607		545,607
		ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS			
1804n	300	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	4,626		4,626
1804n	310	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	197,171		197,171
		MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS			
1804n	320	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	30,928		30,928
1804n	330	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	1,660		1,660
1804n	340	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	20,236		20,236
		TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**800,228**		**800,228**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING			
1804n	350	OFFICER ACQUISITION	134,960		134,960
1804n	360	RECRUIT TRAINING	9,973		9,973
1804n	370	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	105,067		105,067

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING			
1804n	380	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	517,787		517,787
1804n	390	FLIGHT TRAINING	425,434		425,434
1804n	400	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	121,568		121,568
1804n	410	TRAINING SUPPORT	168,461		168,461
		RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION			
1804n	420	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	245,469		245,469
1804n	430	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	148,588		148,588
1804n	440	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	75,337		75,337
1804n	450	JUNIOR ROTC	46,649		46,649
		TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**1,999,293**		**1,999,293**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
1804n	460	ADMINISTRATION	719,357		719,357
1804n	470	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	3,555		3,555
1804n	480	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	103,611		103,611
1804n	490	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	186,113		186,113
1804n	500	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	274,108		274,108

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1804n	510	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	798,527	-30,000	768,527
		NMCI program management		[-30,000]	
1804n	520	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES			
		LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT			
1804n	530	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	218,575		218,575
1804n	540	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS			
1804n	550	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	242,607		242,607
1804n	560	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	518,512		518,512
1804n	570	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	58,202		58,202
1804n	580	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	43,143		43,143
1804n	590	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	81,528		81,528
		INVESTIGATIONS AND SECURITY PROGRAMS			
1804n	600	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	391,438		391,438
		SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS			
1804n	650	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	10,478		10,478
1804n	660	PRESIDENTIAL DRAWDOWN AUTHORITY			
		CANCELLED ACCOUNTS			
1804n	670	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		OTHER PROGRAMS			
1804n	999	OTHER PROGRAMS	484,619		484,619
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**4,134,373**	**-30,000**	**4,104,373**
		Military to civilian conversions		-40,000	-40,000
		Civilian personel pay in excess of requirements		-96,800	-96,800
		Unobligated balances		-67,300	-67,300
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy	**31,330,984**	**-200,200**	**31,130,784**
		Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		EXPEDITIONARY FORCES			
1106n	010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	503,462	32,900	536,362
		High performance base layers		[4,000]	
		Cold Weather Layering System		[6,000]	
		Portable Tent Lighting System		[8,400]	
		Individual Water Purification System		[4,500]	
		Ultra Light Camouflage Net System		[6,000]	
		Command Post - large tactical shelters		[4,000]	
1106n	020	FIELD LOGISTICS	424,331	5,000	429,331
		Corrosion prevention and control		[5,000]	

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1106n	030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	111,210		111,210
1106n	040	BASE SUPPORT			
		USMC PREPOSITIONING			
1106n	050	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	70,801		70,801
1106n	060	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	5,284		5,284
		BASE SUPPORT			
1106n	070	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	419,418		419,418
1106n	080	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	1,428,003		1,428,003
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**2,962,509**	**37,900**	**3,000,409**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING			
1106n	090	RECRUIT TRAINING	11,581		11,581
1106n	100	OFFICER ACQUISITION	390		390
		BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING			
1106n	110	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	41,130		41,130
1106n	120	FLIGHT TRAINING	187		187
1106n	130	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	16,476		16,476
1106n	140	TRAINING SUPPORT	144,692		144,692

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION			
1106n	150	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	108,883		108,883
1106n	160	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	55,524		55,524
1106n	170	JUNIOR ROTC	17,257		17,257
		BASE SUPPORT			
1106n	180	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	50,810		50,810
1106n	190	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	141,242		141,242
		TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**588,172**		**588,172**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
1106n	200	SPECIAL SUPPORT	255,058		255,058
1106n	210	SERVICE-WIDE TRANSPORTATION	24,140		24,140
1106n	220	ADMINISTRATION	34,266		34,266
		CANCELLED ACCOUNT			
1106n	230	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT			
		BASE SUPPORT			
1106n	240	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, AND MODERNIZATION	2,913		2,913

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1106n	250	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	11,904		11,904
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**328,281**		**328,281**
		Military to civilian conversions		-10,000	-10,000
		Unobligated balances		-1,600	-1,600
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	**3,878,962**	**26,300**	**3,905,262**
		Operation and Maintenance, Air Force			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS			
3400f	010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	4,307,850		4,307,850
3400f	020	PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	281,366		281,366
3400f	030	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	603,703		603,703
3400f	040	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,439,196	100	1,439,296
		Joint modular targets and urban CAS site		[100]	
3400f	050	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	1,619,591		1,619,591
3400f	070	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,943,368	900	1,944,268
		F-16 supply chain management DMSMS program		[900]	
3400f	080	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	924,187		924,187
3400f	090	BASE SUPPORT	2,405,434		2,405,434

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS			
3400f	100	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	1,147,409		1,147,409
3400f	110	NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	243,878		243,878
3400f	120	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	610,059		610,059
3400f	130	JCS EXERCISES	29,240		29,240
3400f	140	MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HQ	241,730		241,730
3400f	150	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	350,629		350,629
		SPACE OPERATIONS			
3400f	160	LAUNCH FACILITIES	324,467		324,467
3400f	170	LAUNCH VEHICLES	59,713		59,713
3400f	180	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	255,325		255,325
3400f	190	SATELLITE SYSTEMS	81,845		81,845
3400f	200	OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	320,801	4,500	325,301
		Air Force Space Surveillance System		[4,500]	
3400f	210	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	133,825		133,825
3400f	220	BASE SUPPORT	553,394		553,394
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**17,877,010**	**5,500**	**17,882,510**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
		MOBILITY OPERATIONS			
3400f	230	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,948,518		2,948,518
3400f	240	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	47,313		47,313

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3400f	250	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	204,721		204,721
3400f	260	PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA	7,134		7,134
3400f	270	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	311,703		311,703
3400f	280	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	179,242		179,242
3400f	290	BASE SUPPORT	560,838		560,838
		TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**4,259,469**		**4,259,469**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING			
3400f	300	OFFICER ACQUISITION	81,429		81,429
3400f	310	RECRUIT TRAINING	6,306		6,306
3400f	320	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	95,282		95,282
3400f	330	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	43,461		43,461
3400f	340	BASE SUPPORT	75,354		75,354
		BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING			
3400f	350	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	351,352		351,352
3400f	360	FLIGHT TRAINING	836,910		836,910
3400f	370	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	175,225		175,225
3400f	380	TRAINING SUPPORT	89,025		89,025
3400f	390	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	12,558		12,558
3400f	400	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	134,126		134,126
3400f	410	BASE SUPPORT	590,856		590,856

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION			
3400f	420	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	133,600		133,600
3400f	430	EXAMINING	3,713		3,713
3400f	440	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	192,847	8,000	200,847
		Tuition assistance		[8,000]	
3400f	450	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	115,394		115,394
3400f	460	JUNIOR ROTC	60,380		60,380
		TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**2,997,818**	**8,000**	**3,005,818**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		LOGISTICS OPERATIONS			
3400f	470	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	892,899		892,899
3400f	480	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	629,064		629,064
3400f	490	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	176,222		176,222
3400f	500	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	47,817		47,817
3400f	510	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	252,911		252,911
3400f	520	BASE SUPPORT	993,307		993,307
		SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
3400f	530	ADMINISTRATION	254,311		254,311
3400f	540	SERVICE-WIDE COMMUNICATIONS	510,987		510,987
3400f	550	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	222,416		222,416

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3400f	560	ARMS CONTROL	49,933		49,933
3400f	570	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	280,473		280,473
3400f	580	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	37,775		37,775
3400f	590	CIVIL AIR PATROL	21,087		21,087
3400f	600	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	16,267		16,267
3400f	610	BASE SUPPORT	325,670		325,670
		SECURITY PROGRAMS			
3400f	620	SECURITY PROGRAMS	1,478,190		1,478,190
		SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS			
3400f	630	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	18,681		18,681
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**6,208,010**		**6,208,010**
		Interoperable communications		10,000	10,000
		NCR operational enhancements		3,500	3,500
		Consequence management		3,800	3,800
		Military to civilian conversions		-50,000	-50,000
		Unobligated balances		-75,000	-75,000
		National security space institute		3,000	3,000
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	**31,342,307**	**-91,200**	**31,251,107**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
0100d	010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	582,003	9,500	591,503
		Gamma Radiation Detection System		[9,500]	
0100d	020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	2,852,620		2,852,620
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	**3,434,623**		**3,444,123**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
0100d	030	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	104,671		104,671
		RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION			
0100d	040	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	85,131		85,131
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	**189,802**		**189,802**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
0100d	050	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	150,329		150,329

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0100d	060	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	106,503		106,503
0100d	090	DEFENSE BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY	179,255		179,255
0100d	100	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	391,949		391,949
0100d	110	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	452		452
0100d	120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	998,618		998,618
0100d	140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES	35,538		35,538
0100d	150	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	297,502	30,000	327,502
		Meals ready to eat war reserve stockpile		[30,000]	
0100d	160	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	16,191		16,191
0100d	170	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY AGENCY	21,899		21,899
0100d	180	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	314,555		314,555
0100d	190	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY	1,728,851	1,500	1,730,351
		Early childhood education pilot projects		[1,500]	
0100d	200	DOD HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	374,352		374,352
0100d	210	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,040,297		1,040,297
0100d	220	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	140,472		140,472
0100d	230	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	287,059		287,059
0100d	250	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	73,021		73,021
0100d	260	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	748,368	31,000	779,368
		Conservation buffer zones		[30,000]	
		Information assurance scholarships		[3,000]	
		Militarily critical technologies program (Transfer to RDDW 122)		[-2,000]	
0100d	270	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE	466,961		466,961

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		OTHER PROGRAMS			
0100d	999	OTHER PROGRAMS	9,079,059		9,079,059
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	**16,451,231**	**62,500**	**16,513,731**
		Armed Forces medical and food research		2,200	2,200
		OEF/OIF commemoration funding		20,000	20,000
		Institute for National Security Analysis		1,000	1,000
		Military to civilian conversions		-10,000	-10,000
		Unobligated balances		-54,100	-54,100
		Impact Aid		30,000	30,000
		Impact Aid for children with severe disabilities		5,000	5,000
		DLA WCF excess balances		-50,000	-50,000
		Citizen soldier support program		5,000	5,000
		Special assistance to local education agencies		10,000	10,000
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	**20,075,656**	**31,100**	**20,106,756**
		Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		LAND FORCES			
2080a	010	DIVISIONS	29,104		29,104
2080a	020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	20,498		20,498

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2080a	030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	288,426		288,426
2080a	040	EAC SUPPORT FORCES	190,481		190,481
2080a	050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	443,161		443,161
		LAND FORCES READINESS			
2080a	060	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	187,781		187,781
2080a	070	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	90,397		90,397
2080a	080	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	131,485		131,485
		LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
2080a	090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	528,256		528,256
2080a	100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	215,890		215,890
2080a	110	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	8,504		8,504
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**2,133,983**		**2,133,983**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
2080a	120	ADMINISTRATION	60,096		60,096
2080a	130	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	8,852		8,852
2080a	140	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	7,642		7,642
2080a	150	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	88,629		88,629
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**165,219**		**165,219**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		Unexplained budget growth		-125,800	-125,800
		Cost avoidance for mobilized miltechs		-33,700	-33,700
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	**2,299,202**	**-159,500**	**2,139,702**
		Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS			
1806n	010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	591,126		591,126
1806n	020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	16,969		16,969
1806n	030	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	2,090		2,090
1806n	040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	132,570		132,570
1806n	050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	387		387
		SHIP OPERATIONS			
1806n	060	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	63,574		63,574
1806n	070	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	554		554
1806n	080	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	69,215		69,215
1806n	090	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	537		537
		COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT			
1806n	100	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	10,705		10,705

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1806n	110	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	112,300		112,300
		WEAPONS SUPPORT			
1806n	120	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,861		5,861
		BASE SUPPORT			
1806n	130	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	105,813		105,813
1806n	140	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	52,136		52,136
1806n	150	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	101,524		101,524
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**1,265,361**		**1,265,361**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
1806n	160	ADMINISTRATION	4,712		4,712
1806n	170	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	7,828		7,828
1806n	180	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	5,392		5,392
1806n	190	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	5,074		5,074
		CANCELLED ACCOUNTS			
1806n	210	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		OTHER PROGRAMS			
1806n	999	OTHER PROGRAMS	397		397
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**23,006**		**23,006**
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	**1,288,764**		**1,288,764**
		Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		EXPEDITIONARY FORCES			
1107n	010	OPERATING FORCES	58,038		58,038
1107n	020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	13,714		13,714
1107n	030	TRAINING SUPPORT	23,930		23,930
		BASE SUPPORT			
1107n	040	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	9,579		9,579
1107n	050	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	72,971		72,971
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**178,232**		**178,232**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
1107n	060	SPECIAL SUPPORT	12,158		12,158
1107n	070	SERVICE-WIDE TRANSPORTATION	814		814
1107n	080	ADMINISTRATION	8,087		8,087
1107n	090	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,091		8,091
		BASE SUPPORT			
1107n	100	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,529		4,529
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**33,679**		**33,679**
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	**211,911**		**211,911**
		Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS			
3740f	010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,798,478		1,798,478
3740f	020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	89,340		89,340
3740f	030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	373,336		373,336
3740f	040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	59,849		59,849

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
3740f	050	BASE SUPPORT	288,560		288,560
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**2,609,563**		**2,609,563**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
3740f	060	ADMINISTRATION	67,419		67,419
3740f	070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	18,204		18,204
3740f	080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	21,712		21,712
3740f	090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,236		6,236
3740f	100	AUDIOVISUAL	666		666
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**114,237**		**114,237**
		Training, test and ferry flying hours		-48,000	-48,000
		Cost avoidance for mobilized miltechs		-100,700	-100,700
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	**2,723,800**	**-148,700**	**2,575,100**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		LAND FORCES			
2065a	010	DIVISIONS	598,935		598,935
2065a	020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	560,370		560,370
2065a	030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	373,045	11,500	384,545
		Battlefield mobility enhancers (M-Gators)		[11,500]	
2065a	040	EAC SUPPORT FORCES	642,935		642,935
2065a	050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	26,884		26,884
		LAND FORCES READINESS			
2065a	060	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	225,770		225,770
2065a	070	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	129,371		129,371
2065a	080	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	351,832		351,832
		LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
2065a	090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	631,832		631,832
2065a	100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	387,882		387,882
2065a	110	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	466,837		466,837

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
2065a	120	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	74,500	3,000	77,500
		Operator driving simulator		[3,000]	
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**4,470,193**	**14,500**	**4,484,693**
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
2065a	130	ADMINISTRATION	133,881		133,881
2065a	140	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	54,663		54,663
2065a	150	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	53,197		53,197
2065a	160	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	126,731		126,731
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**368,472**		**368,472**
		WMD CST sustainment training and evaluation program		8,500	8,500
		WMD CST equipment upgrades		5,000	5,000
		Pilot program on reintegration into civilian life after deployment		6,663	6,663
		Cost avoidance for mobilized miltechs		-15,600	-15,600
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	**4,838,665**	**19,063**	**4,857,728**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS			
3840f	010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,434,443		3,434,443
3840f	020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	512,771	6,200	518,971
		Warrior skills and convoy trainer		[6,200]	
3840f	030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	602,590		602,590
3840f	040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	255,322		255,322
3840f	050	BASE SUPPORT	491,218		491,218
		TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**5,296,344**	**6,200**	**5,302,544**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
3840f	060	ADMINISTRATION	29,661		29,661
3840f	070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	10,012		10,012
		TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**39,673**		**39,673**
		Cost avoidance for mobilized miltechs		-23,500	-23,500
		Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	**5,336,017**	**-17,300**	**5,318,717**
		TRANSFER ACCOUNTS			
0810a	010	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND, ARMY	413,794	50,000	463,794
		Clean up of UXO at BRAC sites		[50,000]	
0810n	020	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND, NAVY	304,409		304,409
0810f	030	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND, AIR FORCE	423,871		423,871
0810d	040	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND, DEFENSE	18,431		18,431
0811d	050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	242,790	40,000	282,790
		Increased funding		[40,000]	
		TOTAL, O&M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS	**1,403,295**	**90,000**	**1,493,295**

Title III - Operation and Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	Program Title	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
0104d	060	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	11,721		11,721
0838d	070	SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS			
0118d	080	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	10,000		10,000
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	63,204		63,204
1236d	180	KAHO'OLAWE			
0134d	190	FORMER SOVIET UNION (FSU) THREAT REDUCTION	372,128		372,128
		TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS	**457,053**		**457,053**
		TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:	**130,088,996**	**-557,237**	**129,531,759**

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

Limitation on availability of funds for the Army Logistics Modernization Program (sec. 311)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the expenditure of any funds for continuing the Army Logistics Modernization Program (LMP), other than $6.9 million in operation and maintenance funds, until the Deputy Secretary of Defense certifies that the program has adequately addressed its many shortcomings. The budget request included $109.5 million for the development, fielding, and operation of the Army LMP. Costs have doubled over the past 2 years in a program that was initially designed in 1999 as a fixed-price contract. The fiscal year 2007 funds represent just a fraction of the total funds now required. Since contract award in 1999, the program has fallen behind schedule by years, and only a fraction of logistics community is currently being served by the LMP.

In a 2005 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, entitled "Army Depot Maintenance: Ineffective Oversight of Army Depot Operations," the GAO indicated that Tobyhanna Army Depot's experience with the LMP—the only Army depot to have implemented LMP—is troubling. The GAO concluded that the Tobyhanna Army Depot still lacks financial and management reports required for depot operations. The system inefficiently causes orders of excess materials to be made. There is no depot level repairable process in LMP, and the lack of on-site support by the LMP contractor is causing delays in fixing systems problems.

Legacy systems, which currently handle the majority of transactions within the logistics community, are annually under resourced while awaiting the implementation of the LMP solution. Additionally, other promising logistics transformation programs, such as Product Lifecycle Management (PLM+), remain under funded due to scarce resources for information technology transformation. The committee expects that the Chairman of the Defense Business Systems Management Committee will review the requirements for, and performance of, the LMP as part of the larger logistics modernization efforts underway within the Army and the Department of Defense. Only after the Chairman certifies that continuing the LMP is in the best interests of the Army, the Department, and the taxpayer, may the Army expend any fiscal year 2007 funds on the Army LMP.

Availability of funds for exhibits for the national museums of the Armed Forces (sec. 312)

The committee recommends a provision that would make $3.0 million of Operations and Maintenance appropriated to each armed force available to each Secretary of a military department for education and training purposes to contract with the entity established to support the official national museum for each armed force. The funds would be available for the acquisition, installation, and maintenance of exhibits in each museum. This provision would also authorize the Secretary of each military department to accept amounts as reimbursement from the entity and to credit those re-

imbursements to the account used to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary.

Limitation on financial management improvement and audit initiatives within the Department of Defense (sec. 313)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Department of Defense from obligating or expending any funds for financial management improvement activities related to the Department's preparation, processing, or auditing of financial statements until the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a determination that each activity proposed to be funded would likely result in real and sustainable improvements in the Department's financial management systems and controls.

The committee believes that the most effective way to fix the Department's financial management problems is to address the root problems by fixing the Department's business systems and processes so that they provide timely, reliable, and complete data for management purposes. By requiring that the Department pursue audit activities only in accordance with a comprehensive financial management improvement plan that coordinates such activities with needed systems improvements, the provision would ensure that the Department first addresses the underlying problems with its systems and processes.

Limitation on availability of operation and maintenance funds for the management headquarters of the Defense Information Systems Agency (sec. 314)

The committee recommends a provision that would make available only 50 percent of the operation and maintenance funding for the management headquarters function of the Defense Information Management Agency until the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress the report on an acquisition strategy for commercial satellite communication services, as required by section 818(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–136; 119 Stat. 3385).

In April 2006, the Under Secretary of the Air Force testified before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services that the Department of Defense "depends on a vast network of commercial ground and space-based systems to meet its telecommunications needs." The Under Secretary also stated that "commercial satellite communications is a large part of the space communication system that supports the warfighter." The Under Secretary further indicated that commercial satellite services will be "an integrated part of our communications architecture going forward." This testimony reinforces the previous view of this committee that the Department of Defense requires a strategic approach for acquiring commercial satellite services that aggregates purchases and leverages the purchasing power of the Department, including through the use of multiyear contracting, if appropriate.

Subtitle C—Environmental Provisions

Response plan for remediation of military munitions (sec. 331)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense to set remediation goals for the clean up of unexploded ordnance, discarded military munitions, and munitions constituents. Those goals would be to complete, by not later than September 30, 2007, preliminary assessments at all active installations and formerly used defense sites; to complete, by not later than September 30, 2010, site inspections at all active installations and formerly used defense sites; to achieve, by not later than September 30, 2009, a remedy in place or response complete at all military installations closed or realigned as part of a round of defense base closure and realignment prior to 2005; and to achieve, by a time certain established by the Secretary of Defense, a remedy in place or response complete at all active installations and formerly used defense sites (other than operational ranges) and all military installations realigned or closed under the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment.

The provision would require the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees a comprehensive plan for addressing the remediation of unexploded ordnance by March 1, 2007. The plan would include a schedule, including interim goals, and an estimate of funding required, for achieving the goals for remediation of unexploded ordnance at all active installations and formerly used defense sites (other than operational ranges). The Secretary would be required to update this plan not later than March 15 of 2008, 2009, and 2010. The provision would allow the goals established for unexploded ordnance clean up to be adjusted to respond to unforeseen circumstances as part of the annual update of the plan.

The provision would also require the Secretary to submit a report, to the congressional defense committees, not later than March 1, 2007, on the status of efforts to achieve agreement with relevant regulatory agencies on appropriate reuse standards or principles related to the remediation of unexploded ordnance, discarded military munitions, and munitions constituents.

Extension of authority to grant exemptions to certain requirements (sec. 332)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to grant an exemption for up to 3 years to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to transport polychlorinated biphenyls generated by, or under the control of, the Department of Defense into the United States for purposes of their disposal, treatment, or storage. The current period of such waivers is 1 year. This limited expansion of the period in which an exemption may be granted would expire on September 30, 2012, but would not effect the validity of any exemption that had been granted prior to that date. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to report by no later than March 1, 2011, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of

Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, on the remaining volume of polychlorinated biphenyls that may require transportation into the United States for disposal, treatment, or storage, and the efforts made by the Department and other federal agencies to reduce such volume.

The committee notes that the proposed expansion of the waiver period that may be granted to the Secretary of Defense or the Secretaries of the military departments from 1 to 3 years would not change the public notice and comment process required before the Administrator of the EPA is authorized to grant such a waiver.

The committee expects the Department to conduct appropriate planning to provide for the safe, orderly, and predictable storage, disposal, and shipment of polychlorinated biphenyls generated outside the United States by, or under the control of, the Department. The committee does not intend that the expansion of the waiver period from 1 to 3 years, as recommended by this provision, serve as a substitute for such long-term planning.

Research on effects of ocean disposal of munitions (sec. 333)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and the heads of other relevant federal agencies, to conduct a historical review of available records to determine the number, size, and probable locations of sites where the armed forces disposed of military munitions in U.S. coastal waters. The Secretary of Defense would be required to periodically, but no less often than annually, submit interim reports to Congress with the updated results of the historical review. The Secretary of Defense would be required to complete the historical review and submit the final report of the findings as part of the annual report to Congress on environmental restoration activities for fiscal year 2009.

The Secretary of Defense would be required to provide information to the Secretary of Commerce to assist NOAA in preparing nautical charts and other navigation materials for coastal waters that identify hazards posed by disposed military munitions to private activities, including commercial shipping and fishing operations. The Secretary of Defense would be required to continue activities to inform potentially affected users of the ocean environment of the possible hazards from contact with disposed military munitions and the proper methods to mitigate such hazards.

The Secretary of Defense would be required to continue to conduct research on the effects on the ocean environment and those who use it of military munitions disposed of in coastal waters. The scope of research would be required to include sampling and analysis of ocean waters and sea beds at or adjacent to representative disposal sites to determine whether the munitions have caused, or are causing, contamination of ocean waters or sea beds; investigation into the long-term effects of seawater exposure on disposed military munitions; investigation into the impacts on the ocean environment, including the public health risks; investigation into the

feasibility of removing or otherwise remediating the military munitions; and the development of effective safety measures. In conducting the research, the Secretary of Defense would be required to ensure that the sampling, analysis, and investigations are conducted at representative sites, taking into account depth, water temperature, nature of the military munitions, and relative proximity to onshore populations. At least two sites in areas off the Atlantic coast, the Pacific coast (including Alaska), and the Hawaiian Islands would be required among the representative sites.

If the historical review or the required research indicates that contamination is being released at a particular site, or that the site poses significant risk to public health or safety, the Secretary of Defense would be required to institute appropriate monitoring mechanisms at the site, and report to the congressional defense committees on any additional steps that may be needed to address the release or the risk to public health or safety.

Clarification of multi-year authority to use base closure funds to fund cooperative agreements under Environmental Restoration Program (sec. 334)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that cooperative agreements with eligible entities for environmental restoration at defense facilities may extend beyond 2 years when the agreements are funded out of either the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 or the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005. The committee notes that under section 2701 of title 10, United States Code, cross-fiscal year agreements for environmental restoration are limited to 2 years. The committee also notes that, for facilities closed or realigned under a round of base closure, environmental restoration is funded out of the base closure account until the account is exhausted. Funds in a base closure account do not expire annually, but continue to be available until the base closure account is exhausted. This provision would clarify that agreements for environmental restoration that are funded from base closure accounts may extend beyond the 2-year limitation that would otherwise apply.

Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for certain costs in connection with Moses Lake Wellfield Superfund Site, Moses Lake, Washington (sec. 335)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide discretionary authority to the Secretary of Defense to transfer not more than $111,114.03 to the Moses Lake Wellfield Superfund Site, 10–6J special account, formerly the home of Larson Air Force Base. This payment would be for reimbursement to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for costs incurred in overseeing a remedial investigation and feasibility study being performed by the Department of Defense at the former Larson Air Force Base.

Subtitle D—Reports

Comptroller General report on readiness of the ground forces of the Army and the Marine Corps (sec. 351)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to provide an assessment of the readiness of Army and Marine Corps ground forces. The GAO assessment would include: (1) An analysis of the current readiness status of the active and Reserve component ground forces of the Army and the Marine Corps, including a description of any major deficiencies identified, an analysis of the trends in Army and Marine Corps readiness over the past ten years, and a comparison of the current readiness status of those forces to these historical readiness patterns; (2) an assessment of the ability of the Army and Marine Corps to provide trained and ready forces for ongoing operations as well as their other worldwide commitments; (3) an analysis of the availability of equipment for training by units in the United States in configurations comparable to that being used in ongoing operations; (4) an analysis of the current and projected "reset" requirement for repair or replacement of equipment due to ongoing operations and the impact of that required maintenance on the availability of equipment for training; (5) an assessment of the current personnel tempo of those forces, including an analysis of particular occupational specialties that are experiencing unusually high or low deployment rates and the retention rates in those specialties; (6) an assessment of each service's efforts to mitigate the impact of high operational tempos, including cross-leveling of personnel and equipment or cross-training of personnel or units; and (7) a description of the current policy being used by each service to govern the mobilization of Reserve component personnel and an analysis of the number of Reserve component personnel in each service that are projected to be available for deployment under those policies.

U.S. forces are engaged at extremely high levels at home and abroad. In particular, ongoing operational commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan are requiring significant deployments by and a high operational tempo of U.S. ground forces. These units must fulfill these deployment requirements in addition to other demands including the ongoing and impending redeployment of forces from overseas locations and the conversion of Army brigades to a new modular configuration. In addition to the impact on individual service members and their families, the committee is concerned about the impact of sustained high operational tempo due to ongoing operations on the readiness of our forces and their ability to respond to other events or threats. On March 15, 2006, the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support held a hearing on the readiness of our ground forces with Army and Marine Corps representatives. This hearing identified a number of readiness challenges and the steps being taken to address those concerns.

The committee also notes that the GAO has already undertaken an analysis of some of these issues, and expects the report required by this provision to build on the work GAO has already provided to the committee. While detailed information on readiness is classified, the issues being assessed in this report are of enormous im-

portance 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 may be provided separately, as long as all the required elements are submitted before March 1, 2007, and the information used to satisfy the reporting requirement is current.

Subtitle E—Workplace and Depot Issues

Minimum capital investment levels for public depots serviced by working capital funds (sec. 361)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a public depot that utilizes a working capital fund to invest, at a minimum, 6 percent of the actual total revenues from the previous year for capital investment within that depot, as defined by DOD financial regulations (DOD Financial Management Regulation 700.14R of June 2004). The Secretary of Defense would have authority to grant a waiver to a service if that minimum is not met, but then must report to the congressional defense committees the reason(s) for missing the goal, and a plan to return to the stipulated minimum level.

Department of Defense working capital funds are designed to provide flexibility, accountability, and visibility for critical defense customers and process owners. Within public depots, these funds are used to meet customer needs, operate the depots, and maintain the depot facilities. While the working capital fund mechanism may provide a stable work flow and funding stream, there have also been adverse consequences of under investment in depot infrastructure, equipment, information technology, and software.

While focusing on keeping overhead costs down, working capital funds have chronically under funded capital investment. The Department has no established baseline or benchmark from which to evaluate the level of investment funding in its public depots. Further, each military department has stated that oversight of capital investment programs tends to reduce the level of funding during budget deliberations, not enhance it. For example, in 2002, the Air Force recognized that their public depots were suffering from chronic under funding of its capital budgets. The Air Force responded by establishing a Depot Maintenance Strategy and Master Plan. One of the central components was the commitment of the Air Force to allocate $150.0 million each fiscal year for 6 years, beginning in fiscal year 2004, for recapitalization and investment, including the procurement of technologically advanced facilities and equipment, of the nation's three Air Force depots. The key facet of the Air Force strategy was to double the amount of investment, raising investment spending to 6 percent of total revenues—a documented private depot industry benchmark.

Even while attempting to address the problem of chronic under funding, the Air Force plan only goes through 2009. Further, that plan falls short of the benchmark of 6 percent because the Air Force uses low future revenue estimates from which to determine their benchmark figure and includes funding for basic property

maintenance as part of its calculation of capital investment—funding that is not defined as capital investment.

The committee expects that this provision will address the chronic under funding of capital investment in public depots serviced by working capital funds. The committee further expects the Air Force to fully fund the projects identified in its 6 year capital investment plan.

Permanent exclusion of certain contract expenditures from percentage limitation on the performance of depot-level maintenance (sec. 362)

The committee recommends a provision that would make permanent the exclusion of work performed by non-federal personnel at designated Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence from the 50 percent limitation on contracting for depot maintenance (10 U.S.C. 2466(a)) outside the Department of Defense, pursuant to a public-private partnership. Currently the exemption is limited to funds made available in fiscal years 2003 through 2009.

Additional exception to prohibition on contractor performance of firefighting functions (sec. 363)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide an exception to the prohibition on contracting for the performance of firefighting functions on any military installation or facility. This exception would only apply to contractor performance of firefighting functions to respond to nonstructural fires that occur on wildlands, such as ranges and forests, located on military installations, and to conduct preventative measures such as maintenance of firebreaks, and removal of underbrush.

This provision would reduce or eliminate the reliance on members of the armed forces to respond to such fires, and permit needed supplementation of the civilian workforce for wildland firefighting. Other federal agencies with land management responsibilities, such as the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, have the authority provided for in this provision.

Temporary security guard services for certain work caused by realignment of military installations under the base closure laws (sec. 364)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow a military department to contract for security-guard services at installations being realigned, for a period not to exceed 1 year, to safely relocate munitions and associated equipment as well as high-value items located in temporary storage areas.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Recycling of military munitions (sec. 371)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to establish a separate program to sell recyclable munitions materials resulting from the demilitarization of conventional military munitions in the United States and its possessions. This program would be exempt from the provisions of title 40, United States Code, relating to the disposal of property by exec-

utive agencies. The recyclable munitions material would include materials such as brass, scrap metal, propellants, and explosives. The proceeds from sales would be credited to the funds available to the Army for reclamation, recycling, and reuse of conventional military munitions. This process would be consistent with the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) and its implementing regulations. This section would assist the Army in addressing the increasing costs associated with its conventional munitions demilitarization program.

Incentives clauses in chemical demilitarization contracts (sec. 372)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of Defense authority to include an incentives clause in any contract for the destruction of the U.S. stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in order to accelerate the safe elimination of the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile and to reduce the total cost of the chemical demilitarization program by affording the contractor an opportunity to share in the life cycle cost savings that the U.S. government would realize by early completion of destruction operations and facility closure. The provision would limit the amount of incentive payments at each facility to $110.0 million for completion of destruction operations within the specified target incentive range, and to $55.0 million for completion of facility closure activities within the specified target incentive range. The provision would require that this authority be exercised consistent with the Secretary's obligation under law to provide for maximum protection for the environment, the general public, and the personnel who are involved in the destruction of the lethal chemical agents and munitions. The authority to include an incentives clause in a contract would be subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose.

The committee notes that this authority is intended to be available for all elements of the chemical demilitarization program, including the Chemical Stockpile Disposal Project, the Alternative Technologies and Approaches Project, and the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternative Program.

The committee notes its deep disappointment in the notification from the Secretary dated April 10, 2006, that the United States will not be able to meet the Chemical Weapons Convention extended destruction deadline of April 29, 2012, for the complete destruction of the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile. The committee notes the Secretary's commitment in the notification that "The Department will continue working diligently to minimize the time to complete destruction without sacrificing safety and security. We will also continue requesting resources needed to complete destruction as close to April 2012 as practicable." The committee strongly concurs in those sentiments and expects the Department to live up to them. The committee is providing the authority in this provision to give the Department the authority it has said it needs to incentivize the chemical demilitarization contractors to expedite their work in a safe manner. The committee urges the Department to continue to request the resources and authorities needed to redouble the Department's efforts to meet the Treaty's deadlines or,

failing that, to come as close to them as possible. It is imperative that the international community understand that the United States is doing everything in its power to honor its international commitments and comply with this critical Treaty obligation.

Extension of Department of Defense telecommunications benefit program (sec. 373)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the termination date for the Department of Defense telecommunications benefit authorized in section 344 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), as amended by the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), from September 30, 2006, to 60 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense determines that a contingency operation has ended. The provision would authorize the Secretary to extend the Department telecommunications benefit to members who remain hospitalized as a result of wounds or injuries incurred while serving in direct support of a contingency operation, or after the benefit would have expired as a result of the end of a contingency operation.

The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on implementation of the Department of Defense telecommunications benefit 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The committee is eager to be informed on the total implementation of the telecommunications benefit for members serving in support of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, including the cost of implementation and donations received from public and private entities in support of this benefit. In addition, the committee seeks recommendations from the Department concerning additional policy, program, or legislative changes that are needed to improve the value of the telecommunications benefit for members of the armed services serving in support of a contingency operation.

Extension of availability of funds for commemoration of success of the Armed Forces in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom (sec. 374)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 378(b)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) to extend the authority for commemoration of success of the armed forces in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom through fiscal year 2007. The provision would authorize the use in fiscal years 2006 and 2007 of up to $20.0 million to cover costs associated with the participation of members and units of the armed forces in activities associated with the commemoration and a day of celebration honoring soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who have served in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom and have returned to the United States.

Budget Items—Other Defense Programs

Chronic pain management research

The budget request included no funding for expansion of research on chronic pain and fatigue management. The committee believes that research being conducted under the auspices of the United States Army Medical Research and Materiel Command is contributing to better understanding of post-deployment conditions characterized by "chronic, multi-symptom illness." The committee believes that by focusing on the internal mechanisms of the body which experience such symptoms, this research will contribute to more effective treatment of post-deployment related illnesses, including Gulf War Illness and fibromyalgia. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in Defense Health Program for research and development for chronic pain management.

Defense Health Program unobligated balances and administrative efficiencies

The budget request included $20.2 billion in the Defense Health Program. The committee is concerned that the request does not accurately reflect the true costs of the health program for fiscal year 2007. The Department of Defense has consistently under executed its operation and maintenance authorization and appropriation for the Defense Health Program. According to the Government Accountability Office, the Department returned an annual average of $174.3 million in unexpended Defense Health Program account balances to the U. S. Treasury for fiscal years 1996 through 2000. The annual average amount of unobligated balances grew to $280.6 million for fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

The committee is also concerned that the President's budget for fiscal year 2007 does not sufficiently identify costs attributable to the expense of administration of the Defense Health Program. In contrast to private sector trends in health cost containment, the request does not set forth specific performance measures related to reducing health care administrative and overhead costs. The committee directs that in the future, as part of its budget justification submission, the Secretary of Defense will provide the costs of administration of the Defense Health Program, including headquarters support, and provide goals for reducing those costs. Management controls also need to be instituted to reduce the amount of unobligated balances returned to the U.S. Treasury through a more careful assessment of Department health care costs.

In the course of the committee's consideration of Department proposals for modification of health care benefits in fiscal year 2007, health care experts have identified numerous opportunities for achieving administrative efficiencies that are consistent with good business practices. The Department has acknowledged that such opportunities exist, and the committee believes that it should proceed to implement them. The committee recommends a decrease of $140.3 million in the Defense Health Program.

Medical education and training on Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder

The budget request included $460.1 million in the Defense Health Program for education and training. The committee believes that additional educational resources are needed to increase dissemination of information and teaching of Department of Defense health care personnel to identify and treat Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and related mental health conditions. Mental health experts agree that mental health concerns most frequently manifest months after experiencing combat or deployment related trauma. The committee is concerned that as military members are reintegrated into the force, failure to identify combat-related mental health concerns will undermine the health of the member and readiness of the force. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in the Defense Health Program for expanded education and training on Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Pregnancy recovery education program for military women and military spouses

The budget included no funding for a focused pregnancy recovery education project for military women and military spouses. The committee believes that there is a need for additional research and educational resources to assist both women on active duty and the female spouses of members on active duty in their physical recovery following the birth of a child, in order to minimize the risk of untreated illness due to the rigors of military duty, including deployment and isolation from family members. The committee believes that such additional research and education efforts on will be most effective if carried out in conjunction with the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, and that data gathering and testing of educational materials should be conducted on at least two large military installations experiencing a high level of deployment. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million to the Defense Health Program for the pregnancy recovery education program for military women and military spouses.

Primary care enhancement for early detection and treatment of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder

The budget request included no additional funding for an initiative to improve post-deployment mental health care for military members. The committee believes that a project initiated at Ft. Bragg, North Carolina by the Walter Reed Army Medical Center Deployment Health Clinical Center, known as RESPECT–MIL, is contributing to the development of educational materials and care models needed to enhance the capability of primary care providers to conduct post-deployment mental health evaluations, and to identify and treat Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and related mental health disorders. The committee believes that broader testing and evaluation of these models involving primary care and mental health care specialists is needed, and that ultimately effective primary care models for early identification and treatment of PTSD and related mental health disorders should be available throughout the military health system. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in Defense Health Program for expan-

sion of the RESPECT–MIL model to two additional military installations.

Robotic surgery for prostate cancer

The budget request included $381.1 million in Defense Health Program (DHP) for medical equipment replacement and modernization, but included no funding for advanced technology robotic surgery capability at Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland. Robotic surgical devices use technology to allow the surgeon to operate in a minimally invasive manner with great precision. The committee believes that capability for procedures such as the da Vinci Prostatectomy, which utilizes a four-armed robotic device, will improve health outcomes for military victims of prostate cancer and also contribute to the development of robotic surgical techniques for potential new applications, including cardiac surgery. The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in DHP for expansion of robotic surgery capability.

Budget Items—Army

Battlefield mobility enhancers

The budget request included no funding for lightweight tactical utility vehicles (M-Gators). The committee recommends an increase of $6.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army, for lightweight tactical utility vehicles. The committee supports efforts by the Army to improve battlefield mobility and resupply.

UH–60 add-on armor

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for UH–60 add-on armor. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in OMA to acquire UH–60 add-on armor for the 82nd Airborne Division.

Rapid Data Management System

The budget request included no funding for the Rapid Data Management System (RDMS). This program would expand a capability for collecting and disseminating critical information to personnel deployed in the U.S. Southern Command (USSOUTHCOM). It provides a web-based common operating picture that is used for planning and operations, to include disaster and humanitarian relief and stability and reconstruction operations. The committee recommends an increase of $2.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army for the Rapid Data Management System for the USSOUTHCOM.

Cognitive Air Defense Simulators

The budget request included no funding for Cognitive Air Defense Simulators (CADS). This system would improve home station training for soldiers for calling for air defense. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army, for CADS.

Army corrosion prevention and control

The budget request included $415.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for logistics support activities. The committee recommends an increase of $5.2 million in OMA for corrosion prevention and control.

Blood bag transport modernization project

The budget request included no funding for modernizing the transport of blood on the battlefield. The committee recommends an increase of $17.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army, for the blood bag transport modernization project.

Quadruple specialty containers

The budget request included $197.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for strategic mobilization. The committee notes that the Army deploys quadruple specialty containers (QUADCONS) at key power projection platforms for early deploying units. This equipment has been particularly well used in support of ongoing contingency operations. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in OMA for QUADCONS.

Army Strategic Management System

The budget request included $6.1 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for the Army Strategic Management System (SMS). The SMS provides senior leadership with an Army enterprise-wide strategic performance management system that ensures Army Transformation Strategy is translated into actionable programs and initiatives and communicated throughout its component headquarters. The system also provides an automated format for assessing performance and managing resource allocation for attainment of the Army's strategic objectives. Finally, the SMS meets the 2002 DoD Management Initiative Decision 901, Performance Outcomes and Tracking Performance Results, which required the Army to use the Balanced Scorecard methodology in support of the President's Performance Management Agenda.

The committee is encouraged by the Army's use of a strategic performance management system and the improvements in the technology supporting that system, but is concerned that the Army is not fully funding the requirements of the program. Therefore, the committee directs that the Army move forward with accelerated implementation of the program, and that, of the funds available in Operation and Maintenance, Army, $30.0 million may be made available to accelerate the full enterprise-wide implementation of the Army Strategic Management System.

Aviation and Missile Life Cycle Management Command Integrated Digital Environment pilot program

The budget request included $453.4 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for Central Supply Activities. The committee notes the utility of electronic business (e-business) portals in weapon systems product life cycle management. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in OMA to allow the Aviation and Missile Life Cycle Management Command Integrated Material Management Center to complete the expansion of the Army avia-

tion fleet logistics management e-business portal. This portal will demonstrate the utility of extending product life cycle management from the program office to the operational user at Ft. Drum, New York. This will allow the integration of acquisition, logistics, and operational communities under the Life Cycle Management Command (LCMC) concept.

In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2007, on the status of the pilot program as well as evaluating the effectiveness of Integrated Digital Environments in achieving the goals of the LCMC concept.

Military to civilian conversions

The committee remains concerned that the Department of Defense has not provided adequate information on the funding requirements and execution data for military to civilian conversions. While the committee recognizes that the military to civilian conversion program is an important tool to alleviate stress on the force by replacing uniformed service members in non-military essential positions with federal civilian or contractor personnel, it remains concerned that budget justification materials do not adequately describe the Department's conversion program, and that the Department lacks a clear methodology for developing its budget estimates.

According to an April 29, 2005, analysis by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Office of the Secretary of Defense and service budget officials acknowledged that they were unable to provide a clear methodology to calculate the Department's budget cost estimates for replacing military positions with civilians in fiscal year 2006. According to the GAO analysis, Department officials also acknowledged that the services had not determined the federal civilian employee and contractor mix for these conversions. The GAO analysis stated: "Without determining this mix, the Department can not be certain whether it accurately estimated its need for staffing resources and the funds to pay for such resources in its fiscal year 2006 budget."

The committee concurred with this assessment in the Fiscal Year 2006 National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). The committee believed that the military to civilian conversions should be reviewed and validated by the Secretary of Defense to ensure that such requirements are formulated in a consistent manner; that there is an availability of qualified civilian employees; and that the mix of Department civilians and contractors be more clearly understood. The Department has yet to respond with adequate justification or methodology.

In the statement of managers to accompanying the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (H. Rept. 109–359), the conferees directed the Department to include comprehensive data on the military to civilian conversion program in future budget justification materials. The conferees directed that the budget materials should include: the number of conversions completed in the two fiscal years prior to the budget request year, the mix of positions filled by civilian contractors or government employees, the number of conversions expected to occur in the budget year, the mix of civilian contractors and government employees expected to

be hired, and a detailed explanation of the cost estimates used in developing the budget request. This information was not provided in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2007 nor was it provided in response to subsequent requests for information.

Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $160.0 million in Department's Operation and Maintenance (O&M) accounts for military to civilian conversions, as follows:

O&M, Army (OMA)—$50.0 million;
O&M, Navy (OMN)—$40.0 million;
O&M, Marine Corps (OMMC)—$10.0 million;
O&M, Air Force (OMAF)—$50.0 million; and
O&M, Defense-wide (OMDW)—$10.0 million.

Working capital funds

The budget request included $2.4 billion in discretionary spending for defense working capital funds. These working capital funds serve a vital role in providing financial transaction flexibility for critical defense customer support activities. When working capital funds produce an annual net operating result involving a surplus—revenues exceeding expenses—consideration should be given to adjusting customer rates in future years. Working capital funds that do not appropriately return surplus funds to the supported departments, commands, and agencies through rate-change mechanisms artificially inflate the cost of support and deprive the supported units of limited resources. In many cases, the global war on terrorism has created increased work flow in and out of working capital funds annually over scheduled peacetime projections.

The committee continues to urge the Department of Defense to anticipate the full amount of increased workload being experienced within the working capital funds and to budget accordingly. While some agencies and services have begun to take these additional revenue and expenses into account, the Army and the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) still plan the next year revenues at only 75 percent of current operations tempo. Consequently, end of year positive operating balances and excess cash balances continue to grow for these working capital funds.

Revenues of the DLA have exceeded expenses for the past 3 years. The DLA had over $539.9 million in excess balances at the end of fiscal year 2005. The DLA plans to use these excess balances in its non-energy supply accounts to supplement planned losses due to higher-than-expected fuel prices in its energy supply accounts. However, the committee believes the two accounts must be managed separately. Any actual losses due to higher-than-expected fuel prices should be managed as they have been in the past—either through increased surcharges on customers, through supplemental emergency appropriations, or accounted for within the overall budget. Allowing one working capital fund to subsidize another leads to inefficient management decision making, and negates the customer-buyer relationship created under a working capital fund. To ensure proper management of the funds, the committee recommends a decrease of $50.0 million in the DLA working capital fund to reduce excess balances within the account.

The current projections of net operating result for fiscal year 2007 for the Army are also based, in part, on artificially low rev-

enue estimates. Since 2002, revenues within the Army Working Capital Fund have risen by billions of dollars each year. However, the current Army plan counterintuitively calls for revenues to fall by $2.0 billion from fiscal years 2006 to 2007. As higher revenues are realized, the Army working capital fund will continue to maintain large, positive operating balances and excess cash balances. To ensure proper management of the funds, the committee recommends a decrease of $50.0 million in the Army working capital fund to reduce excess balances within the account.

Unobligated balances

The Department of Defense has consistently under executed its operation and maintenance (O&M) authorization and appropriation since fiscal year 1995 for the active and Reserve components. According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Department returned an annual average of $976.6 million in unexpended balances to the U.S. Treasury for fiscal years 1996 through 2000. The Department had $750.8 million in average yearly unobligated balances for fiscal years 2001 through 2005. While the trend is improving, the committee remains concerned with the Department's inability to properly manage the funds for which it is authorized and appropriated.

The Department reduced the O&M portion in its fiscal year 2007 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 reduce the fiscal year 2007 amounts fully in accord with the analysis, or as significantly as in the out years. The committee recommends a decrease of $265.6 million in O&M accounts, as follows:

Operation and Maintenance, Army—$67.6 million;
Operation and Maintenance, Navy—$67.3 million;
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps—$1.6 million;
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force—$75.0 million; and
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide—$54.1 million.

Information assurance vulnerability alert cell

The budget request included $957.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for service-wide communications support. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in OMA to complete the establishment of the logistics program manager for the information assurance vulnerability alert cell and to provide information security analysis and response capabilities to protect systems from attack.

Connect and Join

The budget request included no funding for the Connect and Join project. Connect and Join is a secure Internet web portal where families can share information and photographs with a service member during deployment. The committee believes that Connect and Join would significantly enhance the ability of deployed military members to communicate at no cost with family members. Connect and Join supports a need identified by the National Military Family Association report on the "Cycles of Deployment", in which military families expressed a need to expand communication

for deployed members and their families throughout deployments. The committee believes that Connect and Join would be responsive to that need, and in doing so will enhance both soldier and family readiness. The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army, for Connect and Join.

Budget Items—Navy

Long arm high-intensity arc metal halide handheld searchlight

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), for high-intensity handheld searchlights. The committee understands that the Navy uses high-powered handheld lighting to allow safer nighttime operations. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in OMN to acquire high-intensity handheld searchlights.

Man Overboard Identification safety system

The budget request included no funding to procure Man Overboard Identification (MOBI) safety systems. The MOBI system provides devices, which are worn by sailors aboard ship, to allow rescue forces to respond quickly in the event a sailor falls overboard. The committee believes MOBI not only saves lives, but also reduces the time spent searching for sailors who have fallen overboard. The committee recommends an increase of $3.9 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy, for installation and maintenance of MOBI systems.

Mark-45 gun system overhauls

The budget request included $433.9 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), for weapons maintenance. The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in OMN for Mark-45 gun system overhauls.

Navy Marine Corps Intranet program management

The budget request included $1,681.5 million for the Navy Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI) program. Of these funds, the Navy requested $94.0 million for the program management of the contract with Electronic Data Systems (EDS). The requested amount for fiscal year 2007 is over three times the amount requested in fiscal year 2004, and three times the amount budgeted for the future years of the contract from 2008 through 2010. The Navy should better define its program management roles, mission, and budget in future budget justification materials to the Congress. The committee recommends a decrease of $30.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy, for the NMCI program office—to more closely align the 2007 funding level with future years plans.

The committee notes that the Navy recently had to reprogram $74.6 million to settle numerous legal claims between EDS and the Federal Government. The committee is concerned that the flawed development of the NMCI contract led to this additional, unplanned cost. The committee notes that many organizations within the Navy and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, including the Chief Information Officers of both organizations and the Office of

Program Analysis and Evaluation, did not perform adequate oversight and analysis of the details of the contract and its terms. The committee believes that the Department of Defense should examine the development of this contract to derive lessons learned on structuring, managing, and performing adequate oversight for similar information technology programs in the future. Additionally, the NMCI program should remain on the "watch list" of major automated information systems which the Department uses to monitor the progress of such programs.

Despite past difficulties, the committee is encouraged by the recent negotiations between the Navy and EDS. By exercising the 3 year option on the NMCI contract, the Navy expects to realize lower costs per sailor and marine for information technology services. Long-standing disputes surrounding the initial contract, including fees and legacy systems migration, are being remedied.

However, the committee notes that entering the recent renewal negotiation, the Navy was not in the best position to explore all possible options to acquire needed information technology services. The committee has been assured that the modified contract will enable the Navy to acquire the information technology services it requires and be in a more flexible position to adjust how it acquires those services in the future—should it be deemed necessary. With nearly $6.0 billion already spent, and another $3.0 billion expected to be expended over the next 3 years, the Congress will continue its close oversight of this program to ensure that sailors and marines receive world-class information technology services.

Civilian personnel pay in excess of requirements

The budget request included $57.3 billion for civilian personnel pay in fiscal year 2007. Based on an analysis of the services' end strength data for civilian personnel as of April 14, 2006, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) projects that the Navy/Marine Corps' civilian personnel costs are overstated for fiscal year 2007 by $96.8 million. The committee recommends a decrease of $96.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy.

Budget Items—Marine Corps

Acclimate high performance undergarments

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), for acclimate high performance undergarments. The committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps continues to support the initiative to make improvements in form, fit, and function of Marine clothing and accessories. Acclimate high performance undergarments allow Marines to adapt to all environments using one type of undergarment system. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in OMMC for acclimate high performance undergarments.

Cold Weather Layering System

The budget request included no funding for the Cold Weather Layering System (CWLS). The CWLS is part of the Marine Corps' Mountain and Cold Weather Clothing and Equipment Program, which provides lightweight, durable combat clothing, that allows

Marines to operate in all kinds of cold weather environments. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, for the CWLS.

Command Post-Large

The budget request included no funding for upgrading the Marine Corps' Command Post Shelters. The Marine Corps has a requirement for Command Post Shelters that require less manpower, contain more square footage, and are easier to assemble. New shelter technology would eliminate the redundancy involved with having multiple types of shelters, which would provide enhanced support to current and future Command and Control, and Medical Systems. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, for Command Post-Large tactical shelters.

Individual Water Purifier System

The budget request included $2.2 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), for the Individual Water Purifier System. This system enables Marines to gather water from any source and purify it into drinking water that meets EPA standards. It is part of the Marine Corps' Individual Load Bearing Equipment. The committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million in OMMC to procure additional Individual Water Purifier Systems.

Portable tent lighting

The budget request included $2.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), for portable tent lighting. The committee notes that Marine Corps portable tent lighting is electro-magnetic interference hardened to prevent compromising peripheral electronics and computers. Additional funding for portable tent lighting has been included on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' Unfunded Programs List. The committee recommends an increase of $8.4 million in OMMC for portable tent lighting.

Ultra-light Camouflage Net System

The budget request included $26.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), for the Ultra-light Camouflage Net System (ULCANS). The committee notes that ULCANS greatly enhances the ability of combat troops and support units to conceal military target signatures of weapons, vehicles, and semi-permanent positions in situations where natural cover or concealment may be absent or inadequate. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in OMMC for ULCANS.

Marine Corps corrosion prevention and control

The budget request included $10.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), for corrosion prevention and control. The committee notes that Marine Corps equipment is regularly subjected to extreme conditions due to the normal operating locations of many Marine forces. The result is a significant amount of rust and corrosion that, if unattended, can rapidly degrade the operational capability of that equipment. The committee rec-

ommends an increase of $5.0 million in OMMC for the Marine Corps corrosion prevention and control program.

Budget Items—Air Force

Joint Modular Ground Targets and Urban Close Air Support site

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) for ground targets for training at the Bell Fourche Range in South Dakota and the Powder River Training complex in South Dakota and Wyoming. The committee is aware that training at these facilities could enhance training opportunities and reduce costs. Joint Modular Ground Targets (JMGT) are visual and heated targets used for aircrew training. The committee recommends an increase of $0.1 million in OMAF for JMGT and shipping containers, for use as part of the Urban Close Air Support Site at the Bell Fourche Range and Powder River Training complex.

F–16 supply chain management DMSMS program

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), for a F–16 Diminishing Manufacturing and Material Shortages (DMSMS). The committee recommends an increase of $0.9 million in OMAF for a DMSMS proactive program to ensure support to the warfighter throughout the life cycle of the F–16 weapons system.

Air Force space surveillance system

The budget request included $31,342.3 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), but included no funding for space situational awareness. As part of the Space Surveillance Network, the Air Force Space Surveillance System (AFSSS) provides observations of objects in near earth and deep space in support of U.S. Strategic Command's space situational awareness mission. The AFSSS was transferred from the Navy to the Air Force in fiscal year 2004, requiring additional Air Force funding to operate and maintain the system. The committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million in OMAF to support the AFSSS.

Consequence management

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintencance, Air Force (OMAF), account for command and control integration for Joint Task Force Civil Support (JTF–CS) consequence management. JTF–CS msut be capable of providing rapid, standardized, and integrated command and control responses to domestic chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and high-yield explosive (CBRNE) consequence management events.

The Commander, U.S. Northern Command (USNORTHCOM), has identified funding shortfalls for the operations and maintenance of JTF–CS to conduct effective command and control integration in response to consequence management incidents. The Commander, USNORTHCOM, has identified consequence management as one of the highest priorities for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.8 million in OMAF to address this funding shortfall and to support the enhancement of JTF–CS command and control capabilities to respond to consequence management incidents.

Interoperable communications

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), for interoperable communications. U.S. Northern Command requires the capability to effectively communicate with Federal, State, and local governments in order to facilitate support to civil authorites, share information, and provide situational awareness in response to natural or manmade disasters.

The Commander, U.S. Northern Command (USNORTHCOM), identified a funding shortfall for the operations and maintenance of interoperable communications, and has identified interoperable communications as his highest priority for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in OMAF to address this funding shortfall and to provide the interoperable communications capability for USNORTHCOM to effectively communicate with federal, state, and local authorites.

National capital region operational enhancements

The budget request included no funding in the Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), for command and control integration for Joint Force Headquarters National Capital Region (JFHQ–NCR).

The committee notes the Commander, U.S. Northern Command (USNORTHCOM), has identified funding shortfalls for JFHQ–NCR to effectively integrate and disseminate information during natural or manmade disasters and national special security events. The Commander, USNORTHCOM, has identified JFHQ–NCR operational enhancements as one of the highest priorities for additional funding.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in OMAF to address this funding shortfall and to provide the Commander, USNORTHCOM, the capability to enhance JFHQ–NCR situational awareness, as well as their capability to rapidly respond to natural or manmade disasters in the national capital region.

National Security Space Institute

The budget request included $19.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), for space training, education, and professional development, of which $12.0 million is for the National Security Space Institute (NSSI). The committee understands that NSSI is the execution arm of the congressionally-mandated Space Professional Development Program for the Air Force, and is designed to develop and maintain a sufficient cadre of space-qualified personnel to support the Air Force mission in space. The committee believes more should be done to support this critical training mission. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in OMAF for the NSSI to expand the instructor base; accelerate development of advanced space courses; develop a distance learning laboratory; and enhance NSSI interaction with space educational ef-

forts outside the Air Force, to include universities, colleges, and primary education.

Tuition assistance

The budget request included $156.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), for the voluntary educational assistance program. The committee believes that voluntary educational assistance programs contributes to the quality and readiness of the armed forces. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in OMAF for the voluntary educational assistance program for military members.

Budget Items—Defense-wide

Gamma Radiation Detection System

The budget request included no funding for Gamma Radiation Detection Systems (GaRDS) at U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) facilities. USCENTCOM has a validated force protection requirement to inspect foreign workers and non-authorized visitors for weapons and explosives, as well as requirements to install this technology throughout Central Asia and the Middle East. The committee recommends an increase of $9.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, for two GaRDS mobile units and six GaRDS gantry units for USCENTCOM.

Information assurance scholarship program

The budget request included $5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for the information assurance scholarship program (IASP). The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in OMDW for this program. As noted elsewhere in this report, information and cyber security remain a challenge for the Department of Defense. There are currently 120 students in the IASP, supported in part by previous increases to the budget request. Ensuring adequate numbers of experts in the areas of information security, assurance, and architecture who are educated and recruited through the scholarship program remains a priority for the committee.

Meals Ready to Eat war reserve stockpile

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for the Meals Ready to Eat (MRE) war reserve stockpile. The committee is aware of the potentially life-saving role MREs play in responding to any crisis, humanitarian or otherwise. The committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million in OMDW for increasing the number of MREs in the war reserve stockpile to ensure there are enough available to meet any crisis. Furthermore, the committee directs the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency to provide to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2007, a report containing a description and justification of the current inventory objective for the MRE war reserve stockpile and any additions or reductions to that inventory objective over the past three years, together with an analysis of the usage of MREs over that time period.

Increased funding for conservation buffer zones

The budget request included $20.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), to continue implementation of conservation buffer zones under the Department of Defense's Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative.

The committee believes that the Department should continue to pursue voluntary agreements with willing third parties under section 2684a of title 10, United States Code, to limit 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 which may reduce current or anticipated environmental restrictions on military installations.

The committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million in OMDW for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative. The committee directs that, in allocating the funding provided for the Department's Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative, the Department should give priority to projects that benefit high-priority training sites, which have the greatest potential to reduce or prevent encroachment through the implementation of a compatible use buffer zone.

Citizen-Soldier Support Program

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (OMDW), for the Citizen-Soldier Support Program. The Citizen-Soldier Support Program is a partnership involving academic and community-based organizations, which is developing community-based strategies designed to promote support systems for members of the National Guard and Reserves. The committee believes that the Citizen-Soldier Support Program, authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law l09–163), has begun to play a vital role in developing a model for strengthening local community support to members of the National Guard and Reserve component personnel and their families. The committee also believes that there is a need for further development of strategies to increase access to support services for these members, many of whom reside far away from military installations, and encourages expansion of the Citizen-Soldier Support Program both geographically and programmatically. For example, the program could focus new efforts on providing assistance to eligible family members in obtaining health care benefits under TRICARE, in addition to other needed community support services. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in OMDW, for the Citizen-Soldier Support Program.

Institute for national security information analysis

The requirement for employees trained in national security analysis is growing across the Federal Government. Traditional liberal arts colleges and universities at the undergraduate level often do not provide training in national security analysis. This unique skill set requires a multidisciplinary approach with emphasis on foreign language training, regional studies, as well as rational decision theory, counterfactual reasoning, information technologies, information assurance, and statistical analysis. The 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review Report describes a need to develop a new breed of

warriors. Accordingly, our national security analysts require a new blend of skills.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, to further develop such an institute or program in national security analysis at a civilian undergraduate institution.

Budget Items—Army Reserve

Army Reserve budget justification materials

The budget request included $2,134.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve (OMAR), a $325.8 million increase over the fiscal year 2006 appropriated amount. The committee notes the outstanding contributions of the Reserves in the ongoing global war on terrorism. The committee expects that contribution will continue as the United States remains engaged in this long war. However, the committee is concerned by the lack of detail provided in the Army Reserve operation and maintenance budget justification materials. The budget justification books differed from briefing materials provided to the committee. Those discrepancies were not adequately clarified, and the committee found the budget materials for this account insufficient to justify the requested increase. The committee recommends a decrease of $125.8 million in OMAR.

Military technicians pay in excess of requirements

Based on analysis of the services' actual mobilization data as of April 14, 2006, the General Accountability Office projects that the Department of Defense could realize $28.9 million in cost avoidance per month for mobilized technicians (MilTechs), for a total savings in fiscal year 2007 of $347.0 million. Normally, compensation costs plus benefits for MilTechs in their capacity as civilian employees are included in Operation and Maintenance Appropriation accounts. When MilTechs are mobilized, their compensation is covered by the Military Personnel Appropriation account. Assuming that the services experience the same level of participation of the Reserves in the ongoing global war on terrorism in fiscal year 2007, the Department will not require the amounts included in its budget request for MilTechs. The committee recommends a decrease in Operation and Maintenance accounts by $173.5 million, as follows:

Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve—$33.7 million;

Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve—$100.7 million;

Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard—$15.6 million; and

Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard—$23.5 million.

Budget Items—Air Force Reserve

Air Force Reserve training, test and ferry flying hours

The budget request included $197.9 million for Air Force Reserve training, test, and ferry (TTF) flying hours. The TTF is the funding process for the Air Force Reserve to reimburse for strategic airlift

associate aircrew readiness training. The TTF currently funds C–5 and C–17 aircrew flying hours for Air Force Reserve and Air Mobility Command (AMC) flight crews to maintain or upgrade readiness and flying proficiency.

Budgeting for the TTF is based on hourly rate structures developed by the U.S. Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) as a subset of the Transportation Working Capital Fund (TWCF). Current Department of Defense policy requires TTF rates to recover 100 percent of the costs of the TWCF, including recouping direct and indirect costs—support, depreciation, and amortization—incurred by AMC in providing airlift services and operating the global air transportation system. The USTRANSCOM budget requests, and the TTF rates, attempt to maintain or recover TWCF operating balances.

While sound in theory, in practice, encumbering readiness training flying with the full costs of maintaining the Department's global mobility air transportation system results in substantial added expense. Current TTF flying hour rates are nearly double the costs per flying hour for Air Force Reserve units that have aircraft assigned. Additionally, the TTF account has grown 100 percent over the last 2 years, while another subset account that is designed to also maintain or recover TWCF operating balances, the Airlift Readiness Account (ARA), has not been utilized. Until the ARA is funded to help defray TWCF operating expenses, the Air Force Reserve should not be charged the full burdened rates of the TTF. The committee recommends a decrease of $48.0 million in the TTF.

Budget Items—Army National Guard

Battlefield mobility enhancers

The budget request included no funding for lightweight tactical vehicles. The committee recommends an increase of $11.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard, for lightweight tactical utility vehicles. The committee supports efforts by the Army to improve battlefield mobility and resupply.

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 9 states. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard, for operator driving simulators.

Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams sustainment training and evaluation program

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG), for the development

and implementation of a comprehensive sustainment training program to address the perishable and critical skills of the 55 congressionally-authorized Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams (WMD–CST).

The committee notes that each WMD–CST must achieve the certification required by law in accordance with Department of Defense criteria prior to their deployment. The committee further notes that the National Guard must be properly resourced to develop, implement, and execute a comprehensive sustainment training program that will ensure WMD–CST maintain the highest level of proficiency in their critical and technical skills.

To ensure the WMD–CST are effectively and comprehensively trained and exercised, the committee recommends an increase of $8.5 million in OMARNG for the development of a sustainment training and exercise program for the WMD–CST. The committee is aware that a number of federal entities possess the capability and expertise in scenario-based training that could assist in the development of a comprehensive sustainment training program, and encourages the National Guard to utilize those existing federal facilities when implementing this initiative.

Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams upgrades

The budget request included no funding to upgrade the original 32 Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams (WMD–CST) to the same level of technology as the 23 teams fielded during fiscal years 2004 and 2005. Because the current acquisition process has not kept pace with most rapid technological developments, most of the purchased equipment used by the WMD–CST are commercial, off-the-shelf. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard, for WMD–CST equipment upgrades.

Budget Items—Air National Guard

Warrior skills and convoy trainer

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (OMANG) for warrior skills and convoy trainers for the Air National Guard. There are 4 Air National Guard regional training centers, and 3 do not have this equipment. The committee recommends an increase of $6.2 million in OMANG for warrior skills and convoy trainers.

Budget Items—Transfer Accounts

Funding for Formerly Used Defense Sites

The budget request included $242.8 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 2006. The committee notes that it is Department of Defense's goal to achieve a remedy in place or response complete at all FUDS sites 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 sites by 2007, and complete site inspections at all FUDS sites by 2010, under the Military Munitions Response Program for clean up of unexploded ordnance.

The committee recommends an increase of $40.0 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.

Increased funding for clean up of unexploded ordnance at BRAC sites

The budget request included $413.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for the Defense Environmental Restoration Fund, Army. The committee notes that according to the Defense Environmental Programs Fiscal Year 2005 Annual Report to Congress, the estimated cost to complete the clean up of unexploded ordnance under the Military Munitions Response Program at defense installations closed in the 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995 rounds of base closure and realignment (BRAC) is $699.2 million. Funding for environmental remediation at BRAC sites is provided from the applicable Department of Defense base closure account until the closure of that account, and afterwards from the applicable environmental restoration account. The committee expects the Department to fund environmental restoration accounts at levels that are consistent with the Department's goal to achieve clean up of unexploded ordnance at BRAC sites closed prior to 2005 by fiscal year 2009. The committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million in OMDW to expedite unexploded ordnance clean up at sites closed or realigned under BRAC rounds prior to 2005.

Items of Special Interest

40 mm day/night training cartridge

The committee supports the Marine Corps, Army, Air Force, and Special Operations Command interests in acquiring non-developmental solutions to provide safe, "dud free" training ammunition to the operating forces in support of the 40 mm MK–19 heavy machine gun. The committee understands that these non-developmental "green ammunition" solutions were initially requested and fielded by the Marine Corps. The new 40 mm day/night training cartridges have been providing the Marine Corps with the ability to conduct safe, yet realistic day and night fire and maneuver training, which could not be conducted with the older pyrotechnic MK19 training cartridge. The committee also understands that the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command notified the Army of problems related to MK19 training and requested that the Army rapidly replace its old pyrotechnic training cartridge with the fielded solution used by the Marine Corps.

The committee recognizes that in addition to the reduced unit costs for acquisition of this new training cartridge, the Department of Defense will enjoy significant financial savings in operation and maintenance accounts related to (1) reduced frequency of fire fighting operations, (2) reduced frequency of UXO render safe oper-

ations, (3) reduced costs for range clearance and safety, and (4) reduced fuel and transport expenses for transporting Reserve personnel to Department training ranges.

Besides the obvious cost savings, the committee notes that non-developmental training ammunition provides all Department personnel with improved training opportunities where dry conditions on Department training ranges frequently preclude commanders from training with pyrotechnic devices. Further, the committee notes that the reduced frequency of range fires will directly reduce the environmental damage that results from range fires and UXO contamination.

The committee commends the Marine Corps on their leadership in applying non-developmental technology to improve the quality of training, while reducing training costs, and encourages all Department elements to budget and quickly transition to the new 40 mm day/night training ammunition to provide realistic fire and maneuver training and improved utilization of Department training ranges.

Comptroller General study of the Defense Transportation Coordination Initiative

The U.S. Transportation Command initiated the Defense Transportation Coordination Initiative (DTCI) to change how the Department of Defense handles its transportation management services for freight shipping within the continental United States. The DTCI intends to incorporate industry best practices to decrease costs and improve operational effectiveness, while increasing visibility of overall traffic movement patterns and performance across the Department's supply chain. The committee supports efforts by the Department to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its material shipments. However, the committee is concerned that current implementation efforts of DTCI may undermine the intended objectives of DTCI or weaken the additional goal of supporting small businesses throughout the nation.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to conduct a study of the DTCI and to submit a report not later than February 1, 2007, to the congressional defense committees. The report shall: (1) assess the business case analysis underlying the DTCI, including the assumptions regarding cost savings; (2) identify lessons learned from the 3 year pilot study on improving the Department's transportation management services in the southeast United States; and (3) examine whether those identified lessons are being fully incorporated into the DTCI.

Defense Information System Network Access Transport Services

The committee notes that the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) is in the process of acquiring additional network access to connect remote Department of Defense locations to terrestrial networks that are part of a component of the Global Information Grid (GIG), known as the GIG Bandwidth Expansion (GIG–BE). This connectivity, called the Defense Information System Network Access Transport Services (DATS), will provide the Depart-

ment with a high speed fiber optic network that will greatly enhance network-centric operations.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) is currently reviewing the analyses and underlying assumptions used by DISA in developing its DATS acquisition strategy. Preliminary analyses that the CBO has shared with the committee indicates that there may be a cost benefit to the Department in using a combination of purchases and leases of fiber optic connectivity to the remote sites, rather than the current approach of leasing all of the connections.

The committee also notes that the Department's estimates of the growth in required bandwidth for defense missions have changed over time. Estimates for the annual growth of bandwidth requirements by the Department have changed from 100 percent down to 35 percent. The level of growth in bandwidth requirement will strongly influence the DATS acquisition strategy. The committee directs the Department's Chief Information Officer to ensure that an accurate assessment of future bandwidth requirements growth, and the final results of the CBO review, be utilized to pursue future network access acquisitions.

Defense Readiness Reporting System

As the challenges to our country have grown, so too has the need for a readiness reporting system that more accurately assesses and reports the capabilities of the Department of Defense to respond to the increased ranges of threats to the safety of our nation. The committee supports the goals of the Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS) as the single, capability-based readiness reporting system for the Department.

The committee is concerned that multiple, redundant readiness systems are both wasteful and undermine the Department's ability to ensure timely and accurate information. Furthermore, the committee believes it is inexcusable to allow the expenditure of funds on other readiness reporting systems that do not meet the requirements of a capability-based system in light of the many demands on the resources of the Department.

The existing reports submitted to Congress pursuant to section 482 of title 10, United States Code, are not providing information to the Congress in a timely manner, and the committee expects the DRRS to enhance both the ability of Department managers to manage readiness issues and congressional oversight. The committee supports the full and rapid implementation of the DRRS, and believes that no funds should be expended on any other readiness reporting system in the Department other than as necessary to support the implementation of DRRS.

Defense Travel System

Over the last 10 years, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and the Department of Defense Inspector General's office have documented serious problems with existing Defense travel systems. The Department responded to these concerns by working to develop a new travel system, known as the Defense Travel System (DTS), which would process all Defense travel requests.

The committee is aware that DTS has experienced serious problems. More than seven years after the initial DTS contract was awarded, the system still is not fully functional.

Nonetheless, the committee continues to support investment in the travel reengineering effort. In this regard, the committee is encouraged by the fundamental restructuring of the DTS contract, which took place in 2004. The Department has indicated that this restructuring should address many of the problems identified by GAO and the Department Inspector General.

Moreover, the committee remains convinced that the Department's travel problems must be addressed on a comprehensive basis. As a GAO witness explained at a hearing before the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee last year:

> One of DOD's long-standing problems has been the lack of integrated systems. To address this issue and minimize the manual entry of data, interfaces between existing systems must be developed to provide the exchange of data that is critical for day-to-day operations. For example, DTS needs to know before permitting the authorization of travel that sufficient funds are available to pay for the travel—information that comes from a non-DTS system—and once the travel has been authorized, another system needs to know this information so that it can record an obligation and provide management and other systems with information on the funds that remain available.

At the present time, DTS remains the only integrated approach to these issues available to the Department.

However, DTS will not be able to maximize savings unless it is utilized on a more extensive basis throughout the Department. It is not helpful for the Department to develop a comprehensive and money-saving solution to its travel problems if this system is not used by Defense officials at sites where it has been deployed.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Department to provide a semi-annual report on DTS to the congressional defense committees for the next 2 years, beginning in 2007. Each report should address: (1) the number of defense installations at which DTS has been deployed; (2) the extent of usage of DTS at such sites; (3) steps taken or to be taken by the Department to increase such usage; (4) the savings resulting from such deployment and usage; and (5) any continuing problems in the implementation and usage of DTS.

Department of Defense foreign language training

The budget request included $8.3 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 addi-

tion, SCOLA is developing a digital archive that will allow users anywhere to review and sort language training on demand.

The committee commends the Department of Defense for increasing investment in language technology. SCOLA can help sustain and improve foreign language skills and cultural understanding of military and civilian linguists in the Department. Accordingly, the committee expects that funding provided for SCOLA related training activities be used for the intended purpose.

Marine Aviation Training Transformation savings

The committee understands that the Marine Corps' Deputy Commandant for Aviation issued the Marine Aviation Training Transformation Policy Letter (dated April 4, 2005), which directs the reorganization of Marine aviation training into a comprehensive and fully integrated system that more effectively links training to readiness requirements and to the Marine Corps' Flying Hour Program, while increasing the efficient use of aircraft resources. To encourage maximum savings from this transformation process, the committee directs the Department of the Navy to allow Marine aviation to reinvest funds from Aircraft Acquisition Programs, Flight Hour Programs, and Flight Hour Other, made available through implementation of Marine Aviation Training Transformation, into Marine aviation training and readiness.

Performance of certain work by Federal Government employees

Section 343 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) required the Secretary of Defense to prescribe guidelines and procedures for ensuring that consideration is given to Federal Government employees for certain work that is currently performed or would otherwise be performed under Department of Defense contracts. These guidelines and procedures apply only to work that: (1) has been performed by Federal Government employees at any time since, October 1, 1980; (2) is associated with inherently governmental functions; (3) was not awarded on a competitive basis; or (4) was determined by a contracting officer to have performed poorly. Section 343 does not specify a deadline for the issuance of such guidelines and procedures. The committee directs the Secretary to issue the required guidelines and procedures not later than January 6, 2007, which is 1 year after the date of enactment of section 343.

Radio frequency identification report

The committee is aware that under the Department of Defense's July 30, 2004, Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) Policy, all "consolidated shipments moving to, from, or between overseas locations are tagged" and are made a part of the In-Transit Visibility Network, which tracks all material from point to point. This policy should substantially increase the Department's visibility of overseas shipments of supplies, resulting in cost savings.

The committee understands that the Department's policy currently mandates use of active data-rich RFID for overseas shipments. The use of this tracking method within the United States has not been fully implemented. The committee directs the Sec-

retary of Defense to review the potential costs and benefits of mandating the use of active data-rich RFID to track supplies and shipments within the United States, and to submit a report on the findings of that review to the congressional defense committees not later than February 1, 2007.

Training Range Vegetation Encroachment

The committee is concerned that significant amounts of Army training range acreage may have become unusable because of uncontrolled vegetation, such as excessive weed and tree growth as well as invasive species. Maintaining usable training ranges is vitally important for ensuring our armed forces remain fully prepared to execute whatever missions are required of them. Ensuring all of our range facilities are usable is even more important given the movement of forces as a result of the Global Posture Review. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to conduct a statistically significant survey of Army training ranges and provide a report no later than 1 February 2007, to the congressional defense committees detailing the extent of loss of training range acreage to vegetation and the types of vegetation involved at each training range site.

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 2007, as shown below:

	Fiscal Year		
	2006 authorization	2007 request	2007 recommendation
Army	512,400	482,400	512,400
Navy	352,700	340,700	340,700
Marine Corps	179,000	175,000	180,000
Air Force	357,400	334,200	334,200

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) authorized active duty end strength for the Army at 512,400 and 179,000 for the Marine Corps. Additional authority was also provided in section 403 of that Act to increase active duty end strength for the Army by up to 20,000 and increase Marine Corps active duty end strength by up to 5,000 above the fiscal year 2006 authorized levels of 512,400 and 179,000, respectively, during fiscal years 2007 through 2009.

The Army and the Marine Corps continue substantial deployment of forces in support of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, although the growing number of trained Iraqi and Afghan military and security forces may allow reduction of U.S. commitments in the future. The Army continues major organizational change by creating modular units of deployment at the combat brigade level, shifting soldiers between the institutional Army and the operational Army, and rebalancing critical skills and units between the active and Reserve component forces.

The Marine Corps continues to shift manpower to meet the requirement for high demand skills in deploying units and is establishing a Marine Corps component command within U.S. Special Operations Command. The Commandant of the Marine Corps has testified before the Committee on Armed Services that he believes that the Marine Corps will continue to require an active duty end strength of about 180,000.

The committee believes that given the challenges the Army faces in continuing to meet the requirement for deploying forces in support of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, and its ongoing internal restructuring efforts, the authorized active duty end strength for the Army should remain at 512,400, while retaining the discretionary authority to increase that level by up to 20,000 through 2009. The committee also believes that the active duty Marine

Corps end strength should be increased to 180,000, while retaining the discretionary authority to increase that level up to 184,000 through 2009.

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 are extremely challenging and will be monitored closely.

The committee recommends an active duty end strength for the Army of 512,400 and 180,000 for the Marine Corps for fiscal year 2007. The Army level is 30,000 above the requested level for fiscal year 2007 and equal to the level authorized in fiscal year 2006. The recommended level for the Marine Corps is an increase of 5,000 from the requested level and an increase of 1,000 from the authorized level in fiscal year 2006. The committee has recommended funding for these higher end strength levels within the regular budget, rather than through supplemental appropriations. The recommended active duty end strength for the Navy is decreased by 12,000 and the recommended active duty end strength for the Air Force is decreased by 23,200, as requested.

Repeal of requirement for permanent end strength levels to support two major regional contingencies (sec. 402)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 691 of title 10, United States Code, that establishes permanent end strength levels necessary to support a national defense strategy calling for the United States to be able to successfully conduct two nearly simultaneous major regional contingencies.

The committee notes that the national defense strategy has evolved over time since 1996 when section 691 was enacted and is no longer based on a response to two nearly simultaneous major regional contingencies. The committee also believes that section 691 has not been effective as a management tool for sustaining the size of the armed forces. During time of war or national emergency, the President is authorized under section 123a of title 10, United States Code, to waive any statutory end strength with respect to that fiscal year. Section 115 of title 10, United States Code, provides further management flexibility by authorizing the Secretary of Defense to vary end strength of the active duty forces by 3 percent, and Selected Reserve forces by 2 percent. Section 115 also authorizes service secretaries to vary the end strength of active duty forces by 2 percent.

Section 691 has not precluded, and should not preclude, the President from proposing in the annual budget end strength levels that vary from those set in section 691 as the armed forces modernize, reorganize, shift manpower from military personnel to civilian employees, and rebalance skills between the active duty and Reserve component forces. The committee believes that the requested personnel force levels made as part of the annual budget submission provide a more accurate and timely measure upon which to judge the proper size of the armed forces and the sufficiency of funding to sustain them. Should the annually requested personnel levels fall short of what Congress believes provides for

the proper size of the armed forces, Congress has the constitutional authority to act to increase the force levels and provide funding for them. Section 691 does not add to this constitutional authority and does not provide a more meaningful or effective means of managing personnel force levels.

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 2007, as shown below:

	Fiscal Year		
	2006 authorization	2007 request	2007 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	350,000	350,000	350,000
The Army Reserve	205,000	200,000	200,000
The Navy Reserve	73,100	71,300	71,300
The Marine Corps Reserve	39,600	39,600	39,600
The Air National Guard of the United States	106,800	107,000	107,000
The Air Force Reserve	74,000	74,900	74,900
The Coast Guard Reserve	10,000	10,000	10,000

The budget request included $5.3 billion in National Guard Personnel, Army, to support an end strength of 332,900 for fiscal year 2007. The committee recommends an increase of $164.0 million in the National Guard Personnel, Army, appropriation to support the requested end strength of 350,000 for the Army National Guard. The committee directs that the increase in authorized appropriations for Army National Guard end strength be executed only for Army National Guard personnel. Should Army National Guard end strength fall below the authorized number, the unused additional funds may only be used to procure Army National Guard equipment, and only after the Department of Defense complies with the normal budget process that includes submitting prior notification and a detailed justification to Congress.

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 2007, as shown below:

	Fiscal Year		
	2006 authorization	2007 request	2007 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	27,396	27,441	27,441
The Army Reserve	15,270	15,416	15,416
The Navy Reserve	13,392	12,564	12,564
The Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	2,261
The Air National Guard of the United States	13,123	13,206	13,206
The Air Force Reserve	2,290	2,707	2,707

The committee recommends increases of 45 in the Army National Guard, 146 in the Army Reserve, 83 in the Air National Guard, and 417 in the Air Force Reserve. The committee supports in-

creases in full-time support manning consistent with requested levels to increase readiness in the Reserve components.

The committee also recommends a decrease of 828 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 2006 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 2007, as shown below:

	Fiscal Year		
	2006 authorization	2007 request	2007 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	25,563	26,050	26,050
The Army Reserve	7,649	7,912	7,912
The Air National Guard of the United States	22,971	23,255	23,255
The Air Force Reserve	9,852	10,124	10,124

Fiscal year 2007 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish numerical limits on the number of non-dual status technicians who may be employed in the Department of Defense as of September 30, 2007, as shown below:

	Fiscal Year		
	2006 authorization	2007 request	2007 recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	1,600	1,600	1,600
The Army Reserve	695	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, 2007, as shown below:

	Fiscal Year		
	2006 authorization	2007 request	2007 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 a total of $112.0 billion for military personnel for fiscal year 2007, an increase of $1.3 billion above the budget request. This includes: (1) $1.7 billion for active-duty Army end strength; (2) $265.0 million for active-duty Marine Corps end strength; and (3) $164.0 million for Army National Guard end strength.

Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 422)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $54.8 million to be appropriated for fiscal year 2007 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Budget Items

Unobligated balances

The Department of Defense has consistently under executed its military personnel funding authorization and appropriation since fiscal year 1995 for the active and Reserve components. According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), from fiscal years 2000 through 2004, the lowest annual unobligated balance was $248.1 million and the highest was $2,049.2 million.

The Department reduced the fiscal year 2007 military personnel funding request by $318.6 million based, in part, on the GAO analysis of unobligated balances. The Department stated, "While it is recognized that some low level of unexpended balances are likely to occur to avoid Anti-Deficiency Act (ADA) violations, the continued loss of limited Departmental resources each year due to excessive balances is unacceptable." However, the Department did not reduce the fiscal year 2007 amounts fully in accord with GAO's analysis, or as significantly as they should have. The committee recommends a decrease of $752.2 million in the services' accounts, as follows:

Military Personnel, Army—$31.4 million;
Military Personnel, Navy—$85.0 million;
Military Personnel, Marine Corps—$88.1 million;
Military Personnel, Air Force—$248.3 million;
Military Personnel, Army Reserve—$66.5 million;
Military Personnel, Navy Reserve—$17.3 million;
Military Personnel, Marine Corps Reserve—$15.4 million;
Military Personnel, Air Force Reserve—$25.8 million;
Military Personnel, Army National Guard—$84.5 million; and
Military Personnel, Air National Guard—$89.9 million.

Reserves cost avoidance

Based on analysis of the services' current and planned mobilization of the Reserve components during fiscal year 2006 and fiscal year 2007, the General Accounting Office (GAO) projects that the services will sustain military personnel strength levels lower than that planned in the Department of Defense's budget request due to

their activation for the ongoing global war on terrorism. The GAO estimates cost avoidance of $71.1 million for fiscal year 2007. The committee recommends a decrease of $71.1 million in the Reserve component military personnel accounts according to GAO's estimates by component, as follows:

Army Reserve—$34.9 million;

Air Force Reserve—$3.3 million; and

Air National Guard—$31.9 million.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy

Part I—Officer Personnel Policy Generally

Military status of officers serving in certain intelligence community positions (sec. 501)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the status of flag and general officers assigned to certain positions in the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to protect the officers and organizations concerned from perceptions of organizational conflicts of interest or inappropriate influence.

Officers serving in these positions shall not be subject to the supervision or control of the Secretary of Defense or exercise any supervision or control of military or civilian personnel in the Department of Defense, except as authorized by Law. While serving in these positions and remaining on active duty, the officers shall continue to receive military pay and allowances, but shall not receive pay prescribed for the position. In addition, the provision directs that ODNI and CIA shall reimburse the Department for the military pay and allowances of the officers serving in these positions.

This provision is consistent with provisions formerly in place for certain officers assigned to the Office of the Director of Central Intelligence before they were repealed by the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act (IRTPA) of 2004 (Public Law 108–458). This provision is also consistent with provisions in IRTPA for flag and general officers assigned as the Director of National Intelligence or as the Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence.

Extension of temporary reduction of time-in-grade requirement for eligibility for promotion for certain active-duty list officers in grades of first lieutenant and lieutenant (junior grade) (sec. 502)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 619(a) of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority from October 1, 2005, through October 1, 2008, to promote officers in the grade of first lieutenant or lieutenant (junior grade) who satisfy a time-in-grade requirement of 18 months.

Extension of age limits for active-duty general and flag officers (sec. 503)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1251 of title 10, United States Code, to increase the age for mandatory retirement for general and flag officers from 62 to 64. The provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to defer retirement of officers serving in grades above major general and rear

admiral to age 66 and the President to defer retirement for such officers until age 68. The provision would also eliminate the numerical limit on the number of deferments of retirement that may be in effect at any one time. The committee believes that it is not unusual for highly qualified and experienced commissioned officers, and particularly the most senior general and flag officers, to exceed current age limits as a result of changes in the officer corps and military career patterns and that reducing the requirement for deferments by the Secretary and the President is warranted.

Modification of authorities on senior members of the Judge Advocate General's Corps (sec. 504)

The committee recommends a provision that would raise the required statutory grades of the Judge Advocates General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to lieutenant general or vice admiral, as appropriate. These three officers would be in addition to the numbers that would otherwise be permitted for their armed forces for officers serving on active duty in grades above major general or rear admiral, as the case may be. The provision would also change the title of the Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Army to "Deputy Judge Advocate General," as is presently the case for the corresponding officers in the Navy and Air Force.

The greatly increased operations tempo of the armed forces has resulted in an increase in the need for legal advice from uniformed judge advocates in such areas as operational law, international law, the law governing occupied territory, the Geneva Conventions, and related matters. In addition, the system of military justice, administered by the Judge Advocates General, has taken on increased importance. Section 508 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) gave permissive authority for the appointment of these three officers in the grades of lieutenant general or vice admiral. However, none of these officers has been so appointed. In view of the developments set out above and the vital importance of the duties of these officers, the committee believes that the time has come to raise the required statutory grade and to grant corresponding grade relief.

Requirement for significant joint experience for officers appointed as Surgeon General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force (sec. 505)

The committee recommends a provision that would add a new section 3036a and amend sections 3036, 5137, and 8036 of title 10, United States Code, to require that officers recommended for appointment as the Surgeon General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force must have significant joint experience as determined by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The committee believes that senior military medical executives who are appointed in the future as the Surgeon General must be afforded opportunities to develop joint experience and qualifications in order to effectively manage and lead the uniformed medical professional communities and medical commands worldwide, and to participate most effectively in the management of the Defense Health Program and TRICARE. In this regard, the committee considers key positions in the defense health system, particularly the TRICARE Regional Directors, as assign-

ments which provide significant joint experience. The requirements of this provision would become effective with respect to all appointments to the position of Surgeon General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force on or after October 1, 2008, but this limitation would be waivable by the Secretary of Defense, if warranted, until October 1, 2010.

Grade and exclusion from active-duty general and flag officer distribution and strength limitations of officer serving as Attending Physician to the Congress (sec. 506)

The committee recommends a provision that would add section 722 to chapter 41 and amend section 12210 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that an active-duty or Reserve general or flag officer, while serving as the Attending Physician to the Congress, would hold the grade of major general or rear admiral and be excluded from the numerical and distribution requirements of sections 525 and 526 of title 10, United States Code. The committee believes that the important role of the Attending Physician to the Congress and the dedicated service of the officers who have held this position warrant statutory recognition and an exception from the limits on numbers and grades of general and flag officers.

Discretionary separation and retirement of chief warrant officers, W–4, twice failing selection for promotion (sec. 507)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 580(a) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the service secretaries in their discretion to retain, retire, or separate from active duty chief warrant officers in the grade of W–4, who have twice failed of selection for promotion. The committee believes that current procedures, which require automatic retirement or separation of regular chief warrant officers who twice fail of selection for promotion unless they are continued by selection board action, should be more flexible and that this provision would support the retention of highly experienced and qualified chief warrant officers in the grade of W–4.

Increased mandatory retirement ages for Reserve officers (sec. 508)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the mandatory retirement age for Reserve component officers. The provision would increase the mandatory retirement age for officers in the grade of O–8 from 62 to 64 years; for officers in the grade of O–7 from 60 to 62 years; and for officers in grades below O–7 from 60 to 62 years. The provision would also increase the mandatory retirement age of officers holding certain offices, such as the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, Chiefs of Reserve of the services, Directors of the Army and Air National Guard, and the adjutants general of the states, from 64 to 66 years.

Part II—Officer Promotion Policy

Promotions (sec. 515)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 624 and 14311 of title 10, United States Code, relating to promotion procedures. The provision would specify that a promotion list that requires Senate confirmation shall be treated as being established for purposes of chapter 38 of title 10 on the date the list is received by the Senate for consideration. This provides a clear line of demarcation between the procedures applicable for processing reports of selection boards and promotion lists. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than March 1, 2008, to prescribe regulations controlling delays in appointment following Senate confirmation under sections 624 and 14311. The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense should establish uniform procedures in this regard aimed at ensuring consistency in service practices, necessary oversight, and timely review and disposition of allegations of potentially adverse information arising after nomination and Senate confirmation, but prior to appointment. The provision would also clarify that delays in appointment to higher grade are warranted by the need to review substantiated and potentially adverse information which may be material to the decision on whether or not to appoint based on a determination that an officer has not fulfilled the requirements for exemplary conduct for commanding officers and those in positions of authority is permissible.

Consideration of adverse information by promotion selection boards in recommendations on officers to be promoted (sec. 516)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 616(c) and 14108(b) of title 10, United States Code, to require that a promotion selection board may not recommend an officer for promotion unless a majority of the members of the board, after consideration by all the board members of any adverse information about the officer that is provided to the board under section 615 of title 10, United States Code, finds that the officer is among those best qualified for promotion to meet the needs of the armed force concerned consistent with the requirement of exemplary conduct set forth in sections 3583, 5947, and 8583 of title 10, United States Code. The committee views this as an essential function of promotion board members in making their recommendations.

Expanded authority for removal from reports of selection boards of officers recommended for promotion to grades below general and flag grades (sec. 517)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 618(d) and 14111(b) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense, in addition to the President, to remove the name of an officer from the report of a selection board with respect to officers being recommended for promotion to grades below brigadier general and rear admiral (lower half). The committee believes that limiting this

removal authority to the President for officers below general and flag officer rank is unnecessary.

Clarification of nondisclosure requirements applicable to promotion selection board proceedings (sec. 518)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 618 and 14104 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the nondisclosure requirements applicable to deliberations of military promotion selection boards. The provision would specify that discussions and deliberations of selection boards, including any written or documentary records thereof, shall be immune from legal process; shall not be admitted as evidence; and shall not be used for any purpose in any action or suit, or judicial or administrative proceedings without the consent of the Secretary of the military department concerned.

The committee believes that existing policies of the Department of Defense and the services and oversight exercised by senior military and civilian officials relating to selection board procedures provide necessary safeguards and are effective in ensuring that promotion selection board members fulfill their duty under law to recommend the best qualified officers for promotion. Erosion over time of the limits on judicial review and discovery in connection with litigation have not been consistent with the statutory framework and military necessity.

Special selection board authorities (sec. 519)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 628 and 14502 of title 10, United States Code, with respect to authority to conduct special selection boards. The provision would limit the availability of special selection boards to officers who are in or above the primary promotion zones. This is consistent with the treatment of Reserve component officers under section 14502 and, additionally, limits the substantial administrative burden of conducting special selection boards only to those cases in which material error may have occurred. The provision would also clarify that errors in active and Reserve board procedures that are not in accordance with law must also be determined by the service secretaries to be material to the outcome of the board's determination.

Removal from promotion lists of officers returned to the President by the Senate (sec. 520)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 629 and 14310 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the conditions under which officers whose nominations have not received the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate will by operation of law be removed from promotion lists. The committee believes, consistent with the intent of existing sections 629 and 14310, that there must be statutory procedures for automatic removal of officers from promotion lists when it is clear that these officers will not receive a favorable committee recommendation or the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate and, within a foreseeable time frame, fulfill the legal requirements for appointment to higher

grade after ample opportunity for review of adverse or potentially adverse information.

Currently, under these conditions, and when designated senior military and civilian leaders take no action to remove an officer from a promotion list under sections 629 or 14310, officers may be permitted to remain on a promotion list for protracted, indefinite periods. Relegation of any officer to such a "limbo" status serves the interests of neither the individual officer nor the officer corps. This provision would enable changes in the status quo, require the officer, if removed from a promotion list, to compete once again with his or her peers for promotion, and lead to final resolutions consistent with the efficient administration of officer personnel and the needs of the services.

The provision would prescribe processes applicable to both active-duty and Reserve officers whose nominations require Senate confirmation. The provisions for automatic removal would not apply to officers on promotion lists that have been returned to the President by the Senate on the date of enactment of this Act. No later than October 1, 2008, however, any such officer would be removed from a promotion list.

Part III—Joint Officer Management Requirements

Modification and enhancement of general authorities on management of joint qualified officers (sec. 526)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 661 of title 10, United States Code, to restructure the system for designation and management of joint qualified officers. This provision would implement the recommendation made by the Department of Defense in its strategic plan to link joint officer development to overall missions and goals of the Department, as required by section 531 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375). The provision would facilitate the commencement of a process aimed at achieving the strategic objectives of developing a joint officer management system relevant to 21st century missions and force structure requirements, producing the largest possible number of fully qualified and inherently joint officers for joint command and staff responsibilities and service as general and flag officers, and maintaining the highest quality of officers serving in joint assignments.

Key aspects of this provision would include: (1) replacement of the term "joint specialty officer" with "joint qualified officer;" (2) authorizing the Secretary of Defense to establish criteria for designation of officers as joint qualified; (3) retention of the requirement for joint professional military education (JPME) but permitting waiver of the JPME under certain circumstances, e.g., completion of two tours of duty in joint assignments resulting in demonstrated mastery of knowledge, skills, and abilities on joint matters; and (4) replacing the system of required time in billets for joint qualification to a capabilities-based system in which experience and performance lead to progressive levels of joint qualification.

Modification of promotion policy objectives for joint officers (sec. 527)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 662(a) of title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for a separate promotion policy objective for officers who have the joint specialty or who are designated as joint qualified. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that officers who are serving in or have served in joint duty assignments, including those officers who previously have been designated as joint specialty officers (JSO) and are determined to be joint qualified under the changes to section 661 of title 10, United States Code, included in this Act, are expected, as a group, to be promoted to the next higher grade at a rate not less than the rate for all officers of the same armed force in the same grade and competitive category. The committee believes that the increased number of officers who have attained the joint specialty qualification and who will be designated as joint qualified, the acceptance throughout the officer corps of the importance of joint qualification, and the assignment of JSO and joint qualified officers to numerous "other joint" billets throughout the Department calls for elimination of a separate promotion policy objective for JSO.

Applicability of joint duty assignment requirements limited to graduates of National Defense University schools (sec. 528)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 663 of title 10, United States Code, to specify that joint professional military education (JPME) schools for purposes of this section are limited to schools within the National Defense University. The provision would limit the requirement that more than 50 percent of officers completing the second phase of JPME must be assigned to joint duty assignments as those officers' next duty assignments following graduation. The committee believes that this change, in conjunction with the increased availability of JPME credit at service colleges, is necessary to enable the services to fill all joint and internal billets, particularly those in warfighting specialties, with appropriately qualified officers.

Modification of definitions relating to jointness (sec. 529)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 668 of title 10, United States Code, to revise the definition of the term "joint matters." The new definition would expand the concept of joint matters to include integrated use of military forces that may be conducted under unified action on land, sea, or air, in space, or in the information environment with participants from multiple armed forces, the armed forces and other departments and agencies of the United States Government, the armed forces and the military forces or agencies of other countries, the armed forces and non-governmental persons or entities, or any combination thereof. The committee believes that this revised definition more accurately reflects the nature of modern military operations and recognizes that jointness should be understood as broader than the integrated operation of two or more services.

The provision would also modify the definition of "joint duty assignments" to broaden the assignments that may be considered and recognize the value of certain assignments within the services and to add a definition to section 668 of the term "critical occupational specialty."

Subtitle B—Reserve Component Personnel Matters

Enhanced flexibility in the management of Reserve component personnel (sec. 531)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize members of the National Guard and Reserve serving on Active Guard and Reserve duty, and military technicians (dual status), to perform specified additional duties that would expand their flexibility to train and instruct other personnel and increase the ability of such personnel to support certain operations or missions.

The provision would authorize such members, performing Active Guard and Reserve duty under either title 10 or title 32, to instruct or train active-duty members, foreign military forces (under the same authorities and limitations that apply to active-duty personnel), Department of Defense contractor personnel, and Department of Defense civilian employees.

The provision would also authorize members of the National Guard and Reserve, on Active Guard and Reserve duty under section 12310 of title 10, United States Code, to support operations or missions assigned in whole or in part to the Reserve components; to support operations or missions performed or to be performed by a unit composed of elements from more than one component of the same armed force, or joint forces that include Reserve component units or personnel; and to provide advice to senior officials in the Department on Reserve component matters.

The provision would also expand the duties of military technicians (dual status), in section 10216a of title 10, United States Code, to support operations or missions assigned in whole or in part to the military technician's unit; or to be performed by elements from more than one component of the military technician's armed force, or joint forces that include units or personnel of the military technician's Reserve component.

The provision would also amend title 32 to authorize members who have been ordered by their Governor, with consent of the secretary concerned, to perform National Guard Active Guard and Reserve duty, to perform additional duties to support operations or missions undertaken by the member's unit at the request of the President or the Secretary of Defense, and to support federal training operations or training missions assigned in whole or in part to the member's unit.

The provision would also authorize National Guard technicians to perform additional duties under title 32 to support operations or missions undertaken by the member's unit at the request of the President or the Secretary of Defense, and to support federal training operations or training missions assigned in whole or in part to the member's unit.

The additional duties that may be assigned to National Guard and Reserve members on Active Guard and Reserve duty, and mili-

tary technicians (dual status), would only be authorized to the extent that the additional duties do not interfere with the ability of such members to carry out their prescribed duties relating to organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the Reserve components.

Expansion of activities authorized for Reserves under Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams (sec. 532)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to approve the deployment of Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams (WMD–CSTs) to Canada and Mexico, if appropriate authorities in those countries consent to the entry of any WMD–CST into their sovereign territory in order to train for or respond to cross-border incidents. The provision would also expand the types of emergencies for which the Secretary may prepare or employ WMD–CSTs to include the intentional or unintentional release of nuclear, biological, radiological, toxic or poisonous chemical materials, or natural or manmade disasters.

The committee notes that natural disasters, criminal acts, acts of negligence, and unforseen accidents can result in the release of nuclear, biological, radiological, or toxic or poisonous chemical materials that could have catastrophic impacts similar to the intentional release of a Weapon of Mass Destruction or a terrorist attack.

The committee further notes that WMD–CSTs are a limited resource, and as such, the use of WMD–CSTs for such disasters should be limited to catastrophic situations where resources of State governments are overwhelmed and are authorized by the Secretary and performed in an active-duty status if the activities are performed outside of the United States.

Modification of authorities relating to the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves (sec. 533)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 513 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), which created the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves, to authorize the chairman of the commission to exercise the same waiver authority regarding eligibility by annuitants for pay as would be available to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under sections 8344(i)(1) and 8468(f)(1) of title 5, United States Code. Additionally, the provision would authorize extension of the commission's deadline for submission of a final report from 12 to 18 months after its first meeting.

Pilot program on reintegration of members of the National Guard into civilian life after deployment (sec. 534)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of a voluntary program to facilitate the reintegration of members of the National Guard into civilian life upon return from an overseas deployment. The program would consist of: (1) initial reintegration training to facilitate reintegration with families and communities; (2) 30-day reintegration training to identify signs and symptoms of combat stress; (3) 60-day reintegra-

tion training to assist in matters relating to combat stress, including chemical dependency, anger management, and gambling abuse; (4) 90-day reintegration training to conduct a thorough physical and mental health assessment; and (5) development and distribution of educational materials on reintegration for National Guard families and communities. The Secretary of the Army shall submit a report on the pilot program to the congressional defense committees not later than one year after commencement of the pilot program.

Subtitle C—Military Justice and Related Matters

Applicability of Uniform Code of Military Justice to members of the Armed Forces ordered to active duty overseas in inactive duty for training status (sec. 551)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the service secretaries, no later than March 1, 2007, to prescribe regulations, or amend current regulations, consistent with article 2 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), to provide that military personnel who are ordered to perform inactive duty for training at overseas locations shall be subject to jurisdiction under the UCMJ throughout the period that the orders are in effect. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense, pursuant to section 557 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), has concluded that the differences between services' policies regarding inactive duty for training and the inapplicability of the UCMJ during drill periods could present obstacles to the invocation of protections under status of forces agreements (SOFA). The committee believes that prompt regulatory action should be taken at the earliest time to enhance good order and discipline through extension of UCMJ jurisdiction over reservists training overseas and, by doing so, to make the strongest case possible for SOFA coverage for Reserve personnel performing inactive duty for training.

Subtitle D—Education and Training Matters

Detail of commissioned officers as students at medical schools (sec. 561)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of a military department to detail up to 25 commissioned officers of the armed forces each year as students at accredited medical schools or schools of osteopathy in the United States for training leading to the degree of doctor of medicine. To be eligible for such medical training, an officer must agree to serve on active duty for 2 years for each year of the officer's medical training.

The committee recommends this provision, in addition to others in this subtitle, in response to significant and growing shortfalls of military medical personnel, in both active and Reserve components of the armed forces. The committee has learned, for example, that the Army has only 65 percent of the general surgeons and 66% of the thoracic surgeons required to meet requirements for the active component. Army transformation to the brigade combat team structure would deepen medical shortfalls. The committee intends in

this and other sections of this subtitle to provide greater flexibility to the Secretaries of the military departments in the recruitment and retention of students and fully qualified health care personnel.

Expansion of eligibility to provide Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps instruction (sec. 562)

The committee recommends a provision that would expand the eligibility of officers and non-commissioned officers who may be employed as Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) instructors to include retired Reserve and National Guard members. Currently, only active-duty and retired regular officers and non-commissioned officers are authorized to serve as JROTC instructors. The Department of Defense would be authorized to pay an institution hiring a retired Reserve or National Guard member an amount equal to one-half of the amount paid to the retired member by the institution for any period, up to a maximum of one-half the difference between the retired or retainer pay for an active-duty officer or noncommissioned officer of the same grade and years of service for that period and the active-duty pay and allowances, which the member would have received for that period if on active duty.

Increase in maximum amount of repayment under educational loan repayment for officers in specified health professions (sec. 563)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize an increase from $22,000 to $60,000 for each year of obligated service the amount the Secretary of a military department may repay for educational loans of a fully qualified health care professional that the Secretary of the military department concerned has determined to be necessary to meet identified skill shortages.

Increase in benefits under Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program (sec. 564)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish new maximum amounts for stipends and grants, under the Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program. The Health Professions Scholarship Program is the primary source for the accession of medical and dental corps officers for the military departments. The committee is concerned that the current statutory formula for the educational assistance programs for health care professionals does not permit flexibility for the Secretary of the military department to respond to economic factors faced by medical and dental students.

Report on Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program (sec. 565)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to report by March 1, 2007, to congressional defense committees on the success or failure of the military departments in achieving recruiting goals under the Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program for active service during fiscal years 2000 through 2006.

The committee is concerned that the decline in achievement of goals for these programs will create significant medical manpower

challenges in future years. Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends a provision that would authorize a modification to the amount of payment of stipends under these programs.

Expansion of instruction available at the Naval Postgraduate School for enlisted members of the armed forces (sec. 566)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize all eligible enlisted members of the armed forces to participate in certificate programs and courses required for the performance of their duties offered by the Naval Postgraduate School by removing the current limitation that restricts such participation to enlisted members of the Navy and Marine Corps. The provision would also authorize eligible enlisted members who hold a baccalaureate degree to receive graduate-level instruction at the Naval Postgraduate School on a space-available basis in programs leading to a master's degree in technical, analytical, and engineering curricula. Upon successful completion of the course of instruction, an enlisted member may be awarded a master's degree by the Naval Postgraduate School.

The 2005 Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommended realigning the Naval Postgraduate School and the Air Force Institute of Technology. The Commission's recommendation is intended to eliminate unnecessary curricula and program development; identify, approve, and implement programs of collaboration in research and instruction between the two schools; and expand nonresident programs and arrangements with private institutions of higher learning to meet common curriculum and non-Department of Defense focused class requirements. A current distinction between the Naval Postgraduate School and the Air Force Institute of Technology is the broader authority of enlisted members to participate in programs at the Air Force Institute of Technology.

The provision would expand the eligibility of enlisted members to receive instruction from the Naval Postgraduate School as a means of achieving a closer alignment of the programs of instruction at the two institutions.

Modification of actions to address sexual harassment and sexual violence at the service academies (sec. 567)

The committee recommends a provision that would change the frequency of the administration of the service academy sexual assault survey and its associated report to Congress from an annual to a biennial requirement. The provision would also extend until 2010 the academy program years in which the survey is required. The provision clarifies that the subject of the required academy policy and the survey is sexual harassment and sexual violence, and that the policy and survey are directed at cadets and midshipmen.

Department of Defense policy on service academy and ROTC graduates seeking to participate in professional sports before completion of their active-duty service obligations (sec. 568)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe a policy not later than July 1,

2007, on whether to authorize service academy and Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) graduates to participate in professional sports before completion of their active-duty service obligation, and if so, on the active-duty service obligations of such personnel.

Prior to prescribing the policy, the Secretary of Defense would be required to review current policies, practices, and regulations of the military departments on the active-duty service obligations of graduates of the service academies and ROTC, including policies on authorized leaves of absence and excess leave programs. The Secretary of Defense would be required to consider the compatibility of participation in professional sports, including training for professional sports, with service on active duty; the benefits for the armed forces of waiving obligations for service on active duty; the manner in which the services have resolved issues relating to participation in professional sports, including the extent of, and any reasons for, differing policies by service; and the recoupment of the costs of education if the period of obligated service is not completed. Variations in the policy due to distinctive requirements of a particular armed force would be allowed, but would be specifically addressed. The Secretary of Defense would set a prospective effective date for the policy and address its application to personnel currently serving as commissioned officers, cadets, or midshipmen.

The provision would require the secretary of each military department to prescribe regulations, or modify current regulations, to implement the policy of the Secretary of Defense by no later than December 1, 2007.

Subtitle E—Defense Dependents Education Matters

Funding for assistance to local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the armed forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 571)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $30.0 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. 572)

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.

Plan to assist local educational agencies experiencing growth in enrollment due to force structure changes, relocation of military units, or BRAC (sec. 573)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to prepare a plan to provide assistance to local educational agencies that will experience a growth in enrollment of military and Department of Defense civilian children as a result of force structure changes, the relocation of military units, and the closure or realignment of a military installation as a result of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round. The committee is concerned that the impact of troop relocation on local educational districts during the time period between 2005 and 2010 will be significant, and expects the Department to work in partnership with the Congress, local governments, and other governmental agencies to provide maximum support to local communities as they face growth challenges associated with troop relocations, rebasing, and BRAC.

The committee intends that the plan required by this provision would be in addition to the report on school enrollment increases, including a plan for working with federal, state and local agencies, for the period 2004 through 2011, directed in the report accompanying section 572 of the Conference Report for the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163).

Pilot program on parent education to promote early childhood education for dependent children affected by military deployment or relocation of military units (sec. 574)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out a 3-year pilot program to develop models to enhance educational tools and support for parents of preschool aged children, who are affected by deployments or the relocation of military units. The provision would require the utilization of models designed to identify specific risk factors for children related to military life, and maximize the educational readiness of young children who experience the rigors of military life. The provision would require that the Secretary designate military installations for conduct of the pilot program, and that one or more of the installations include outreach services to members in the National Guard or Reserve components who have been mobilized in the global war on terrorism. The committee recommends that $1.5 million be authorized for the pilot program in fiscal year 2007.

The committee believes that high quality services for children are an essential factor in military quality of life, and encourages the Department of Defense to utilize organizations such as Parents as Teachers, which has broad experience through its Heroes at Home program in enhancing child development and school achievement through parent education involving military families. The committee believes that outreach is needed to families of National Guard and Reserve components who have been mobilized in support of the global war on terrorism, and believes that a program known as Our Military Kids has gained valuable experience in working with local community resources to provide enrichment opportunities for children of Guard and Reserve families that would inform the Department's outreach to such families.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Administration of oaths (sec. 581)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 502 and 1031 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the oath required in connection with enlistment or appointment in the armed forces to be administered by the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, any commissioned officer of any armed force, or any other person designated under regulations prescribed by the Secretary. The provision would clarify differences in existing law regarding who may administer oaths required for enlistment or appointment of any person in the armed forces.

Military ID cards for retiree dependents who are permanently disabled (sec. 582)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretaries of the military departments to issue a permanent military ID card to a permanently disabled dependent of a military retiree. The provision would lessen the challenges faced by a military retiree in arranging for support of a disabled dependent based on eligibility for Department of Defense benefits.

Military voting matters (sec. 583)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 1566(d) of title 10, United States Code, to require the Department of Defense Inspector General to periodically conduct unannounced assessments of the compliance of Department installations with the requirements of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA), set forth in section 1973ff of title 42, United States Code. The committee believes that these assessments are unnecessary in view of the requirement for annual reviews of the effectiveness of voting assistance programs by the inspectors general of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force under section 1566(c) of title 10, United States Code, and the requirement for an annual report by the Department Inspector General.

The provision would also require the Comptroller General to submit a report to Congress by March 1, 2007, on the programs and activities undertaken by the Department to facilitate voter registration, transmittal of ballots to absentee voters, and voting using electronic means. The report would assess progress made, if any, in developing a secure, deployable system for Internet-based, electronic voting, pursuant to section 567 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375). While the goal of providing a means for reliable, secure, and timely electronic voting should remain a priority, the committee believes that, in the present, every effort should be made to support and cooperate with state and local officials in authorizing and relying on electronic methods of communication, particularly email, to facilitate voter registration and the forwarding of balloting materials to military and civilian voters covered under UOCAVA.

Presentation of Medal of Honor Flag to primary next of kin of Medal of Honor recipients (sec. 584)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 3755, 6257, and 8755 of title 10, United States Code, and section 505 of title 14, United States Code, to authorize the President to present a Medal of Honor Flag to all living recipients of the Medal of Honor. Additionally, the provision would authorize presentation of one Medal of Honor Flag to the primary, living next of kin of a deceased Medal of Honor recipient under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Homeland Security in the case of members of the U.S. Coast Guard. The committee trusts that the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of Homeland Security will prescribe appropriate procedures for the presentation of the Medal of Honor Flag and issue consistent regulations that will designate the primary, living next of kin and readily resolve any potential conflicts over who should be presented the flag on behalf of a deceased recipient of the Medal of Honor.

Modification of effective period of authority to present recognition items for recruitment and retention purposes (sec. 585)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2261 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the presentation of recognition items during any period of war or national emergency declared by the President or Congress. The committee believes that appropriate use of this authority during wartime and periods of national emergency in order to recognize the service of military members and their families and individuals who support the men and women of the armed forces is essential.

Military Severely Injured Center (sec. 586)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a Military Severely Injured Center to augment and support programs of the military departments to provide individual case management services to severely injured members of the armed forces and their families. The provision would require the Secretary to establish a central data base for the purposes of tracking all severely injured service members who qualify for support by the Center.

The committee commends the Department of Defense, including the service secretaries, for mobilizing support programs for severely injured members of the armed forces and their families. These programs include the Military Severely Injured Joint Support Operations Center, which was established in February 2002 by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Army Wounded Warrior Support Program, the Navy Safe Harbor Program, the Air Force Palace HART Program, and the Marine for Life Injured Support Program of the Marine Corps. The committee believes that the complexity of long term needs of severely injured service members requires a continuous, fail-safe structure of support; integration of services; and a capability for augmentation over a period of many years. A Military Severely Injured Center is essential to ensure that those needs will be met.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense, in cooperation with the Department of Veterans Affairs, Department of Labor, Transportation Security Administration within the Department of Homeland Security, and State and local governments, is meeting the challenge of providing timely, expert assistance to severely wounded members and their families. The committee, however, believes that more needs to be done. Community-based support groups and non-profit service organizations can play a key role in addressing many of the needs of severely wounded personnel. Organizations such as Still Serving Veterans in Huntsville, Alabama, provide invaluable assistance to wounded service members, including guiding them to successfully making use of existing support systems in their region when leaving active duty, and obtaining gainful employment and necessary support services. The committee expects the Department of Defense to ensure that the contributions of community-based support organizations are addressed in the comprehensive policy required by section 563 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) and that the individual services and the Military Severely Injured Center will work closely with them in support of individual members and veterans.

Items of Special Interest

Funding for the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command

The committee is concerned that the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command (JPAC) may not be organized or funded to effectively accomplish its mission of achieving the fullest possible accounting of personnel who remain missing as a result of hostile acts. JPAC was created at the direction of the Secretary of Defense on October 1, 2003, by merging the Joint Task Force-Full Accounting with the U.S. Army Central Identification Laboratory, Hawaii, as a single, joint command reporting to the U.S. Pacific Command (USPACOM). JPAC functions include analysis, archival research, operational and technical planning, negotiation, investigation, recovery, repatriation, identification, and reporting.

Funding for JPAC was initially established by merging the fiscal year 2004 operating budget for the U.S. Army Central Identification Laboratory with the budget for Joint Task Force-Full Accounting. The fiscal year 2006 funding baseline for JPAC was $44.0 million, which is about $2.5 million lower than the fiscal year 2004 baseline when JPAC was created. JPAC had planned missions for fiscal year 2006 to support recovery operations in Southeast Asia and world-wide that would have required about $50.4 million. Because JPAC is burdened with inordinately high personnel and overhead costs, the lower amount made available for fiscal year 2006 resulted in fewer recovery missions being executed than had been planned in Vietnam and Laos, as well as in World War II battlefields in the Pacific. The fiscal year 2007 budget is $47.2 million.

The committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense review carefully the organization of the command and the funding relationship between JPAC, USPACOM, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of Defense to determine if the current alignment under USPACOM and funding through the Navy, as the Ex-

ecutive Agent, is appropriate and efficient considering the mission of JPAC. The committee also recommends that the JPAC organization, management, and budget be reviewed to achieve efficiencies, where possible, and that JPAC be funded to sustain a robust POW/MIA accounting effort.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2007, on the Department's review of these matters and actions it considers appropriate to address them.

Military medical recruiting

The committee is concerned that shortfalls in recruitment and retention of medical, dental, and nurse corps officers have received insufficient attention from senior Department of Defense leadership. The inability of the military departments to achieve recruiting and retention goals for critical health care professionals, in both the active and Reserve components, has resulted in shortages in critical medical, dental and nurse corps resources that could threaten future medical readiness. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, in conjunction with the military personnel chiefs and senior medical leadership, to analyze the Department's current and projected needs in medical manpower, and to report to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2007, on the results of a comprehensive analysis of medical, dental, nurse, and medical service corps personnel needs and shortages. As part of its analysis, the Department must reassess its plans for conversion of military medical positions to civilian positions, an initiative which the committee believes has, in some instances, compounded shortages of personnel needed in support of military operations.

At a minimum, the report must include the following:

(1) a reassessment of the adequacy of current manpower modeling tools in capturing requirements for medical and dental personnel in the global war on terrorism;

(2) an analysis of current and projected manpower needs for military medical, dental, nurse, and medical service corps personnel;

(3) identification of shortfalls, in both active and Reserve components;

(4) an analysis of monetary and non-monetary incentives to improve recruitment and retention, such as reexamining the Navy's policy on general medical officer deployments, and examining tour lengths for key medical personnel in both active and Reserve components;

(5) an analysis of medical recruitment efforts by the military departments, and a plan of action to make necessary improvements, including greater use of medical and dental corps officers to assist in recruiting;

(6) reexamination of the professions deemed to be critical skills needed in wartime, including clinical psychologists to address combat-stress related mental health concerns;

(7) a plan of action to provide resources necessary to address any shortfalls; and

(8) recommendations on changes in policy and legislation needed to provide greater flexibility to the military departments to assist them in meeting medical readiness manpower requirements.

The committee believes that in addition to the report directed in this section, it is critical that the Tenth Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation (QRMC), directed by the President on August 2, 2005, carefully examine compensation issues pertaining to the military's shortage of uniformed medical personnel to support the global war on terrorism. The committee expects the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to provide the results of the analysis required by this section to the QRMC to inform its analysis of future military compensation of military medical personnel.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

Fiscal year 2007 increase in military basic pay and reform of basic pay rates (sec. 601)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a pay raise for members of the uniformed services of 2.2 percent effective on January 1, 2007; targeted pay raises for warrant officers and enlisted members serving in the E–5 to E–7 grades that would be effective on April 1, 2007; and extension of the basic pay table to 40 years, providing longevity step increases for the highest officer, warrant officer, and enlisted grades.

The committee supports the goal of the Department of Defense, as recommended by the 9th Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation, to bring regular military compensation to the 70th percentile of private civilians when comparing experience and education. This provision contributes to its achievement. The provision would also accommodate longer career lengths and provide appropriate financial incentives for continued active-duty service beyond 30 years by the most experienced and capable military, officer and enlisted, leaders of the armed forces.

Increase in maximum rate of basic pay for general and flag officer grades (sec. 602)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 203(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code, to provide that the rates of basic pay for officers in pay grades O–7 through O–10 may not exceed the monthly equivalent of the rate of pay for level II, vice III, of the Executive Schedule. The committee notes that this provision will primarily affect officers serving in positions of importance and responsibility under section 601 of title 10, United States Code. Raising the pay cap for these officers is fully commensurate with the levels of authority and responsibility typically vested in such officers.

Clarification of effective date of prohibition on compensation for correspondence courses (sec. 603)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 206(d) of title 37, United States Code, to clarify that the prohibition on compensation for work or study in connection with correspondence courses, including the prohibition as it relates to a member of the National Guard while not in federal service, applies to any such work or study performed on or after September 7, 1962, and to any claim for compensation based on such work or study arising after that date.

The committee believes that judicial rulings interpreting section 206(d) to permit compensation for completion of correspondence courses misinterpreted this provision and did not give adequate weight to the consistent practices of the services in administering training of members of the Reserve and National Guard in this regard. The changes to section 206(d) of title 37, United States Code, incorporated in section 604 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) did not, in the committee's view, change, but rather clarified the meaning and purpose of this section.

One-year extension of prohibition against requiring certain injured members to pay for meals provided by military treatment facilities (sec. 604)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 402(h)(3) of title 37, United States Code, to extend for an additional year the prohibition on requiring members who are undergoing medical recuperation or therapy, or are otherwise in the status of continuous care, including outpatient care, at a military treatment facility for injuries, illnesses, or diseases incurred or aggravated while on active duty serving in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2007, on the administration of section 402(h)(3), including an assessment of the implementation by the services and recommendations regarding whether this authority should be continued.

Additional housing allowance for Reserves on active duty in support of a contingency operation (sec. 605)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 403(g) of title 37, United States Code, to authorize service secretaries to pay a second housing allowance in lieu of per diem to Reserve component members who are ordered to active duty in support of a contingency operation for greater than 139 days when government quarters are not available. Implementation of this provision would reduce costs while ensuring that mobilized reservists are adequately compensated both for their civilian housing costs at home and while serving at their contingency operation duty locations when their mobilization will be for extended periods.

Extension of temporary continuation of housing allowance for dependents of members dying on active duty to spouses who are members of the uniformed services (sec. 606)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 403(l) of title 37, United States Code, to provide that a member of the uniformed services, who is a spouse of a deceased member who died while serving on active duty, may continue to be paid the basic allowance for housing (BAH). Only non-military spouses currently qualify for the temporary continuation of BAH. This provision would avoid loss of income in the aftermath of a military spouse's death and could encourage military spouses to continue serving on active duty despite their loss.

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 service; 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 certain 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 care professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve; the accession bonus for registered nurses; incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists; special pay for Reserve health professionals in critically short wartime specialties; the accession bonus for dental officers; and the accession bonus for pharmacy officers.

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; assignment incentive pay; the reenlistment bonus for active members; the enlistment bonus for active members; the retention bonus for members qualified in critical military skills or assigned to high priority units; the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills; and the incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage. The provision would also extend through December 31, 2009, the authority to pay the incentive bonus for transfer between the armed forces.

Increase in special pay for Selected Reserve health care professionals in critically short wartime specialties (sec. 615)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase from $10,000 to $25,000 the maximum amount of special pay the Secretary of a military department could pay health care professionals in the Selected Reserve who are in critically short wartime specialties. The committee is concerned that the operational tempo in the global war on terrorism has put intense pressure on strength levels of these critically needed health care specialties. An increase in

special pay for certain Selected Reserve health professionals would support efforts to meet vitally important retention goals in the Selected Reserve.

Expansion and enhancement of accession bonus authorities for certain officers in health care specialties (sec. 616)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize an increase in the maximum amount authorized for an accession bonus for dental officers from $30,000 to $200,000. The provision also authorizes a new accession bonus of up to $400,000 for medical officers and dental specialists in critically short wartime specialties. In order to be eligible for receipt of these bonuses, an individual must be a graduate of a fully accredited school of medicine or dentistry, and commit to remaining on active duty for 4 consecutive years.

The committee believes that, in addition to improved recruiting and education provisions included elsewhere in this report, accession bonuses for fully qualified medical and dental personnel will allow the Secretaries of the military departments to rapidly address personnel shortfalls. The committee also believes that the current accession bonus level for dental officers has lost its effectiveness and has not changed since 1997. The lump sum nature of the existing and new accession bonuses is intended to serve as a recruitment inducement and recompense for the lower annual salary that medical and dental officers earn during 4 years of military service.

Increase in nuclear career accession bonus for nuclear-qualified officers (sec. 617)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 312b(a)(1) of title 37, United States Code, to increase the maximum authorized amount of the nuclear career accession bonus for nuclear-qualified officers from $20,000 to $30,000. The committee believes that this authority is necessary to ensure that the Navy is able to succeed in a highly competitive recruiting environment for individuals who qualify for the nuclear power program.

Modification of certain authorities applicable to the targeted shaping of the Armed Forces (sec. 618)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1175a of title 10, United States Code, to facilitate targeted shaping of the armed forces. The provision would make the voluntary separation incentive (VSI) available to officers and enlisted personnel with more than 6 but no more than 20 years of service. It would increase the maximum authorized amount of the VSI to an amount not greater than four times the full amount of separation pay for a member of the same pay grade and years of service who is involuntarily separated under section 1174 of title 10, United States Code. The provision would also extend the authority to use the provision through December 31, 2012, and increase the maximum amount of the incentive bonus for transfer between the armed forces from $2,500 to $10,000. The committee recognizes the value of the military training, skills, and experience possessed by certain sailors and airmen leaving active duty, and believes that an

incentive comparable to what they would receive for affiliating with the Selective Reserve of their parent service would be useful in encouraging more officers and enlisted personnel to remain on active duty in connection with a "blue to green" transfer to the Army.

Extension of pilot program on contributions to Thrift Savings Plan for initial enlistees in the Army (sec. 619)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the pilot program on contributions to Thrift Savings Plan (TSP) for initial enlistees in the Army, as required by section 606 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), until December 31, 2008. This pilot program requires the Army to test the effects on recruiting and levels of participation in the TSP stemming from the availability of matching contributions for the most junior soldiers (i.e., those serving under an initial enlistment for a period of not more than 2 years). The committee notes that the Army did not commence the pilot program until April 2006 and believes that additional time is necessary to demonstrate the effects of matching TSP contributions. The provision would also extend the due date for the report on the pilot program to February 1, 2008.

Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances

Expansion of payment of replacement value of personal property damaged during transport at Government expense (sec. 631)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2636a of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense, no later than March 1, 2008, to include in contracts for the transportation of baggage and household effects for military members and civilian employees a clause requiring the carrier to pay the full replacement value for loss or damage. The provision would also require certain certifications by the Secretary about, and a review and assessment by the General Accountability Office on December 1, 2006, and June 1, 2007, of the "Families First" program.

The committee believes that the time is past due for implementing the contractual authority requested by the Department in 2003 and included in section 634 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). Military personnel and their families have waited long enough for realization of the Families First promise of full replacement value for household goods lost and damaged by movers in connection with permanent changes of station.

The committee has concluded that implementation of the full replacement standard for both military members and civilian employees by means of contractual changes with carriers must precede implementation of the Defense Personal Property System (DPS) under the Families First program. The collective inability over an extended period of the Military Surface Deployment and Distribution Command (SDDC), its predecessor, the Military Traffic Management Command, and the Defense Information Systems Agency to successfully develop, test, and field a commercial, off-the-shelf

computer application represents another troubled information technology program requiring strong oversight. In this regard, the committee believes that, in addition to the Internet application problems DPS has experienced, SDDC has not made sufficient progress in ensuring Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps participation in the design of DPS and that much work needs to be done to avoid problems with service acceptance and deployment.

The committee acknowledges the efforts by Commander, U.S. Transportation Command, to correct the problems with DPS. However, in view of the importance of the Families First program, the committee urges the Secretary to transfer responsibility for the development of DPS from SDDC to the Defense Business Systems Acquisition Executive under the Department's Business Transformation Agency. At a minimum, the Department should include this program on the "watch list" of major automated information systems that the Department uses to monitor the progress of such programs.

Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits

Modification of Department of Defense contributions to Military Retirement Fund and Government contributions to Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund (sec. 641)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 1111, 1465, and 1466 of title 10, United States Code, in order to authorize the Department of Defense to contribute into the Military Retirement Fund (MRF) at the lower, part-time normal cost percentage rate for Reserve component members who are mobilized or performing active duty for special work. This provision, which would become effective on October 1, 2007, would correct excessive retirement accrual contributions the Department currently is obligated to make to the MRF. This provision would also exclude cadets and midshipmen from the end strength figures on which accrual payments to the Medicare-Eligible Health Retiree Care Fund (MERHCF) are based because these individuals do not receive credit towards retirement while serving in this status. The provision would also clarify section 1115 of title 10, United States Code, regarding exclusion of certain active-duty members, and change references from the Ready Reserve to the Selected Reserve to achieve greater consistency with the actuarial calculations that establish the accrual rates.

Repeal of requirement of reduction of SBP survivor annuities by dependency and indemnity compensation (sec. 642)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 1450 and 1451 of title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of annuities received under the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) by the amount of dependency and indemnity compensation paid to certain beneficiaries under section 1311(a) of title 38, United States Code. The provision would require return, without interest, over a period of time (not to exceed 10 years) agreed to by the surviving spouse or specified by the Secretary of

Defense, of SBP premiums refunded to beneficiaries under section 1450(e) of title 10, United States Code. The committee believes that recoupment of premiums, with provision for waiver by the Secretary in the event of hardship, is a necessary action in view of the substantial benefit that this provision represents. The committee notes that the funding for implementation of this provision was included in the Senate version of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2007 (S. Con. Res. 83), which passed on March 16, 2006.

Effective date of paid-up coverage under Survivor Benefit Plan (sec. 643)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1452(j) of title 10, United States Code, to change the effective date for paid-up coverage under the Survivor Benefit Plan from October 1, 2008, to October 1, 2006. The committee notes that the funding for implementation of this provision was included in the Senate version of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2007 (S. Con. Res. 83), which passed on March 16, 2006.

Expansion of conditions for direct payment of divisible retired pay (sec. 644)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1408(d) of title 10, United States Code, to provide that direct payments of divisible retired pay by the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) may be made in all cases in accordance with the terms of a court decree. The committee notes that the provision would not affect the eligibility of former spouses of military members for a portion of retired pay and would only enable DFAS to provide direct payment. The committee agrees with the conclusion made in the "Report to Congress Concerning Federal Former Spouse Protection Laws," as required by section 643 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), with respect to this recommendation. The Report stated that:

> Overwhelming justification exists for abolishing this requirement. First, no other examined public or private retirement plan or system contains such a restriction. Second, repeal should prevent the courts, practitioners, and parties to divorce proceedings from mistakenly interpreting a rule applicable to direct payments as a prerequisite to allocation of retired pay. Third, repealing this requirement would allow DFAS to issue separate Federal income tax reporting documents to the parties for their respective shares of the allocations.

Authority for cost of living adjustments of retired pay treated as divisible property (sec. 645)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1408 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of cost of living adjustments in connection with awards of retired pay stated in dollar amounts. Existing law limits the flexibility of the parties and the courts in this regard in negotiating property settlement agreements and causes unnecessary confusion.

Notice and copy to members of court orders on payment of retired pay (sec. 646)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1408 of title 10, United States Code, to allow members to waive notice of an application for payment of retired pay and eliminate the requirement that a copy of the court order be sent to all members in every case. Under the provision, the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) would notify members that, upon request, it would send a copy of the order to them. This would eliminate an unnecessary administrative burden on the DFAS.

Retention of assistive technology and devices by certain members of the Armed Forces after separation from service (sec. 647)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize severely injured or ill members of the armed forces who have been provided assistive technology or devices to retain such technology or devices after separation from the armed forces.

The committee commends the Department of Defense Computer/Electronic Accommodations Program (CAP) for its outreach to military members who have been wounded in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. Building on more than 10 years of experience in providing assistive technology to employees with disabilities throughout the Federal Government, CAP has reached out to wounded military members at Walter Reed and Brooke Army Medical Centers to provide computer technology and assistive devices, which facilitate communication and enhance the capability of the wounded members for reemployment. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to provide appropriate increases in the budget in future years for CAP in recognition of its increased mission in support of severely injured or ill members of the armed forces.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Audit of pay accounts of members of the Army evacuated from a combat zone for inpatient care (sec. 661)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to conduct an audit of the pay accounts of each member of the Army wounded or injured in a combat zone who was evacuated from a theater of operations for inpatient care during the period beginning on May 1, 2005, and ending on April 30, 2006. The provision would also require the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, no later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on the results of the audit. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to establish within the Department of Defense an assistance center through which a member of the armed forces or the primary next of kin of deceased members, using toll free telephone numbers, may obtain assistance in resolving difficulties relating to military pay within prescribed time standards.

Item of Special Interest

Department of Defense child care services

The committee is pleased with the progress the Department of Defense is making in reducing the shortfall of subsidized childcare spaces for military members and their families, based on additional appropriations and more flexible military construction authorities provided by the Congress. Phase I of the Department's child care plan would increase capacity by 4,077 spaces on military installations; phase II of the plan would increase capacity by an additional 3,799 spaces. Because of the importance of the availability of child care as a quality of life asset to military personnel, the committee expects the Department to continue to make progress toward the goal of reducing the remaining shortfall of 30,000 child care spaces. In addition, the committee is concerned that outreach to Reserve and National Guard families needs to be improved. The committee directs the Department to report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2007, on strategies to improve opportunities for support of child care services for mobilized members of the National Guard and Reserve components who do not live in the immediate vicinity of military installations.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE

Subtitle A—Benefits Matters

Improved procedures for cancer screening for women (sec. 701)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide additional flexibility to the Secretary of Defense in providing primary and preventive health care services needed by women, specifically screenings for cervical cancer and breast cancer. The committee is concerned that the current statutory limitation concerning pap smears and mammograms in section 1074d of title 10, United States Code, is a barrier to access to newly developed and more effective screening techniques.

National mail-order pharmacy program (sec. 702)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the existing pharmacy benefit for military beneficiaries by requiring that all refill prescriptions of maintenance medications be obtained from the Department of Defense national mail-order pharmacy program, unless waived by the Secretary of Defense based on clinical need. The provision would also prohibit the Department from requiring co-payment for refills of generic medications, as well as brand name medications determined by a physician to be medically necessary, which are obtained from the national mail-order pharmacy program.

The committee believes that the Department has ample evidence to support action to stimulate use of the national mail-order pharmacy program as an alternative to its more costly retail pharmacy program, and that benefit changes in the pharmacy program should be initiated in fiscal year 2007. Shifting refills of maintenance medications from military treatment facility pharmacies to the national mail-order pharmacy program should provide opportunities to realign hospital and clinic resources in support of other needs. The committee commends the Department for providing incentives and encouragement for beneficiaries to use the national mail-order pharmacy program.

Availability under TRICARE of anesthesia for children in connection with dental procedures for which dental anesthesia is inappropriate (sec. 703)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize payment under TRICARE for hospitalization and anesthesia services in connection with dental treatment for a child under the age of six for whom conventional dental anesthesia is not advisable or safe. Although such services may be available in certain military treatment facilities, cost sharing features of the TRICARE Dental

Program are a barrier to access to these services from civilian hospitals if care is not available in a military hospital.

TRICARE coverage for forensic examinations following sexual assaults and domestic violence (sec. 704)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize payment under TRICARE for forensic examinations following a sexual assault or domestic violence. Although such examinations may be compensated by a State's Victim Compensation Funds, practices vary widely within and among states. The committee believes that a consistent policy of payment for such examinations is an appropriate improvement to the TRICARE program.

Prohibition on increase in fiscal year 2007 in enrollment fees for coverage under TRICARE Prime (sec. 705)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit any increase in TRICARE Prime enrollment fees during fiscal year 2007. The committee is concerned that the proposed fee adjustments, intended to achieve a cumulative increase of 115 percent, comparable to that of the Federal Employee Health Benefit Program, by fiscal year 2008, are premature. The committee notes that the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness has pledged to work in partnership with the Congress in determining future benefit changes. The committee believes that the audit of health care costs of the Department of Defense by the Comptroller General, authorized elsewhere in this report, is an essential building block prior to consideration of future increases.

Limitation on fiscal year 2007 increase in premiums for coverage under TRICARE of members of Reserve components who commit to continued service in Selected Reserve after release from active duty (sec. 706)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the increase in premiums under the program known as TRICARE Reserve Select to 2.2 percent, the amount of the pay raise, in fiscal year 2007. The committee believes that the audit of Department of Defense health care costs required elsewhere in this report is essential prior to consideration of further significant adjustments to health care cost sharing requirements, including the application of any annual inflationary index.

Subtitle B—Planning, Programming, and Management

Treatment of TRICARE Retail Pharmacy Network under Federal procurement of pharmaceuticals (sec. 721)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that the TRICARE retail pharmacy network is covered by the federal pricing limits applicable to covered drugs under section 8126 of title 38, United States Code. The provision would reaffirm a decision made by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on October 24, 2002, and implemented by the Department of Defense on October 1, 2004, that drugs purchased by the Department of Defense through the TRICARE retail pharmacy network are subject to the same federal pricing limits that have long applied to drugs pur-

chased by the Department and provided through military hospitals and clinics and the national mail order program.

Relationship between the TRICARE program and employer-sponsored group health care plans (sec. 722)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit public and private employers with 20 or more employees from providing a financial incentive to TRICARE-eligible retirees to utilize TRICARE as the primary payer for health care in lieu of health care benefits offered to all other employees. The provision would establish a penalty of $5,000 for each violation. The provision would ensure the right of any military retiree who is eligible for TRICARE to obtain those benefits on the same basis as all other retirees who have earned such coverage in return for a career of military service.

The Secretary of Defense testified before the Committee on Armed Services on February 7, 2006, that as a result of many private and state employers dropping their employer coverage for military retirees and directing or encouraging them to rely on TRICARE, "the military is increasingly subsidizing the health care costs of private corporations, organizations and state and local governments." The committee believes that such efforts will drain needed operational resources from the Department of Defense, and though legal at this time, must be curtailed in the future.

The committee expects the Department to consult with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Attorney General, as appropriate, in the administration and enforcement of this provision.

Enrollment in the TRICARE program (sec. 723)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a system of enrollment for all beneficiaries who obtain health care services from the military health care system. The provision would authorize the Secretary to collect a one-time administrative fee not to exceed $25.00 for individuals and $40.00 for families, unless waived, as a condition for certain beneficiaries to receive military health care services under TRICARE standard. The provision would require the Secretary to reach out to covered beneficiaries through health risk assessments, improved communication, and surveys. The committee believes that a modern health care system must have the capability to reach out to its users in order to become more efficient, to improve customer service, and to identify persons whose complex medical conditions will benefit from improved care management.

Incentive payments for the provision of services under the TRICARE program in medically underserved areas (sec. 724)

The committee recommends a provision that would require incentive payments for physicians who provide services to TRICARE eligible beneficiaries in medically underserved areas. The incentive payment would be 5 percent of the amount payable for the service under the TRICARE program in an area designated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services as a primary care scarcity

county or specialist care scarcity county, and 10 percent of the TRICARE amount in an area designed as a health professional shortage area. The bonus amount would be in addition to the maximum authorized payment under the TRICARE program.

The committee is concerned that eligible service members and their families who live in such areas, especially members of the National Guard and Reserve components, continue to experience challenges in access to health care services under TRICARE. The provision is intended to extend to the TRICARE program authority similar to that provided in the Medical Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–173) to improve health care access in medically underserved areas. The committee believes that the recommended provision would be complementary to the Department's existing authority to waive local reimbursement rates when access is impeded due to lack of providers, and will contribute to improvements in health care access for all beneficiaries, especially members of the National Guard and Reserve components.

Standardization of claims processing under TRICARE program and Medicare program (sec. 725)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that by October 1, 2007, all TRICARE claims processing requirements with respect to identification of providers and documentation of medical necessity be identical to medicare claims processing requirements. The provision would also authorize Department of Defense health care claims processing contractors to collect amounts owed by third party payers immediately upon presentation of claims. Finally, the provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report to Congress setting forth a complete list of claims processing requirements under the TRICARE program that differ from the medicare program, and a business case justifying the Department's unique requirement. The committee believes that increased efficiencies can be obtained through a higher degree of uniformity with the medical claims processing requirements in medicare, including greater utilization of electronic claims submission by providers.

Requirements for support of military treatment facilities by civilian contractors under TRICARE (sec. 726)

The committee recommends a provision that would require each TRICARE Regional Office Director to develop an integrated plan for support of military treatment facilities by contracted civilian health care and administrative personnel. The provision would require approval by the TRICARE Regional Office Director of all such contracts, in accordance with a consistent process for developing cost benefit analyses of such agreements prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The provision would also require consistent standards of quality for contracted support personnel, including accreditation of health care staffing in accordance with the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Health Care Organization Health Care Staffing Standards.

The committee is concerned that contracting for support services has become fragmented and inefficient in the TRICARE program.

Based on information obtained from beneficiaries and contractors alike, it appears to lack rigor in terms of performance outcomes, providing incentives for achieving efficiencies, and consistent quality standards for contracted personnel. In light of the Department's intent to continue conversion of military medical personnel to civilians, either as federal employees or contracted support, it is crucial that the Department reexamine the effectiveness of all of its contracting approaches in order to achieve maximum efficiency in the military health care system.

Uniform standards for access to health care services for wounded or injured servicemembers (sec. 727)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe uniform standards for the access of wounded or injured service members to health care services. The provision would ensure that if the standard established by the Secretary of Defense cannot be met due to any limitation on military health care resources, that services will be obtained, in accordance with access standards, from authorized civilian providers. The Secretary of each military department would be required to maintain a system to track the performance of the military health care system in achieving uniform standards of access for all types of care for wounded or injured members.

In cases that have been brought to the attention of the committee, wounded members have been delayed in obtaining needed medical and rehabilitative services due to a shortage of providers in military hospitals and clinics. The required policy is intended to clarify the priority for service to the wounded throughout the military health care system, to ensure that care is obtained through civilian sources of care if it is not available in a timely manner in military hospitals and clinics, and to ensure that the performance of the health care system in this regard is monitored by senior leadership.

Disease and chronic care management (sec. 728)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a comprehensive program on disease and chronic care management for all categories of beneficiaries under TRICARE. The program would include, at a minimum, the most common chronic diseases—diabetes, cancer, heart disease, asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disorder, and depression and anxiety disorders. The program would meet nationally-recognized accreditation standards for such programs, such as those available through the National Committee for Quality Assurance.

The committee notes that the Defense Business Board's Healthcare for Military Retirees Task Group recommended in its December 2005 report that the Department move aggressively in the establishment of wellness initiatives. The committee believes that a more comprehensive and structured care management program for chronically ill beneficiaries of all ages is needed. The committee recognizes that quality improvements and savings will be dependent on the level of financial investment, and would require the Secretary to eliminate financial disincentives in support of dis-

ease and chronic care management programs within the Department of Defense health care system.

Post-deployment health assessments for members of the Armed Forces returning from deployment in support of a contingency operation (sec. 729)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe requirements for post-deployment health and mental health assessments for each member of the armed forces returning from deployment in support of a contingency operation, and that each such assessment be conducted by a qualified health care provider. The provision would require the Secretary to prescribe the criteria to be used by health care providers in determining whether to refer a member of the armed forces for further evaluation for mental health care, and to ensure that providers are properly trained in the consistent application of the criteria. The provision would also require the establishment of tracking and quality assurance mechanisms to ensure that needed referrals for mental health care are accomplished and can be documented.

The committee is concerned by recent findings of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) that reveal significant shortfalls in the Department's post-deployment health assessment processes in the area of mental health care. The GAO found that the Department of Defense did not provide specific criteria for health care providers to follow when deciding to issue a referral for mental health or combat/operational stress evaluation, and that there was no specific training required to ensure the consistent identification by health care providers of persons who are at risk for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). On average, only 22 percent of service members whose response to questions on the post-deployment health assessment were consistent with risk for PTSD were referred for further evaluation. In addition, the Department could not document that mental health services were obtained by service members as a result of the referral for care. The committee expects urgency in the resolution of the problems identified by the GAO concerning consistency and effectiveness of post-deployment mental health referrals.

Subtitle C—Studies and Reports

Pilot projects on early diagnosis and treatment of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and other mental health conditions (sec. 741)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct three pilot projects during fiscal year 2007 to evaluate the efficacy of various approaches to improving the capability of the military and civilian health care systems to provide early diagnosis and treatment of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and other mental health conditions experienced by military members returning from combat.

The provision would require that:

(1) one pilot project be carried out at a military medical facility that supports a large mobilization and demobilization site;

(2) a second pilot project be carried out at the location of a National Guard or Reserve unit located more than 40 miles away from a military installation; and

(3) a third pilot project use and evaluate the utility of Internet-based automated tools to aid military and civilian health care providers in the diagnosis and treatment of PTSD, as well as web-based tools available to family members to assist them in the identification of emerging symptoms in military members.

The committee recommends $10.0 million for support of the pilot projects in fiscal year 2007.

Studies of soldiers returning from Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom conducted over the last 2 years have consistently found that a significant number of military service members are at risk for depression or PTSD due to combat-related stress. Although the Department of Defense announced in January 2005 its intention to require additional follow-up mental health assessments, the program is not fully implemented. A recent General Accountability Office study on post-deployment mental health care found that 80 percent of service members who were at risk for PTSD based on answers to post-deployment mental health questions were never referred for additional care. Of those that were referred, the Department could not document that care was actually received. Finally, as of April 21, 2007, the Department had not established the Department of Defense Task Force, as required in section 721 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), which was intended to be instrumental in the initiation of a broad range of mental health efforts for military members and their families, and has not, to our knowledge, implemented the required pilot project in section 721(b) of that Act, which would employ Internet-based tools for diagnosis, treatment, and educational assistance to families on PTSD and other combat-related stress disorders.

The committee expects that the Department of Defense will, in the development and implementation of strategies to address the mental health needs of those serving in the global war on terror, ensure that such programs are designed to address the unique needs and circumstances faced by members and families of the National Guard and Reserve.

Annual reports on certain medical malpractice cases (sec. 742)

The committee recommends a provision that would require each Secretary of a military department to report annually to the Secretary of Defense on cases involving allegations of medical malpractice for non-active duty beneficiaries in military hospitals, and involving a judgment or settlement in the amount of $1.0 million or more. The provision would also require the Secretary of a military department to report annually to the Secretary of Defense on any case in which the death or serious injury of a military member occurred as a result of medical malpractice. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the congressional defense committees the results of the reports submitted by the Secretaries of the military departments by February 1, 2007, and annu-

ally thereafter. The committee intends in this provision to increase timely awareness of significant cases involving medical malpractice, and actions taken to improve medical quality performance throughout the Department of Defense health care system.

Comptroller General study on the Department of Defense pharmacy benefits program (sec. 743)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a study of the Department of Defense pharmacy benefits program by the Comptroller General 9 months from the date of enactment of this Act. The study would examine the cost and structure of the program required by section 1074g of title 10, United States Code, as well as the composition and function of the Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee and Beneficiary Advisory Panel. The committee believes that an external review of the pharmacy benefit program is timely, in light of expanding utilization of pharmaceuticals in health care delivery. The Department's pharmacy benefits program has not been reviewed externally since its implementation in 2003.

Comptroller General audits of Department of Defense health care costs and cost-saving measures (sec. 744)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General to conduct a detailed audit of Department of Defense health care costs, in order to examine the basis for comparison of costs for health care benefits provided to eligible beneficiaries from 1995 to 2005. The provision would require analysis of the assumptions used by the Department in estimating savings through increased cost-sharing by beneficiaries beginning in fiscal year 2007, including the annual rate of inflation of defense health care costs and how that rate compares with the average annual rate of increase in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program. The provision would also require an audit of the costs of the Department in implementing expanded health care benefits for Reserves through the TRICARE Reserve Select Program, and a comparison of premium rates established for that program with actual costs of providing benefits, including the 8.5 percent increase applied in January 2005.

The committee believes that an independent audit of the financial basis and effect of any proposed increase in TRICARE premiums or deductibles is necessary prior to proceeding with further consideration of future benefit changes.

Review of Department of Defense medical quality improvement program (sec. 745)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to contract for an independent review of the scope and performance of the Department of Defense medical quality improvement program, and to compare the program with quality improvement programs and mechanisms used by other public and private health care systems and organizations.

The committee understands that the Department is pursuing numerous quality improvement techniques, based on its annual report to Congress on health care quality. The committee believes that

continuous improvement in medical quality is the highest healthcare priority. Accordingly, the committee believes than an independent assessment of the Department's program, along with a comparative analysis of the practices of other public and private health care organizations, is a valuable building block in ensuring health care quality for all military beneficiaries.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Extension of limitation on conversion of military medical and dental positions to civilian medical and dental positions (sec. 761)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend to fiscal year 2007 and future years a requirement in section 744 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) for the Secretary of Defense to certify that conversion of military medical positions to civilian or contractor positions does not increase the cost, or erode access to or the quality of military health care. The provision would require that the certification be submitted with the President's budget request beginning in fiscal year 2008.

The committee intends to remain vigilant over the planned conversions of military medical positions in the Department of Defense, especially in light of challenging medical readiness requirements and anticipated shortfalls in medical personnel needed during wartime. The committee considers a conversion of a military medical position to a civilian or contractor position to occur on the effective date of the documentation converting the position. The committee encourages the Department to consider the full cost, including training costs, of military and civilian health care personnel in making its determination concerning cost saving in this initiative.

Items of Special Interest

Sustaining the military health care benefit

The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense has acted prudently in calling attention to the increasing costs of military health care benefits, and concurs that reform is needed in order to sustain the highest quality health care benefits for all members of the armed forces and their families, and for retired members and their families. The committee is concerned, however, that the President's budget request for fiscal year 2007 was reduced by $735.0 million in anticipation of enactment of legislation and significant benefit changes related to its package of reforms, known as "Sustain the Benefit", without prior consultation with Congress. The committee believes that more time is needed to examine both the factual basis and the potential for savings assumed by proposed increases in enrollment fees for retirees under TRICARE Prime, increases in deductible amounts for TRICARE Standard, and a potential annual inflation index for future financial stability. The committee is also concerned that savings which rely on the departure from TRICARE of military retirees who have earned health care coverage in return for a career of military service is contrary

to the nation's responsibility for stewardship that such retirees deserve.

The committee is aware of the programming and budgeting practices of the Department of Defense. As such, the committee has reason to believe that the Defense Health Program (DHP) has been decreased in the Future Years Defense Program in anticipation of savings from these reforms. Inasmuch as the committee is not recommending that all the reforms be enacted, the DHP is also underfunded in future years. The committee strongly urges the Secretary to adjust the funding programmed for the DHP accordingly before the President's budget request for fiscal year 2008 is submitted to the Congress.

Rising health care costs are not unique to the military health care system. In hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services in April 2005, private sector experts described ongoing reform efforts in private industry that include, but are not limited to, increasing the level of financial participation by covered beneficiaries. Best practices in private industry also include aggressive disease management and quality improvement programs.

The committee commends the Department for reform efforts already underway, including plans for the deployment of an electronic medical records system. However, the committee believes that more needs to be done. Health care reform will be incremental, but it must be achieved. The committee recommends 10 provisions (secs.702, 721, 722, 723, 725, 726, 728, 744, 745, and 923) for fiscal year 2007 that are intended to support the transformation of the military health system to a modern and more efficient health care system. The committee will continue to work with all TRICARE stakeholders in the formulation of future health care reforms to ensure that high quality benefits are sustainable for generations to come.

Basrah Children's Hospital, Iraq

The Basrah Children's hospital is a public-private venture of the United States Government and Project Hope to provide a 94 bed acute care hospital to care for severely ill children throughout Iraq. The facility will include a capability to provide a special focus on childhood cancers. In spite of schedule delays, which are consistent with reconstruction efforts elsewhere in Iraq, Project Hope and the Iraqi Ministry of Health continue to train Iraqi health care providers in specialty medical services needed by severely ill children in Iraq. The committee believes that the Basrah Children's Hospital, when complete, will serve as a model of excellence for improving pediatric health care in Iraq and treatment for critically ill infants and children.

Mental Health Self-Assessment Program

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has utilized the Mental Health Self-Assessment Program to facilitate identification by soldiers and their families of symptoms or warning signs of depression or Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) following deployment. The committee believes that this program can be an effective tool in helping service members and their families

deal with the stress of deployments. The committee directs that the Secretary of Defense report to the congressional defense committees within 120 days of enactment of this Act on the Department's efforts:

(1) to include the Mental Health Self-Assessment Program in ongoing efforts to address PTSD and other mental health conditions related to deployment;

(2) to include services for the children of deployed or mobilized service members in the program; and

(3) to increase awareness of the program for military members and their families, including the National Guard and Reserve components.

Services for autism

The committee has learned from concerned military families that a recent change in policy concerning Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) services for autistic children under TRICARE has resulted in restricted access to care for hundreds of military families who had previously received such services. Prior to the establishment of the Extended Care Health Option (ECHO) on September 1, 2005, military families had access to ABA services for autistic children under TRICARE, generally in accordance with the recommendation of the National Research Council report on "Educating Children with Autism" (2001), of 25 hours a week, 12 months a year, using trained therapists working under the supervision of a Board Certified Behavior Analyst. Upon institution of the ECHO program, the Department of Defense restricted reimbursement for the hands-on providers of ABA services to Board Certified Behavior Analysts, based on quality of care concerns. The committee is concerned about the restriction on access to care that the new policy under ECHO has created. The committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs to reexamine the policy on ABA services in light of the needs of hundreds of military families for such services, and to report to the congressional defense committees on the results of such reexamination within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, including any policy, program, and legislative changes needed to provide adequate ABA services to autistic children who are authorized TRICARE beneficiaries.

TRICARE customer service

The committee views improvements in customer service as a continuing challenge for the Department of Defense, and one which must be accorded a high priority in health care reform efforts. While overall satisfaction with TRICARE remains high, according to independent surveys and comparison with other large health plans, the committee believes that greater efficiencies are achievable in customer service support. TRICARE has more than 14 separate toll free lines, each operated to address a specific program, such as the TRICARE pharmacy program, TRICARE for Life, or the TRICARE Dental Program. At the local level, individual telephone access numbers for appointments, beneficiary counseling, or debt collection multiply even further. The committee believes that the proliferation of separate telephone lines in a unified health benefits program represents an outdated solution to modern cus-

tomer service support, and that opportunities for improved customer service need to be examined as the Department proceeds to define requirements for future health care support contracts. The committee directs the Department to conduct a study on the cost benefit and feasibility of establishing an enterprise-level call and communications system for the TRICARE program, and to report to the congressional defense committees its findings by February 1, 2007.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management

Additional certification requirements for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 801)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 39 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to include additional certifications before a major defense acquisition program receives Milestone B approval, or Key Decision Point B approval in the case of a space program.

Section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) required the Secretary to make certain certifications regarding the maturity of technology at the initiation of a major acquisition program; the affordability of the program; the completion of an analysis of alternatives with respect to the program; and the validation of the operational requirements for the program by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council. However, the committee understands that the Defense Acquisition Board takes other factors into consideration that must be considered as part of the process for Milestone B approval.

The National Military Strategy provides the overarching guidance for the Department of Defense's execution of the National Security Strategy and a program should be evaluated and validated in that context. Prior into entry into system development and demonstration, the Department conducts an independent cost estimate that includes the total costs of the program. The Secretary should pay particular attention to estimated costs of the program as it enters into full rate production to ensure that the program is affordable within an estimate of the future defense budget.

This provision would ensure that a program certified by the Secretary meets validated requirements consistent with the National Military Strategy; reasonable estimates have been developed to execute the product development and production plan under the program; and funding is available to execute the product development and production plan.

Extension and enhancement of Defense Acquisition Challenge program (sec. 802)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend and modify authority for the Department of Defense to execute the Defense Acquisition Challenge program. The provision would extend through 2012 the program originally established in the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314). Although the Department originally opposed the es-

tablishment of the program, the committee notes that the Department now supports the program and believes it "helps to encourage small and medium business innovation in weapon system products and facilitates rapid adoption of near-term technologies by the warfighter." Despite the programmatic mission to increase participation by nontraditional defense contractors, the committee understands that 7 out of the Department's 10 largest dollar volume contractors in fiscal years 2004 and 2005 have made use of the limited acquisition challenge budget and staff resources to pursue challenge proposals. Consistent with the original congressional and Department plans for the program, the provision would also provide the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics with authority to establish procedures to ensure that the program is focused on small and medium-sized businesses, as well as nontraditional defense contractors, who often serve as the engine of innovation in technology.

Baseline description and unit cost reports for major defense acquisition systems (sec. 803)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the definition of the term "Original Baseline Estimate", and provide for periodic reporting of program acquisition unit costs and procurement unit costs above the significant cost growth thresholds identified in section 2433 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) defined the term Original Baseline Estimate and restricted the circumstances in which a baseline estimate could be modified. The committee acknowledges that cost estimates made prior to a program entering into systems development and demonstration are a more realistic approximation of the actual costs of the program and are independently reviewed by the Department of Defense. The provision would modify the definition of Original Baseline Estimate to mean the baseline established before the program enters into system development and demonstration.

The provision would also clarify the Department's reporting obligations after the program acquisition unit cost or procurement unit cost has exceeded the significant cost growth threshold. The provision would require that each Selected Acquisition Report following the breach include updated information concerning unit costs, but does not compel the program manager to submit an out of cycle report of each additional increase in unit costs.

Major automated information system programs (sec. 804)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that, as part of the annual budget justification materials, the Department of Defense provide to the congressional defense committees a report on programs designated as major automated information systems (MAIS). The report would include the estimate of developmental costs and total life-cycle costs (original and current), a schedule of major events (original and current), and a brief summary of key performance criteria (original and current).

The provision would further require the Department to promptly notify the congressional defense committees when a program man-

ager responsible for a MAIS program becomes aware that a MAIS program may exceed 25 percent of either developmental or life-cycle cost estimates, expects to slip any major scheduled event by more than 1 year, or expects to deviate significantly in performance goals. That program would be subject to the reporting requirements similar to those included in section 2433, of title 10, United States Code, commonly referred to as the Nunn-McCurdy reporting requirements.

Over the past several months, the committee has been disappointed to learn of multiple major automated information systems within the Department that have slipped in both cost and schedule without notification to Congress. The committee remains disturbed by the continued requirements creep and resources drain from which most major information technology programs suffer.

In Department of Defense (DoD) Instruction Number 5000.2, the Department stipulates the criteria to be met in order to designate a program as a major automated information system (MAIS). Currently, 47 programs meet the MAIS criteria. The Department has 26 internal reporting requirements for MAIS programs that incorporate aspects of cost, schedule, and performance. Additionally, the services are required to report deviations in accordance with Department Strategic Information Management Plans. As of June 2004, according to the Government Accountability Office, no MAIS program has been reported as having deviated significantly from its goals, despite not one MAIS program having met cost, schedule, or performance criteria. This legislative provision would clarify reporting requirements to the congressional defense committees for MAIS programs and stipulate actions required if deviations occur to program cost, schedule, or performance criteria.

Adjustment of original baseline estimates for major defense acquisition program experiencing cost growth resulting from damage caused by hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma (sec. 805)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Department of Defense to adjust the original baseline estimate under section 2435(d) of title 10, United States Code, for a major defense program that is carried out primarily in the areas affected by Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma for the sole purpose of addressing cost growth that is directly attributable to damage caused by those hurricanes. The provision would require that the Secretary of Defense notify the congressional defense committees of a program adjustment under this provision and provide an explanation of the basis for an adjustment in the first Selected Acquisition Report that is submitted under section 2432 of title 10, United States Code.

In division B of the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–138), the Congress appropriated $1.9 billion "for extraordinary shipbuilding and ship repair costs * * *" for areas affected by Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. In the Department's fiscal year 2006 supplemental request for hurricane relief and recovery, the Department requested an additional $1.0 billion for ship repair and shipyards-related costs. The committee acknowledges that supplemental funds added to the shipbuilding pro-

grams affected by Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma will likely cause the shipbuilding programs to breach Nunn-McCurdy thresholds. This provision would allow for a one-time adjustment to address cost growth associated with these natural disasters.

Internal controls for procurements on behalf of the Department of Defense by certain non-defense agencies (sec. 806)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense Inspector General (IG), in consultation with applicable Inspector's General of non-defense agencies, to determine whether the policies, procedures, and internal controls of non-defense agencies for purchases on behalf of the Department are adequate to ensure compliance with defense procurement requirements. The provision would also expand section 811 of the National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) to include IG reviews of the National Institutes of Health and the Veterans' Administration. The provision would modify section 811 to make clear that in case of a disagreement between the Department IG and the IG of a non-defense agency on the level of compliance with defense procurement requirements or termination of applicable limitations the Department IG would make the final determination.

Regulations on use of fixed price contracts in development programs (sec. 807)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to modify Department of Defense regulations regarding the use of fixed-price contracts in development programs. The provision would permit contracts other than fixed-price contracts, only if the Secretary determines that the program is so complex and technologically challenging that it would not be practical to reduce program risk to the level that would permit the use of a fixed-price contract. The provision would also repeal section 807 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1989 (Public Law 100–456), which prohibited the use of fixed-price development contracts.

Twenty years ago, the Department experimented with the aggressive use of fixed-price development contracts, and learned that the use of such contracts is not practicable in development programs with a high degree of technical risk. In response, Congress enacted section 807, which prohibits the use of fixed-price type development contracts unless a waiver is granted by the Secretary of Defense. In testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on March 29, 2006, Mr. Terry R. Little, Acquisition Advisor to the Director, Missile Defense Agency, stated:

> In particular, the Department applied fixed-price contracts to very high-risk development programs and, typically, the program selected the low bidder as the winning contractor. These two factors together produced contracts with very unrealistically low prices and predictable bad results as the work unfolded.

Unfortunately, the prohibition on the use of fixed-price development contracts appears to have contributed to widespread cost and schedule growth on major defense acquisition programs. Mr. Little further explained:

> The certain prospect of a cost reimbursable contract encourages contractors and acquirers to undertake developments that are excessively high risk. A new development that relies on essential technologies that are immature, manufacturing processes that not yet proven, or beyond the state-of-the-art breakthroughs is surely going to be disappointing. It's going to cost more, take longer, and deliver less than anyone expected when it started. I argue that most everything the Department needs to develop today can proceed in low-risk stages with each stage providing an increment of capability. The expectation for that capability should be consistent with what we know we can provide at low-risk and in a short, predictable development time. Therefore, each increment should also be compatible with a fixed price contract; if it's truly not, then the risk is probably too high to start.

The committee and the Department have consistently recognized the importance of reducing program risk by avoiding the incorporation of immature technologies and unproven manufacturing processes into major defense acquisition programs. Over the past several months, a series of major studies have reaffirmed the need for reducing program risk, including a July 2005 report by the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a January 2006 report of the Defense Acquisition Program Assessment, a February 2006 report by the Defense Science Board, and the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review. One of the common themes that ran through all these reports was the need for program stability and reduced program risk.

In a March 2006 report, entitled "Improved Business Case Is Needed for Future Combat System's Successful Outcome," the Government Accountability Office (GAO) highlighted the use of technology readiness levels (TRL) as:

> a valuable decision-making tool because they can presage the likely consequences of incorporating a technology at a given level of maturity into a product development. The maturity level of a technology can range from paper studies (level 1), to prototypes that can be tested in a realistic environment (level 7), to an actual system that has proven itself in mission operations (level 9).

The GAO noted that "best practices of leading commercial firms and successful DOD programs have shown that critical technologies should be mature to at least a TRL 7 before the start of product development."

According to Department acquisition policy, a technology should have been demonstrated in a relevant environment (TRL 6) or, preferably, in an operational environment (TRL 7) to be considered mature enough to use for product development in systems integra-

tion. DOD Instruction 5000.2 states that at the time of entry into the System Demonstration phase of a program:

> The management and mitigation of technology risk, which allows less costly and less time-consuming systems development, is a crucial part of overall program management and is especially relevant to meeting cost and schedule goals. * * * If technology is not mature, the DOD component shall use alternative technology that is mature and that can meet the user's needs.

The committee believes that fixed-price contracts are preferable, if the Department has a firm grasp of the requirements and the technology to meet these requirements. A prudent application of technology readiness levels should enable the Department to lower risk and develop a better understanding of program costs. At the same time, the committee recognizes that this contract type will not be appropriate for all situations. Therefore, the provision would authorize the Secretary to make a determination on the use of different types of contracts in appropriate to the circumstances.

For production programs, as for development programs, the contract type selected should reflect the level of risk in the program. A major defense acquisition program that meets the criteria in DOD Instruction 5000.2 for production programs should be a relatively low-risk program for both the Department and the contractor. Absent unusual circumstances, the contract type selected should reflect that level of risk.

Finally, the committee notes that the reduction of manufacturing risks may be measured, consistent with the recommendations of the Defense Science Board and in accordance with industry standards, through the use of Manufacturing Readiness Levels (MRL's). Similarly, the system interoperability may be measured through Interoperability Readiness Levels (IRL's). The committee directs the Department to report to the congressional defense committees by no later than March 1, 2007, on the feasibility of incorporating MRL's and IRL's into DOD Instruction 5000.2 as explicit criteria for milestone decisions.

Availability of funds for performance-based logistics contracts for weapons systems logistics support (sec. 808)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use Operation and Maintenance (O&M) funds for Performance Based Logistics (PBL) contracts to finance costs associated with the implementation of engineering changes that result in a reduction of government O&M costs. By authorizing the use of O&M funds for these traditional investment costs, the contractor would have an incentive to make engineering changes that would actually result in a lower cost of operation, resulting in cost savings that would not otherwise be available.

The provision would require the Secretary of the military department concerned to notify Congress not later than 30 days before entering into a performance-based logistics contract. That notification must include a statement that the procuring agency had demonstrated in a business case analysis that the proposed PBL contract's implementation of engineering changes would result in a re-

duction of O&M costs, including an estimate of the projected costs and savings along with an explanation of the basis for those estimates.

Quality control in procurement of ship critical safety items and related services (sec. 809)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe in regulation a quality control policy for the procurement of ship critical safety items and the procurement of modifications, repair, and overhaul of such items. This provision would bring the quality control requirements for ship critical safety items and related services in line with the requirements for aviation critical safety items.

The committee remains concerned by periodic reports about problems with the quality of critical parts for major weapon systems acquired by the Department of Defense. For this reason, the committee directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to conduct a comprehensive review of the quality assurance and quality control systems used by the Department and its largest contractors. The GAO review should compare the systems used by the Department and its contractors to the quality control and quality assurance systems used by private sector companies who are considered to be industry leaders, and make such recommendations as the Comptroller General determines to be appropriate. The Comptroller General will submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than April 1, 2007, on the findings of the review.

Three-year extension of requirement for reports on commercial price trend analyses of the Department of Defense (sec. 810)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the requirement for an annual report on price trend analyses for commercial items purchased by the Defense Logistics Agency and the military departments through 2009. The committee believes that aggressive price trend analysis can play an important role in ensuring that prices paid on Department of Defense contracts are fair and reasonable. This report is an important oversight tool in support of that goal.

Pilot program on time-certain development in acquisition of major weapon systems (sec. 811)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program on the use of time-certain development in the acquisition of major weapon systems.

In a January 2006 report to the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the assessment panel of the Defense Acquisition Performance Assessment (DAPA) Project concluded that the Department of Defense's failure to appropriately balance technology maturity, system capability, cost, and program risk before undertaking major defense acquisition programs has led to products that "take tens of years to deliver and cost far more than originally estimated."

The panel concluded that a shift to time-certain development, with schedule as a key performance parameter, would help the Department address these problems. The report stated that:

> Time Certain Development enforces evolutionary acquisition by making time the focus of the up front requirement statement. Capabilities should be upgraded over time as technologies mature and operational requirements become clearer. Time Certain Development differs from prior attempts at valuing time to market, such as evolutionary acquisition and spiral development in that a maximum number of years is mandated, the start and end dates are defined, and the driving processes (requirements, budget, source selection, etc.) are revamped to support it."

The committee concurs with the panel's recommendation that a disciplined approach to time-certain development should help reduce program risk, resulting in a less costly and time-consuming process for the acquisition of major weapon systems.

The committee also notes that the DAPA panel recommended that the military departments be authorized to create management reserves to support stable program funding by using expiring funds budgeted for termination liability to reduce the impact of unexpected technical upsets during program execution. The committee does not believe that there is sufficient discipline in the Department's budget, requirements, and acquisition processes to support the authorization of such accounts. However, this provision would authorize the establishment of a more limited special reserve account, similar to the accounts recommended by the DAPA panel, but limited to major weapon systems that are included in the pilot program for time-certain development under this section.

Subtitle B—Defense Industrial Base Matters

Removal of hand and measuring tools from certain requirements (sec. 821)

The committee recommends a provision that would remove hand and measuring tools from the requirement to buy certain articles from American sources. The committee is not aware of a current national security requirement to limit the production of hand and measuring tools to domestic sources.

Substitution of specialty metals with titanium and nickel under certain requirements (sec. 822)

The committee recommends a provision that would specify that domestic source requirements for specialty metals be applied specifically to titanium and nickel. The committee understands the concerns about the domestic industrial base for specialty metals are specific to titanium and nickel.

Waiver authority for domestic source or content requirements (sec. 823)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to waive the application of statutory domestic source requirements and domestic content require-

ments, provided that: (1) the application of the requirements would impede the reciprocal procurement of defense items under a Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and another country; and (2) the other country does not discriminate against items produced in the United States to a greater degree than the United States discriminates against items produced in that country. The proposed waiver is identical to the standard previously adopted by the Congress for products covered by the domestic content restrictions in section 2534 of title 10, United States Code.

Repeal of requirement for identification of essential military items and military system essential item breakout list (sec. 824)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the requirement for identifying essential military items on a military system essential item breakout list.

The Department has indicated that the information required by section 813 of the National Defense Authorization Action for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) is of limited utility.

Consistency with United States obligations under trade agreements (sec. 825)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that no provision of this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall apply if the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the U.S. Trade Representative, and the Secretary of State, determines that the application of the provision would be inconsistent with international trade agreements of the United States.

Subtitle C—Defense Contractor Matters

Requirements for defense contractors relating to certain former Department of Defense officials (sec. 841)

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. A former Department official who is identified in one contractor report would not have to be identified in subsequent annual reports. The Government Accountability Office reported that the monitoring of former Department employees who take positions with defense contractors is limited. The committee concludes that additional information is required to ensure the effectiveness of the Department's ethics program.

Lead systems integrators (sec. 842)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the participation of lead systems integrators (LSI) in the development or construction of any individual system or element of a systems of systems. The provision would also direct the Secretary of Defense to define the term "lead systems integrator" and to update regulations on LSIs taking into consideration the importance of LSIs in

the production, fielding and sustainment of complex systems; the unique engineering skills of LSIs; and the management and organizational skills and capabilities of LSI. Finally, the provision would direct the Secretary to include a specification of various types of contracts and fee structures, including award and incentive fees, that are appropriate for use by LSIs.

The committee remains concerned with organizational conflicts of interest, the potential for a company to end up in a situation whereby the company is essentially evaluating itself or its competitors in making contract awards. The potential for organizational conflicts of interest continues to grow as the Department of Defense contracts for more work relating to acquisition, engineering, planning, integrating, or managing a system of systems as a major defense acquisition program.

Section 805 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) required the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than September 30, 2006, on the use of LSIs in the acquisition of major systems. The report required by section 805 directed that the Department include a detailed description of the actions taken, or to be taken, regarding "the prevention of organization conflicts of interest arising out of any financial interest of lead systems integrators without system responsibility in the development or production of individual elements of a major weapons systems."

The committee understands that this report may be a work in progress. However, the committee believes that the financial interests of the Department and the taxpayer need to be protected now, not at some point in the future. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services on March 1, 2006, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) stated,

"And ideally, you'd want the LSI to be financially indifferent to the outcome of the program." The provision would address the immediate need to place limitations on the financial interest of LSIs in the acquisition process.

In a December 2005 report, entitled "DOD Has Paid Billions in Award and Incentive Fees Regardless of Acquisition Outcomes", the GAO noted that the Department has paid out an estimated $8.0 billion in award fees to date on a set of contracts they studied for the report. The committee believes that the Department must review the types of contracts involving LSIs and large complex systems, and issue guidance regarding the use of award and incentive contracts when contracting with LSIs for complex systems.

Linking of award and incentive fees to acquisition outcomes (sec. 843)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to issue detailed implementation guidance, including definitions for performance outcomes, for appropriate use of award and incentive fee contracts. The guidance should: ensure new award and incentive fee contracts are linked to acquisition outcomes; provide instruction and establish standards on evaluation of contractor performance and appropriate award of fees; ensure no award fees are paid for poor performance; and provide specific direction for roll over of fees. The provision would also require

performance measures to evaluate the effectiveness of award and incentive fees and mechanisms for sharing successful acquisition strategies. The provision would further require an independent evaluation of the impact of award fee payment decisions on contractor performance.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense issued an award fee contract guidance memo on March 29, 2006, in response to recommendations made by the General Accountability Office (GAO) in a report, entitled "Defense Acquisitions: DOD Has Paid Billions in Award and Incentive Fees Regardless of Acquisition Outcomes," in December, 2005. During testimony before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services in April 2006, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics Ken Krieg acknowledged that the new guidance is a first step in addressing ineffective use of performance contracts and that the Department must solve the strategic and tactical issues behind acquisition and contracting problems. The committee commends Department plans to provide senior-level strategic thinking to the manner in which the Department "governs, manages and executes its activities." The committee believes that establishing some guidelines, standards and accountability in the use of award and incentive fee contracts, along with an evaluation of their strengths and weaknesses when effectively used will improve productive use of performance contracts.

Prohibition on excessive pass-through charges (sec. 844)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to modify Department of Defense regulations to prohibit excessive pass-through charges on contracts or subcontracts that are entered into, for or on the behalf of the Department. The provision would exempt contracts that are not in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold and fixed-price contracts that awarded on the basis of adequate price competition or are for the purchase of commercial items.

The Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services has identified a potential problem with pass-through charges by contractors responsible for major defense acquisition programs. The subcommittee is particularly concerned by the possibility that the Department could be paying unnecessary pass-through charges to lead-system integrators on major weapon systems for which the integrator provides no value added, but that are acquired as a part of a system-of-systems.

In addition, recent press articles have described a process in which work was passed down from the Army Corps of Engineers to a prime contractor, then to a subcontractor, and then to another subcontractor—with each company charging the government for profit and overhead—before finally reaching the company that would actually do the work. In one case, the Army Corps of Engineers reportedly paid a prime contractor $1.75 per square foot to nail plastic tarps onto damaged roofs in Louisiana. The prime contractor paid another company 75 cents per square foot to do the work; that subcontractor paid a third company 35 cents per square foot to do the work; and that subcontractor paid yet another company 10 cents per square foot to do the work. In a second case, the

Army Corps of Engineers reportedly paid prime contractors $28 to $30 per cubic yard to remove debris. The companies that actually performed the work were paid only $6 to $10 per cubic yard. A representative from one of the companies was quoted as saying: "Every time it passes through another layer, $4 or $5 is taken off the top. These others are taking out money, and some of them aren't doing anything." In testimony before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services on April 5, 2006, the Comptroller General, when asked his view on pass-through charges, stated that "* * * one of the things that we need more visibility over is: How many layers, how many players, how many margins are in here?".

The committee believes that the Department needs a regulation that addresses excessive pass-through fees to ensure that authorized and appropriated funds are spent on developing and procuring capabilities, rather than paying for layers of contractors who provide no value-added.

Report on Department of Defense contracting with contractors or subcontractors employing members of the Selected Reserve (sec. 845)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on actual or potential contractors or subcontractors who employ members of the Selected Reserve. The study should address the extent to which Department of Defense contractors employ members of the Selected Reserve; potential disadvantages to such contractors in competing for Department contracts if their employees are mobilized; and make recommendations for any appropriate action to provide such contractors with time or assistance in meeting contract deadlines. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the study to Congress within a year after the date of enactment of this Act, and would repeal section 819 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), which provided authorization for the Secretary to use employment of Selected Reserve members by a contractor as an evaluation factor for award of contracts.

Subtitle D—Program Manager Matters

Program Manager Matters (secs. 861–865)

The committee recommends five provisions under subtitle D that would provide for better management of Department of Defense acquisition programs by enhancing the role of program managers.

The committee remains concerned by continued growth in the cost and time it takes to field major weapon systems. In January 2005, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that the Department acquisition process "consistently yields undesirable consequences—cost increases, late deliveries to the warfighter, and performance shortfalls—in weapon system programs." Similarly, a June 2005 memorandum from the Deputy Secretary of Defense concluded that "Many programs continue to increase in cost and schedule even after multiple studies and recommendations that span the past 15 years."

In response to a request from the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services, GAO reviewed best management practices of private sector companies. In a November 2005 report, entitled "Best Practices: Better Support of Weapon System Program Managers Needed to Improve Outcomes," GAO concluded that leading private sector companies empower their program managers to execute their programs and hold them accountable for the results.

By contrast, GAO found that the Department fails to give program managers the authority they need to execute acquisition programs and, as a result, is unable to hold them accountable. GAO determined that:

> [O]nce programs begin, the program manager is not empowered to execute the program. In particular, program managers cannot veto new requirements, control funding, or control staff.
>
> * * * * *
>
> With so much outside their span of control, program managers say that DOD is unable to hold them accountable when programs get off track. Another reason that it is difficult to hold program managers accountable is that their tenure is relatively short. The problems being encountered today may well be the result of a poor decision made years ago by another program manager.

The program manager provisions (secs. 861–865) are designed to help address these problems by requiring the application of best practices from the commercial sector to Department acquisition programs.

Section 861 would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a comprehensive strategy for enhancing the role of Department program managers in carrying out defense acquisition programs. The strategy should address a wide array of issues identified in the GAO report, including additional recruiting incentives, enhanced training and educational opportunities, increased emphasis on mentoring, identification of career paths, improved resources and technical support, better collection and dissemination of lessons learned, better access to information and data management tools, increased accountability for acquisition results, and enhanced monetary and nonmonetary incentives for program managers.

Section 862 would address the tenure and accountability of program managers for the program development period. The provision would establish responsibilities of such program managers and require that they be assigned to a program until a business case has been completed and the program is ready for a Milestone B decision.

Section 863 would address the tenure and accountability of program managers for the program execution period. The provision would require each such program manager to enter into a performance agreement with the milestone decision authority (MDA) that establishes the expected parameters of performance, including the commitment of the MDA that adequate funding and resources are available and will be provided and assurance of the program manager that the parameters are achievable. The provision would also

require that program managers be given authority comparable to the authority given to private sector program managers and that they be assigned to a program until the delivery of the first production units, with a narrow waiver authority.

Section 864 would address the related issue of contingency program management. Several senior officials responsible for the reconstruction of Iraq have indicated that the effort was hindered by deficiencies in the Federal Government's capability to manage large projects outside the United States. This provision would require the Department, in coordination with other relevant components of the Federal Government, to develop a comprehensive strategy to ensure the United States has the capability to deploy an expert force of appropriate size for rapid, independent management of large, complex programs in varied, potentially harsh environments.

Section 865 would require the Comptroller General to submit to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2007 a report on actions taken by the Secretary of Defense to comply with the requirements of the four sections.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Clarification of authority to carry out certain prototype projects (sec. 871)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160), as amended by section 823 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), to allow the director of a defense agency to make the written determination necessary to exercise other transaction authority on a prototype project that is expected to cost the Department of Defense in excess of $20.0 million, but not more than $100.0 million.

One-year extension of special temporary contract closeout authority (sec. 872)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend by 1 year authority under section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) to allow the Department of Defense to settle contracts entered into prior to October 1, 1996, under specified conditions.

One-year extension of inapplicability of certain laws to contracting with employers of persons with disabilities (sec. 873)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year section 853 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) to ensure the continuation and completion of existing contracts, including any options, awarded under the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C 46 et seq) and the Randolph-Sheppard Act (20 U.S.C. 107 et seq) programs for the operation of military troop dining facilities, military mess halls, and other similar military dining facilities.

Items of Special Interest

Application and interpretation of the Berry amendment

Over the last several months, the Department of Defense has begun to insist that contractors on major weapon systems certify that specialty metals included in the components of such systems, including every nut, bolt, screw and wire, were made in the United States out of domestic materials. This new interpretation of the specialty metals provision of the so-called "Berry amendment" (section 2533a of title 10, United States Code) has significantly slowed the acceptance of badly-needed military systems and could soon make it difficult for operational units of the armed forces to deploy.

The committee notes that the Berry amendment, by its terms, applies to the procurement of "an item", including "specialty metals." The committee understands that the Department has chosen to support the specialty metals industrial base by applying the provision to the acquisition of many items containing specialty metals. The specialty metals provision of the Berry amendment, by its terms, applies only to the purchase of specialty metals and not to the acquisition of major systems that include specialty metals or to subcontracts that are entered at various tiers under such contracts. However, the committee believes that the Department has ample flexibility to implement the provision in a manner that is consistent with the national security needs of the United States.

For the last 30 years, the Department has taken appropriate advantage of this flexibility. The specialty metals provision of the Berry amendment was initially interpreted by the Department in a November 20, 1972, memorandum issued by then-Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird. The Laird memorandum stated that:

> The bulk of these specialty metals which are used in one form or another in myriad items purchased by the Department of Defense are actually procured at the subcontract level—often many subcontract tiers removed from the prime contract—so as to make impracticable any precise evaluation of all such purchases, even at enormous expense in both money and time.
>
> It is apparent, from the legislative history of this provision, that is was not intended that this Department achieve or attempt to achieve the impossible in its implementation. Rather, it is clear that its purpose is to afford reasonable protection to the specialty metals industry to help preserve our domestic production capacity to satisfy mobilization requirements, without forcing a massive disruption of our existing procurement methods and programs. An accommodation is therefore needed to give maximum effect to this new requirement without losing sight of other Congressional objectives that the Department of Defense function in an efficient and economical manner in meeting its mission.
>
> [For these reasons] this restriction will not be applied to purchases under $2,500. To do so would result in a massive and costly administrative burden, essentially impossible of real accomplishment, with apparently no more

> than a de minimis benefit to the industry. Such a result could not have been intended by the Congress.

The Laird memorandum did not automatically apply the specialty metal provision of the Berry amendment to all Department systems. Rather, it authorized the Secretaries of the military departments to waive the applicability of the Berry amendment to the acquisition of specific weapon systems, upon a determination under the statute that the application of the restriction would preclude the procurement of a satisfactory quality and quantity of such systems, as and when needed.

On this basis, the Department has, for more than 30 years, applied a rule of reason in implementing the specialty metals provision of the Berry amendment, consistent with the underlying intent of that provision, including the de minimis rule and waiver authority described in the Laird memorandum. This interpretation and exercise of administrative flexibility has enabled the Department to avoid the absurdity of denying a needed weapon system to our armed forces in the field because a single fastener contains the wrong specialty metal.

The committee is concerned that the Department now appears to be backing away from this longstanding practice of implementing the specialty metals provision of the Berry amendment in a manner that provides needed flexibility in the acquisition of major weapon systems. The committee is not aware of any new industrial base requirements that would require the Department to apply more stringent domestic source restrictions to specialty metals at this time. For this reason, the committee urges the Department to review its policies with respect to the specialty metals provision of the Berry amendment to ensure that these policies do not unnecessarily restrict the Department's ability to rapidly and economically purchase needed equipment for the warfighter.

Brand-name specifications

Part 11.105 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) states that "agency requirements shall not be written so as to require a particular brand name, product, or feature of a product, peculiar to one manufacturer, thereby precluding consideration of a product manufactured by another company." On April 11, 2005, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy issued a memorandum for Chief Acquisition Officers of federal agencies, expressing concern about the proliferation of brand-name specifications and directing agencies to strictly comply with the requirements of the FAR.

The committee is aware of a particular problem with specifications for brand-name microprocessors that are associated with a single manufacturer. In some cases, such specifications appear to have had the unfortunate effect of precluding the use of newer and more advanced products available from the same or other manufacturers. In other cases, the use of brand-name specifications may unnecessarily limit competition—even if the specification permits the use of "brand-name or equal" products.

Because of the large volume of microprocessor procurements undertaken by the Department of Defense each year and the relatively small number of products available to meet those needs, it should be possible for the Department to develop model specifica-

tions for use by defense components that are based on performance benchmarks rather than brand-name specifications. The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to submit a report to the Committee on Armed Services on the use of product model specifications rather than brand-names not later than February 1, 2007.

Clarification of rapid acquisition authority to respond to combat emergencies

The Department of Defense submitted a legislative proposal for fiscal year 2007 that would expressly add domestic source and content restrictions to the categories of statutes and regulations that may be waived by the Department, pursuant to section 811 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–136), when necessary to prevent combat fatalities.

The statement of managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) determined that an identical provision was unnecessary, because domestic source and content restrictions are already waivable under section 811. The statement of managers stated that:

> The conferees note that the Senate provision adding a new category of statutes and regulations that are waivable to prevent combat fatalities was not necessary, because the Department may already waive any provision of law, policy, directive, or regulation addressing the solicitation and selection of sources pursuant to the authority in section 811 * * * for the procurement of equipment urgently needed to eliminate a combat deficiency that has resulted in combat fatalities.

The committee concludes that the Department already has the authority to waive any domestic source or content restriction imposed by law or regulation in connection with the procurement of equipment that is urgently needed to eliminate a combat deficiency that has resulted in combat fatalities.

Coal gasification report

The administration's Clean Coal Power Initiative includes support for developing coal gasification technologies. These technologies have the potential to produce power from coal with significantly reduced effect on the environment, while reducing the United States' reliance on foreign sources of energy. At a time when the cost of petroleum-based fuels has increased considerably, the commercial development of a domestic industry to use coal to produce diesel, jet fuel, and other liquid fuels could have substantial benefit to satisfying the Department's energy requirements. The use of coal-to-liquid technology could provide a means of powering a range of military vehicles at a cost savings by providing an alternative to volatile oil prices.

The committee notes that the statement of managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 directed the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy, to submit a report on the potential use of coal-

to-liquid transportation fuels by the Department of Defense by no later than April 7, 2006. The committee urges the two Secretaries to complete and submit the required report in a timely manner. The report should address the potential costs and benefits to the Department of Defense of utilizing coal gasification technologies, including the Fischer-Tropsch process which converts the gas into a liquid hydrocarbon that resembles current petroleum products.

In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the merits of specific contracting approaches to coal gasification technology projects, and to submit a report on the findings of the review to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2007. This report shall include: (1) an assessment on whether longer-term contracts would be required to effectively implement such projects; (2) an assessment on whether energy savings performance contracts would be an appropriate contracting vehicle for such projects; and (3) a discussion of statutory and budgetary impediments, if any, that may prevent the Department from effectively implementing coal gasification technology projects and recommendations for new authorities necessary to enable the effective implementation of such projects.

Contracting with Federal Prison Industries

The website for a major Army command recently posted a notice, entitled "So, you want new furniture?" The notice stated:

> UNICOR, which is the trade name for Federal Prison Industries, is the mandatory source for furniture. That means *federal law* prescribes the way we are to purchase furniture. The government (including all IMPAC purchase cardholders) must either (1) purchase furniture from UNICOR, or (2) obtain a waiver from UNICOR before purchasing furniture from any other source.

This notice is incorrect. Congress eliminated FPI's mandatory source status with the enactment of section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) and section 819 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314). Under these provisions, the Department may not purchase any FPI product or service unless a contracting officer of the Department determines that the product or service is comparable to products or services available from the private sector, and meets Department needs in terms of price, quality, and time of delivery. If Department officials believe that better products or services are available from the private sector, no FPI waiver is required. This determination is in the sole discretion of Department contracting officials.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to ensure that accurate information on legal requirements for the purchase of products and services that are available from Federal Prison Industries is provided to all military commands and defense agencies.

Past performance evaluations

Section 1091 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355) established the importance of past contract

performance as an indicator of the likelihood that a vendor will successfully perform on a future contract. On this basis, Congress directed the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy to establish guidance regarding the appropriate use of past performance to facilitate the consistent and fair evaluation of potential contractors. The required guidance is provided in subpart 42.15 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR).

The committee continues to believe that past performance information provides key decision-making support to contracting officials carrying out their source selection responsibilities. However, the committee is concerned by reports that some federal agencies may be requiring contractors to submit to or purchase third party performance evaluations as a prerequisite to consideration of contractor proposals. Such third party evaluations may not meet statutory and regulatory requirements. Past performance evaluations should focus on information that is relevant to future performance and offer vendors an opportunity to supplement or rebut information provided by other sources.

The committee does not believe that it is appropriate to require potential contractors to pay third parties for the right to bid on federal contracts. Moreover, any past performance evaluation conducted for or on behalf of a federal agency must comply both with the requirements of section 6 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405) and subpart 42.15 of the FAR. The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide guidance to the military departments and defense agencies on the appropriate means of evaluating and considering past performance information, including the appropriate use, if any, of third party performance evaluation reports.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Subtitle A—Duties and Functions of Department of Defense Officers and Organizations

United States Military Cancer Institute (sec. 901)

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 and 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.

Senior acquisition executive for Special Operations within staff of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflicts (sec. 902)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a senior acquisition executive position within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (ASD) for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict (SO/LIC). The senior acquisition executive in ASD SO/LIC would assume service secretary-level responsibility for acquisition policy and oversight for SOCOM budget, operations, research, development, and procurement programs. The committee notes the importance of this position in light of past failures to effectively manage the Advanced SEAL Delivery System (ASDS) program by the U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM), the Navy, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The committee expects that the senior acquisition executive should be a member of the Senior Executive Service (SES). Further, the committee expects the Secretary of Defense to provide the SES allocation and such other staff and resources as are necessary to enable the senior acquisition executive to successfully accomplish the committee's intent.

Subtitle B—Space Activities

Establishment of operationally responsive space capabilities (sec. 911)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a hybrid program office within the Department of Defense to demonstrate, acquire, and deploy, as soon as technologically possible,

an effective capability for operationally responsive space (ORS) to support the warfighter.

The committee is aware that the services and other agencies within the Department continue to pursue low-cost, quick-response space capabilities for the warfighter, and that U.S. Strategic Command is in the process of developing requirements for such capabilities. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services in April 2006, the U.S. Strategic Command's Joint Functional Component Commander responsible for space and global strike stated that the military would like to have "a truly responsive capability to put assets into space, something that takes hours, not months, to launch; a satellite that can be put up quickly and then made to operate quickly."

However, the committee remains concerned that such activities lack focus and a sense of urgency. According to a March 2006 report on low-cost responsive tactical space capabilities, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that the Department lacks a department-wide strategy for implementing ORS efforts, and recommended that the Secretary of Defense assign accountability for developing and implementing a department-wide strategy for ORS, and to identify corresponding funding.

The provision would require the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a plan for acquisition of operationally responsive space capabilities. The plan shall include: (1) an identification of all departments and agencies that have a role in ORS; (2) the capabilities required for ORS; (3) a schedule and associated costs for implementing the plan; and (4) an identification of the chain of command, reporting structure, acquisition policy, classification requirements, and additional acquisition authorities for the ORS Hybrid program office.

Extension of authority for pilot program on provision of space surveillance network services to non-United States Government entities (sec. 912)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through September 30, 2009, a pilot program that is determining the feasibility and desirability of providing space surveillance data support to non-United States Government entities. Section 913 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) authorized the Secretary of Defense to carry out a 3-year pilot program. Extending the pilot program would allow for continuation of the current service support while allowing the necessary time to fully determine the feasibility and desirability of providing space surveillance data support to non-United States Government entities.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

Department of Defense policy on unmanned systems (sec. 921)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to develop a Department-wide policy for re-

search, development, test, and evaluation; procurement; and operation of unmanned systems. The provision would require a senior-level policy for establishing unmanned system mission requirements and a preference for the use of unmanned vehicles and devices in development of new defense systems. The policy required by the provision would also include: strategy and schedules for replacing manned systems with unmanned for selected routine and dangerous missions; joint development and procurement of unmanned systems and components; divestment of service unique unmanned systems in favor of joint systems; programs to address capability gaps and technical challenges; joint management and budgeting for unmanned systems; and integration of unmanned capabilities with manned systems.

Congress emphasized the future potential for unmanned systems to perform dull, dangerous, and difficult missions in support of the warfighter by establishing goals for the use of unmanned air and ground combat vehicles in section 220 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398). Since that time, the proliferation and technical sophistication of unmanned vehicles and capabilities has resulted in removal of uniformed personnel from harm's way in the performance of tasks such as explosive ordnance investigation and disposal and surveillance and reconnaissance missions over hostile territory. The committee believes exploration of untapped capacity for battlefield successes utilizing unmanned systems will likely broaden and deepen the significant accomplishments achieved to date.

Properly trained, equipped and highly dedicated personnel are the nation's most valuable military asset. The committee expects the Department to continue a long-standing commitment to the value of the American warfighter by asking "why manned?" when planning missions or considering new systems. Rapid deployment of vehicles such as the PackBot, Predator, and Remus demonstrate initial, impressive capabilities. The committee directs the Department to elevate planning for the long-term potential use of unmanned systems. Interoperability, survivability, commonality, sustainment, manufacturing, and training should be jointly examined for seamless integration between manned and unmanned system development, acquisition and operation in the air, on the ground and at sea.

Executive Schedule level IV for Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness (sec. 922)

The committee recommends a provision that would move the position of Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness from Executive Schedule level III to level IV. The proposed change would not be applicable to an incumbent in this position. The committee intends that, in view of the high priority for performance in the acquisition field, the position of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall remain at Executive Level II, and the position of Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology shall remain at Executive Schedule level III.

Three-year extension of joint incentives program on sharing of health care resources by the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs (sec. 923)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization for the Department of Defense—Department of Veterans Affairs Joint Incentives Program until September 30, 2010. The committee believes that the program, authorized in Section 721(d) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), has resulted in many worthy joint projects that increase the efficiency of the military health care system. The committee expects that the Secretary of Defense will comply with the statutory requirement for an annual contribution of a minimum of $15.0 million for the purposes of the Joint Incentives Program. To ensure that the Departments concerned have the opportunity to continue and expand efficiencies achieved through this program, the committee recommends a three-year extension of the joint incentives program.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

Transfer authority (sec. 1001)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide fiscal year 2007 transfer authority to the Department of Defense for amounts up to $4.0 billion for the transfer of funds authorized in division A of this Act to unforeseen higher priority needs in accordance with normal reprogramming procedures. The committee is concerned by the recent trend whereby reprogramming requests on important matters spend weeks or months in the Department approval process and are then presented to the Congress as urgent matters requiring action within a matter of days.

In November 2005, the Army identified an overobligation of funds in its Reserve Personnel, Army, 05/05 appropriation, yet the Army and the Department waited until the account in question was depleted of funds in April 2006 to present the Congress with an urgent reprogramming request. In March 2005, another reprogramming request for funds to counter the improvised explosive device (IED) threat, FY06–07PA, followed a similar pattern. As the Department seeks increased flexibility from the Congress on the use of reprogramming authority, the Department must work with the congressional defense committees in a timely manner in order for the committees to appropriately perform their oversight responsibilities.

Because of concerns the committee has over the current reprogramming process, the amount of reprogramming authority recommended is $1.0 billion lower than the President's budget request.

Authorization of supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2006 (sec. 1002)

This provision would authorize emergency supplemental appropriations pursuant to an emergency supplemental appropriations act for fiscal year 2006.

Reduction in certain authorizations due to savings relating to lower inflation (sec. 1003)

The Department of Defense assumed an inflation rate of 2.2 percent in its fiscal year 2007 budget submission. However, the Congressional Budget Office's January 2006 estimate of inflation for 2007 falls an additional 0.4 percentage points lower than the administration's estimate. The Committee on the Budget of the Senate reported in the Senate Concurrent Resolution of the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006 (S. Con. Res 18) that both the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office have contin-

ually overstated inflation. The savings resulting from lower-than-expected inflation for fiscal year 2007 is $951.5 million.

Increase in fiscal year 2006 general transfer authority (sec. 1004)

This section would amend section 1001(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) to increase the fiscal year 2006 transfer authority from $3,500.0 million to $3,750.0 million.

United States contribution to NATO common-funded budgets in fiscal year 2007 (sec. 1005)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the U.S. contribution to NATO common-funded budgets for fiscal year 2007, including the use of unexpended balances from prior years. 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 notes the significant contribution NATO is making to international peace and stability. NATO has undertaken important out of area missions such as leadership of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan, and is considering additional out of area missions, to include an expanded role in Sudan's western Darfur province. NATO's expanding missions require larger budgets, and so the U.S. contribution to the NATO common-funded budgets can be expected to grow. The committee urges the Department of Defense to ensure that it requests sufficient funding in future years' budget requests to cover the anticipated increase in the United States financial contribution to NATO's common-funded budgets.

Modification of date of submittal of OMB/CBO report on scoring of outlays (sec. 1006)

This provision would change the date of the currently required report on the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) outlay estimates (section 226 of title 10, United States Code) from January 15 to April 1 of each year. The committee is encouraged by the progress made by the OMB and CBO in reconciling differences in outlay estimates and expects that progress to continue. The date change reflects a more realistic time period for the two agencies to meet each year to discuss differences and report back to the congressional defense committees.

Prohibition on parking of funds (sec. 1007)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit any officer or employee of the Department of Defense from directing the allocation of funds in the President's budget or the supporting documents for such budget with the knowledge or intent that the funds would not be used for the purpose for which they are allo-

cated. A violation of this prohibition would be subject to the same penalties as a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act, as codified in section 1341 of title 31, United States Code.

In September 2003, the St. Petersburg Times reported allegations that the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) allocated $20.0 million to certain programs in the USSOCOM budget submission that was actually intended for other uses. The reports cited internal USSOCOM e-mails indicating that these funds had been "parked" at USSOCOM as a "favor" to the Department of Defense Comptroller, because the previous "agency they had it parked with had a problem and couldn't do it."

After a lengthy review of the matter, the Department's Inspector General confirmed that "USSOCOM Comptroller personnel agreed to 'park' $20.0 million" in six USSOCOM programs. The Inspector General determined that this money was placed in USSOCOM's budget "in an attempt to balance the Budget Estimate Submission with the top line dollar amount" of the budget, with the understanding that it was likely to be reprogrammed for other purposes.

According to the Inspector General, however, no witnesses could direct investigators to a regulation or policy that prohibited such "parking" of funds. In fact, a number of employees in the Department of Defense Comptroller's office told the Inspector General that the "parking" of money in Defense budgets is a common practice. As a result, the Inspector General concluded that no laws were broken, no rules were violated, and there was no impropriety in the "parking" of these funds.

The committee believes that the President's budget and the supporting documents must accurately reflect the purposes for which funds are expected to be used. The practice of allocating funds for a particular purpose with the knowledge and intent that after those funds have been appropriated they will be reprogrammed for a different purpose, is not consistent with this principle. For this reason, the provision recommended by the committee would prohibit the practice of "parking" funds in the future.

Subtitle B—Naval Vessels

Repeal of requirement for 12 operational aircraft carriers within the Navy (sec. 1011)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate the requirement for the naval combat forces of the Navy to include no fewer than 12 operational aircraft carriers.

The 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) Report determined that a naval force including 11 aircraft carriers meets the combat capability requirements of the National Military Strategy. In testimony before the Committee on Armed Services in March 2006, the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) emphasized that the decision by the QDR followed a rigorous evaluation of future force structure requirements by the Navy, and that 11 aircraft carriers are sufficient to ensure the Navy's ability to provide coverage in any foreseeable contingency with persistent combat power. The committee is further aware that advances in ship systems, aircraft, and precision weapons, coupled with fundamental changes to fleet maintenance and deployment practices implemented by the Navy, have provided

today's aircraft carrier and associated air wings substantially greater strike capability and greater force availability than possessed by the fleet during previous quadrennial defense reviews.

The Navy has reported on revisions to its method and frequency of deployments for vessels. Under the new concept, referred to as the "Fleet Response Plan," the Navy has reduced forward presence requirements in order to increase surge capability in response to national security demands. Under this approach, with 12 aircraft carriers in the fleet, the Navy proposed to have six carrier strike groups available for a crisis response within 30 days and two more carrier strike groups available in 90 days, referred to as "6 plus 2." At a force structure of 11 aircraft carriers, this becomes "6 plus 1" or "5 plus 2," which the Navy determined supports the National Military Strategy with acceptable risk.

In certain cases, the success of the Fleet Response Plan relies on the timeliness of the decision to surge-deploy the naval forces, and with smaller force levels and reduced forward presence, the Fleet Response Plan approach may increase risk if we do not have the level of insight into the threat necessary for timely action. Further, the Navy's long-term plan for aircraft carrier force structure declines to 10 carriers in 2013, when the USS *Enterprise* is scheduled to retire. That carrier would be replaced by CVN–21 in 2015, which has yet to start construction. The Navy believes that they can manage this gap through a number of added measures, but if there are any delays in delivering CVN–21, this gap will increase.

The committee maintains its concern, expressed in the Senate report accompanying S. 1042 (S. Rept. 109–69) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, regarding the declining size of the naval force and the reduction to the number of aircraft carriers. The committee agrees, however, with the Navy's determination that it is not feasible to maintain 12 operational aircraft carriers by restoring the USS *John F. Kennedy* (CV–67) to a deployable, fully mission-capable platform. The committee believes that it is vital to the national security of the United States that a fleet of at least 11 aircraft carriers be maintained to support the National Military Strategy, and has taken extraordinary action to support the CNO's force structure plan by authorizing increased procurement for shipbuilding and, specific to aircraft carriers, by authorizing additional advance procurement and incremental funding for the construction of the first 3 CVN–21 class aircraft carriers.

Further, recognizing the increased need for timeliness of surge operations that today's smaller force structure places on the Fleet Response Plan, the committee reaffirms the judgment that the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Clark, provided in testimony before the Committee on Armed Services in February 2005, that the Atlantic Fleet should continue to be dispersed in two homeports.

Approval of transfer of naval vessels to foreign nations by vessel class (sec. 1012)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 7037 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the transfer of a specified number of ships to a particular nation without identi-

fication of each specific vessel (hull number, ship name). This provision would continue to require that Congress authorize the release of the specific naval capability and technology (characterized by ship class) to specific countries.

Section 7037 requires legislative approval for the transfer to other nations of specific naval vessels exceeding 3,000 tons or that are less than 20 years old. The committee is aware that the process for gaining congressional approval for ship transfer notionally commences 2 years prior to the actual decommissioning of the U.S. Navy vessel. The effect of changes to ship operational commitments leading up to decommissioning, the final assessment of material condition in conjunction with decommissioning, and other dynamics associated with ship transfer can result in a lost transfer opportunity if that vessel's decommissioning status changes and it must be replaced by another vessel of the same class as a transfer candidate. Further, the committee is aware that the U.S. Navy and potential customer navies place a priority on conducting "hot ship" transfers coincident with U.S. Navy decommissioning in order to avoid U.S. Navy costs for decommissioning preparation and lay-up, and customer navy costs for reactivation.

Subtitle C—Counterdrug Matters

Extension of availability of funds for unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia (sec. 1021)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorities provided in the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) that allows the Department of Defense to use funds appropriated for counterdrug activity to support Colombian efforts against terrorist organizations involved in narcotics activity in fiscal years 2007 and 2008. It also extends the limitation on the number of U.S. military personnel assigned to Colombia in support of Plan Colombia to 800 personnel, and the number of federally-funded contractor personnel employed in support of Plan Colombia to 600 personnel in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.

Extension of authority of Department of Defense to provide additional support for counterdrug activities of other governmental agencies (sec. 1022)

The committee recommends a 5-year extension in the current authorities of the Department of Defense to assist the counterdrug activities of any other department or agency of the Federal Government or any other state, local, or foreign law enforcement agency through 2011.

Extension and expansion of certain authorities to provide additional support for counterdrug activities (sec. 1023)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the current authorities of the Department of Defense to support the counterdrug activities of other countries through the end of fiscal year 2008. In addition, the provision would: (1) add 15 countries to the list of countries eligible for support that are situated either along key drug smuggling routes or are facing an increasing threat

of narco-terrorism; (2) expand the types of equipment and supplies that can be provided for counterdrug support, to include vehicles, aircraft, and detection, interception, monitoring, and testing equipment; and (3) double the funding limit for counterdrug support through fiscal year 2008 from $40.0 million to $80.0 million. The provision would direct the Secretary of Defense to seek the concurrence of the Secretary of State on matters of counterdrug support to foreign nations. The committee expects that the authority granted in this section will be administered in the spirit of maintaining current military parity between Azerbaijan and Armenia. The provision would further require the Secretary of Defense to submit a comprehensive report on how these counter-drug funds were expended in each of these 15 countries, not later than 60 days following the conclusion of each fiscal year for which this program is authorized.

Subtitle D—Defense Intelligence and Related Matters

Two-year extension of authority to engage in commercial activities as security for intelligence collection activities (sec. 1031)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 2 years the authority to conduct commercial activities necessary to provide security for authorized intelligence collection abroad.

Annual report on intelligence oversight activities of the Department of Defense (sec. 1032)

The committee recommends a provision that requires the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report to the congressional defense and congressional intelligence committees on intelligence oversight activities of the Department of Defense. The term "intelligence oversight activities of the Department of Defense" refers to any activity undertaken by an agency element or component of the Department of Defense to ensure compliance with regard to intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Department under law or any Presidential directive, or Executive Order, including Executive Order No. 12333.

The report shall contain a description of any questionable activity that came to the attention of any General Counsel or Inspector General within the Department, or the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, and a description of the actions taken with respect to such activity. The report shall also contain the results of oversight inspections and changes in the Department's directives and training programs.

Administration of pilot project on Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps (sec. 1033)

The committee recommends a provision that would transfer administration of the pilot project on Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps from the Director of National Intelligence to the Secretary of Defense. The Corps would be comprised of U.S. citizens fluent in foreign languages who would be available to provide translation services and related duties. The Director of National Intelligence entered into a contract with the Department of Defense for services

to carry out the pilot project, as authorized under section 613 of the Intelligence Authorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 108–487). The Director of National Intelligence has expressed interest in transferring responsibility of the pilot project to the Department.

Improvement of authorities on the National Security Education Program (sec. 1034)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1902(b)(2) of title 50, United States Code, to modify the service agreement associated with participation in the National Security Education Program. Under current law, participants in the program may perform federal service in a position of the Department of Defense or other entity of the intelligence community that is certified by the Secretary of Defense as appropriate to utilize the unique language and regional expertise acquired by the program participants. The provision would expand the entities in which mandated service could be performed to include the Department of Homeland Security or Department of State. The award recipients would be able to fulfill their service requirement in a position in the field of education in a discipline related to the study supported by the program, but only if no positions are available in federal agencies or offices covered under this section.

The provision would further provide authority to the Secretary to hire a program participant in a position in the Department of Defense on a temporary, interim basis, for a period not to exceed 2 years, to expedite security clearances and other personnel processes, if there is no other permanent position available for the participant. The provision would also require the Secretary to submit a plan to Congress, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, for improving the recruitment, placement, and retention within the Department of Defense of individuals who receive assistance under the program and for improving the ability of the Department of Defense to meet its requirements to acquire individuals with critical foreign language skills and individuals who are regional experts.

Subtitle E—Defense Against Terrorism and Related Security Matters

Enhancement of authority to pay monetary rewards for assistance in combating terrorism (sec. 1041)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the flexibility and responsiveness of the rewards protection program available to the Department of Defense for assistance in combating terrorism. The provision would (1) delegate approval authority to subcombatant commanders, like the Commander, Multi-national Forces-Iraq; (2) direct that delegated authority must be approved by the designated Under Secretary of Defense; and (3) increase the current maximum reward amount from $2,500 to $10,000.

Use of the Armed Forces in major public emergencies (sec. 1042)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 15 of title 10, United States Code, the so-called "Insurrection

Act," to clarify and update the statute, and would make corresponding changes to other provisions of law. Chapter 15 contains a collection of statutes authorizing the use of the armed forces to put down an insurrection, enforce federal authority, or suppress conspiracies that interfere with the enforcement of federal or state law. The earliest of these dates to 1795, and others were enacted at the beginning of the Civil War (1861) and during Reconstruction (the so-called "Ku Klux Act" of 1871). While these statutes grant the President broad powers to use the armed forces in situations of public disorder, the antique terminology and the lack of explicit reference to such situations as natural disasters or terrorist attacks may have contributed to a reluctance to use the armed forces in situations such as Hurricane Katrina.

The provision would amend section 333 of title 10, United States Code. As amended, section 333 would authorize the President, in any situation in which he determined that, as a result of a natural disaster, epidemic or other serious public health emergency, terrorist attack or incident, or other condition, domestic violence occurred to such an extent that the constituted authorities of the State or possession were incapable of maintaining public order, and the domestic violence obstructed the execution of the laws of the United States or impeded the course of justice thereunder, to use the armed forces, including the National Guard in federal service, to restore public order and enforce the laws of the United States. The committee emphasizes that this authority is temporary, to be employed only until the state authorities are again capable of maintaining order. The President is to notify Congress of his determination to exercise this authority as soon as practicable, and every 14 days thereafter for the duration of the exercise of the authority. The title of chapter 15 is changed from "Insurrection" to "Enforcement of the Laws to Restore Public Order" to take account of the broader stated purposes of the chapter. The existing language of section 333, relating to suppression of insurrections, violence, or conspiracies that interfere with federal or state law, is retained.

The provision also amends chapter 152 of title 10 to authorize the President, in any situation in which he determines to exercise the section 333(a)(1)(A) authority, to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide supplies, services, and equipment necessary for the immediate preservation of life and property. Such supplies, services, and equipment may be provided (1) only to the extent that the constituted authorities of the State are unable to provide them; (2) only until other departments and agencies of the United States charged with such responsibilities are able to provide them; and (3) only to the extent that their provision will not interfere with military preparedness or ongoing operations or functions. The authority under this section is not subject to the provisions of section 403(c) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170b(c)).

A conforming amendment is made to 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.

Treatment under Freedom of Information Act of certain confidential information shared with State and local personnel (sec. 1043)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that sensitive but unclassified homeland security information in the possession of the Department of Defense that is shared with state and local personnel who are involved in the prevention of or response to terrorist activity does not become subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)(5 U.S.C. 552) by virtue of such sharing.

Section 892 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 482) requires the President to implement procedures under which federal agencies share relevant and appropriate homeland security information with each other, and with appropriate state and local personnel. Such information may be either formally classified or unclassified but of a sensitive nature. Any information shared with state and local officials is not subject to disclosure under state or local disclosure laws.

Concern has been expressed over the necessity for the Department to share such information with first responders and others involved in defense against a terrorist attack. Much of this information came from entities outside the Department, such as universities, power companies, transportation agencies, and the like. Classification of such information raises obvious problems with respect to sharing it with state and local personnel. However, much of the information is exempt from disclosure under FOIA either as confidential business information or under other exemptions. This provision would make it explicit that sharing of unclassified but sensitive information for homeland defense purposes under section 892 does not change the status of that information with respect to disclosure under FOIA.

Subtitle F—Miscellaneous Authorities on Availability and Use of Funds

Acceptance and retention of reimbursement from non-Federal sources to defray Department of Defense costs of conferences (sec. 1051)

The committee recommends a provision that would create a statutory exception to the Miscellaneous Receipts Act (31 U.S.C. 3302(b)) by authorizing the Department of Defense to accept and retain reimbursement from non-federal sources for its conference costs. The Secretary of Defense would be permitted to accept reimbursement into its applicable appropriation or account from which its conference costs were paid. The Secretary would also be allowed to employ general business practices when conducting conferences and symposiums.

This provision would further require the Secretary of Defense, as part of the annual submission of budget justification materials, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the use of the authority granted by this provision. The report should include: a listing of conferences held in the previous year(s), receipts and expenses, vendor fees collected, and a list of planned events for the upcoming fiscal year.

Currently, the miscellaneous receipts statute effectively prohibits the Department from collecting conference fees from individual conference participants to defray the costs of the conference. The statute requires these collections to be deposited into the general Treasury and not into any appropriation available to the Department.

The committee recognizes the business practice of employing conference planners to orchestrate the conference—often at no additional cost to the government. Conference planners are experts at conducting such events and, as such are best able to minimize costs, while allowing Department employees to focus on mission-related functions. When vendors participate in exhibitions, the conference planner can defray costs of the conference through exhibitor fees and advertising, thereby reducing the costs ultimately borne by the Department through the reimbursement of employees' conference fees.

The committee expects that this provision would provide the necessary authority for the Department to collect conference fees from conference participants and use the amounts collected to pay the conference expenses, such as commercial conference space, audio-visual support, educational materials, authorized refreshments, speakers' fees, and advertising. The government would also be permitted to collect reasonable fees from vendors at government exhibitions.

Minimum annual purchase amounts for airlift from carriers participating in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (sec. 1052)

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. Awarding sufficient guaranteed amounts of the Department's peacetime business has been an effective incentive to convince air carriers to commit aircraft to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet program. This provision would authorize the Department of Defense to guarantee a minimum level of peacetime business for the Civil Reserve Air Fleet participants so that air carriers will commit a sufficient number of aircraft to the program to meet the Department's contingency transportation requirements. The guarantee would not be based on known requirements at the time of the award. The minimum guarantee of business would instead be based on the Department's forecast needs for the following year, but capped at a maximum of 80 percent of the annual average expenditures of peacetime airlift for the prior 5-year period utilizing transportation funds already appropriated annually to the services.

Increased flexibility in the use of funds for Joint Staff exercises (sec. 1053)

The committee recommends a provision that would expand the flexibility of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to use funds earmarked for the Chairman's joint exercise program to be available for expenses relating to self-deploying watercraft under the jurisdiction of a military department; port facilities support activities; and prepositioned watercraft and lighterage for joint logistics and

over the shore exercises in connection with such exercises. Currently, the Chairman's exercise transportation funds can only be used for strategic airlift and sealift of equipment and forces, port handling, and inland transportation.

Subtitle G—Report Matters

Report on clarification of prohibition on cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment (sec. 1061)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the President to prepare a report that sets forth unclassified legal opinions on whether certain interrogation techniques constitute cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, as defined in section 1403 (d) of the Detainee Treatment Act for 2005 of title XIV of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). The report shall be transmitted to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act. The provision would also direct the President to ensure that these legal opinions be disseminated to all personnel of such departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and all contractors of such departments.

In testimonies before Senate committees, senior military commanders, Judge Advocates General, and various civilian officials of the executive branch have given incomplete or varying answers to questions on what constitutes cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment. This provision would ensure consistency on treatment of detainees for members of the armed forces engaged in detention and interrogation operations.

Reports on members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense serving in the Legislative Branch (sec. 1062)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a monthly report to the congressional defense committees if a member of the armed forces or a civilian employee of the Department of Defense, who has been assigned to the legislative branch as a detailee or as a legislative fellow, exceeds 1 year in such an assignment. The report would require information about the nature of the projects or tasks undertaken by the detailee or fellow and the anticipated date of completion. Additionally, the provision would require reporting if a military member receives such an assignment as the last tour of duty before retirement or separation from active duty. The committee believes that the Department has prescribed effective policies controlling the assignment of legislative fellows and detailees to the legislative branch, but that greater efforts are required to ensure compliance by the services and effective oversight within the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The committee believes that this reporting requirement should be terminated after a sufficient time has elapsed for evaluation of the reasons for extended details or fellowships and a determination that the professional qualifications and career progression of individual officers and civilian employees are not being adversely affected.

Additional element in annual report on chemical and biological warfare defense (sec. 1063)

Section 1701 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160; 50 U.S.C. 1522) authorized a separate program in research and development for chemical and biological warfare defense for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), but directed that the DARPA director "shall coordinate the activities under the program with those of the military departments and defense agencies."

In prior years, it appeared that the DARPA biological warfare defense program was not sufficiently coordinated with the military departments and defense agencies. The committee commends DARPA for its successful recent efforts to transition several technologies to the joint Department of Defense chemical and biological defense program, and to improve its coordination with, and support for, that program. The committee is interested in ensuring that the DARPA program remains effectively coordinated and integrated in the overall Department chemical and biological defense program.

Therefore, beginning in fiscal year 2008, the committee directs the Department to include a description of any DARPA research and development efforts on chemical and biological warfare defense in the annual report on the Department chemical and biological defense program, as required by section 1703 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160; 50 U.S.C. 1523). The report should include a discussion of the coordination and integration of relevant DARPA work with the overall Department chemical and biological defense program, and the degree to which DARPA's work supports the Department's overall program.

Report on Local Boards of Trustees of the Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1064)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress within 30 days of the date of enactment of this Act on the composition and activities of the Local Board of Trustees of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, as required by section 1516 of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Act of 1991 (Public Law 101–510). The committee expects the Chief Operating Officer to facilitate participation of the Local Board of Trustees in an advisory capacity as required by law in the evaluation of options for future development and improvement to the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Repeal of certain report requirements (sec. 1065)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the requirement for certain personnel reports that are no longer necessary. These would include: (1) the annual report on aviation career incentive pay under section 301a of title 37, United States Code; (2) the annual report required by section 1015 of title 37, United States Code, on the effects of certain recruitment and retention initiatives taken in fiscal year 2000; (3) the report of the Secretary of Defense's recommendation on the need for Department of Defense review of proposed federal agency actions to consider possible impact on national defense; (4) the report on a pilot program

to enhance military recruiting by improving military awareness of school counselors and educators; (5) the annual report on the activities of the Medical Informatics Advisory Committee and on coordination of informatics systems within the Federal Government; and (6) the reporting requirement associated with changes made by service academies in the amount of authorized charges or fees.

Subtitle H—Technical and Conforming Amendments

Uniform definition of national security system for certain Department of Defense purposes (sec. 1071)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify three sections of title 10, United States Code, to ensure the definition of national security system is consistent with the current definition in the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–347) and with the definition of information technology in 44 U.S.C. section 3542(b)(2).

Conforming amendment relating to redesignation of Defense Communications Agency as Defense Information Systems Agency (sec. 1072)

The committee recommends a provision that would update the definition of "combat support agency" in section 193 of title 10, United States Code, by changing the "Defense Communications Agency" to the "Defense Information Systems Agency." The Department of Defense officially renamed and rechartered the Defense Communications Agency as the Defense Information Systems Agency in June 1991 (title 32 of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations part 362). This proposed correction would eliminate any continuing confusion between the retired agency name and the current name.

Technical amendment (sec. 1073)

The Committee recommends a provision that would make technical and conforming changes in section 341(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). This change corrects section 341(e) to exempt a pilot program for best-value selection of information technology services, authorized by section 336 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), from a portion of the requirements of the public-private outsourcing competition process. The exempted portion of the public-private outsourcing competition process would require the continued performance of a function by Department of Defense employees, unless the difference in the cost of performance of that function is at least 10 percent of the personnel-related costs for that function or $10 million.

Subtitle I—Other Matters

National Foreign Language Coordination Council (sec. 1081)

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 to the President and the relevant committees of Congress the strategy 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.

Support of successor organizations of the disestablished Interagency Global Positioning System Executive Board (sec. 1082)

The committee recommends a provision that would make a technical change to the Commercial Space Transportation Competitiveness Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–405) to reflect the subsequent disestablishment of the Interagency Global Positioning Executive Board and its replacement by a new organizational structure created by National Security Presidential Directive 39, entitled United States Space-based Position, Navigation, and Timing Policy.

Sense of Congress on the Quadrennial Defense Review (sec. 1083)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) is a vital document in laying out the strategic military planning and threat objectives of the Department of Defense. The committee believes the QDR is critical to building the correct mix of military planning assumptions, defense capabilities, and the strategic focus of the armed forces of the United States.

The committee notes the QDR is intended to provide more than an overview of global threats and the general strategic orientation of the Department. The committee reiterates that the QDR analysis and recommendations were not intended to be constrained by the Department's budget submission.

The committee further believes that the QDR process would benefit from: (1) more specific guidance on the defense capabilities rec-

ommended in the QDR, including the numbers and types of systems or platforms required to achieve the strategic and war-fighting objectives; (2) an official "red team" assessment of the QDR assumptions, planning guidelines, and recommended capabilities, and having the red team provide its results to the Congress; and (3) a more comprehensive risk assessment from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that describes the additional capabilities needed to reduce the risks identified in his assessment.

The committee has requested that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) conduct an assessment on whether the 2006 QDR Report was consistent with congressional intent. The committee intends to review the QDR process and make any legislative changes that may be needed before the submission of the next QDR. The GAO assessment will represent one element of that review.

The committee looks forward to working with the Department of Defense, the GAO, and outside experts in its review of the QDR process.

Items of Special Interest

Developing a new staff structure for combatant command headquarters

Strengthening interagency operations is one of the major tenets of the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) Report. The QDR states that "success requires unified statecraft: the ability of the U.S. Government to bring to bear all elements of national power and to work in close cooperation with allies and partners abroad." In the years since the passage of the Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986, "jointness" has promoted more unified direction and action of the armed forces. In recent months, senior military leaders, including combatant commanders, have emphasized the importance of interagency planning and coordination for interagency operations.

The committee recognizes the importance of interagency operations and supports intiatives to strengthen interagency planning and coordination. Currently, interagency presence in the staffs of combatant commands is usually limited in number and serves primarily as a liaison from the parent organization to the combatant command.

The committee believes there is benefit to increasing the size of the interagency presence in the staff of each command headquarters and fully embedding the interagency personnel in the combatant command structure. The committee also believes this may require a realignment or restucture of the basic staff components. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on the development of an integrated interagency structure or organization for combatant commands. The Secretary should submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 1 year after the enactment of this Act.

Distributed decision support system

Commanders and staffs conducting military operations in the 21st century will find themselves responsible for planning and executing tasks outside the scope of their military training and experi-

ence. Deploying or deployed commanders could be aided significantly by having more ready access to expertise and technology, either resident or non-resident in the Department of Defense or U.S. Federal Government, on an array of topics not normally included in a commander's professional military education. These commanders would benefit significantly from routine and readily available access to subject matter experts, centers of expertise, and tailored data. This distributed decision support system will require an agent to broker the expertise and a data mining, retrieval, and interface tool capable of performing data query, visualization, organization, statistical analysis, and posting.

The committee recommends that the Department of Defense conduct a proof of concept demonstration that would develop a distributed decision support system to leverage available communications infrastructures to assemble an on-demand network of subject matter experts, specialized organizations, databases, and computing resources to assist joint force commanders and staffs in planning, decision-making, and complex problem solving. The committee does not intend that such a system would replace any existing system, but would augment the force with non-resident expertise to enhance dynamic plannng and decision-making. The committee recommends that the Department conduct the proof of concept demonstration in one combatant command area and submit a report to Congress no later than 6 months after the completion of the proof of concept demonstration.

Report on Special Operations Command UAV intelligence collection requirements

The committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict (SO/LIC) to study and report on the unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) intelligence collection requirements in future years for the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), specifically the number of Predator UAVs needed as intelligence collection platforms in the future-years defense program.

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services held a hearing on April 6, 2006, with, among others, USSOCOM Deputy Commander, Vice Admiral Eric Olson. In that hearing, Admiral Olson indicated that his command was not slated to receive a sufficient quantity of Predator UAVs and ground sensors for intelligence collection capabilities according to the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) Report. Admiral Olson further informed the subcommittee that USSOCOM would be best served by a second squadron of 24 Predator UAVs, beyond the first squadron planned for in the QDR planning process. The Commander, USSOCOM has been designated as the lead combatant commander with the responsibility for the military engagement in the global war on terrorism.

The committee believes that sufficient intelligence collection capabilities are critical to develop the actionable intelligence necessary to find, fix, and eliminate terrorist threats. The committee directs the Department to submit an unclassified, and if necessary classified, report to the congressional defense committees not later than 120 days after enactment of this legislation.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL POLICY

Accrual of annual leave for members of the uniformed services on terminal leave performing dual employment (sec. 1101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military members on terminal leave, who are entitled to accrue leave authorized in section 5534a of title 5, United States Code, based on civilian federal employment, to accrue such leave while remaining in a terminal leave status.

Strategy for improving the senior management, functional, and technical workforce of the Department of Defense (sec. 1102)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to include a strategy for the senior management, functional, and technical workforce of the Department in the Strategic Human Capital Plan as required by section 1122 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163).

The committee is aware that several of the military departments have initiated efforts to realign their senior civilian workforces to ensure that they are building the leaders the Department of Defense will need to meet future challenges. The committee's review of these efforts has identified a number of questions that merit further examination by the Department. For example:

(1) The number of senior executives assigned to the Department dropped dramatically in the 1990s, and has not changed as the Department's budget and responsibilities have increased since September 11, 2001. Does the Department have an adequate number of senior executives to meet its responsibilities?

(2) The Department has initiated a process of military-to-civilian conversions to ensure that the Department can make the best use of its soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. How does the process of military-to-civilian conversions impact the demands placed on the Department's senior civilian workforce?

(3) Congress has provided the Department a number of different authorities to hire senior management, functional, and technical personnel. Do these authorities give the Department the authority and the flexibility required to recruit and retain the categories of senior management and technical personnel that it needs?

(4) Section 1125 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) authorized increased pay for senior executives in agencies (including the Department of Defense) that are certified as having effective per-

formance appraisal systems. Comparable changes in the pay system and pay levels were not made for senior scientific and technical personnel serving in the Department. Should some adjustment be made to ensure that the Department can attract and retain highly-qualified senior scientific and technical personnel?

The provision is not intended to limit the ability of the Secretary to reexamine the structure and salary for all senior level employees, and make recommendations for change to the congressional defense committees as the Secretary believes are appropriate. The committee believes that this evaluation is critical to the future of the Department, and encourages the Department to begin the evaluation even before the enactment of this Act. The committee also urges the Department to develop a program which would expand joint capabilities at senior levels within the civilian workforce.

Authority to equalize allowances, benefits, and gratuities of personnel on official duty in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 1103)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend to the heads of all agencies, for their civilian personnel serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, the same authority as the Secretary of State already has under section 413 and chapter 9 of title I of the Foreign Service Act (22 U.S.C. § 4081 et seq.) with respect to allowances, benefits, and death gratuities for Foreign Service personnel. This authority would not derogate from any existing authority granted by law to an agency head.

The heads of a number of U.S. agencies whose personnel traditionally serve abroad already have authority to grant to their personnel serving abroad allowances, benefits and death gratuities comparable to those granted by the Secretary of State to similarly-situated Foreign Service personnel serving abroad. For example, with respect to allowances and benefits, the Secretary of Defense has such authority for civilian and military defense attaché personnel (10 U.S.C. § 1605 and 37 U.S.C. § 431) and National Security Agency personnel (50 U.S.C. § 402 note); the Secretary of the Treasury has such authority with respect to Treasury international affairs personnel (31 U.S.C. § 325); the Secretary of Agriculture has such authority with respect to agricultural attaché personnel (7 U.S.C. § 1766c); the Secretary of Transportation has such authority with respect to personnel with aviation powers and duties (49 U.S.C. § 322(d)(6)); and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency has such authority with respect to Central Intelligence Agency personnel (50 U.S.C. § 403e(b)(1)). Similarly, for Central Intelligence Agency and certain Department of Defense personnel (10 U.S.C. §§ 1475, 1478, and 1489; 50 U.S.C. § 403k), agency heads may provide death gratuities comparable to those afforded with respect to Foreign Service personnel (22 U.S.C. § 3973).

The committee believes that the missions in Iraq and Afghanistan requires coordinated and integrated action among all federal departments and agencies. In recent months, General Peter Pace, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and General John P. Abizaid, Commander, United States Central Command, have emphasized the importance of strengthening interagency coordination in Iraq

and Afghanistan. In his 2006 posture statement to the Committee on Armed Services, General Abizaid stated that "We need significantly more non-military personnel . . . with expertise in areas such as economic development, civil affairs, agriculture, and law."

Strengthening interagency operations has also become a principal theme in the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) Report. The QDR aptly states that "success requires unified statecraft: the ability of the U.S. Government to bring to bear all elements of national power at home and to work in close cooperation with allies and partners abroad." In the years since the passage of the Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986, "jointness" has promoted more unified direction and action of our armed forces. The committee believes that the time has come for similar changes to take place elsewhere in the Federal Government.

Item of Special Interest

Highly qualified experts

Section 9903 of title 5, United States Code, provided the Department of Defense new authority to hire up to 2,500 appropriately qualified experts from outside the civil service to oversee and direct its reform process, without going through normal hiring processes. The committee is concerned that only 12 of the 2,500 high-qualified experts have been hired. The committee is also concerned that the Department has imposed restrictions on the use of the new authority that were not included in the legislation, such as prohibiting highly qualified experts from participating in policy or decision-making and limiting the delegation of authority for hiring to certain senior level Department officials. The committee has also been informed that the Department has implemented the new hiring authority in an unnecessarily bureaucratic manner.

As a result, Department reform activities remain severely understaffed and highly dependent on contractors to perform critical acquisition and financial management functions.

For example, the committee has learned that bureaucratic impediments have prevented the Business Transformation Agency (BTA), which was established by the Deputy Secretary of Defense on October 7, 2005, to address pervasive problems in the Department's business systems, from filling a significant number of critical positions despite having documented requirements and funding for those positions.

In a letter to the Committee on Armed Services dated March 24, 2006, the Deputy Secretary of Defense acknowledged that the guidelines and policy concerning the highly qualified expert authority were too restrictive and implementation of the authority has yielded few results. The committee understands that work is underway to revise the guidance, and strongly urges the Department to promptly issue improved guidance, consistent with the authorizing statute, in order to produce the intended results for the highly qualified expert authority.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees no later than June 15, 2006, on steps that the Department has taken and a schedule for additional steps the Department plans to take to:

(1) address unnecessary restrictions in the guidelines for hiring Highly Qualified Experts;

(2) eliminate unnecessary bureaucratic barriers in the hiring process;

(3) strengthen recruiting efforts; and

(4) ensure that the BTA is fully staffed and able to meet its important mission.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

Subtitle A—General Matters

Expansion of humanitarian and civic assistance to include communications and information capacity (sec. 1201)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 401, title 10, United States Code, to expand the authority of the Secretary of Defense to provide humanitarian and civic assistance in conjunction with military operations to include information and communications technology as necessary to provide basic information and communications services.

The committee acknowledges that rudimentary construction and repair of information and communications technology facilities should be considered a fundamental element of humanitarian and civic assistance. The committee, however, expects that humanitarian and civic assistance carried out in conjunction with military operations will promote: (1) the security interests of both the United States and the country in which the activities are to be carried out; and (2) the specific operational readiness of the U.S. armed forces who participate in humanitarian and civic activities. Further, the assistance shall complement, and may not duplicate, any other form of foreign assistance that may be provided to the country by the United States.

Modification of authorities relating to the Regional Defense Counterterrorism Fellowship Program (sec. 1202)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2249c of title 10, United States Code, to change the title of the "Regional Defense Counterterrorism Fellowship Program" to the "Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Program." The provision would also increase the amount of authorized annual funding for the program from $20.0 million to $25.0 million.

The committee recognizes the critical need to provide education and training opportunities to our allies in the global war on terror and further notes the importance of the Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Program as an integral part of that effort.

The committee expects the Department of Defense to continue to ensure that the program conforms to the spirit of statutory guidelines governing the administration of related programs.

Logistic support of allied forces for combined operations (sec. 1203)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, permanent authority to use up to $100.0 million from oper-

ation and maintenance funds in any fiscal year to provide logistic support, supplies, and services to allied forces participating in combined operations with the armed forces of the United States. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to make a determination that the allied forces to be provided the logistic support, supplies, and services are essential to the success of the combined operations, and that the allied forces would not be able to participate in the combined operations without the provision of the logistical support, supplies, and services. The provision would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide up to an additional $5.0 million from operation and maintenance funds in any fiscal year to provide logistic support, supplies, and services to allied forces participating in combined operations with the armed forces of the United States solely for the purposes of enhancing the interoperability of the logistical support systems of the allied forces with the logistical support systems of the United States in order to facilitate combined operations.

Exclusion of petroleum, oil, and lubricants from limitations on amount of liabilities the United States may accrue under acquisition and cross-servicing agreements (sec. 1204)

The committee recommends a provision that would exclude the acquisition of petroleum, oil, and lubricants from the monetary limitations placed on acquisitions made under Acquisition and Cross-servicing Agreements (ACSA) with foreign allies. The ACSA limitations have not been raised for over 10 years. The rising cost of and demand for petroleum, oil, and lubricants make it reasonable to exclude these items from the ACSA monetary caps, which were intended to place a reasonable, but not overly restrictive, limit on the value of acquisitions that could be made through ACSA agreements.

Temporary authority to use acquisition and cross-servicing agreements to loan significant military equipment to foreign forces in Iraq and Afghanistan for personnel protection and survivability (sec. 1205)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of Defense temporary authority to treat significant military equipment as logistical support, supplies, and services under subchapter I of chapter 138 of title 10, United States Code, authorizing the use of Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreements. The provision would permit this authority to be used only for purposes of providing for the use of such equipment by military forces of foreign nations participating in combined operations with U.S. forces in Iraq and Afghanistan if the Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, determines in writing that it is in the national security interest of the United States to provide for the use of such equipment for that purpose. The provision would limit the duration of the loan of equipment under this authority to 1 year, and would require that the equipment be used by foreign military forces solely for personnel protection or to aid in the personnel survivability of such forces. The provision would stipulate that the provision of equipment under this authority shall be subject to the

Arms Export Control Act and any other export control regime under law relating to the transfer of military technology to foreign nations.

The provision would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit semi-annual reports to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives. The reports would include for each exercise of this authority: a copy of the written determination; a statement of each recipient of equipment under this authority; a statement of the type, quantity and value of the equipment supplied under this authority; and the terms and duration of the loan of the equipment. This authority would expire on September 30, 2008.

The committee notes that this authority is intended to permit the temporary loan of equipment such as armored HMMWVs or HMMWVs with add-on armor kits, counter-improvised explosive device equipment, and defusing equipment to our coalition partners in Iraq and Afghanistan so that they can be better protected against improvised explosive devices and other weapons they are encountering in those theaters.

Modification of authorities relating to the building of the capacity of foreign military forces (sec. 1206)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) by permitting the Secretary of Defense to use funds available for operation and maintenance to conduct or support the activities authorized under that section, and by extending the duration of the authority provided in that section through September 30, 2008.

The provision would also provide new authority to the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to authorize any commander of a geographic combatant command to respond to unanticipated changes in a security environment within that commander's area of responsibility (AOR) to build the capacity of the national military forces of a country within that AOR in order for that country to conduct counterterrorist operations or participate in or support military and stability operations. The provision would require that a program constructed under this authority promote observance of and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and respect for legitimate civilian authority within the country concerned. A program constructed under this authority could include the provision of equipment, supplies, and training. The provision would allow the Secretary of Defense to use funds available for operation and maintenance for fiscal years 2007 and 2008, up to $200.0 million in a fiscal year for this purpose. Of that amount, no more than $50.0 million may be available for any one geographic combatant commander in a fiscal year. This authority could not be used to provide assistance that is otherwise prohibited by any provision of law, nor could it be used to provide assistance to any foreign nation that would otherwise be prohibited from receiving such assistance. The provision would further require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe guidance for programs con-

structed under this authority. That guidance shall require a combatant commander to formulate any program under this authority for a country jointly with the U.S. Ambassador or Chief of Mission to that country, and to coordinate with the U.S. Ambassador or Chief of Mission to that country in implementing any program under this authority. The provision would further require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide a notification to specified congressional committees no later than 15 days after the initiation of activities in a country under this authority. This authority would expire on September 30, 2008.

The provision would also provide the Secretary of Defense new authority to authorize a geographic combatant commander to respond to urgent and unanticipated humanitarian relief or reconstruction requirements in a foreign country within the commander's AOR if the commander determines that the provision of such assistance will promote the security interest of the United States and of the country to which such assistance would be provided. The provision would permit such assistance to be provided without regard to chapters 137, 140, or 141 of title 10, United States Code, or any other provision of law that would otherwise prohibit, restrict, or limit the provision of such assistance. Assistance provided under this authority could include: construction, reconstruction or repair of municipal, educational, cultural or other local facilities; reconstitution or improvement of utilities or other local infrastructure; and provision of any other goods and services necessary to respond to urgent and unanticipated humanitarian relief or reconstruction requirements. The provision would prohibit this authority from being used in Iraq or Afghanistan. The provision would limit the amounts available for this authority to $200,000 in any country in a fiscal year. Funding for the exercise of this authority would come from funds available for operation and maintenance for fiscal years 2007 and 2008. The provision would further require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe guidance for the provision of assistance under this authority. That guidance shall include a requirement that any assistance to a country be provided only with the concurrence of the U.S. Ambassador or Chief of Mission to that country. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the guidance, and any modification of that guidance, to the congressional defense committees. The provision would further require the Secretary of Defense, no later than November 1, 2007 and 2008, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the provision of assistance under this authority in the preceding fiscal year. The report shall include the source of funds used to provide assistance, identification of each country to which assistance was provided, and for each country, the type and amount of assistance provided. This authority would expire on September 30, 2008.

The committee underscores that the authorities provided in this section are provided in the spirit of a pilot program. The committee intends to review carefully how these authorities are implemented so as to have a basis for determining whether and, if so, in what precise manner, to reauthorize these or provide other authorities after the conclusion of the pilot program. Important factors in the committee's future consideration of these matters will be the report

that is to be provided under section 1206, and the record of implementing these authorities that is built by the Department of Defense and the geographic combatant commanders over the next 2 years. The committee strongly discourages further modifications to these authorities until a track record implementing the pilot program authorized in this section has been developed. The committee believes it will be important to demonstrate through experience that these expanded authorities can and will be exercised consistent with the effective coordination of U.S. foreign policy writ large.

Participation of the Department of Defense in multinational military centers of excellence (sec. 1207)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize during fiscal year 2007 the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to permit the participation of Department of Defense civilian and military personnel in multinational military centers of excellence for the purpose of enhancing the ability of participating nations to engage in joint exercises or coalition or international military operations, or to improve their interoperability. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into memoranda of understanding, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, that would govern the terms of the Department's participation in such centers. The provision would permit the Secretary of Defense to use up to $3.0 million from funds available for operation and maintenance in fiscal year 2007 to pay the U.S. share of the expenses of such centers in which the Department participates, and to pay for the salaries and expenses of the Department personnel participating in such centers. The provision would further authorize the use of Department facilities and equipment to support such centers that are hosted by the Department. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than October 31, 2007, on the use of this authority, including a detailed report on the centers and activities in which the Department participated, and the cost of that participation.

The provision would define a center of excellence as an entity sponsored by one or more nations that is accredited and approved by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Military Committee as offering recognized expertise and experience to personnel participating in the activities of such entity for the benefit of NATO.

The committee notes that it requires further information regarding the Department's expressed interest in expanding the authority beyond NATO-approved centers of excellence.

Distribution of education and training materials and information technology to enhance interoperability (sec. 1208)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide electronically-distributed learning content and associated information technology for the education and training of military and civilian personnel of friendly foreign governments and personnel of internationally-recognized non-gov-

ernmental organizations to enhance allied and friendly military capabilities for multinational operations, including joint exercises and coalition operations. The provision would require the concurrence of the Secretary of State if the activity proposed to be undertaken is not authorized by another provision of law. The provision would further require that the provision of learning content and information technology under this authority shall be subject to the Arms Export Control Act and any other export control regime under law relating to the transfer of military technology for foreign nations.

The provision would also require the Secretary to: develop and issue guidance on the procedures for the use of this authority; submit a report to the congressional defense committees on that guidance no later than 30 days after it is issued; and submit any modifications of the guidance to the congressional defense committees. The committee recommends that the guidance include procedures for vetting by the Department of State and/or the U.S. country team of the proposed recipients of any materials or information technology to be provided under this authority. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report to the congressional defense committees on the use of the authority during the preceding fiscal year. The authority would expire on September 30, 2008.

Subtitle B—Report Matters

Report on increased role and participation of multinational partners in the United Nations Command in the Republic of Korea (sec. 1221)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit a report within 180 days of enactment of this Act to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives on an increased role and participation of multinational partners in the United Nations Command in the Republic of Korea. The report shall include: (1) a list of the nations that are current members of the United Nations Command and a detailed description of the role and participation of each member nation in the responsibilities and activities of the United Nations Command; (2) a detailed description of efforts being taken by the United States to encourage enhanced participation in United Nations Command responsibilities and activities by the member nations; (3) a discussion of whether and how United Nations Command members might be persuaded to deploy military forces in peacetime to the Republic of Korea to bolster the deterrence mission of the United Nations Command; (4) an assessment of how the military and political requirements for U.S. military forces in the Republic of Korea might be affected were multinational partners in the United Nations Command to increase their contribution of military forces stationed in the Republic of Korea; and (5) an assessment of whether and how the contribution of additional military forces to the United Nations Command in the Republic of Korea by a multinational partner might affect that partner's approach to facilitating a diplo-

matic resolution of the nuclear challenge posed by the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea. The report should be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

Report on interagency operating procedures for stabilization and reconstruction operations (sec. 1222)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the President to develop a plan to establish interagency operating procedures for federal agencies to plan and conduct stabilization and reconstruction operations. The provision would require the President to prepare and transmit to Congress a report on the plan not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

The report shall include: (1) a delineation of roles, responsibilities, and authorities of federal agencies involved in support of stabilization and reconstruction operations; (2) a description of the operational processes for setting policy direction to guide agency operational planning and making funding decisions for programs, overseeing policy implementation, integrating all programs and activities of designated federal agencies into an implementation plan, interfacing and integrating civilian and military planning efforts for stabilization and reconstruction operations, providing guidance to field-level personnel on program direction and priorities, and monitoring field implementation of assistance programs; (3) a description of available capabilities and resources of each federal agency that could be used in support of stabilization and reconstruction activities and identification of additional resources needed; (4) a description of how the capabilities and resources of federal agencies will be coordinated among the federal agencies; (5) a description of existing, or planned, protocols between federal agencies on the utilization and allocation of assets in field operations; (6) recommendations for improving interagency training, education, and simulation exercises in order to adequately prepare civilian and military personnel in federal agencies to perform stabilization and reconstruction activities; (7) a discussion of statutory and budgetary impediments, if any, that prevent civilian agencies of the Federal Government from fully and effectively participating in stabilization and reconstruction activities, and recommendations for new authorities necessary to enhance the ability of the executive branch to conduct stabilization and reconstruction activities; and (8) guidance on implementation of the plan.

Since 1945, the U.S. military has undertaken numerous stabilization and reconstruction operations and related missions, with varying degrees of success and each operation generally wider in scope and more ambitious in intent than the last. In the post-Cold War era, the United States led six major operations, including in Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, and now in Afghanistan and Iraq. In each of these recent and current operations, the United States Government has lacked a standard, integrated approach to the planning and conduct of interagency operations, with each new administration issuing new guidance on how to manage complex operations and creating new arrangements to coordinate civil-military operations. This ad hoc approach has hindered the effective performance of the United States in achieving its national security objectives.

In response to recent operational experiences, the administration has taken a number of steps to improve the United States performance in contingency operations. In 2004, the administration created the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization within the Department of State to coordinate and strengthen efforts of the United States Government to prepare, plan for, and conduct interagency operations. In 2005, the President issued National Security Presidential Directive-44, entitled "Management of Interagency Efforts Concerning Reconstruction and Stabilization," to improve coordination, planning, and implementation for reconstruction and stabilization assistance. Additionally, the Department of Defense issued Directive number 3000.05, entitled "Military Support for Stability, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction Operations," making stability operations a core military mission comparable to combat operations.

The committee commends the administration for taking these steps to strengthen interagency operations. The committee, however, believes that the United States government should develop a standardized approach to the planning and conduct of interagency operations to ensure a coherent and unified United States Government response to contingency operations.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds (sec. 1301)

The committee recommends a provision that would define the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs; define the funds as those authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this Act; and authorize the CTR funds to be available for obligation for three fiscal years.

Funding allocations (sec. 1302)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $372.1 million, the amount included in the budget request, for the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program. This provision would also authorize specific amounts for each CTR program element; require notification to Congress 30 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2007 funds for a purpose other than the purposes described in each of the CTR program elements; and provide limited authority to exceed the amount authorized for a specific CTR program element.

Extension of temporary authority to waive limitation on funding for chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia (sec. 1303)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through December 31, 2011, the President's authority to waive, on an annual basis for each calendar year, existing certification requirements before obligating or expending funds for the construction of the Shchuch'ye chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia.

TITLE XIV—AUTHORIZATION FOR INCREASED COSTS DUE TO OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

Overview

The committee recommends a supplemental authorization of $50.0 billion in funds to be appropriated for fiscal year 2007 to support operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the global war on terrorism. The committee notes that the President's fiscal year 2007 budget request included a $50.0 billion supplemental fund in anticipation of additional needs in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the global war on terrorism. Providing authorization of these funds in advance of need ensures our troops in the field will be given adequate resources to meet ongoing demands of current military operations and any emergent needs of the ongoing global war on terrorism.

Summary table of authorization

The following table summarizes authorizations included in this title for ongoing operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the global war on terrorism for fiscal year 2007.

Title XIV EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	Senate Authorized
PROCUREMENT	
Aircraft Procurement, Army	404,100
Missile Procurement, Army	450,000
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles Procurement, Army	214,400
Other Procurement, Army	686,600
Procurement, Marine Corps	319,800
Other Procurement, Air Force	51,800
Total Procurement	**2,126,700**
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	
Operation and Maintenance, Army	22,124,466
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	2,349,560
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	1,544,920
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	2,779,898
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	3,388,402
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	59,000
Total Operation and Maintenance	**32,246,246**
OTHER PROGRAMS	
Defense Health Program	960,200
Total Other Programs	**960,200**
MILITARY PERSONNEL	
Military Personnel, Army	5,466,987
Military Personnel, Navy	321,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	466,092
Military Personnel, Air Force	1,081,793
Total Military Personnel	**7,335,872**
Transfer Authority /a	**[2,500,000]**
Classified Programs	**3,000,000**
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	**2,100,000**
Iraqi Freedom Fund	**2,230,982**
Total	**50,000,000**

a/ Values in brackets are non-additive

Title XIV EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	Senate Authorized
PROCUREMENT	
Aircraft Procurement, Army	
UH-60 battle losses (5 aircraft)	71,000
CH-47 battle losses (12 aircraft)	333,100
Total Aircraft Procurement, Army	**404,100**
Missile Procurement, Army	
Upgrade Patriot battalions to configuration-3 capability	400,000
Additional PAC-3 missiles (16)	50,000
Total Missile Procurement, Army	**450,000**
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles Procurement, Army	
M1A1 Abrams integrated management program	136,500
Tank urban survivability kit	77,900
Total Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles , Army	**214,400**
Other Procurement, Army	
Uparmored HMMWV or M1151/M1152 HMMWV	508,000
HMETT-ESP program	125,000
Land mobile radio	30,000
Profiler	23,600
Total Other Procurement, Army	**686,600**
Procurement, Marine Corps	
Cougar and Buffalo procurement	100,000
Assault breacher vehicle	12,000
AAV7A1 product improvement program	22,500
Gunner protection kits	100,000
HIMARS re-supply systems armor	85,300
Total Procurement, Marine Corps	**319,800**
Other Procurement, Air Force	
Up-armored HMMWVS	51,800
Total Other Procurement, Air Force	**51,800**
Total Procurement	**2,126,700**

Title XIV EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	Senate Authorized
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	
Operation and Maintenance, Army	
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	20,160,706
Incremental ONE wartime costs	202,720
Abrams M1A1 Abrams integrated management program	231,000
Base support - mobilization and demobilization	643,000
Sustainment costs related to end strength	887,040
Total O&M, Army	**22,124,466**
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	1,834,560
Navy flying hour program	75,000
Aviation depot maintenance	174,000
Ship operations	121,000
Ship depot maintenance	145,000
Total O&M, Navy	**2,349,560**
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	1,389,920
Sustainment costs related to end strength	49,000
Depot maintenance	106,000
Total O&M, Marine Corps	**1,544,920**
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	2,477,429
Incremental ONE wartime costs	302,469
Total O&M, Air Force	**2,779,898**
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	
Defense Contract Audit Agency DCAA	9,063
Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA)	3,187
Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)	11,234
Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA)	127,667
Defense Logistics Agency (DLA)	1,721,811
Defense Legal Services Agency (DLSA)	5,513
Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA)	46,872

Title XIV EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	Senate Authorized
Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA)	586,556
Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA)	17,550
National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA)	191,307
National Security Agency (NSA)	9,405
OASD(NII)	11,564
Special Operations Command	511,673
Sustainment costs related to Army and Army NG end strength	126,000
Sustainment costs related to USMC end strength	9,000
Total O&M, Defense-wide	**3,388,402**
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	
Sustainment costs related to end strength	59,000
Total O&M, Army National Guard	**59,000**
Total Operation and Maintenance	**32,246,246**
OTHER PROGRAMS	
Defense Health Program	
Incremental wartime costs	739,200
Army and Army NG costs related to end strength	192,000
USMC costs related to end strength	29,000
Total Defense Health Program	**960,200**
Total Other Programs	**960,200**
MILITARY PERSONNEL	
Military Personnel, Army	
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	5,396,581
Recruiting and retention initiatives	70,406
Total Military Personnel, Army	**5,466,987**
Military Personnel, Navy	
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	321,000
Total Military Personnel, Navy	**321,000**

Title XIV EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Program Title	Senate Authorized
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	466,092
Total Military Personnel, Marine Corps	**466,092**
Military Personnel, Air Force	
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	840,616
Incremental ONE wartime costs	241,177
Total Military Personnel, Air Force	**1,081,793**
Total Military Personnel	**7,335,872**
Transfer Authority /a	**[2,500,000]**
Classified Programs	**3,000,000**
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	**2,100,000**
Iraqi Freedom Fund	**2,230,982**
Total	**50,000,000**

a/ Values in brackets are non-additive

Purpose (sec. 1401)

This section would establish this title as an authorization of appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2007, in addition to the amounts otherwise authorized in this Act, of $50.0 billion to be available for activities in support of operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the global war on terrorism.

Army procurement (sec. 1402)

This section would authorize an additional $1.8 billion for fiscal year 2007 Army procurement.

Marine Corps procurement (sec. 1403)

This section would authorize an additional $319.8 million for fiscal year 2007 Marine Corps procurement.

Air Force procurement (sec. 1404)

This section would authorize an additional $51.8 million for fiscal year 2007 Air Force procurement.

Operation and maintenance (sec. 1405)

This section would authorize an additional $32.2 billion for fiscal year 2007 operation and maintenance programs.

Defense Health Program (sec. 1406)

This section would authorize an additional $960.2 million to the Defense Health Program for operation and maintenance for fiscal year 2007.

Military personnel (sec. 1407)

This section would authorize an additional $7.3 billion for fiscal year 2007 to the Department of Defense for military personnel.

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1408)

This section would authorize an additional $2.1 billion for fiscal year 2007 for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund. The funding provided for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund would ensure the rapid development and deployment of intelligence; tactics, techniques and procedures; training; and the associated procurement of equipment to counter improvised explosive devices in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Classified programs (sec. 1409)

This section would authorize an additional $3.0 billion for fiscal year 2007 for classified programs.

Iraq Freedom Fund (sec. 1410)

This section would authorize an additional $2.2 billion for an Iraqi Freedom Fund to be available until expended for activities in support of operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the global war on terrorism. These funds would be available for transfer to other accounts in this title, subject to a 5 day prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1411)

This section designates that the authorization of appropriations in this title are in addition to the amounts otherwise in this Act.

Transfer authority (sec. 1412)

This section would provide fiscal year 2007 transfer authority of $2.5 billion to the Department of Defense for the authorizations contained in this title.

Availability of funds (sec. 1413)

This section would require that the funds provided in this title be made available for obligation by the end of the second quarter of fiscal year 2007.

Budget Items

UH–60M Black Hawk helicopters

The budget request included $740.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army, for UH–60M Black Hawk helicopters. The committee notes that the budget request contained no funding for UH–60M helicopter battle losses in the U.S. Central Command area of operations. Additional funding for five UH–60M Black Hawk helicopters has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $71.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army, for UH–60M Black Hawk helicopters, for a total authorization of $811.4 million.

CH–47F cargo helicopters

The budget request included $622.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army, for CH–47 cargo helicopter modifications. The committee notes that the budget request contained no funding for CH–47D cargo helicopter battle losses in the U.S. Central Command area of operations. The committee also notes that the CH–47D cargo helicopter is no longer in production. Additional funding for 11 new-build CH–47F cargo helicopters as replacement for CH–47D cargo helicopter battle losses has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $333.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army, for new-build CH–47F cargo helicopters, for a total authorization of $955.2 million.

Patriot missile defense system

The budget request included $489.1 million in Missile Procurement, Army (MPA) for 108 Patriot PAC–3 missiles; and $70.0 million in MPA for Patriot modifications in MPA. The Patriot ballistic missile defense system demonstrated its worth during Operation Iraqi Freedom by intercepting all nine Iraqi short-range ballistic missiles that were engaged by Patriot. The committee notes that the predominant foreign ballistic missile threat to U.S. forces is from short-range ballistic missiles, and the U.S. Central Command recommends the acceleration of upgrades for Patriot and additional PAC–3 missile production.

The committee recommends an increase of $400.0 million in MPA to support the upgrade of Patriot battalions to the configuration–

3 capability. This upgrade would significantly extend the defensive range and capability of over 2,000 Patriot PAC–2 missiles now in the inventory. Additional funding for these Patriot PAC–3 upgrades has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list. The committee also recommends an increase of $50.0 million in MPA for purchases of 16 additional PAC–3 missiles in fiscal year 2007, in response to calls from combatant commanders for more Patriot missiles to keep pace with the threat.

M1A1 Abrams integrated management and tank urbanization upgrade kits

The budget request included $364.9 million in Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat, Army, but no funding for the M1A1 Abrams Integrated Management (AIM) program or tank urbanization survival kits (TUSK).

The committee understands that the Army has decided to "pure fleet" Army tanks in two configurations, Abrams M1A2 System Enhancement Package (SEP) tanks and M1A1 AIM tanks. Although numerous improvements have been made to the M1A1 tank, it retains its analog backbone and will not be interoperable with the M1A2 SEP without further improvements to the M1A1 AIM tank configuration. The committee notes that the M1A1 AIM program appears to be funded in the future years defense program (FYDP) and encourages the Army to retain M1A1 AIM tanks in base budget requests. The Secretary of the Army will submit a report to the congressional defense committees, no later than March 15, 2007, that provides an explanation of how heavy brigades in the active and Reserve components will achieve interoperability on the battle field. The report will detail the specific equipment required for interoperability, the quantities required by brigade combat teams, and the costs associated with this equipment.

TUSK components are add on kits for M1A1 and M1A2 series tanks to increase crew survivability in urban environments. The Army requires 505 TUSK to meet the operational needs of the combatant commanders.

Additional funding for the M1A1 AIM program and TUSK has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $136.5 million for M1A1 AIM tanks and $77.9 million for TUSK, in Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, for a total authorization of $579.3 million.

High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles

The budget request included $582.6 million in Other Procurement, Army, for High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles (HMMWV), including $428.9 million for the procurement of the M1151 and M1152 HMMWV variants with armor. The committee supports the Army's decision to transition from the up-armored HMMWV variant to a more versatile M1151/M1152 HMMWV variant with removable armor. However, the committee also understands that the Army Component Commander of the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) has determined that all Level II HMMWVs in the CENTCOM area of operations will be upgraded to the Level I configuration. The requirement was validated on February 24,

2006. The Army has funded 16,129 of the 18,669 requirement. Additional funding for HMMWVs has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $508.0 million in Other Procurement, Army, for the procurement of up-armored HMMWVs or M1151/M1152 HMMWV variants with armor, for a total authorization of $1,090.6 million.

Heavy expanded mobile tactical truck extended service program

The budget request included $220.4 million in Other Procurement, Army, for the heavy expanded mobile tactical truck (HEMTT) extended service program (ESP). HEMTT–ESP is the primary source of M1120A2R1 HEMTT Load Handling System (LHS) variants, which reduce the logistics footprint on the battlefield to support the Army's evolving transportation-based, just-in-time supply system. Additional funding for HEMTT has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $125.0 million in Other Procurement, Army for HEMTT–ESP, for a total authorization of $345.4 million.

Land mobile radios

The budget request included $33.8 million in Other Procurement, Army, for base support communications, but no funding for land mobile radios. Lessons learned from the natural disasters of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma in 2005 indicate that the Department has an immediate need for a handheld radio capability which allows interoperability with the Federal Emergency Management Agency and other civilian agencies. Additional funding for land mobile radios has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million in Other Procurement, Army, for land mobile radios, for a total authorization of $63.8 million.

Profiler

The budget request included $2.1 million in Other Procurement, Army, for the Profiler meteorological system. The committee notes that the budget request contained no funding for the Profiler system for units deploying to the U.S. Central Command area of operations. The Profiler system is the only system capable of providing accurate meteorological data used in calculations for accurate delivery of precision munitions. Additional funding for 17 Profiler systems has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $23.6 million in Other Procurement, Army, for the Profiler system, for a total authorization of $25.7 million.

Assault Amphibious Vehicle/7A1 product improvement program

The budget request included $12.5 million in Procurement, Marine Corps, for the Assault Amphibious Vehicle 7A1 Product Improvement Program (AAV7A1 PIP). Title IX of the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–148) appro-

priated $80.6 million for the AAV7A1 PIP. The Department of Defense requested $58.1 million for the AAV7A1 PIP in the Department of Defense Emergency Supplemental Request for Fiscal Year 2006. The Marine Corps provided information that indicated there is a $22.5 million unfunded requirement that could not be executed in fiscal year 2006 but could be executed in fiscal year 2007. The committee recommends an increase of $22.5 million in Procurement, Marine Corps for AAV7A1 PIP, for a total authorization of $35.0 million.

High mobility artillery rocket system re-supply system armor

The budget request included $57.5 million in Procurement, Marine Corps, for the High Mobility Artillery Rocket System (HIMARS) but no funding for HIMARS re-supply system (RSS) armor. Armoring of the HIMARS RSS not only supports a key performance parameter of a Joint Requirements Oversight Council requirement but also provides enhanced personnel survivability for Marines operating the HIMARS RSS. Additional funding for the procurement of HIMARS RSS armor has been included on the Commandant of the Marine Corps's fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $85.3 million in Procurement, Marine Corps for HIMARS RSS armor, for a total authorization of $142.8 million.

Gunner protection kits

The budget request included no funding in Procurement, Marine Corps, for gunner protection kits for High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles (HMMWV) and Medium Tactical Vehicle Replacement (MTVR) vehicles. The Marine Corps has developed armor kits which provide protection for Marines exposed in unprotected turrets while traveling in HMMWV or in unprotected truck beds in MTVRs. These gunner protection kits include side and door armor, underbelly armor, transparent armor, fuel tank fire suppression kits, and rear door armor. The committee recommends an increase of $100.0 million in Procurement, Marine Corps, for armor kits, for a total authorization of $100.0 million.

Family of explosive ordnance demolition equipment

The budget request included $14.8 in Procurement, Marine Corps, for explosive ordnance demolition systems, but no funding for the procurement of assault breacher vehicles, Cougar hardened engineer vehicles, or Buffalo armored vehicles.

The Assault Breacher Vehicle (ABV) is a single platform that provides deliberate and in-stride obstacle and minefield breaching capability to the Ground Combat Element of the Marine Air Ground Task Force (MAGTF). The committee understands that the ABV is currently in the System Development and Demonstration Phase, with plans for a full-rate production decision in fiscal year 2007. The Marine Corps acquisition objective is for 33 vehicles but only 24 vehicles are funded. Additional funding for the procurement of three ABVs has been included on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list.

The Cougar and Buffalo vehicles have proven to meet the Marine Corps' immediate need for hardened engineer and explosive ordinance disposal (EOD) vehicles with a V-shaped hull designed to withstand both anti-personnel and anti-tank mine blasts and a nuclear, biological and radiological over-pressure system.

The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million for ABVs and $100.0 million for the procurement of Cougar and Buffalo armored vehicles, in Procurement, Marine Corps for a total authorization of $126.8 million.

Up-armored high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles

The budget request included $11.3 million in Other Procurement, Air Force, for up-armored high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles (HMMWV). The committee notes that the Air Force has a new requirement for 1,041 up-armored HMMWVs because of additional mission requirements. Specifically, Air Force security teams have an immediate requirement for 205 up-armored HMMWVs to support security and counter-improvised explosive device missions in the U.S. Central Command area of operations. Additional funding for 205 up-armored HMMWVs has been included on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's fiscal year 2007 unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $51.8 million in Other Procurement, Air Force, for additional up-armored HMMWVs, for a total authorization of $63.1 million.

Abrams M1A1 Abrams Integrated Management program

The budget request included $974.4 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for Land Forces Depot Maintenance, including $56.0 million for the Abrams M1A1 Abrams Integrated Management (AIM) program. This program upgrades the capabilities of the Abrams tank, and is an integral part of the Army modularity transformation process. The committee recommends an increase of $231.0 million in OMA, to support M1A1 AIM tanks for three more Brigade Combat Teams, in order to accelerate the Army's transformation to a modular combat force.

Navy flying hour program

The budget request included $31,331.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), including $3,587.8 million for Mission and Other Flight Operations. The budget request is insufficient to support the Training and Readiness T-rating goals of 2.3 for the Navy and 2.0 for the Marine Corps tactical aviation. The committee recommends an increase of $75.0 million in OMN for the Navy flying hour program to increase the Navy and Marine Corps tactical Aviation T-ratings to the Training and Readiness goals.

Aviation depot maintenance

The budget request included $31,331.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), including $902.9 million for Aircraft Depot Maintenance. Naval aircraft are in high demand around the world, and supporting critical combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. To maintain necessary operational availability, both for current operations, and for unforseen requirements, maintenance on naval aircraft must keep pace with operational demands. The

committee recommends an increase of $174.0 million in OMN for aviation depot maintenance.

Ship operations

The budget request included $31,331.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), including $3,166.9 million for Mission and Other Ship Operations. The budget request is insufficient to support the goal of 51 steaming days per quarter while deployed. The committee recommends an increase of $121.0 million in OMN, to increase the number of deployed steaming days per quarter to 51. The committee is disappointed that the Navy did not properly fund one of its most basic operational requirements, and expects the Navy to provide adequate funding to support its required deployments in future budget requests.

Ship depot maintenance

The budget request included $31,331.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), including $3,722.7 million for ship depot maintenance. As the number of ships in the Navy continues to decrease, the demands on the remaining ships will increase, resulting in increased maintenance. Required maintenance must be conducted on the remaining ships to ensure the Navy can meet any unexpected threats that may arise around the world. The committee recommends an increase of $145.0 million in OMN for ship depot maintenance.

Marine Corps depot maintenance funding

The budget request included $424.3 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), for depot maintenance activities, but included insufficient funds to perform depot maintenance for all Amphibious Assault Vehicles (AAV) and M1A1 Abrams tanks identified on the Marine Corps' mandatory Operation Iraqi Freedom principal end item rotation plan. The committee recommends an increase of $106.0 million in OMMC for depot maintenance of AAVs and M1A1 Abrams tanks.

Joint improvised explosive device defeat defense fund

In the Senate Appropriations Committee Defense Subcommittee (SAC–D) markup of the Department of Defense Emergency Supplemental Request for Fiscal Year 2006, the SAC–D recommended the initiation of a Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (JIEDDF) to provide adequate funding and management flexibility to the Department in developing and fielding the necessary tactics, equipment, and training to defeat improvised explosive devices (IED).

The budget request included no funding for the development or procurement of IED countermeasures. Over the past two years, the Committee has worked closely with the Department and the Joint IED Defeat Task Force (JIEDDTF) to provide the authority and funding for the Department to deal with the IED threat. The committee supported the Secretary of Defense's decision to elevate the position of the director of the JIEDDTF and to make a permanent organization to "expand upon existing efforts to ensure innovative solutions across ground, air, maritime and special operations do-

mains by integrating technology and training with battlefield tactics, techniques and procedures, while leveraging outside sources for rapid acquisition of technical solutions." The committee understands that the new organization, named the Joint IED Defeat Office (JIEDDO) will also provide for governmentwide coordination of resources and analysis.

The committee supports the Department and the JIEDDO in their pursuit of measures to defeat IEDs and expects the JIEDDO to not only use all the resources available within the Department of Defense but also reach out to the private sector to find technical solutions to countering the IED threat, giving equal opportunity to big as well as medium and small-sized firms that desire to participate. Additionally, the committee believes that more non-technical means should be employed to defeat IEDs.

Discussions with the JIEDDO indicate that the JIEDDO anticipates the organization will require $2.1 billion for the rapid development and deployment of intelligence; tactics, techniques and procedures (TTP); training; and the associated procurement of equipment to counter IEDs. The committee recommends that $2.1 billion be authorized for the JIEDDF.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Explanation of funding tables

Division B of this Act authorizes funding for military construction projects of the Department of Defense. It includes funding authorizations for the construction and operation of military family housing and military construction for the Reserve components, the defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment program. It also provides authorization for the base closure accounts that funds 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.

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 included authorization of appropriations for military construction and housing programs totaling $16,698,423,000. Of this amount, the budget request included authorization of appropriations for $5,626,223,000 to implement the results of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) round. The amount authorized for appropriation is included in the following table in a line designated "Base Realignment & Closure V".

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations for military construction and housing programs totaling $17,098,423,000. The total amount authorized for appropriations reflects this committee's commitment to continue a strong investment in the recapitalization of facilities and infrastructure in the Unites States, while continuing to invest prudently in overseas installations that are identified in the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy released by the President in September, 2004 as enduring installations with firmly defined, long-term operational missions. Of the $400.0 million added to the budget request for military construction, the committee recommends authorization of appropriation of $363.5 million for projects which will recapitalize existing deteriorated facilities identified by military installation commanders as urgent unfunded priorities. The committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the level of future investment in military installations meets goals established by the Department for rates of recapitalization and sustainment.

Summary of FY 2007 Military Construction
Authorization of Appropriations
(Dollars in Thousands)

Military Construction	President's Budget	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Military Construction, Army	2,059,762	120,999	2,180,761
Military Construction, Navy	1,162,038	106,801	1,268,839
Military Construction, Air Force	1,156,148	101,128	1,257,276
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	1,208,198	-4,517	1,203,681
(Chemical Demilitarization Program)	130,993	10,000	140,993
NATO Security Investment Program	220,985	-15,000	205,985
BRAC IV	191,220	0	191,220
BRAC V	5,626,223	-99,329	5,526,894
Military Construction, Army National Guard	473,197	50,834	524,031
Military Construction, Air National Guard	125,788	116,355	242,143
Military Construction, Army Reserve	166,487	23,330	189,817
Military Construction, Navy & MC Reserve	48,408	0	48,408
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	44,936	0	44,936
Total Military Construction	**12,614,383**	**410,601**	**13,024,984**
Family Housing			
Family Housing Construction, Army	594,991	0	594,991
Family Housing Support, Army	676,829	0	676,829
Family Housing Construction, Navy	305,071	0	305,071
Family Housing Support, Navy	509,126	-10,601	498,525
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	1,183,138	0	1,183,138
Family Housing Support, Air Force	755,071	0	755,071
Family Housing Construction, Defense-Wide	8,808	0	8,808
Family Housing Support, Defense-Wide	48,506	0	48,506
Family Housing Improvement Fund	2,500	0	2,500
Total Family Housing	**4,081,540**	**-10,601**	**4,073,439**
Total Authorization of Appropriations, Military Construction & Family Housing	**16,698,423**	**400,000**	**17,098,423**
Prior Year Rescissions		**0**	**0**
Total Military Construction and Family Housing:	**16,698,423**		**17,098,423**

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	FY07 Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Alabama	Army	Redstone Arsenal	Construct Software Engineering Annex, Ph II		20,000	20,000
Alabama	Army National Guard	Anniston	Readiness Center Phase 1	13,223		13,223
Alabama	Army National Guard	Mobile	Armed Forces Reserve Center, Phase III	9,012		9,012
Alaska	Army	Fort Richardson	Ammunition Supply Point Upgrade	9,800		9,800
Alaska	Army	Fort Richardson	Barracks Complex	50,000		50,000
Alaska	Army	Fort Richardson	Child Development Center	12,500		12,500
Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Railhead Operations Facilty, Phase 1		8,800	8,800
Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Replace Chapel Center	14,400		14,400
Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Add/Alter Physical Fitness Center	23,900		23,900
Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Dormitory (120 Room)	21,000		21,000
Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Corrosion Cntrl/Low Obsv/Composite Rpr Fac F-22	31,750		31,750
Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Fighter Town East Infrastructure (F-22)	3,350		3,350
Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Maintenance Complex (C-17), Increment 2	30,000		30,000
Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Replace Joint PME Center, Ph 1		12,000	12,000
Alaska	TRICARE	Fort Richardson	Health Clinic	37,200		37,200
Arizona	Navy	MCAS Yuma	Fixed Wing Fueling Apron	5,966		5,966
Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	CSAR Group Headquarters Facility	4,600		4,600
Arizona	Army National Guard	Florence	Construct Field Maintenance Shop		10,870	10,870
Arizona	DLA	MCAS Yuma	Fixed Wing Hydrant Fuel System	8,715		8,715
California	Army	Fort Irwin	Land Acquisition, Phase 4	10,000		10,000
California	Navy	Camp Pendleton	Regimental Maintenance Facitities, Phase 2	14,860		14,860
California	Navy	Camp Pendleton	AVTB Maintenance Annex	2,320		2,320
California	Navy	Camp Pendleton	Fire Station - Del Mar	4,710		4,710
California	Navy	Camp Pendleton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - 22 Area	14,940		14,940
California	Navy	Camp Pendleton	Armory/Communications Complex	12,160		12,160
California	Navy	Camp Pendleton	Wastewater Reclamation/Conveyance, Increment 2	33,290		33,290

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	*Service/Agency*	*Installation*	*Project Title*	*FY07 Request*	*Senate Change*	*Senate Auth*
California	Navy	Camp Pendleton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters/Dining Fac (MARSOC)	31,115		31,115
California	Navy	Camp Pendleton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	18,068		18,068
California	Navy	Camp Pendleton	Light Armored Recon Battalion Facility	7,969		7,969
California	Navy	MCAS Camp Pendleton	Tactical Support Van Pads Expansion	5,057		5,057
California	Navy	MCAS Camp Pendleton	Taxiway Improvements	1,355		1,355
California	Navy	MCAS Miramar	Missile Magazine	2,968		2,968
California	Navy	NAS North Island	Waterfront Amphibious Operations Facility	21,535		21,535
California	Navy	MCB Twentynine Palms	Comm/Elec Maintenance/Storage Facility	8,217		8,217
California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Distributed Common Ground Station Ops Facility	28,000		28,000
California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Replace Main Base Runway, Increment 2	31,000		31,000
California	Air Force	Travis AFB	Taxiway Lima (C-17)	8,500		8,500
California	Air Force	Travis AFB	Munitions Storage Facility (C-17)	6,200		6,200
California	Air Force	Travis AFB	Upgrade Roads/Utilities (C-17)	8,800		8,800
California	Air Force	Travis AFB	Construct Two-2-Bay Hangar (C-17)	50,400		50,400
California	Air Force	Travis AFB	Construct Large Fire/Crash Rescue Station		11,900	11,900
California	Army National Guard	Fresno	Aviation Classification And Repair Depot, Phase I	30,000		30,000
California	Army National Guard	Camp Roberts	Infantry Squad Battle Course	2,000		2,000
California	Army National Guard	Fort Irwin	Maneuver Area Training Equipment Site, Phase 2	20,000		20,000
California	Army National Guard	Sacramento Army Depot	Add/Alter Field Maintenance Shop	4,500		4,500
California	Air National Guard	Fresno/Yosemite	Replace Squadron Operations Facility		9,800	9,800
California	Army Reserve	Fort Hunter Liggett	Combat Pistol/MP Qualification Course	1,351		1,351
California	Army Reserve	Moreno Valley	AFRC/OMS/AMSA/Unheated Storage	32,562		32,562
California	Naval Reserve	MCB Twentynine Palms	USMCR Reserve Training Center	11,453		11,453
California	Air National Guard	March AFB	Predator Operations and Training Complex	6,000		6,000
California	Air Force Reserve	March AFB	Alter General Maintenance Hangar (C-17)	10,300		10,300
California	TRICARE	Fort Irwin	Add to/Alter Dental Clinic	6,050		6,050

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	*Service/Agency*	*Installation*	*Project Title*	*FY07 Request*	*Senate Change*	*Senate Auth*
California	SOCOM	Camp Pendleton	Construct MARSOC Headquarters (SOF)	24,400		24,400
California	DLA	Beale AFB	Replace Fuel Storage and Distribution System	9,000		9,000
Colorado	Army	Fort Carson	Airfield Arrival/Depart Complex, Phase 2	24,000		24,000
Colorado	Air Force	Buckley AFB	Consolidated Fuels Facility	10,700		10,700
Colorado	Air Force	Schriever AFB	Space Test & Evaluation Facility	21,000		21,000
Colorado	Air National Guard	Buckley AFB	Replace Squadron Ops Facilty (ASA)		7,000	7,000
Colorado	Chem Demil	Pueblo Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Incr VIII	41,836		41,836
Colorado	SOCOM	Fort Carson	Combat Service Support Complex (SOF)	26,100		26,100
Connecticut	Navy	NSB New London	Waterfront Operations Small Craft Facility		9,580	9,580
Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	Construct Engine Storage Facility (C-17)	3,000		3,000
Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	Construct Aircrew Life Support Facility (C-17)	7,400		7,400
Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	Add/Alter Composite Maintenance Shop (C-17)	2,600		2,600
Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	Alter Hangars (C-17)	13,400		13,400
Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	Construct Precision Measurement Equipment Lab		4,000	4,000
Florida	Navy	NAS Jacksonville	Replace Helicopter Hangar, Increment 2	43,250		43,250
Florida	Navy	NS Pensacola	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	13,486		13,486
Florida	Navy	Cape Canaveral	Engineering Services Facility		9,900	9,900
Florida	Air Force	Hurlburt Field	Vehicle Maintenance Facility (823 RED HORSE)	7,000		7,000
Florida	Air Force	Hurlburt Field	Joint Operations Planning Facility	7,250		7,250
Florida	Air Force	Hurlburt Field	Add/Alter Security Forces Operations Facility	1,900		1,900
Florida	Air Force	Hurlburt Field	Dormitory (50 Room)	8,400		8,400
Florida	Air Force	Hurlburt Field	Realign Cruz Avenue	2,000		2,000
Florida	Air Force	Hurlburt Field	Fire Crash/Rescue Station	6,400		6,400
Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Replace Explosive Ordnance Disposal Complex	4,350		4,350
Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Dormitory (144 Room)	15,000		15,000
Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Dormitory (96 Room)	11,000		11,000

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	FY07 Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Add to US CENTCOM Headquarters	60,000		60,000
Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Add/Alter CENTCOM Joint Intelligence Ctr, Incr 2	23,300		23,300
Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	Add to Operations Facility (F-22)	1,800		1,800
Florida	TRICARE	MacDill AFB	Clinic Replacement	87,000		87,000
Florida	TRICARE	NH Jacksonville	Hospital Alteration	16,000		16,000
Florida	SOCOM	Hurlburt Field	Talon II Squadron Operations Facility (SOF)	5,982		5,982
Florida	SOCOM	Hurlburt Field	Construct Engine Maintenance & Storage Fac (SOF)	8,500		8,500
Florida	SOCOM	MacDill AFB	Add to Building 501-D (SOF)	27,300		27,300
Georgia	Army	Fort Gillem	Expand Forensic Lab	15,000		15,000
Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart	Digital Multipurpose Range Complex	34,000		34,000
Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	23,000		23,000
Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart	Child Development Center (Hunter AAF)	7,700		7,700
Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart	Brigade Complex	23,800		23,800
Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart	Child Development Center	6,800		6,800
Georgia	Navy	NSB Kings Bay	Reaction Force Auxiliary Support Complex	13,648		13,648
Georgia	Navy	NSB Kings Bay	Waterfront Security Force Facility	6,634		6,634
Georgia	Navy	USMCD Albany	Land Settlement - Blount Island	62,000		62,000
Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	Depot Maintenance Support Hangar	8,600		8,600
Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	Advanced Metal Finishing Facility	30,000		30,000
Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	Construct Software Support Facility, Ph 1		14,000	14,000
Georgia	Air National Guard	Savannah	Replace Ops Training/Security Forces Complex	7,100		7,100
Georgia	NSA	Augusta	Regional Security Operations Center, Increment II	107,118		107,118
Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Construct Unit Operational Facilities	42,000		42,000
Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Child Development Center	12,500		12,500
Hawaii	Navy	NS Pearl Harbor	Helicopter Flight Training Facility	4,324		4,324
Hawaii	Navy	NS Pearl Harbor	Dredge West Loch Channel For T-AKE (Ewa Beach)	30,994		30,994

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	*Service/Agency*	*Installation*	*Project Title*	*FY07 Request*	*Senate Change*	*Senate Auth*
Hawaii	Navy	NS Pearl Harbor	Site Prep Mobile User Objective System (Wahiawa)	13,020		13,020
Hawaii	Navy	NSY Pearl Harbor	Dry Dock Ship Support Services		22,000	22,000
Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Restore Aircraft Apron and Access Road (C-17)	3,538		3,538
Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Construct Fuel Cell Nose Dock (C-17)	25,000		25,000
Hawaii	TRICARE	NS Pearl Harbor	Construct Environmental Preventive Med Unit Fac	7,700		7,700
Hawaii	NSA	Kunia	Regional Security Operations Center, Increment IV	47,016		47,016
Idaho	Army National Guard	Gowen Field	Construct Railhead, Phase II		6,964	6,964
Illinois	Navy	NS Great Lakes	Upgrade RTC Infrastructure, Increment II	23,589		23,589
Illinois	Air Force	Scott AFB	Dormitory (120 Room)	20,000		20,000
Illinois	Air Force	Scott AFB	Child Development Center		8,200	8,200
Illinois	Army National Guard	Sparta	Fire Station (ADRS)	1,700		1,700
Illinois	Army Reserve	Granite City	Reserve Center/OMS/AMSA/Unheated Storage	20,935		20,935
Illinois	Air Force Reserve	Scott AFB	Squadron Operations Facility	10,200		10,200
Illinois	Air Force Reserve	Scott AFB	Contractor Logistics Support Storage Fac	4,350		4,350
Illinois	TRICARE	NH Great Lakes	Health Care Facility Parking Structure	20,000		20,000
Indiana	Navy	NSA Crane	Replace Special Weapons Assessment Facility		6,730	6,730
Indiana	Army National Guard	Camp Atterbury	Urban Assault Course	1,601		1,601
Indiana	Army National Guard	Camp Atterbury	Live Fire Shoot House	1,929		1,929
Indiana	Army National Guard	Evansville	Motor Vehicle Storage Compound (ADRS)	2,566		2,566
Indiana	Air National Guard	Fort Wayne IAP	Replace Security Forces Ops/Training Facility	4,300		4,300
Iowa	Army National Guard	Iowa City	Construct Readiness Center		10,724	10,724
Iowa	Army National Guard	Waterloo	Army Aviation Support Facility	11,432		11,432
Kansas	Army	Fort Leavenworth	Battle Seminar Facility	15,000		15,000
Kansas	Army	Fort Riley	Construct Barracks Complex	32,000		32,000
Kansas	Army	Fort Riley	Child Development Center	5,200		5,200
Kansas	Army	Fort Riley	Vehicle Inspection/Cargo Processing Fac		10,200	10,200

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	*Service/Agency*	*Installation*	*Project Title*	*FY07 Request*	*Senate Change*	*Senate Auth*
Kentucky	Army	Blue Grass Army Depot	Construct Block & Brace Facility	3,500		3,500
Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Construct Barracks Complex	50,000		50,000
Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Battle Command Training Center	24,400		24,400
Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Child Development Center	5,000		5,000
Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	10,000		10,000
Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Construct Barracks	26,000		26,000
Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Warrior Rehabilitation/Fitness Center, Ph 1		11,800	11,800
Kentucky	Air Force	Fort Knox	Replace TACP ASOS Facility	3,500		3,500
Kentucky	Chem Demil	Blue Grass Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Incr VII	89,157	10,000	99,157
Kentucky	SOCOM	Fort Campbell	Battalion Operations Complex (SOF)	24,500		24,500
Kentucky	DODEA	Fort Knox	Replace High School	18,108		18,108
Louisiana	Army	Fort Polk	Construct Brigade Facility (4th BDE 10th HQ)		9,800	9,800
Maine	Navy	NSY Portsmouth	Drydock #3 Waterfront Support Facility		9,650	9,650
Maryland	Army	Aberdeen PG	Automotive Technology Evaluation Fac, Ph 1		8,800	8,800
Maryland	Navy	NAS Patuxent River	Renovate Test Facilities (MMA)	16,316		16,316
Maryland	Navy	NSA Suitland	Add/Renovate National Maritime Intel Ctr, Incr I	11,780		11,780
Maryland	Navy	USNA	Construct Wesley Brown Field House, Increment II	26,685		26,685
Maryland	Air Force	Andrews AFB	Strategic Planning & Development Fac	29,000		29,000
Maryland	Army National Guard	Gaithersburg	Add to/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	5,612		5,612
Maryland	Naval Reserve	NSA Washington	Administrative & Boat Storage Facility, Annapolis	1,924		1,924
Maryland	TRICARE	Fort Detrick	Construct USAMRIID Stage I, Increment I	29,000		29,000
Maryland	NSA	Fort Meade	Classified Material Conversion, Increment II	11,151		11,151
Maryland	NSA	Fort Meade	Upgrade Utilities for Headquarters	4,517	-4,517	-
Massachusetts	Air Force	Hanscom AFB	Renovate Acquisition Mgt Facility, Bldg 1102C		12,400	12,400
Massachusetts	Army Reserve	Fort Devens	Urban Assault Course	1,713		1,713
Michigan	Army	Detroit Arsenal	Ground System Power and Energy Lab		18,500	18,500

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	*Service/Agency*	*Installation*	*Project Title*	*FY07 Request*	*Senate Change*	*Senate Auth*
Minnesota	Army National Guard	Camp Ripley	Construct Urban Assault Course		1,700	1,700
Minnesota	Army National Guard	St Cloud	Army Aviation Support Facility (AASF)	34,453		34,453
Missouri	Army	Fort Leonard Wood	Construct Barracks	17,000		17,000
Missouri	Army	Fort Leonard Wood	Construct Child Development Center		6,900	6,900
Missouri	Naval Reserve	St Louis	Administrative & Boat Storage Facility	4,108		4,108
Mississipppi	Navy	NAS Meridian	Construct Fire Station		5,870	5,870
Mississippi	Army National Guard	Tupelo	Army Aviation Support Facility	29,888		29,888
Mississipppi	Army National Guard	Camp Shelby	Joint Use Simulation Center		14,839	14,839
Montana	Air National Guard	Great Falls	Replace Operations and Training Facility		9,600	9,600
Nebraska	Army National Guard	Grand Island	Army Aviation Support Facility	17,275		17,275
Nebraska	Army Reserve	North Platte	Reserve Ctr/OMS/AMSA/Storage		7,630	7,630
Nebraska	Army Reserve	Omaha	Reserve Center/OMS/AMSA/Unheated Storage	24,143		24,143
Nebraska	Naval Reserve	Omaha	Relocate Reserve Center to Offut AFB	5,160		5,160
Nevada	Navy	NAS Fallon	Improve Range B-20		7,730	7,730
Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	Construct Airfield Fire Rescue Station		4,800	4,800
Nevada	Air Force	Indian Springs	Construct Various Predator Support Facilities, Ph 2	26,000		26,000
Nevada	Air Force	Indian Springs	Construct Various Predator Ops Facilities, Phase 2	23,923		23,923
Nevada	Air National Guard	Reno-Tahoe	Replace Vehicle Maintenance Complex		5,000	5,000
New Jersey	Air Force	McGuire AFB	Construct NE Assault Landing Zone (C-17)	15,500		15,500
New Jersey	Army National Guard	Lakehurst	Consolidated Logistics And Training Facility,	20,024		20,024
New Jersey	Air National Guard	Altantic City	Expand Arm/Disarm Pad		1,800	1,800
New Mexico	Air Force	Kirtland AFB	Construct Rescue/Recovery Training Ctr (PJ/CRO)		11,400	11,400
New York	Army	Fort Drum	Construct Barracks (AMF)	40,000		40,000
New York	Army	Fort Drum	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	16,500		16,500
New York	Army	Fort Drum	Construct Barracks (AMF)	29,000		29,000
New York	Army	Fort Drum	Construct Barracks Complex Increment 2	16,500		16,500

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	FY07 Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
New York	Army	Fort Drum	Child Development Center	7,400		7,400
New York	Army	Fort Drum	Brigade Complex #1, Phase 1	36,500		36,500
New York	Army	Fort Drum	Brigade Complex #2, Phase 1	37,400		37,400
New York	Army	Fort Drum	Brigade Complex #3, Phase 1	42,400		42,400
New York	Army National Guard	Camp Smith	Readiness Center	21,908		21,908
New York	Army National Guard	Queensbury	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	9,763		9,763
New York	Army National Guard	Fort Drum	Maneuver Area Training Equip Site, Phase II	12,658		12,658
New York	Air National Guard	Griffis ANGB	Construct NEADS Support Facility, Ph II		6,600	6,600
New York	Naval Reserve	Stewart IAP	USMCR Aviation Support Equipment Shop	1,834		1,834
New York	Air Force Reserve	Niagara Falls IAP	Construct Visiting Quarters, Phase 2	7,800		7,800
New York	TRICARE	Fort Drum	Construct Dental Clinic	9,700		9,700
North Carolina	Army	Sunny Point Mil Terminal	Center Wharf Expansion	46,000		46,000
North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Construct Barracks Complex	39,000		39,000
North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks Complex, Div Artillery Increment 2	37,000		37,000
North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks Complex, 3rd Brigade, Increment 2	50,000		50,000
North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks Complex, 2nd Brigade, Increment 2	31,000		31,000
North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Construct Barracks	22,000		22,000
North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Digital Multipurpose Range Complex	28,000		28,000
North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Construct Child Development Center		7,900	7,900
North Carolina	Navy	Washington County	Outlying Landing Field Facilities, Increment III	7,926		7,926
North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	Modify K-Ranges, Phase 1	12,102		12,102
North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	Construct Intel Operations (MARSOC)	20,430		20,430
North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	Construct Maintenance Complex (MARSOC)	22,117		22,117
North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	Construct Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (MARSOC)	61,905		61,905
North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	Construct Dining Facility (MARSOC)	13,420		13,420
North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	Construct Medical/Battalion Aid Station (MARSOC)	3,478		3,478

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	FY07 Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	Constuct Academic Instruction Facility, Phase 2	15,140		15,140
North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	Construct Armories, II MEF	4,702		4,702
North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	Upgrade Ammo Supply Point, Phase 2	7,610		7,610
North Carolina	Navy	MCAS New River	Construct Aircraft Hangar	21,500		21,500
North Carolina	Navy	MCAS New River	Construct Combat Training Tank		5,800	5,800
North Carolina	Army Reserve	Raleigh-Durham	Construct Reserve Ctr/OMS/Unheated Storage	12,114		12,114
North Carolina	Naval Reserve	Camp Lejeune	Construct Vehicle Maint Fac & Add to Training Center	5,792		5,792
North Carolina	Naval Reserve	Camp Lejeune	Relocate Reserve Center	5,210		5,210
North Carolina	Air National Guard	Stanly County Airport	Relocate Comm & Electronics Training Complex	5,100		5,100
North Carolina	SOCOM	Pope AFB	Construct Squadron Ops/Hangar (SOF)	15,276		15,276
North Carolina	SOCOM	Fort Bragg	Construct Training Facility (Camp Mackall) (SOF)	8,650		8,650
North Carolina	SOCOM	Fort Bragg	Add to Bldg O-1900-M (SOF) Northwest	17,927		17,927
North Carolina	SOCOM	Fort Bragg	Add to Bldg O-1900-M (SOF) Northeast	18,291		18,291
North Carolina	SOCOM	Camp Lejeune	Construct MARSOC HQ (SOF)	51,600		51,600
North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Air Traffic Control Complex, Phase 1		8,000	8,000
North Dakota	Air National Guard	Hector IAP	Predator Operations Complex	5,500		5,500
Ohio	Army National Guard	Columbus	Add to /Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	1,108		1,108
Ohio	Army National Guard	Marysville	Readiness Center (ADRS)	6,163		6,163
Ohio	Air National Guard	Rickenbacker IAP	Security Forces Complex/Comm Facility		7,200	7,200
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	Alter Facility For Reserve Training (C-5)	2,700		2,700
Oklahoma	Army	McAlester AAP	Construct Fabrication Facility	3,050		3,050
Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Construct Electrical Substation #6		8,100	8,100
Oklahoma	Air Force	Altus AFB	Repair McQueen Road (DAR)	1,500		1,500
Oklahoma	Air Force	Altus AFB	Construct Visiting Quarters, Phase 1		8,000	8,000
Oregon	Army National Guard	Boardman	Construct Multi-Purpose Training Range	3,314		3,314
Pennsylvania	Army	Letterkenny Depot	Construct Port Staging Facility		7,500	7,500

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	FY07 Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Bradford	Readiness Center (SBCT)	6,206		6,206
Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Butler	Add/Alt Readiness Center, (SBCT)	2,496		2,496
Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Carlisle	Field Maintenance Shop (SBCT)	7,033		7,033
Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Chambersburg	Add/Alt Readiness Center, (SBCT)	4,560		4,560
Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Easton	Field Maintenance Shop (SBCT)	9,707		9,707
Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Easton	Readiness Center (SBCT)	5,190		5,190
Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Lancaster	Field Maintenance Shop (SBCT)	8,309		8,309
Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Lancaster	Readiness Center (SBCT)	10,714		10,714
Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Lewistown	Add/Alt Readiness Center, (SBCT)	8,868		8,868
Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Punxsutawney	Add/Alt Readiness Center, (SBCT)	5,470		5,470
Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Reading	Add/Alt Readiness Center, (SBCT)	5,817		5,817
Pennsylvania	Army Reserve	Beaver Falls	Reserve Ctr/OMS/Unheated Storage	10,285		10,285
Pennsylvania	Air National Guard	State College ANGS	Replace Air Ops Squadron Training Facility	5,300		5,300
Pennsylvania	DLA	DDD New Cumberland	Add To Consolidated Maint Facility	8,900		8,900
Rhode Island	Navy	NS Newport	Hazardous Material Storage Facility		3,410	3,410
Rhode Island	Army National Guard	East Greenwich	Combined Support Maintenance Shop	27,472	2,075	29,547
South Carolina	Navy	Beaufort	Land Acquisition, Phase 1	7,255	-7,255	-
South Carolina	Navy	Beaufort	Enlisted Dining Facility	14,970		14,970
South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Child Development Center		10,200	10,200
South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	Aerospace Ground Equipment Shop	6,200		6,200
South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	Dormitory (144 Room)	16,000		16,000
South Dakota	Air Force	Ellsworth AFB	Install Base Water Well		3,000	3,000
South Dakota	Air National Guard	Joe Foss Field	Replace Civil Engineer Maintenance Complex		7,500	7,500
South Dakota	Army Reserve	Sioux Falls	Res Ctr/OMS/AMSA/Unheated Stor/Acquire Land	12,876		12,876
Tennessee	Army National Guard	Louisville	Army Aviation Support Facility	5,239		5,239
Tennessee	Air National Guard	McGhee Tyson	Replace Squadron Operations Facilty		11,200	11,200

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	*Service/Agency*	*Installation*	*Project Title*	*FY07 Request*	*Senate Change*	*Senate Auth*
Tennessee	Air National Guard	Memphis IAP	Replace Aircraft Supt Equip Shop & Stor (C-5)	4,400		4,400
Tennessee	Air National Guard	Memphis IAP	Repacel Sqadron Ops/Simulator Facility (C-5)	10,000		10,000
Tennessee	Air National Guard	Memphis IAP	Upgrade Infrastructure (C-5)	5,000		5,000
Tennessee	Air National Guard	Memphis IAP	Replace Fire Crash Rescue Station (C-5)	4,350		4,350
Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	28,000		28,000
Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Barracks Complex	47,000		47,000
Texas	Army	Red River Depot	Construct Maneuver System Sustainment Ctr, Ph 1		6,000	6,000
Texas	Air Force	Fort Bliss	Replace TACP ASOS Facility	8,500		8,500
Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Replace Telecommunications Switch/Admin	13,200		13,200
Texas	Army National Guard	Camp Bowie	Multi-Purpose Machine Gun Range	2,229		2,229
Texas	Army Reserve	Ellington Field	Construct Armed Forces Reserve Center, Ph 2		15,000	15,000
Texas	Naval Reserve	Fort Worth	Joint Ground Support Equip & Aircraft Maint Facility	9,428		9,428
Texas	Air National Guard	Ellington Field	Predator Operations Complex	6,000		6,000
Texas	TRICARE	Fort Hood	Add to/Alter Women's Health Services Facility	18,000		18,000
Utah	Army	Dugway Proving Ground	Michael Army Airfield Runway, Phase 3	14,400		14,400
Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	Fueled Composite Aircraft Overhaul/Test Fac F-22	26,000		26,000
Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	Add To Software Support Facility	20,000		20,000
Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	Armament Overhaul Facility	7,400		7,400
Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	Construct Consolidated ALC Warehouse		10,000	10,000
Utah	Army National Guard	Camp Williams	Total Army School System Barracks, Phase I	19,688		19,688
Vermont	Army National Guard	Ethan Allen	Infantry Squad Battle Course	2,204		2,204
Vermont	Air National Guard	Burlington	Improve Base Security, Phase 1		6,000	6,000
Virginia	Army	Fort Belvoir	Construct Museum Support Center	27,000		27,000
Virginia	Army	Fort Belvoir	Administrative Buildings	31,000		31,000
Virginia	Army	Fort Belvoir	Construct Defense Access Road, Phase 2	13,000		13,000
Virginia	Navy	NSWC Dahlgren	Construct Electromagnetic Launch RDT&E Facility		9,850	9,850

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	*Service/Agency*	*Installation*	*Project Title*	*FY07 Request*	*Senate Change*	*Senate Auth*
Virginia	Navy	NS Norfolk	Replace Pier 11, Increment IV	30,633		30,633
Virginia	Navy	NS Norfolk	Add to Helicopter Training Facility	12,062		12,062
Virginia	Navy	Norfolk Naval Shipyard	Replace Ship Repair Pier 3, Increment II	30,939		30,939
Virginia	Navy	Norfolk Naval Shipyard	Modernize Dry Dock #8	34,952		34,952
Virginia	Navy	NSA Norfolk	Construct Damage Control School Trainer	13,502		13,502
Virginia	Navy	NSA Norfolk	Joint Deployment/Fleet Forces Command Center	14,960		14,960
Virginia	Navy	NSA Norfolk	Construct Headquarters, Bldg One, JFCOM		10,500	10,500
Virginia	Navy	MCB Quantico	Construct SNCO Academic Instruction Facility	8,317		8,317
Virginia	Navy	MCB Quantico	Hochmuth Hall Addition, Increment II	11,559		11,559
Virginia	Navy	MCB Quantico	Construct Student Quarters, Basic School, Ph 1	22,311		22,311
Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Dormitory (96 Room)	10,000		10,000
Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Distributed Common Ground Station Ops Facility	47,700		47,700
Virginia	Army National Guard	Fort Pickett	Ammo Supply Point Magazines (SBCT)	1,889		1,889
Virginia	SOCOM	Little Creek	Seal Delivery Vehicle Maintenance Facility (SOF)	22,000		22,000
Virginia	DLA	Fort Belvoir	Material Receiving And Screening Facility	5,500		5,500
Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Construct Barracks Complex	35,000		35,000
Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Construct Barracks Complex	49,000		49,000
Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Construct Brigade Complex (Stryker), Increment 1	102,000		102,000
Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Child Development Center	10,600		10,600
Washington	Navy	NSB Bangor	Limited Area Prod & Strg Complex, Increment III	14,274		14,274
Washington	Navy	NSB Bangor	Reaction Force Fac Auxiliary Support Complex	13,507		13,507
Washington	Navy	NS Everett	Base Enlisted Quarters, Homeport Ashore, Incr II	20,917		20,917
Washington	Navy	NAS Whidbey Island	Hangar 5 Recapitalization	57,653		57,653
Washington	Navy	NAS Whidbey Island	Construct Aircraft Washrack		9,650	9,650
Washington	DLA	NAS Whidbey Island	Consolidated Fuel Facility	26,000		26,000
Wisconsin	Air National Guard	Truax Field	ADD/ALT Fire/Crash/Rescue Station		7,000	7,000

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	FY07 Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Wisconsin	Army Reserve	Fort McCoy	General Purpose Warehouse	13,744		13,744
Wisconsin	Army Reserve	Menasha	Reserve Center/OMS/Unheated Storage	12,159		12,159
West Virginia	Air National Guard	Martinsburg ANGS	Construct Avionics Shop, ASE, Aerial Port (C-5)		5,000	5,000
West Virginia	Air National Guard	Martinsburg ANGS	Replace Fire, Crash & Rescue Station (C-5)	7,500		7,500
West Virginia	Air National Guard	Martinsburg ANGS	Replace Base Supply Facility (C-5)	5,700		5,700
West Virginia	Air National Guard	Martinsburg ANGS	Upgrade/Extend Runway & Taxiways (C-5)	20,500		20,500
West Virginia	Air National Guard	Yeager	Replace Aircraft Maintenance Hangar		17,300	17,300
Wyoming	Army National Guard	Camp Guernsey	Multi-Purpose Machine Gun Range	1,796		1,796
Wyoming	Air Force	F. E. Warren AFB	Renovate Dormitory 320	11,000		11,000
Wyoming	Air National Guard	Cheyenne	Replace Squadron Ops Facility		7,600	7,600
Wyoming	Air National Guard	Cheyenne	Add To/Alter Fire Crash/Rescue Station	4,200		4,200
OVERSEAS						
Diego Garcia	Navy	Diego Garcia	Wharf Improvements & Shore Support Facility	37,473		37,473
Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Construct Vehicle Maintenance Complex	29,500		29,500
Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Construct Vehicle Maintenance Complex	29,500		29,500
Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Construct Barracks	29,000		29,000
Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Construct Vehicle Maintenance Complex	29,500		29,500
Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Construct Barracks	29,000		29,000
Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Brigade Headquarters	11,132		11,132
Germany	Army	Vilseck	Construct Barracks	19,000		19,000
Germany	Air Force	Ramstein AB	Construct Tactical Airlift Ramp 1, Phase 2	27,850		27,850
Germany	Air Force	Ramstein AB	Construct Aircraft Parts Store (C-130)	3,300		3,300
Germany	Air Force	Ramstein AB	Construct 2-Bay Hangar (C-130)	22,000		22,000
Guam	Navy	NB Guam	Improve Alpha/Bravo Wharves, Increment II	29,772		29,772

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	FY07 Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Guam	Air Force	Andersen AFB	Upgrade Northwest Field Infrastructure, Phase 1	12,500	-12,500	-
Guam	Air Force	Andersen AFB	Construct Contractor Gate/Access Road (ISR/STF)	15,500	-15,500	-
Guam	Air Force	Andersen AFB	Global Hawk Aircraft Maintenance & Ops Complex	52,800		52,800
Italy	Army	Vicenza	Construct Barracks Complex, Dal Molin	46,000		46,000
Italy	Army	Vicenza	Construct Infrastructure, Brigade Cmplx, Dal Molin	49,000		49,000
Italy	Army	Vicenza	Construct Brigade Complex, Dal Molin	32,000		32,000
Italy	Army	Vicenza	Construct Barracks Complex, Dal Molin	29,000		29,000
Italy	Army	Vicenza	Construct Physical Fitness Center, Dal Molin	26,000		26,000
Italy	Army	Vicenza	Construct Barracks Complex, Dal Molin	41,000		41,000
Italy	Navy	NAS Sigonella	Mobile User Objective System Installation	13,051		13,051
Italy	Air Force	NAS Sigonella	Global Hawk Acrft Maint. & Ops Complex	26,000		26,000
Italy	TRICARE	Vicenza	Enhanced Health Service Center	52,000		52,000
Italy	DODEA	Vicenza	New Middle School, Villagio	0		0
Italy	DODEA	Camp Ederle	New Elementary School, Casmera Ederle	31,460		31,460
Japan	Army	Camp Hansen	Construct Range Complex Phase 2	7,150		7,150
Japan	Navy	Yokosuka	Upgrade Wharf, Increment II	44,360		44,360
Japan	DLA	Okinawa	Replace Single Point Mooring	5,000		5,000
Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Barracks Complex	42,000		42,000
Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Barracks Complex	35,000		35,000
Korea	Army	Yonpyong	Construct Live Fire Shoot House, Area 1	1,450		1,450
Korea	Army	Yonpyong	Construct Live Fire Shoot House, Area 1	1,600		1,600
Korea	Army	Yonpyong	Digital Multipurpose Range	4,350		4,350
Korea	Air Force	Kunsan AB	Dormitory (480 Room)	46,700		46,700
Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Distributed Common Ground St Intel Sqd Ops Fac	2,156		2,156
Korea	TRICARE	Osan AB	Add to Osan High School	4,589		4,589
Kwajalein Atoll	MDA	Kwajalein Atoll	Upgrade Life Safety, Launch Control Facility	7,592		7,592

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	*Service/Agency*	*Installation*	*Project Title*	*FY07 Request*	*Senate Change*	*Senate Auth*
Puerto Rico	Army Reserve	Camp Santiago	Combat Pistol/MP Qualification Course	2,054		2,054
Qatar	SOCOM	Al Udeid AB	Construct Rotary Wing Hangar (SOF)	16,500		16,500
Qatar	SOCOM	Al Udeid AB	Construct Aircraft Ops & Maint Hangar (SOF)	28,000		28,000
Romania	Army	Babadag Range	Construct Expeditionary Facilities for EETAF, Ph 1	34,800		34,800
Spain	DODEA	NS Rota	Add to Rota High School	23,048		23,048
United Kingdom	NSA	Menwith Hill Station	Operations/Tech Building, Increment II	46,386		46,386
Wake Island	DLA	Wake Island	Replace Fuel Truck Loading Facility	2,600		2,600
UNSPECIFIED						
Worldwide	Navy	Worldwide	Helicopter Support Facility	12,185		12,185
Worldwide	Air Force	Worldwide	Common Battlefield Airman Training Complex	14,200		14,200
Worldwide	Air Force	Classified Location	Classified Project	3,377		3,377
Worldwide	Air Force	Classified Location	Classified Project	1,700		1,700
Worldwide	Air Force	Classified Location	Classified-Special Evaluation Program	4,600		4,600
Worldwide	Army	Worldwide	Planning And Design	191,830	4,799	196,629
Worldwide	Army	Worldwide	Host Nation Support	21,000		21,000
Worldwide	Navy	Worldwide	Planning And Design	46,485	2,699	49,184
Worldwide	Navy	Worldwide	Planning And Design, USMC	21,376	687	22,063
Worldwide	Air Force	Worldwide	Planning And Design	87,504	3,128	90,632
Worldwide	Army National Guard	Worldwide	Planning And Design	57,337	3,662	60,999
Worldwide	Air National Guard	Worldwide	Planning And Design	18,838	7,755	26,593
Worldwide	Army Reserve	Worldwide	Planning And Design	19,509	700	20,209
Worldwide	Naval Reserve	Worldwide	Planning And Design	1,400		1,400
Worldwide	Naval Reserve	Worldwide	Planning And Design, USMCR	987		987

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	FY07 Request	Senate Change	Senate Auth
Worldwide	Air Force Reserve	Worldwide	Planning And Design	5,109		5,109
Worldwide	WHS	Worldwide	Planning And Design	507		507
Worldwide	TRICARE	Worldwide	Planning And Design	81,800		81,800
Worldwide	SOCOM	Worldwide	Planning And Design	47,915		47,915
Worldwide	Defense Level	Worldwide	Planning And Design	35,512		35,512
Worldwide	NSA	Worldwide	Planning And Design	6,416		6,416
Worldwide	Army	Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	23,000		23,000
Worldwide	Navy	Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	8,939		8,939
Worldwide	Air Force	Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	15,000		15,000
Worldwide	Army National Guard	Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	20,844		20,844
Worldwide	Air National Guard	Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	6,000		6,000
Worldwide	Army Reserve	Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,042		3,042
Worldwide	Naval Reserve	Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,112		1,112
Worldwide	Air Force Reserve	Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,477		4,477
Worldwide	DLA	Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,591		4,591
Worldwide	DODEA	Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	466		466
Worldwide	JCS	Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,531		7,531
Worldwide	SOCOM	Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,342		4,342
Worldwide	TRICARE	Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,321		3,321
Worldwide	DFAS	Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,421		1,421
Worldwide	Army	BRAC IV	Environmental Activities	51,340		51,340
Worldwide	Air Force	BRAC IV	Environmental Activities	133,827		133,827
Worldwide	DLA	BRAC IV	Environmental activities	6,053		6,053

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	*Service/Agency*	*Installation*	*Project Title*	*FY07 Request*	*Senate Change*	*Senate Auth*
Worldwide	Army	BRAC V	Construction, Environmental, and Other Activities	3,608,234		3,608,234
Worldwide	Navy	BRAC V	Construction, Environmental, and Other Activities	689,589		689,589
Worldwide	Air Force	BRAC V	Construction, Environmental, and Other Activities	906,941		906,941
Worldwide	Defense Agencies	BRAC V	Construction, Environmental, and Other Activities	421,459	-99,329	322,130
Worldwide	ECIP	Unspecified Worldwide	Energy Conservation Improvement Program	60,000		60,000
Worldwide	OSD	Unspecified Worldwide	Contingency Construction	10,000		10,000
Worldwide	NATO	Unspecified Worldwide	NATO Security Investment Program	220,985	-15,000	205,985
FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION						
Alaska	Army	Fort Richardson	Replace Family Housing, Kodiak Flats (105 Units)	45,000		45,000
Alaska	Army	Fort Richardson	Replace Family Housing, Puffin Park (57 Units)	25,000		25,000
Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Replace Family Housing, Southern Cross (90 Units)	50,000		50,000
Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Replace Family Housing, Northern Lights (86 Units)	50,000		50,000
Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Replace Family Housing, Northern Lights (58 Units)	32,000		32,000
Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Replace Family Housing (129 Units)	87,414		87,414
Arizona	Army	Fort Huachuca	Replace Family Housing (119 Units)	32,000		32,000
Arkansas	Army	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Replace Family Housing (10 Units)	2,900		2,900
California	Navy	Barstow	Replace Family Housing, Desert View (74 units)	27,851		27,851
Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 8 (457 Units)	107,800		107,800
Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	Replace Family Housing (116 Units)	39,270		39,270
Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Replace Family Housing (493 Units)	140,252		140,252
North Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 10 (56 Units)	22,956		22,956
North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 13 (575 Units)	171,188		171,188
Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	Replace Family Housing Phase 7 (199 Units)	49,215		49,215

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	*Service/Agency*	*Installation*	*Project Title*	*FY07 Request*	*Senate Change*	*Senate Auth*
Virginia	DLA	DSC Richmond	Replace Family Housing (25 Units)	7,840		7,840
Wisconsin	Army	Fort McCoy	Replace Family Housing (13 Units)	4,900		4,900
OVERSEAS FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION						
Germany	Air Force	Ramstein AB	Replace Family Housing (101 Units)	73,488		73,488
Germany	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	Replace Family Housing (60 Units)	39,294		39,294
Guam	Navy	NB Guam	Replace Family Housing Old Apra, Ph I (68 units)	48,017		48,017
Guam	Navy	NB Guam	Replace Family Housing, North Tipalo Ph II (108 units)	50,157		50,157
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Replace Family Housing (74 Units)	35,282		35,282
FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENTS						
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Planning & Design	16,332		16,332
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Planning & Design	2,600		2,600
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Planning & Design	13,202		13,202
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Improvements	200		200
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Classified Project	50		50
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Improvements	403,727		403,727
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Improvements	336,859		336,859
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Improvements	176,446		176,446
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Planning & Design	484		484
Worldwide	NSA	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Improvements	284		284
Worldwide	OSD	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Improvement Fund	2,500		2,500
FAMILY HOUSING OPERATIONS						

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	*Service/Agency*	*Installation*	*Project Title*	*FY07 Request*	*Senate Change*	*Senate Auth*
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	55,663		55,663
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	26,384		26,384
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	38,610		38,610
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	1,371		1,371
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	106,133		106,133
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Operations	2,934		2,934
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	204,963		204,963
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Privatization Support Costs	25,990		25,990
Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	214,781		214,781
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	75,085		75,085
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	34,123		34,123
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	18,036		18,036
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	595		595
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	80,751		80,751
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Mortgage Insurance Premium	2		2
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	152,991		152,991
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Privatization Support Costs	15,261		15,261
Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	132,282	-10,601	121,681
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	77,981		77,981
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	25,888		25,888
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	44,545		44,545
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	1,914		1,914
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	103,250		103,250

Military Construction and Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2007
(Dollars inThousands)

Location	*Service/Agency*	*Installation*	*Project Title*	*FY07 Request*	*Senate Change*	*Senate Auth*
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Debt Account	1		1
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance (RMPA & RMPC)	337,798		337,798
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Account	4,500		4,500
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Privatization Support Costs	37,899		37,899
Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	121,295		121,295
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	399		399
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	72		72
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	374		374
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	58		58
Worldwide	DLA	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	236		236
Worldwide	NSA	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities and Operations	33		33
Worldwide	NSA	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	10,261		10,261
Worldwide	NSA	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	70		70
Worldwide	DIA	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	4,182		4,182
Worldwide	DIA	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	32,821		32,821
			Total Authorization of Appropriations	16,698,423	400,000	17,098,423
			Prior Year Rescissions:	0	0	0
			Total After Recisions	16,698,423	400,000	17,098,423

Costs to implement the decisions of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment round

The budget request for fiscal year 2007 includes $5.6 billion to carry out military construction and environmental activities related to the decisions in the 2005 Defense Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round. This amount is in addition to $1.5 billion, which was authorized in fiscal year 2006. The Secretary of Defense included in the justification data to support the request a budget plan to implement the BRAC 2005 round with a one-time cost of over $18.4 billion between fiscal year 2006 and fiscal year 2011. The plan includes an additional $9.5 billion to be spent for recurring costs related to operations and maintenance and military personnel. The Secretary is required by law to complete all installation closures and realignments no later than September 15, 2011.

The Secretary submitted the BRAC 2005 investment plan with the caveat that "the out-year program does not fully reflect the expected costs for the remainder of the BRAC implementation period." The Department of the Army included in its justification data accompanying the 2007 budget request for BRAC 2005 an assessment that the requirements currently identified by the Army to implement its recommendations will cost $5.7 more than the $9.5 billion budgeted by the Department of Defense for the Army. In subsequent testimony to Congress, Army representatives estimated that the shortfall may be as high as $8 billion. The Department of the Air Force has identified a similar problem in which currently identified requirements are estimated to cost $1.8 billion more than currently budgeted by the Department of Defense.

The committee is extremely concerned that the Department proposes to address the BRAC 2005 shortfalls by pursuing two courses of action which may result in long-term detrimental impact to the operational capability of all military units, regardless of whether these units were affected by BRAC 2005.

The first course of action, currently underway in the military departments, is to "scrub" requirements generated from the military units affected by BRAC in order to carry out the minimal number of construction projects required to meet the needs of the department. In many cases, the military unit being moved to another installation may not have the same quality and availability of facilities, infrastructure and training areas comparable to what was available at their original location.

The second course of action will be to use funds currently planned by the military departments for military construction projects not associated with BRAC 2005 to make up the shortfall in BRAC plans. This proposal would result in the deferral of critical recapitalization and modernization projects at military installations not impacted by BRAC. The committee has consistently supported the Department's goal to request authorization of appropriations for military construction, facility restoration, and modernization in the fiscal year 2008 budget at a level that will equate to a recapitalization rate of 67 years. This goal must not be sacrificed due to the lack of an adequate budget for BRAC 2005 activities.

The committee finds neither of these courses of action to be an acceptable solution. The committee expects that the Secretary of Defense will fully budget for all activities required to carry out

BRAC 2005 and will not assume risk or reduce the operational capability of military units in carrying out the decisions.

2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment accounts authorized for appropriations in 2006

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) included authorization of appropriations of $1,504.5 million to carry out military construction, environmental activities and certain operating expenses related to the results of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) round. Section 2404(c) of the aforementioned Act required the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing the specific programs, projects, and activities for which the authorized amounts would be used.

The Department of Defense imposed a 1 percent reduction upon the appropriation for the BRAC account, which resulted in an amount of $1,489.4 million being available for obligation.

On February 10, 2006, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics submitted to the committee a report detailing the planned expenditures of funds to support implementation of the Department of Defense's BRAC requirements.

The planned expenditures included $1,160.3 million to initiate planning, design, and construction of facilities; $82.3 million for activities required by the National Environmental Policy Act and other environmental actions; $193.8 million to carry out personnel permanent changes of station (PCS), transportation of personnel property, sustainment of real property, and BRAC program management; and $52.6 million for the procurement of collateral equipment, information technology systems, training, and other transition support services.

The following table provides the projects and other activities which were identified by the Department to be carried out by each service using amounts made available in fiscal year 2006.

The committee continues to review the justification for the construction projects and other BRAC V activities within these accounts to ensure amounts authorized for this program are used solely to carry out the decisions of the 2005 BRAC round.

2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Program for Fiscal Year 2006

Army BRAC V Program for Fiscal Year 2006 (dollars in thousands)

State	Installation	Project Title	Amount
Arkansas	Fort Chaffee	Armed Forces Reserve Center	19,500
Colorado	Fort Carson	Brigade Combat Team Complex, Increment 1	120,000
Iowa	Camp Dodge	Armed Forces Reserve Center	37,000
Kansas	Fort Riley	Div HQ & Sustainment Bde HQ (IGPBS), Incr 1	91,000
Kentucky	Fort Knox	Brigade Combat Team Facilities, Phase 1	113,000
New Jersey	Fort Dix	Armed Forces Reserve Center	40,000
South Carolina	Fort Jackson	Armed Forces Reserve Center	18,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	BDE Combat Team Complex #1 (IGPBS) Incr 1	85,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	Site Infrastructure (IGPBS), Increment 1	101,000
Wisconsin	Fort McCoy	Armed Forces Reserve Center	21,000
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Army BRAC - Planning and Design (IGPBS)	59,300
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Army BRAC - Planning and Design	98,500
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Army BRAC V Environmental Activities	34,254
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Army BRAC V Operations and Maintenance	27,735
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Army BRAC V Other Services/Procurement (IT, comm, equipment)	0
		Army BRAC V Program Total:	**865,289**

Navy BRAC V Program for Fiscal Year 2006

State	Installation	Project Title	Amount
Florida	NS Mayport	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	12,031
Florida	NS Mayport	DESRON Six Command Bldg	1,769
Florida	NS Mayport	Construct Parking	846
Florida	NAS Jacksonville	Construct Hangar/Parking Apron, Increment 1	21,735
Illinois	NS Great Lakes	Convert Shop Space for Southern Division	853
Illinois	NS.Great Lakes	Renovate Space for Navy Region South	135
Maryland	NAS Patuxent River	Aircraft Research Support Facility	22,527
Rhode Island	NS Newport	Renovate Bldg 370 for OTC-P	7,173
Tennessee	NSA Millington	Construct Bldg for EPMAC/NRPC	11,112
Tennessee	NSA Millington	Renovate Bldg 750 for NRRC	1,301
Virginia	NSA Norfolk	NAVRESFORCOM Administrative Complex	33,509
Virginia	NS Norfolk	Add to Bldg Z140 for EFA NE	5,100
Virginia	NS Norfolk	Renovate Bldg CEP86 REDCOM Mid-Atlantic	845
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Navy BRAC - Planning and Design	59,865
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Navy BRAC V Environmental Activities	17,063
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Navy BRAC V Operations and Maintenance	50,897
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Navy BRAC V Other Services/Procurement (IT, comm, equipment)	0
		Navy BRAC V Program Total	**246,761**

2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Program for Fiscal Year 2006

Army BRAC V Program for Fiscal Year 2006 (dollars in thousands)

State	Installation	Project Title	Amount
Arkansas	Fort Chaffee	Armed Forces Reserve Center	19,500
Colorado	Fort Carson	Brigade Combat Team Complex, Increment 1	120,000
Iowa	Camp Dodge	Armed Forces Reserve Center	37,000
Kansas	Fort Riley	Div HQ & Sustainment Bde HQ (IGPBS), Incr 1	91,000
Kentucky	Fort Knox	Brigade Combat Team Facilities, Phase 1	113,000
New Jersey	Fort Dix	Armed Forces Reserve Center	40,000
South Carolina	Fort Jackson	Armed Forces Reserve Center	18,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	BDE Combat Team Complex #1 (IGPBS) Incr 1	85,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	Site Infrastructure (IGPBS), Increment 1	101,000
Wisconsin	Fort McCoy	Armed Forces Reserve Center	21,000
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Army BRAC - Planning and Design (IGPBS)	59,300
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Army BRAC - Planning and Design	98,500
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Army BRAC V Environmental Activities	34,254
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Army BRAC V Operations and Maintenance	27,735
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Army BRAC V Other Services/Procurement (IT, comm, equipment)	0
		Army BRAC V Program Total:	**865,289**

Navy BRAC V Program for Fiscal Year 2006

State	Installation	Project Title	Amount
Florida	NS Mayport	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	12,031
Florida	NS Mayport	DESRON Six Command Bldg	1,769
Florida	NS Mayport	Construct Parking	846
Florida	NAS Jacksonville	Construct Hangar/Parking Apron, Increment 1	21,735
Illinois	NS Great Lakes	Convert Shop Space for Southern Division	853
Illinois	NS Great Lakes	Renovate Space for Navy Region South	135
Maryland	NAS Patuxent River	Aircraft Research Support Facility	22,527
Rhode Island	NS Newport	Renovate Bldg 370 for OTC-P	7,173
Tennessee	NSA Millington	Construct Bldg for EPMAC/NRPC	11,112
Tennessee	NSA Millington	Renovate Bldg 750 for NRRC	1,301
Virginia	NSA Norfolk	NAVRESFORCOM Administrative Complex	33,509
Virginia	NS Norfolk	Add to Bldg Z140 for EFA NE	5,100
Virginia	NS Norfolk	Renovate Bldg CEP86 REDCOM Mid-Atlantic	845
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Navy BRAC - Planning and Design	59,865
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Navy BRAC V Environmental Activities	17,063
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Navy BRAC V Operations and Maintenance	50,897
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Navy BRAC V Other Services/Procurement (IT, comm, equipment)	0
		Navy BRAC V Program Total	**246,761**

Air Force BRAC V Program for Fiscal Year 2006

State	Installation	Project Title	Amount
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	AF BRAC – Planning and Design	$109,443
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Air Force BRAC V Environmental Activities	28,780
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Air Force BRAC V Operations & Maintenance	59,374
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Air Force BRAC V Military Personnel PCS	0
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Air Force BRAC V Other Services/Procurement (IT, comm, equipment)	33,459
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Air Force BRAC V Homeowners Assistance Program	0
		Air Force BRAC V Program Total	**231,056**

Defense Agencies BRAC V Program for Fiscal Year 2006

State	Installation	Project Title	Amount
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Defense Agencies Planning and Design	67,779
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Defense Agencies Environmental Activities	2,197
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Defense Agencies Operations & Maintenance	55,175
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Defense Agencies Military Personnel PCS	1,681
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Defense Agencies Other Services/Procurement (IT, comm, equipment)	19,073
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Defense Agencies Homeowners Assistance Program	410
		Defense Agencies BRAC V Program Total:	**146,315**

Department of Defense BRAC V Program for Fiscal Year 2006 1,489,421

2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment accounts

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $5,626.2 million for fiscal year 2007 to carry out military construction, environmental activities and certain operating expenses related to the results of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) round.

The following table provides the projects and other activities identified by the Department of Defense to be carried out with amounts authorized for appropriation within each Service's BRAC V account.

The budget request did not account for savings to be realized from the cancellation of construction projects authorized in previous years. Specifically, the committee was notified on March 8, 2006 by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs of the intent to cancel a project at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, authorized in the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. The Secretary noted that these savings would be transferred into the BRAC account to satisfy BRAC requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $99.3 million to the authorization of appropriations for defense agencies for BRAC 2005 to account for the savings.

The committee continues to review the justification for the construction projects and other BRAC V activities within these accounts to ensure amounts authorized for this program are used solely to carry out the decisions of the 2005 BRAC round.

2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Program for Fiscal Year 2007

Army BRAC V Program for Fiscal Year 2007 (dollars in thousands)

State	Installation	Project Title	Amount
Alabama	Birmingham	Armed Forces Reserve Center	28,000
Alabama	Redstone Arsenal	Recruiting Brigade Operations Building	9,400
Arkansas	North Little Rock	Armed Forces Reserve Center	1,050
Arizona	Buckeye	Armed Forces Reserve Center	19,500
California	Bell	Armed Forces Reserve Center	46,900
California	Fort Hunter Liggett	Armed Forces Reserve Center	13,400
California	Moffett Field	Armed Forces Reserve Center	47,000
California	Moffett Field	Armed Forces Reserve Center	23,000
Colorado	Fort Carson	Brigade Combat Team Complex, Incr 2	118,000
Colorado	Fort Carson	Division HQ's, Increment 1	84,000
Connecticut	Middletown	Armed Forces Reserve Center	35,000
Florida	Eglin AFB	Special Forces Complex, Phase 1	115,700
Georgia	Fort Benning	Child Development Center	6,700
Georgia	Fort Benning	Trainee Barracks Complex 1	110,000
Georgia	Fort Benning	Training Brigade Complex	41,200
Georgia	Fort Benning	Fire and Movement Range	2,050
Georgia	Fort Benning	Modified Record Fire Range	4,500
Georgia	Fort Benning	IET Brigade Headquarters Building	20,000
Georgia	Fort Benning	Trainee Barracks Complex 2	110,000
Georgia	Fort Benning	Stationary Gunnery Range	6,100
Kansas	Fort Leavenworth	Regional Correctional Facility	68,000
Kansas	Fort Riley	Battle Command Training Center	27,000
Kansas	Fort Riley	Runway Improvements	17,000
Kansas	Fort Riley	Child Development Center	5,700
Kansas	Fort Riley	Combat Avn Bde Complex - Phase 1	152,000
Kansas	Fort Riley	Cons Soldier/Family Medical Clinic	17,520
Kansas	Fort Riley	Div HQ/Sustainment Bde HQ (IGPBS), Incr 2	87,000
Kentucky	Bluegrass Depot	Armed Forces Reserve Center	21,000
Kentucky	Fort Knox	Human Resources Command Cplx, Ph 1	98,000
Kentucky	Fort Knox	Brigade Combat Team Facilities, Phase 2	77,000
Kentucky	Paducah	Armed Forces Reserve Center	16,500
Massachusetts	Ayer	Armed Forces Reserve Center	81,000
Massachusetts	Westover AFB	Armed Forces Reserve Center	34,000
Maryland	Aberdeen PG	Infrastructure Upgrades	47,000
Maryland	Aberdeen PG	Comm Electronic Res Dev/Engring C Ph 1	145,000
Maryland	Fort Detrick	Armed Forces Reserve Center	13,800
Minnesota	Cambridge	Armed Forces Reserve Center	10,000
North Carolina	Fort Bragg	Veh Maint Shop / 4th BCT	52,000
North Carolina	Fort Bragg	Brigade Combat Team Complex	33,000
Nebraska	Hastings	Armed Forces Reserve Center	12,000
Nebraska	Kearney	Armed Forces Reserve Center	4,700
New Mexico	Kirtland AFB	Armed Forces Reserve Center	20,000
New York	Fort Totten	Armed Forces Reserve Center	21,000
New York	Stewart Newburgh	Armed Forces Reserve Center	22,000
Oklahoma	Fort Sill	Armed Forces Reserve Center	8,700
Oklahoma	Fort Sill	Restation ADA School, Increment 1	138,000
South Carolina	Shaw AFB	Third Army Barracks	13,800
Texas	Camp Bullis	Armed Forces Reserve Center	44,000

State	Installation	Project Title	Amount
Texas	Fort Bliss	Brigade Combat Team Complex #2, Incr 1	85,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	Live Fire Shoot House	2,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	3,950
Texas	Fort Bliss	Live Fire Shoot House	2,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	Infantry Platoon Battle Course	4,650
Texas	Fort Bliss	Urban Assault Course	2,150
Texas	Fort Bliss	Demolition Range Complex	1,750
Texas	Fort Bliss	Combat Pistol Qualification Range	2,250
Texas	Fort Bliss	Combat Aviation Brigade Increment 1	92,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	Child Development Center	5,800
Texas	Fort Bliss	Dental Clinic	13,530
Texas	Fort Bliss	Youth Activity Center - Biggs	4,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	Ammunition Supply Point	15,500
Texas	Fort Bliss	Central Wash Facility	8,700
Texas	Fort Bliss	Battle Command Training Center	27,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	Site Infrastructure (IGPBS), Increment 2	100,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	BDE Combat Team Cmplx #1 (IGPBS) Incr 2	85,000
Texas	Fort Sam Houston	Youth Center	5,100
Texas	Fort Sam Houston	Budge Dental Clinic Add/Alt	1,350
Texas	Fort Sam Houston	Btlfield Health/Trauma Biomed Lab, Increment 1	54,000
Texas	Grand Prairie	Armed Forces Reserve Center	35,000
Texas	Seagoville	Armed Forces Reserve Center	19,500
Virginia	Fort Lee	Combat Service Support Center, Increment 1	197,000
Washington	Fairchild AFB	Armed Forces Reserve Center	31,000
Washington	Fort Lewis	Armed Forces Reserve Center	24,000
Washington	Vancouver	Armed Forces Reserve Center	28,000
Wyoming	Cheyenne	Armed Forces Reserve Center	44,000
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Army BRAC Planning and Design (IGPBS)	71,500
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Army BRAC Planning and Design	160,109
Worlwide	Various Unspecified	Army BRAC V Environmental Activities	73,492
Worlwide	Various Unspecified	Army BRAC V Operations and Maintenance	143,865
Worlwide	Various Unspecified	Army BRAC V Other Services/Procurement (IT, comm, equipment)	136,818
		Army BRAC V Program Total:	**3,608,234**

Navy BRAC V Program for Fiscal Year 2007

State	Installation	Project Title	Amount
Arizona	MCAS Yuma	Construct FRC Maintenance Facility	3,181
California	NS San Diego	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	16,943
California	NS San Diego	Construct Parking Facility	20,991
California	NS San Diego	Squadron Support Facility	4,400
California	NSB San Diego	MINEWARTRACEN Training Facs	24,245
California	NWS Concord	Construct Fire Station	3,400
California	NWS Concord	Construct Administration Bldg	3,145
California	NWS Concord	Constr Railroad Equipmt/Engine Maint Shop	2,891
California	NWS Concord	Construct Electrical Substation	1,409
California	Camp Pendleton	Construct Pre-trial Detainee Facility	4,580
California	MCAS Miramar	Construct FRC Maintenance Facility	3,164
California	NWS China Lake	Weapons and Armament Tech Ctr, Incr 1	30,118
California	NWS China Lake	Renovate Lab Bldgs	3,776

State	Installation	Project Title	Amount
California	NWS China Lake	Bldg Renovation and Storage	7,924
Florida	NAS Jacksonville	Facility Engineering Ctr SE, Engineering Ops	16,025
Florida	NAS Jacksonville	Construct Hangar/Parking Apron, Incr 2	70,955
Florida	NAS Jacksonville	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	16,100
Florida	NAS Jacksonville	Construct Fleet Support Facility	5,092
Georgia	Robins AFB	Add to/Renovate Hangars for HMLA-773 (MCR)	27,460
Georgia	Marietta	Marine Corps Reserve Center	2,690
Louisiana	Belle Chasse JRB	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	23,753
Louisiana	Belle Chasse JRB	Add to Dining Facility	3,614
Louisiana	Belle Chasse JRB	Add to Child Development Center	2,164
Louisiana	Belle Chasse JRB	Medical and Dental Clinic Addition	6,321
Louisiana	Belle Chasse JRB	Add to Indoor Physical Fitness Facility	3,950
Louisiana	Belle Chasse JRB	Construct Youth Center	4,743
Louisiana	Belle Chasse JRB	Construct General Purpose Instructional Bldg	7,264
Louisiana	Belle Chasse JRB	Administrative Support Bldg	10,493
Louisiana	Belle Chasse JRB	Applied Instruction Bldg	3,521
Louisiana	Belle Chasse JRB	Construct Covered Storage Bldg	1,664
Louisiana	Belle Chasse JRB	Military Entrance Processing Station	6,307
Louisiana	Belle Chasse JRB	Construct Family Service Center	1,507
Louisiana	Belle Chasse JRB	Police Station, Security Support Facs	829
Louisiana	Belle Chasse JRB	Construct Road Infrastructure Support	8,186
Louisiana	Belle Chasse JRB	NAVAIRSEFAC Calibration Laboratory	5,343
Maryland	NNMC Bethesda	Joint Medical Command HQ Facilities	1,374
New Jersey	Ft Dix	Construct/Ren Bldgs 5957, 5956 for NMCRC	6,916
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	Construct Pre-trial Detainee Facility	3,007
North Carolina	MCAS New River	Construct FRC Maintenance Facility	6,548
Oregon	Portland	Construct Dock to Relocate ACU-1 (NR)	955
Rhode Island	NS Newport	Dental Clinic Addition	964
Rhode Island	NS Newport	Training Bldg for Naval Supply Corps School	22,164
Texas	Ft Worth JRB	Reconfigure Hangar 1404 for VR-46	4,168
Texas	Ft Worth JRB	Upgrade Hangar 1049 fro VMFA-142	1,504
Texas	Ft Worth JRB	CAG-20, Ft Worth, TX	2,180
Texas	Ft Worth JRB	Administrative Fac, 8th MCD, Ft Worth, TX	4,488
Texas	San Antonio	Construct Regional Medical Fac - Navy Share	48,991
Virginia	NS Norfolk	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar, Increment 1	28,857
Virginia	NS Norfolk	NWDC Administrative Facility	28,427
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Navy BRAC - Planning and Design	40,000
Worlwide	Various Unspecified	Navy BRAC V Environmental Activities	6,483
Worlwide	Various Unspecified	Navy BRAC V Operations and Maintenance	124,415
Worlwide	Various Unspecified	Navy BRAC V Other Services/Procurement (IT, comm, equipment)	0
		Navy BRAC V Program Total:	**689,589**

Air Force BRAC V Program for Fiscal Year 2007

State	Installation	Project Title	Amount
Alaska	Elmendorf AFB	Replicate C-17 Engine Shop	$3,500
Alaska	Elmendorf AFB	Replicate C-17 Parking Apron	$14,800
Alaska	Elmendorf AFB	Construct Infrastructure & Utilities	$30,000
Arkansas	Fort Smith AGS	A-10 Munitions Load Crew Training Facility	$2,850
Arkansas	Fort Smith AGS	A-10 Consolidated 2-Bay Corr/Fuel Cell	$7,000
Arkansas	Little Rock AFB	C-130 Flight Simulator Facility	$4,250

State	Installation	Project Title	Amount
Arkansas	Little Rock AFB	HQ Wing Facility	$7,400
Arkansas	Little Rock AFB	C-130J 1-Bay Corrosion Control Hangar	$12,400
Arkansas	Little Rock AFB	C-130 Squadron Operations/AMU	$12,800
California	Vandenberg AFB	Construct Satellite Control Facility (AFSPC)	$34,000
Florida	Homestead ARS	Add/Alter Squadron Operations/AMXS (AFR)	$3,800
Florida	Homestead ARS	Add Weapons Release Shop (AFR)	$2,350
Florida	MacDill AFB	Training Facility (AFR)	$7,200
Florida	MacDill AFB	Add/Alter Aerial Port Squadron Training (AFR)	$1,700
Florida	MacDill AFB	Add/Alter Bldg 6 for Squad Ops/AMU	$16,500
Georgia	Moody AFB	Weapons Release Shop (A-10)	$3,850
Georgia	Moody AFB	Fuel Cell Hangar, 2Bay (A-10)	$7,700
Georgia	Moody AFB	A-10 Engine Trim Pad	$1,650
Georgia	Robins AFB	Relocate 202 EIS Vehicle Maint Complex	$880
Louisana	Barksdale AFB	Add/Alt Squadron Ops/Life Support (AFRC)	$1,833
Louisana	Barksdale AFB	Aircraft Maintenance Squadron (AFR)	$1,645
Massachusetts	Barnes AGS	Install Aircraft Arresting Systems	$780
Massachusetts	Barnes AGS	Add/Alter Squadron Operations Facility	$4,700
Massachusetts	Barnes AGS	Upgrade F-15 Parking Apron	$1,600
Massachusetts	Barnes AGS	Add/Alter Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	$1,300
Massachusetts	Barnes AGS	Add/Alter Fuel Cell/Corrosion Control Hangar	$5,600
Massachusetts	Barnes AGS	Add/Alter Engine Shop-Building 20	$830
Mississippi	Columbus AFB	Add/Alter Flight Simulator B268	$2,000
Mississippi	Columbus AFB	IFF Squadron Operations Facility	$2,700
Mississippi	Columbus AFB	Unaccompanied Officer's Quarters	$7,700
Mississippi	Columbus AFB	Add/Alter Supt Operations B236	$1,550
Mississippi	Columbus AFB	Expand Compressed Air (CASS) System	$830
Missouri	Whiteman AFB	Squadron Operations/Life Support (AFR)	$8,100
Missouri	Whiteman AFB	Construct Munitions Igloos (AFR)	$1,350
Missouri	Whiteman AFB	Conventional Munitions Maintenance (AFR)	$1,850
Montana	Great Falls AGS	Squadron Operations (ANG)	$8,500
Montana	Great Falls AGS	Upgrade Avionics & ECM (ANG)	$1,150
Montana	Great Falls AGS	Add/Alter Weapons & Release Shop (ANG)	$1,900
Montana	Great Falls AGS	Add/Alter ASE Shop (ANG)	$2,550
Nevada	Nellis AFB	Aircraft Operations Facilities	$25,000
Nevada	Nellis AFB	Flight Simulator Facility	$10,600
Nevada	Nellis AFB	Aircraft Maintenance Shop Facilities	$9,900
Nevada	Nellis AFB	Aircraft Maintenance Complex	$13,200
Nevada	Nellis AFB	Construct Training Facility (AFR)	$10,800
North Carolina	Seymour Johnson	F-100 Propulsion Shop	$4,090
North Carolina	Seymour Johnson	Add/Alter Squad Ops & AMU (AFR)	$9,600
North Carolina	Seymour Johnson	Add/Alter Maintenance Shops (AFR	$1,100
North Carolina	Seymour Johnson	Flight Simulator (AFR)	$3,500
North Carolina	Seymour Johnson	Corrosion Control Hangar (AFR)	$9,400
North Carolina	Seymour Johnson	Add to KC-135 Parts Store, Bldg 4810 (AFR)	$1,000
Ohio	Wright-Patterson	Facilities Infrastructure Upgrade	$19,000
Oklahoma	Tinker AFB	Expand Fuel Hydrant System (AFR)	$1,800
Oklahoma	Vance AFB	Add/Alter Survival Equipment Shop	$877
Oklahoma	Vance AFB	Squadron Facilities	$4,530
Oklahoma	Vance AFB	Add/Alter Aircraft Parking Apron	$7,540
Oklahoma	Vance AFB	IFF No-Drop Range	$2,750
Oklahoma	Vance AFB	Renovate Simulator Facility 672	$1,820
Oklahoma	Will Rogers AGS	Air Traffic Relocation	$4,600
Texas	Carswell ARS	Add/Alter Squadron Operations (AFR)	$2,900
Texas	Carswell ARS	Add Munitions Maintenance (AFR)	$780

State	Installation	Project Title	Amount
Texas	Carswell ARS	Add/Alter Aircraft Maintenance Squadron (AFR)	$2,350
Texas	Carswell ARS	Add Weapons Release Shop (AFR)	$2,350
Texas	Lackland AFB	Medical Administrative Center	$13,800
Texas	Lackland AFB	Intelligence Operations Center	$14,200
Texas	Laughlin AFB	Add/Alter Aircraft Parking Apron	$4,550
Texas	Laughlin AFB	Add/Alter Student Training Complex	$3,150
Texas	Laughlin AFB	Add/Alter Simulator Facility	$1,050
Texas	Laughlin AFB	Construct 55 Person UOQ	$9,200
Texas	Laughlin AFB	Add/Alter Egress Shop	$900
Texas	Laughlin AFB	Add/Alter Aircraft Weather Shelter	$2,000
Texas	Laughlin AFB	Add/Alter NDI Shop	$1,100
Texas	Laughlin AFB	Construct No-Drop Bomb Range- Acquire Land	$3,500
Texas	Randolph AFB	Renovate Hangar 6 MX Shop Relocation (IFF)	$2,894
Texas	Randolph AFB, TX	Add/Alter Bldg 738 for IFF Sims	$1,460
Virginia	Langley AFB, VA	Logistics Support Center	$13,200
Virginia	Langley AFB, VA	Alter Alert Facility	$2,450
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	AF BRAC – Planning and Design	$34,414
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	AF BRAC – Unspecified Minor Construction	$18,361
Worlwide	Various Unspecified	Air Force BRAC V Environmental Activities	1,965
Worlwide	Various Unspecified	Air Force BRAC V Operations and Maintenance	241,877
Worlwide	Various Unspecified	Air Force BRAC V Military Personnel PCS	22,459
Worlwide	Various Unspecified	Air Force BRAC V Other Services/Procurement (IT, comm, equipment)	126,062
Worlwide	Various Unspecified	Air Force BRAC V Homeowners Assistance Program	5,763
		Air Force BRAC V Program Total:	**906,940**

Defense Agencies BRAC V Program for Fiscal Year 2007

State	Installation	Project Title	Amount
Georgia	DDD Warner Robins	DLA - General Purpose Warehouse	24,200
Pennsylvania	DDD New Cumberlar	DLA - General Purpose Warehouse	38,350
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	DLA BRAC V - Planning and Design	6,080
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	DISA BRAC V Planning and Design	140
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	TMA BRAC V Planning and Design	244
Virginia	Fort Belvoir	NGA Site Development Campus	94,400
Virginia	Fort Belvoir	NGA Access Roads Improvement	12,800
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	NGA BRAC V Planning and Design	15,000
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	CIFA BRAC V Planning and Design	2,883
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	AFIS BRAC V Planning and Design	5,819
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	DTRA BRAC V Planning and Design	2,977
Virginia	Fort Belvoir	DOD IG Administration Facility	13,222
Virginia	Fort Belvoir	DHRA BRAC V Planning & Design Admin Fac	8,313

State	Installation	Project Title	Amount
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	DTSA BRAC V Planning and Design	2,404
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	DODEA BRAC V Planning and Design	1,734
Ohio	DSD Columbus	DODEA Convert Industrial Space to Admin Space	1,780
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	WHS BRAC V Planning and Design	89,467
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Defense Agencies Environmental Activities	2,191
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Defense Agencies Operations & Maintenance	84,169
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Defense Agencies Military Personnel PCS	40
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Defense Agencies BRAC V Other Services/Procurement (IT, comm, equipment)	14,516
Worldwide	Various Unspecified	Defense Agencies Homeowners Assistance Program	730
		Defense Agencies BRAC V Program Total:	**421,459**

Department of Defense BRAC V Program for Fiscal Year 2007 5,626,222

Short title (sec. 2001)

The committee recommends a provision that would cite Division B of this Act as the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007.

TITLE XXI—ARMY

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $2,059.8 million for military construction and $1,271.8 million for family housing for the Army in fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations for $2,180.8 million for military construction and $1,271.8 million for family housing for fiscal year 2007.

Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Army construction projects for fiscal year 2007. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Family housing (sec. 2102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2007. 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 improvements to existing Army family housing units for fiscal year 2007.

Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Army's military construction and family housing budget for fiscal year 2007. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount the Army may spend on military construction projects.

Items of Special Interest

Planning and design, Army

The committee directs that the amount of $1.0 million, added to the authorization of appropriation for planning and design for the Army, be used to start design of a military construction project to construct a Joint Asymmetrical Warfare Group headquarters, operational, and training complex at Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia.

The committee also directs that the amount of $500 thousand, added to the authorization of appropriation for planning and design

for the Army, be used to design a military construction project to install a ground water treatment system at Hawthorne Army Depot, Nevada.

Management of military programs in the United States Army Corps of Engineers

The committee notes that the Commander of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) recently implemented a reorganization of the responsibilities within the 45 districts in USACE to establish "centers of standardization." These centers would facilitate the consolidation of design requirements from the USACE's military customers for specific types of facilities, such as dining facilities and dormitories, to one or a few districts in order to improve efficiency. The centers would then be able to carry out large contracts to construct multiple facilities of similar design, potentially saving the USACE's customers millions of dollars in lower bids and material costs.

The committee also notes that this consolidation, as well as other innovations such as state-of-the-art computer-aided design programs, increased use of pre-manufactured building systems, and expanded reliance on design-build and delivery order acquisition contracts, should decrease, within both the districts and the divisions, the overhead costs required to provide design and construction management services to USACE customers. The USACE has estimated cost savings of 15 percent and a time savings of 30 percent, which equates to lower overall overhead costs.

The committee is aware that USACE currently is conducting an internal assessment of the technical capabilities and core competencies required to sustain an acceptable level of readiness and responsiveness in support of national security objectives around the world, including disaster response, as well as enhancing reliability in the performance of civil works and military missions. This internal assessment will include an analysis of how the sustainment of core capabilities and manpower are funded by fees paid by USACE customers for services in civil and military programs.

The committee expects that the USACE's assessment of sustained capabilities, when combined with an analysis of efficient business processes, should yield a comprehensive strategy for an effective and value-driven balance of resource management to assist in the development of future budgets. Therefore, the committee directs the Commander, United States Corps of Engineers to submit to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2006 a report containing the following information:

(1) a list of districts, identifying the centers of standardization and types of facilities to be specialized at each district;

(2) a description of the results and recommendations of the internal assessment conducted by USACE;

(3) a description of the core capabilities identified by the USACE to be sustained;

(4) a business plan detailing the investment required to sustain the core capabilities and the sources of the funds;

(5) an estimate of the savings to be achieved by the implementation of more efficient methods of design, construction and contract management to satisfy customer requirements; and

(6) an estimate of how the savings will be realized, how much will be saved annually, and how the savings will be passed on to military customers.

TITLE XXII—NAVY

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $1,162.0 million for military construction and $814.2 million for family housing for the Navy in fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1,268.8 million for military construction and $803.6 million for family housing for fiscal year 2007.

The committee also recommends a decrease of $10.6 million to the authorization of appropriations of the housing operations and maintenance leasing account to reflect the justification data submitted with the budget request.

Land Acquisition, Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $7.3 million for the first phase of a military construction project to acquire land interests in approximately 600 acres in areas surrounding MCAS Beaufort, South Carolina. The Department of the Navy has proposed that $18.2 million for the second phase of this project would be included in the budget request for Fiscal Year 2008. The Navy proposes to acquire land interests in order to protect the installation from encroachment by ensuring properties in the local community within certain Air Installation Compatible Land Use Zones (AICUZ) established around the installation would be used for purposes compatible with military operations. The AICUZ program was initially established by the Department of Defense in response to the Noise Control Act of 1972 to promote an environment free from noise that jeopardizes public health or welfare.

The justification data accompanying the budget request for the project stated, "The once vacant farmlands surrounding MCAS Beaufort are being converted to high density development without local government land use and zoning control oversight needed to plan for and permit development that is compatible with high performance aircraft operations. The weak county 'Airport Overlay Zoning District' zoning ordinance did not prevent the recent development of incompatible Vivian's Island within the AICUZ." The justification data also stated that, in deciding whether to purchase protective easements for property versus fee simple acquisitions of deeds for properties, "historically, it has shown that in the Beaufort area, easements generally run 80% of the fee value. Should easements quotes be this high, fee purchase is advised."

The committee notes that encroachment of local community development upon military operations is a prevalent problem at many installations. In response, the Department of Defense has promul-

gated a policy of working with local communities to adopt local zoning ordinances to protect military operations by precluding incompatible property use. The Department of Defense's Office of Economic Adjustment has a Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) program established to assist military installation commanders and local community leaders deal with urban encroachment. The Department has, in the past, strongly discouraged the acquisition of real property that did not support a valid military requirement. On November 17, 2002, The Deputy Secretary of Defense reaffirmed the existing moratorium on land acquisitions to ensure that an interest in land would be acquired by the Services only where there is a clearly demonstrated need. The committee notes that the Department of the Navy has not obtained a waiver from the Department of Defense to use military construction funds to purchase property in the AICUZ at MCAS Beaufort.

The committee is aware of the proactive efforts currently underway within the local community and the State of South Carolina to address encroachment at MCAS Beaufort through the development of a State sponsored JLUS that will include proposals for annexation of county land to the City of Beaufort. This initiative offers the Department of the Navy the opportunity to review existing local ordinances with new local government representatives and to work towards more cooperative agreements on local zoning policies.

The committee supports the Department's policy of pursuing all possible means to address encroachment before granting a waiver to the Department's moratorium on the acquisition of land interests. This policy ensures that the Department of Defense does not rely on taxpayer funds to purchase property it does not need, or for which a better solution exists to satisfy the requirement. The decision to purchase property in the AICUZ at MCAS Beaufort may undermine the Department's efforts to encourage local communities to address encroachment with zoning ordinances. Communities will have less incentive to adopt protective measures knowing that they can potentially avoid difficult and politically-charged land-use decisions by relying instead on the Federal Government to purchase property.

Therefore, the committee recommends deferring the authorization of appropriations of $7.3 million for military construction for the Navy at MCAS Beaufort, South Carolina, until the Secretary of Defense certifies that all possible options to prevent incompatible development in the vicinity of MCAS Beaufort have been fully pursued, including using the authorities granted by Section 2684a of title 10, United States Code, and the Secretary has granted a waiver to the moratorium to the acquisition of land interests for the use of military construction funds. The committee strongly supports the efforts of the Department of the Navy to work with the local community to ensure encroachment does not hinder safe aircraft operations at this critical Marine Corps installation.

Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2007. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The

state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Family housing (sec. 2202)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2007. 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 improvements to existing Navy and Marine Corps family housing units for fiscal year 2007.

Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Navy's military construction and family housing budget for fiscal year 2007. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Navy may spend on military construction projects.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2006 projects (sec. 2205)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (division B of Public Law 109–163) to change project authorizations for Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, and Marine Corps Base, Quantico, Virginia.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $1,156.1 million for military construction and $1,938.2 million for family housing for the Air Force in fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1,257.3 million for military construction and $1,938.2 million for family housing for fiscal year 2007.

The committee also recommends deferring the authorization of appropriations of $28.0 million to construct the first phase of utility infrastructure and road expansions at Anderson Air Force Base, Guam. The committee is concerned that force structure requirements for all military services on Guam have not been finalized. Furthermore, the Department of Defense does not have a masterplan that incorporates all proposed infrastructure and facility projects and investments required to support new missions on Guam, including the relocation of 7,000 U.S. Marines from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam. The committee notes that recent estimates of the costs to relocate U.S. Air Force and Marine forces to Guam may exceed $11.0 billion. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing planned investments in projects for facilities and infrastructure by both the U.S. and Japan for new missions on Guam before submitting future budget requests for amounts required for military construction.

Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2007. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Family housing (sec. 2302)

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 2007. 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 improvements to existing Air Force family housing units for fiscal year 2007.

Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Air Force's budget for fiscal year 2007. This section would also provide an overall limit on the amount the Air Force may spend on military construction projects.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2006 project (sec. 2305)

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 decrease a project authorization for MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.

Item of Special Interest

Change of project title at Cape Canaveral, Florida

The committee agrees to change a project title for the Air Force at Cape Canaveral, Florida in the table, "Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006" contained in the statement of managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) from "Satellite Processing Operations Support Facility" to "Satellite Alert Facility."

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $1,208.2 million for military construction and $57.3 million for family housing for Defense agencies in fiscal year 2007.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations for $1,344.7 million for military construction and $57.3 million for family housing for fiscal year 2007.

The budget request also included authorization of appropriations of $191.2 million to carry out environmental activities on military installations affected by the rounds of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) conducted in 1991, 1993, and 1995. The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $5,626.2 million to carry out military construction, environmental activities and certain operating expenses related to the decisions of the 2005 BRAC round.

The budget request did not account for savings to be realized from the cancellation of construction projects authorized in previous years. Specifically, the committee was notified on March 8, 2006 by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs of the intent to cancel a project to construct a hospital at Fort Belvior, Virginia, authorized in the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. The Secretary noted that these savings would be transferred into the BRAC account to satisfy BRAC requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $99.3 million to the authorization of appropriations for defense agencies for BRAC 2005 to account for the savings.

The budget request included $130.9 million to carry out construction activities in support of the chemical demilitarization program at Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado and Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to authorization of appropriations for Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky to accelerate construction activities at the plant.

The committee acknowledges that the Department of Defense's Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) program will develop and implement new cost and schedule baselines in 2007 for the destruction of the chemical weapons stockpile. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit the revised ACWA baselines, as well as updated military construction project data, costs, and timelines at Pueblo Chemical Depot and Blue Grass Army Depot to the congressional defense committees with the budget request for fiscal year 2008.

The committee recommends a decrease to the authorization of appropriations for military construction for the National Security Agency of $4.5 million to upgrade Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition system servers, workstations, and associated software

at Fort Meade, Maryland, as these computer system upgrades are not consistent with the use of funds for military construction and should be funded through appropriations for procurement or operations and maintenance.

Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize defense agency construction projects for fiscal year 2007. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Family housing (sec. 2402)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for defense agencies for fiscal year 2007. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices and housing maintenance and storage facilities.

Energy conservation projects (sec. 2403)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2404)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize specific appropriations for each defense agency military construction program for fiscal year 2007. This provision also would provide an overall limit on the amount that may be spent on such military construction projects.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2006 projects (sec. 2405)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (division B of Public Law 109–163) to increase project authorizations for the National Security Agency for Augusta, Georgia; Kunia, Hawaii; and Menwith Hill, United Kingdom.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriation of $221.0 million for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2007. The committee recommends an authorization of appropriation of $206.0 million for fiscal year 2007, due to the availability of unobligated amounts available from appropriations in prior fiscal years.

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 $206.0 million for the United States' contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2007.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of $858.8 million for military construction in fiscal year 2007 for National Guard and Reserve facilities.

The committee recommends authorizations of appropriations for fiscal year 2007 of $1,049.3 million to be distributed as follows:

Account	*Millions*
Army National Guard	$524.0
Air National Guard	242.1
Army Reserve	189.8
Air Force Reserve	44.9
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	48.5
Total	1,049.3

Authorized Guard and Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for military construction for the Guard and Reserve by service component for fiscal year 2007. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Item of Special Interest

Planning and design, Air National Guard

The committee directs that the amount of $1.8 million, added to the authorization of appropriation for planning and design for the Air National Guard, be used to complete design of a military construction project to replace the jet fuel storage complex at Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Michigan.

TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2701)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the expiration date for authorizations for military construction projects, repair of real property, land acquisition, family housing projects, contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program, and National Guard and Reserve military construction projects as October 1, 2009, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later. This expiration would not apply to authorizations for projects for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 2009, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funding for military construction for fiscal year 2010, whichever is later.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2004 projects (sec. 2702)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain fiscal year 2004 military construction projects until October 1, 2007, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2008, whichever is later.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2003 projects (sec. 2703)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorizations for certain fiscal year 2003 military construction projects until October 1, 2007, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2008, whichever is later.

Effective date (sec. 2704)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, and XXVI of this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2006, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

Three-year extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects outside the United States (sec. 2801)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) to extend for three years the temporary authority provided to the Secretary of Defense to use funds appropriated for operations 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 committee notes that the Secretary has used this temporary authority sparingly and has not requested a waiver to exceed the annual statutory limits of the authority. The committee also notes that military construction projects to support the Combatant Commander's urgent requirements in the Global War on Terrorism have been included in requests for supplemental appropriations. Finally, the Secretary has a permanent authority provided by Congress in Section 2808 of title 10, United States Code, to undertake military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law in support of the armed forces in the event of a declaration of war or a national emergency.

Therefore, the committee supports an extension of the limited authority to provide military commanders flexibility to quickly carry out military construction to satisfy temporary, operational requirements at installations that are not planned to have an enduring presence of U.S. armed forces.

Authority to carry out military construction projects in connection with industrial facility investment program (sec. 2802)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out a military construction project not previously authorized, using funds appropriated or otherwise made available for that purpose, to carry out activities to re-engineer industrial processes related to section 2474(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code. The provision would also authorize the Secretary to credit appropriations made under this authority to the amount required under section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 361 of this Act, for capital investment budgets for public depots.

The committee notes that, at the present time, military construction projects intended to improve industrial processes must compete for scarce resources within each military department with other construction requirements to support new weapon systems, readiness and training, improvements to the quality of life for military personnel and their families, and other equally important requirements. While generally supporting the priorities established by the Department of Defense for military construction investments, the committee notes that every opportunity to realize immediate and substantial savings from a process improvement at an industrial facility has a positive impact on force readiness and operations.

This provision would grant the Secretary the authority to establish an "Industrial Facilities Investment Program," and to request an annual appropriation for unspecified military construction projects to respond to emerging requirements identified by a military department to improve industrial processes. The committee intends that the program would provide the Secretary the flexibility to invest in construction projects which would result in significant savings in terms of working capital funds, man-hours, down-time for major weapon systems, and efficient processes at the Department's industrial facilities. The committee expects the Secretary to be able to quantify the estimated savings from each project carried out under this authority.

Modification of notification requirements related to cost variation authority (sec. 2803)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2853(c) of title 10, United States Code, to modify the requirement for the Secretary of a military department to notify the congressional defense committees of a variation in the cost of a military construction contract and to wait 21 days before carrying out the project. The provision would authorize the Secretary to carry out a project at a cost less than the appropriated amount immediately, and to notify the congressional committees within 14 days after the date funds are obligated in connection with the military construction project or the military family housing project.

Consideration of local comparability of floor areas in construction, acquisition, and improvement of military unaccompanied housing (sec. 2804)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2856 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretaries of the military departments to ensure that the floor areas of unaccompanied housing does not exceed the floor areas of similar housing in the local private sector. This provision is intended to remove an unequal treatment for the determination of maximum net allowable square footage between unaccompanied housing acquired through traditional military construction and unaccompanied housing acquired under the alternative authority for acquisition and improvement of military housing granted by subchapter IV of Chapter 169 title 10, United States Code.

Increase in thresholds for unspecified minor military construction projects (sec. 2805)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2805(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, by raising the threshold of the cost of a construction project authorized by this section from $1.5 million to $2.5 million. This provision would also raise the threshold of the cost of a construction project intended solely to correct a deficiency that is life-threatening, health-threatening, or safety-threatening from $3.0 million to $4.0 million.

The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office, in a report released in February 2004 entitled "Long-term Challenges in Managing the Military Construction Program," estimated that construction costs for the military have increased by an average of 41 percent since the thresholds amended in this provision were last adjusted.

Inclusion of military transportation and support systems in energy savings programs (sec. 2806)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2865 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to designate energy performance goals consistent, where appropriate, with the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58). The provision would also expand the application of the section to include the consideration of alternate energy initiatives for vehicles and military support equipment. The provision would also grant the Secretary the authority to consider longer positive net present value returns for certain equipment upgrades supporting industrial processes. The committee notes that recent technological advancements offer the opportunity for the Department of Defense to invest in resources which would conserve energy in military operations, in addition to traditional improvements to facility systems, utilities, and infrastructure. These new technologies, such as alternative fuel vehicles and more efficient engines, have the potential to save the Department substantial operation and maintenance funds in the current environment of relatively high energy prices.

The committee also recognizes that certain upgrades and improvements to large equipment items and systems supporting industrial facilities and processes offer a substantial return on investment over the life-cycle of the item or system, but not within ten years. The committee intends for the Secretary to have the discretion to assess these proposed investments with a more realistic positive net present value requirement.

Repeal of authority to convey property at closed or realigned military installations to support military construction (sec. 2807)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 2869 of title 10, United States Code authorizing the Secretary of a military department to transfer property at military installations that have been closed or are subject to closure to persons who, in exchange, construct or provide family housing, unaccompanied housing, and military construction activities.

The committee notes that only one military department satisfied the minimum requirement directed by Section 2869(c) of title 10,

United States Code, to use the conveyance authority at least once before December 3l, 2004. The committee also notes that the Department of Defense has not provided to the congressional defense committees in the previous two years a plan for the use of the authority pursuant to section 2869(f)(2) of title 10, United States Code. Furthermore, the committee acknowledges that the burdensome annual reporting requirement in the section does not warrant the limited additional authority and the substantial effort by the Secretary to carry out a transaction using the authority.

The committee is aware of the difficulty in the evaluation of fair market value and best offers in proposals that exchange new construction for land, which may expose the military departments to increased liability and resultant claims during the solicitation and bid process. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretaries of the military departments to continue to receive, as compensation for the disposal of excess land resulting from base closures, amounts in cash which can then be used to accelerate the completion of environmental requirements at closed installations.

Repeal of requirement to determine availability of suitable alternate housing for acquisition in lieu of construction of new family housing (sec. 2808)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 2823 of title 10, United States Code, which requires the Secretaries of military departments to consult with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on the availability of suitable alternate housing before entering into contracts to construct authorized family housing units in the United States. This cumbersome requirement curtails the ability of the Department of Defense to carry out housing construction programs of vital interest to military members and their families. Furthermore, due to the current requirements for military housing, this requirement has not yielded any type of agreement for the use of alternative HUD housing in over ten years.

Updating foreign currency fluctuation adjustment for certain military family housing leases in Korea (sec. 2809)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2828 of title 10, United States Code to modify the adjustments made by a secretary of a military department to maximum lease amounts for family housing in Korea to account for foreign currency fluctuations.

The Committee notes that section 2801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) amended section 2828 of title 10, United States Code to authorize the secretaries of military departments to lease an additional amount of family housing units in Korea at an increased maximum amount of $35,000 per unit per year. This authority was granted in addition to an existing authority for the secretary concerned to lease a certain number of family housing units at $25,000 per unit per year, which was provided by Congress in 1987. Both authorities were accompanied by direction from Congress to the secretary concerned in section 2828 of title 10 to adjust the statutory maximum

amounts annually to account for foreign currency fluctuation and changes to the consumer price index.

Congress clearly intended the legislative provision in 2003 to provide the secretary concerned with an increased maximum lease authority equal to $10,000 more per unit per year than was then currently authorized by statute for a certain number of family housing units in Korea. Therefore, any adjustments for foreign currency fluctuation and the consumer price index made by the secretary concerned to either of the maximum lease amounts should reflect the intent of Congress.

Pilot projects for acquisition or construction of military unaccompanied housing (sec. 2810)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2881a of title 10, United States Code, to extend the expiration date of the authorization for the pilot projects for unaccompanied housing privatization from September 30, 2007 to September 30, 2009. This provision would also reduce from 90 days to 30 days the period for certain notification periods to Congress. The committee expects that the Secretary of the Navy will carry out all three authorized pilot projects within the revised time period granted by this provision and will submit a report as required by section 2881a before requesting that Congress provide authority for additional projects.

Certification required for certain military construction projects (sec. 2811)

The committee recommends a provision that would restrict the obligation of funds for military construction projects that would provide training in urban operations, including urban assault courses, range complexes, shoot houses, and combined arms training facilities, beginning in fiscal year 2007. The provision would require the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), after consultation with the Commander, United States Joint Forces Command, to certify to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary of Defense has approved a strategy for training and facility construction for operations in urban terrain, that each such project has been evaluated and determined to be consistent with that strategy, and that each such project has incorporated appropriate capabilities for joint and interagency use in accordance with that strategy, before construction of such projects may proceed. The certifications could be provided for one or more projects at a time.

The committee is concerned that the Department has yet to complete this strategy. The committee first requested a report describing the requirements for such facilities four years ago in the report (S. Rept. 107–151) accompanying S. 2514, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003. The conferees reaffirmed the need for a strategy to guide the investment in facilities supporting urban operations in the statement of managers (H. Rept. 109–360) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163). The committee notes that the Department's increased emphasis on urban operations requires a comprehensive strategy for resource management and effective investments in ranges and infrastructure to support combined arms,

joint, and interagency training for all sizes and types of military units.

Modification of land acquisition authority, Perquimans County, North Carolina (sec. 2812)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2846 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (division B of Public Law 107–107) as amended by section 2865 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (division B of Public Law 108–375) to increase, from 840 acres to 1,550 acres, the amount of acreage that the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire.

Naming of Research Laboratory at Air Force Rome Research Site, Rome, New York, in honor of Sherwood L. Boehlert, a Member of the House of Representatives (sec. 2813)

The committee recommends a provision that would designate an engineering center at the Air Force Rome Research Site in Rome, New York as the Sherwood L. Boehlert Engineering Center.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

Consolidation of easement provisions (sec. 2821)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2668 of title 10, United States Code to consolidate and clarify authorities available to the Secretaries of the military departments to grant real property easements. This provision would also redesignate section 2668 as section 2672 and would repeal section 2669 of title 10, United States Code.

Authority to grant restrictive easements for conservation and environmental restoration purposes (sec. 2822)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary of a military department to grant restrictive easements on real property transferred by deed to limit future uses of the property. Such restrictive easements would be authorized to ensure preservation of the property for conservation purposes and to ensure the continued effectiveness of any environmental remedy on the property. The provision would authorize granting a conservation easement to State or local governments, or qualified organizations, with their consent. The provision would not authorize granting a conservation easement unless the secretary concerned determines that conservation of the property can not be effectively achieved through the application of state law by units of the State or local government without such an easement; that the jurisdiction that encompasses the property authorizes such easements; and that the secretary concerned can give or assign a third party the responsibility for enforcing such an easement. The provision would also authorize the secretary concerned to grant an environmental easement to a State or local government, with their consent, to ensure the future effectiveness of an environmental remedy. This provision would not alter the established base closure disposal process.

Consolidation of provisions relating to transfers of real property within the Department of Defense and to other Federal agencies (sec. 2823)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2696 of title 10, United States Code to consolidate and clarify the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to screen for use by the Department of Defense or other federal agencies proposed transfers or conveyances of real property currently deeded to the Department of Defense. The provision would also incorporate into section 2896 the existing requirement, with a certain exception, for the Secretary of Defense to notify the Attorney General of the availability of excess Department of Defense real property for correctional facilities purposes.

Authority to use excess property as exchange under agreements to limit encroachments on military training, testing, and operations (sec. 2824)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary concerned to use land that is determined to be excess to the needs of the Department of Defense in an exchange under an agreement with eligible third parties under section 2684a of title 10, United States Code. Such agreements are authorized to create buffer zones to address the use or development of real property in the vicinity of a military installation to prevent encroachment, or to preserve habitat that may eliminate or relieve current or anticipated environmental restrictions on military training, testing, or operations. The provision would authorize the exchange of excess land for non-federal land located within the same State as the installation that is the subject of the agreement. The provision would broaden the type of consideration that may be used as part of an agreement with eligible third parties under section 2684a to include appropriated funds, excess lands, or a combination of the two.

Modification of utility system authority and related reporting requirements (sec. 2825)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2688 of title 10, United States Code, to modify the authority provided to the Secretary of a military department. The provision would authorize the secretary to enter in a contract for utility services for a period not to exceed 50 years without the requirement to assess the relative cost of a 10 year lease period. The provision would also modify the requirement for the secretary of a military department to submit to the congressional defense committees certain data before carrying out utility system conveyances under the authority of the section. The provision would remove the requirement for the Secretary concerned to incorporate within an economic analysis an estimated margin of error of the costs resulting from conveyance or continued ownership by the government.

The committee acknowledges that the two requirements removed by this provision would pose an unnecessary burden on the Secretary concerned, without any substantive effect on the Secretary's decision to carry out transactions using the authority provided by Congress.

Increase in authorized maximum lease term for certain structures and real property relating to structures in foreign countries (sec. 2826)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2675 of title 10, United States Code, to increase from five years to ten years the maximum time period authorized for the lease of a structure required for a military purpose other than family housing in a foreign country. This provision would grant the Secretary of a military department more flexibility to enter into lease agreements containing more favorable terms for the government.

Modification of land transfer authority, Potomac Annex, District of Columbia (sec. 2827)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration other than certain reimbursement requirements, to the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) administrative jurisdiction over one acre and two buildings located thereon, known as building 6 and building 7, in addition to the 3 acres originally authorized.

The committee understands that this additional authorization would have no negative impact on the Navy's plan to transfer the remainder of the Potomac Annex to another federal agency as a result of a decision in the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment round.

The committee supports the efforts of the USIP to create a national center for professional education and training in conflict management and peacebuilding. This center would be sited in buildings 6 and 7, adjacent to the future site of the USIP campus. The committee notes the important work being done by the USIP to educate and train individuals from military departments, federal agencies, nongovernmental organizations, international organizations, foreign governments, and the domestic and foreign private sectors in the skills necessary to prevent conflicts, manage and resolve active conflicts, and support post-conflict peacebuilding operations. The committee believes the USIP can make a positive contribution toward professionalizing the field of conflict management and peacebuilding through establishment and adoption of common concepts, development and propagation of best practices, and promotion of shared doctrine and training. Such education and training is critical for U.S. military and civilian personnel who could be deployed on new and challenging stabilization missions in the future.

Subtitle C—Base Closure and Realignment

Defense Economic Adjustment Program: research and technical assistance (sec. 2831)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2391 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to award grants, conclude cooperative agreements, and supplement other federal funds for research and technical assist-

ance. This provision would allow the Department of Defense's Office of Economic Adjustment to obtain research and technical assistance without the need to carry out the requirement through other federal agencies.

Extension of eligibility for community planning assistance related to certain military facilities not under Department of Defense jurisdiction (sec. 2832)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2391 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to award grants, conclude cooperative agreements, and supplement other federal funds for the purpose of addressing encroachment by civilian communities upon State-owned and operated National Guard facilities used by the armed forces.

The committee notes that the unrestricted development of private property adjacent to military training areas continues to have a detrimental impact on the safe training operations. This provision would allow the Department of Defense's Office of Economic Adjustment to expand their current program of working with local communities to develop joint use land studies and other activities at federal installations to include opportunities to address concerns at State-owned military reservations which are used by all branches of the armed forces.

Modification of deposit requirement in connection with lease proceeds received at military installations approved for closure or realignment after January 1, 2005 (sec. 2833)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2667(d) of title, 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to deposit lease proceeds received as a result of 2005 base realignment and closure decisions into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005. This provision would provide an authority consistent with previous base realignment and closure rounds.

Subtitle D—Land Conveyances

Land conveyance, Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Virginia (sec. 2841)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, to the Commonwealth of Virginia, a parcel of property consisting of approximately 80 acres located at the Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Radford, Virginia for the purpose of establishing a veterans cemetery operated by Commonwealth. This provision would also authorize the Secretary to include a reversionary clause in the terms of the conveyance, in the event the property conveyed was not used in accordance with the purpose stated in the authorization.

Modifications to land conveyance authority, Engineering Proving Grounds, Fort Belvoir, Virginia (sec. 2842)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2836 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (division B of Public Law 107–107) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to carry out an alternate agreement with the Commonwealth of Virginia for the design and construction of a parkway portion as part of the conveyance of two parcels of real property totaling 182 acres at the Engineering Proving Grounds, Fort Belvoir, Virginia. The provision would require the Commonwealth to pay all costs for the design and construction of the parkway portion in the alternate agreement. The provision would require the Commonwealth to acquire all property not under the jurisdiction of the Secretary required to design and construct the parkway portion in the alternate agreement. The provision would also amend the authority for the Secretary to receive consideration from the Commonwealth for real property conveyed under the section to include receipt of funds to construct a security barrier at the Engineering Proving Grounds.

With the pending arrival of over 12,000 personnel and their families to Fort Belvior as a result of decisions in the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment round, the committee expects the Secretary to work with the Commonwealth to expedite the design and construction of this parkway extension. Because this Parkway portion will be vital to the transportation requirements of military operations and the local community, the committee has included in the recommended provision the authority for the Secretary of the Army to consider the use of the Defense Access Roads program to carry out the design and construction of the parkway portion.

Land conveyance, Omaha, Nebraska (sec. 2843)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretaries of the Army and the Navy to convey to the Metropolitan Community College area four parcels of property consisting of approximately 12 acres currently under the control of the Army and Navy Reserve at the Fort Omaha campus of the College in Omaha, Nebraska for educational purposes. This provision would require the Secretaries concerned to receive as consideration fair market value, which may be provided in the form of reduced tuition rates for the military personnel attending the college. The committee intends for the Secretaries concerned to enter into an agreement with the college that would enhance the cooperation between the two parties to provide educational opportunities for military personnel as well as providing continued military access to the college to support recruiting and retention efforts.

Items of Special Interest

Electronic access to data related to 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Round

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has maintained a comprehensive electronic data base containing information used by the Department to support recommendations to the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Commission. This

database, accessible through the internet, continues to serve the general public as a valuable tool during the current phase of implementation of the BRAC decisions by providing data, cost estimates, and analysis conducted by the Department. Of particular importance is the continued access to the Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) data used by the Department to support their recommendations. With the recent disclosure by the Department that the actual costs to implement the BRAC 2005 decisions may substantially exceed COBRA estimates, public access to COBRA data is essential to facilitate an understanding of the model. The committee also notes that the Department conducted a thorough and exhaustive security review in May 2005 to ensure all information contained on the website was unclassified and did not pose a threat to military personnel, installations, or operations.

The Department has also assumed maintenance of the electronic database established by the 2005 BRAC Commission to provide a public record of all data received, meetings held, and other information obtained during the course of the Commission's activities. This database continues to serve the general public as a vital source of information and history of the Commission's work during BRAC 2005.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to maintain, and provide public access to both the BRAC 2005 Department's website and the BRAC Commission website with, at a minimum, all information contained on the site, and in associated electronic links, as of May 1, 2006. The committee encourages the Secretary to continue to add information to the site related to economic assistance for affected communities, pertinent re-use manuals, and other useful information for the implementation of BRAC 2005 decisions.

Facilities for Headquarters, United States Southern Command

The headquarters (HQ) for United States Southern Command (USSOUTHCOM), with 750 personnel, relocated from Panama into a leased facility in Miami, Florida in September 1997. By 2004, a series of leases for the HQ building, support facilities, buffer land, and family housing to support 2,464 USSOUTHCOM HQ personnel were being carried out at a total annual cost of approximately $6.0 million.

The committee notes that the current facility complex housing USSOUTHCOM HQ is not adequate to support assigned personnel. The facilities are undersized, separated from each other, and do not meet Department of Defense standards for force protection and anti-terrorism measures. Despite the Department of Defense's goal to reduce leased space during the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) round, the Department did not make a recommendation to the BRAC Commission to relocate USSOUTHCOM HQ onto a military installation, consistent with other BRAC recommendations for leased space.

In September 2004, the State of Florida offered to construct a new headquarters facility to meet USSOUTHCOM's specific requirements, and to lease it to the Department of Defense for ten years with four ten-year renewal options. The Department is cur-

rently in the process of working with the General Services Administration (GSA) to assess a proposal being developed by the State. GSA intends to enter into the lease with the State and then to sublet the new facility to the Department of Defense. The committee anticipates that the offer to lease facilities on State-owned land that is essentially "rent free" could result in significant savings in the annual lease cost.

The Committee expects the Department of Defense, as with any proposal for the lease of facilities, to perform an analysis using estimates of cumulative net present value to demonstrate that the lease, in comparison to both traditional military construction with government ownership on a military installation, and continuation of the current lease arrangement, is the most economical method to satisfy the military requirement. The committee notes that this analysis would be consistent with the Department's deliberations during BRAC 2005 assessing commercial leases versus the costs of military construction of facilities on military installations, noting the advantages gained for security, force protection, and the availability of support services.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees, before entering into a lease agreement for new USSOUTHCOM HQ facilities, a report with the following information:

(1) a review of the personnel authorizations and functions to be located in the new USSOUTHCOM HQ;

(2) the costs and benefits of extending the current lease with or without an expansion of facilities on the existing leased parcels or adjacent parcels;

(3) the costs and benefits of acquiring the current leased facility;

(4) the costs and benefits of the lease of facilities from the State of Florida through the General Services Administration, to include all anticipated recurring operating and maintenance expenses;

(5) the costs and benefits for the construction and government ownership of new facilities meeting USSOUTHCOM HQ requirements; and

(6) the costs and benefits of constructing the facilities necessary to locate USSOUTHCOM Headquarters at Homestead Air Reserve Base, taking into account the existing facilities and services at that base.

The report shall include an economic analysis of the estimated cumulative net present value over a 30-year period for each of the options listed above.

National Guard Training Site, Camp Atterbury, Indiana

The committee notes that the Adjutant General of the State of Indiana has identified a requirement related to the transportation infrastructure for the National Guard training area at Camp Atterbury, Indiana to expand the rail out-load capability. The expansion of the rail out-load capability would require the use of property currently under the control of the Fish and Wildlife Service as part of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act program.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to work with the Military Department of the State of Indiana and the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service to transfer administrative jurisdiction of over 1,605 acres surrounding the current railhead at Camp Atterbury from the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to the Military Department of the State of Indiana in order to expand the transportation infrastructure at Camp Atterbury.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Overview

Title XXXI authorizes appropriations for atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2007, including: the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment; research and development; nuclear weapons; naval nuclear propulsion; environmental restoration and waste management; operating expenses; and other expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91). This title authorizes appropriations in four categories, which are: (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 $15.8 billion, a 2.5 percent decrease below the fiscal year 2006 appropriated level. Of the total amount requested:

(1) $9.3 billion is for NNSA, of which

(a) $6.4 billion is for weapons activities,

(b) $1.7 billion is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities,

(c) $795.1 million is for naval reactors, and

(d) $386.6 is for the Office of the Administrator;

(2) $5.4 billion is for defense environmental cleanup;

(3) $717.8 million is for other defense activities; and

(4) $388.1 million is for defense nuclear waste disposal.

The budget request also included $6.1 million within energy supply.

The committee recommends $15.7 billion for atomic energy defense activities at the Department, a decrease of $96.8 million below the budget request.

Of the amounts authorized, the committee recommends:

(1) $9.3 billion for NNSA, of which

(a) $6.5 billion is for weapons activities, an increase of $47.5 million above the budget request;

(b) $1.7 billion is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, the amount of the budget request;

(c) $795.1 million is for naval reactors, the amount of the budget request; and

(d) $356.6 million is for the Office of the Administrator, a decrease of $30.0 million below the budget request;

(2) $5.4 billion for defense environmental cleanup activities, an increase of $40.0 million above the budget request;

(3) $624.5 million for other defense activities, a decrease of $93.3 million below the budget request; and (4) $333.1 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, a decrease of $55.0 million below the budget request.

The committee recommends no funds for energy supply, a reduction of $6.1 million.

The following table summarizes the budget request and the authorizations:

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)			
Department of Energy			
Energy Supply	6,079	-6,079	
National nuclear security administration:			
Weapons activities	6,407,889	47,500	6,455,389
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,726,213		1,726,213
Naval reactors	795,133		795,133
Office of the administrator	386,576	-30,000	356,576
Total, National nuclear security administration	**9,315,811**	**17,500**	**9,333,311**
Environmental and other defense activities:			
Defense environmental cleanup	5,390,312	40,000	5,430,312
Other defense activities	717,788	-93,258	624,530
Defense nuclear waste disposal	388,080	-55,000	333,080
Total, Environmental & other defense activities	**6,496,180**	**-148,258**	**6,387,922**
Total, Department of Energy	**15,818,070**	**-96,837**	**15,721,233**
OTHER ACTIVITIES (Discretionary)			
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	22,260		22,260
Total, Other Activities Discretionary	**22,260**		**22,260**
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053) Discretionary	**15,840,330**	**-96,837**	**15,743,493**

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Energy Supply	**6,079**	-6,079	
Weapons Activities			
Directed stockpile work			
Life extension programs			
B61 Life extension program	58,934		58,934
W76 Life extension program	151,684		151,684
W80 Life extension program	102,044		102,044
Total, Life extension programs	**312,662**		**312,662**
Stockpile systems			
B61 Stockpile systems	63,782		63,782
W62 Stockpile systems	3,738		3,738
W76 Stockpile systems	56,174		56,174
W78 Stockpile systems	50,662		50,662
W80 Stockpile systems	27,230		27,230
B83 Stockpile systems	23,365		23,365
W84 Stockpile systems	1,465		1,465
W87 Stockpile systems	59,333		59,333
W88 Stockpile systems	39,796		39,796
Total, Stockpile systems	**325,545**		**325,545**
Reliable replacement warhead	27,707		27,707
Weapons dismantlement and disposition	75,000		75,000

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Stockpile services			
Production support	236,115		236,115
Research and development support	63,948		63,948
R&D certification and safety	194,199		194,199
Management, technology, and production	159,662		159,662
Responsive infrastructure	15,430		15,430
Total, Stockpile services	**669,354**		**669,354**
Total, Directed stockpile work	**1,410,268**		**1,410,268**
Campaigns			
Science campaign			
Primary assessment technologies	50,527		50,527
Test readiness	14,757		14,757
Dynamic materials properties	80,727		80,727
Advanced radiography	36,745		36,745
Secondary assessment technologies	81,006		81,006
Total, Science campaign	**263,762**		**263,762**
Engineering campaign			
Enhanced surety	26,731		26,731
Weapon systems engineering assessment technology	21,156		21,156
Nuclear survivability	14,973		14,973
Enhanced surveillance	86,526		86,526
Engineering campaign construction activities			
MESA, other project costs	4,613		4,613

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Construction:			
01-D-108 Microsystem & engineering science applications (MESA), SNL, Albuquerque, NM	6,920		6,920
Total, Engineering campaign construction activities	**6,920**		**6,920**
Total, Engineering campaign	**160,919**		**160,919**
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign			
Ignition	79,763		79,763
Support of stockpile programs	5,872		5,872
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	45,959		45,959
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	10,603		10,603
University grants/other ICF support	8,903		8,903
Facility operations and target production	43,021		43,021
NIF demonstration program	143,438		143,438

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
High-energy petawatt laser development	2,213		2,213
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	**339,772**		**339,772**
Construction:			
96-D-111 National ignition facility (NIF), Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA	111,419		111,419
Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	**451,191**		**451,191**
Advanced simulation and computing campaign			
Operations and maintenance	617,955		617,955
Total, Advanced simulation and computing	**617,955**		**617,955**
Pit manufacturing and certification			
W88 pit manufacturing	147,658		147,658
W88 pit certification	56,605		56,605
Pit manufacturing capability	33,335		33,335
Total, Pit manufacturing and certification	**237,598**		**237,598**
Readiness Campaign			
Stockpile readiness	17,576		17,576
High explosives and weapon operations	17,188		17,188
Non-nuclear readiness	31,171		31,171

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Tritium readiness			
Operations and maintenance	86,385		86,385
Total, Tritium readiness	**86,385**		**86,385**
Advanced design and production technologies	53,645		53,645
Total, Readiness campaign	**205,965**		**205,965**
Total Campaigns	**1,937,390**		**1,937,390**
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)			
Operations of facilities	1,203,786	11,700	1,215,486
Program readiness	75,167		75,167
Material recycle and recovery	69,982		69,982
Containers	20,130		20,130
Storage	35,285		35,285
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**1,404,350**	**11,700**	**1,416,050**
Construction:			
07-D-140 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations	4,977		4,977
07-D-220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL	14,828		14,828

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
06-D-140 Project engineering design (PED) various locations	51,577		51,577
06-D-402 NTS replace fire stations 1 & 2 Nevada Test Site, NV	13,919		13,919
06-D-403 Tritium facility modernization Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA	7,810		7,810
05-D-140 Project engineering design various locations	9,615		9,615
05-D-402 Beryllium capability(BEC) project, Y-12 National Security Complex, Oakridge, TN	5,084		5,084
04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy research facility replacement, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	112,422		112,422
04-D-128 TA-18 Criticality experiments facility, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	24,197		24,197

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
03-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations	14,161		14,161
01-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations	1,565		1,565
01-D-124 HEU materials facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	21,267	10,000	31,267
Total, Construction	**281,422**	**10,000**	**291,422**
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**1,685,772**	**21,700**	**1,707,472**
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	130,484		130,484
Program direction	78,780		78,780
Total, Secure transportation asset	**209,264**		**209,264**
Nuclear weapons incident response	135,354		135,354
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program			
Operation and maintenance	245,283		245,283
Construction			
07-D-253 TA 1 heating systems modernization (HSM) Sandia National Laboratory, Albuquerque, NM	14,500		14,500

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
06-D-160 Project engineering and design various locations	2,700		2,700
06-D-601 Electrical distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	6,429		6,429
06-D-602 Gas main and distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	3,145		3,145
06-D-603 Steam plant life extension project (SLEP), Y-12, National Security Complex, Oakridge, TN	17,811		17,811
05-D-160 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program project engineering and design (PED), various locations	648		648
05-D-601 Compressed air upgrades project (CAUP), Y-12, National security complex, Oakridge, TN	702		702
Total, Construction	**45,935**		**45,935**
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	**291,218**		**291,218**
Environmental projects and operations			
Long Term Response Actions	17,211		17,211

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Safeguards and security			
Operations and maintenance	665,701	25,800	691,501
Cybersecurity	88,711		88,711
Total, Safeguards and security	**754,412**	**25,800**	**780,212**
Subtotal, Weapons Activities	**6,440,889**	**47,500**	**6,488,389**
Adjustments			
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-33,000		-33,000
Total, Adjustments	**-33,000**		**-33,000**
Total, Weapons Activities	**6,407,889**	**47,500**	**6,455,389**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			
Nonproliferation and verification R&D			
Operations and maintenance	260,967		260,967
Construction:			
07-SC-05, Physical sciences facility, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA	4,220		4,220

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
06-D-180 Physical sciences facility, project engineering and design (PED), Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA	3,700		3,700
Total, Construction	**7,920**		**7,920**
Total, Nonproliferation & verification R&D	**268,887**		**268,887**
Nonproliferation and international security	127,411		127,411
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	413,182		413,182
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	206,654		206,654
Fissile materials disposition			
U.S. surplus materials disposition	235,051		235,051
Russian surplus materials disposition	34,695		34,695
Construction:			
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC	78,700		78,700

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	289,510		289,510
Total, Construction	**368,210**		**368,210**
Total, Fissile materials disposition	**637,956**		**637,956**
Global threat reduction initiative	106,818		106,818
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**1,760,908**		**1,760,908**
Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances	-34,695		-34,695
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**1,726,213**		**1,726,213**
Naval Reactors			
Naval reactors development			
Operation and maintenance	761,176		761,176
Construction:			
07-D-190 Materials research technology complex (MRTC), project engineering and design, West Mifflin, PA	1,485		1,485
05-D-900 Materials development facility building, Schenectady, NY	1,287		1,287
Total, Construction	**2,772**		**2,772**
Total, Naval reactors development	**763,948**		**763,948**

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Program direction	31,185		31,185
Subtotal, Naval Reactors	**795,133**		**795,133**
Total, Naval Reactors	**795,133**		**795,133**
Office Of The Administrator			
Office of the administrator	386,576	-30,000	356,576
Total, Office Of The Administrator	**386,576**	**-30,000**	**356,576**
Defense Environmental Cleanup			
Closure sites:			
Ashtabula	295		295
Closure sites administration	25,896		25,896
Fernald	258,877		258,877
Miamisburg	34,869		34,869
Rocky Flats	1,000		1,000
Total, Closure sites	**320,937**		**320,937**
Hanford site:			
2012 completion projects			
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition PFP	81,651		81,651
SNF stabilization and disposition	81,069		81,069
Nuclear facility D&D river corridor closure project	221,022		221,022

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	39,876		39,876
Total, 2012 completion projects	**423,618**		**423,618**
2035 completion projects			
Solid waste stabilization and disposition 200 area	188,989		188,989
Soil and water remediation - groundwatervadose zone	75,973		75,973
Nuclear facility D&D - remainder of Hanford	94,270		94,270
Operate waste disposal facility	3,534		3,534
Richland community and regulatory support	18,332		18,332
Total, 2035 completion projects	**381,098**		**381,098**
Total, Hanford site	**804,716**		**804,716**
Office of River Protection:			
Waste treatment and immobilization plant			
Project decrease		-10,000	-10,000
01-D-16A Low activity waste facility	77,800		77,800
01-D-16B Analytical laboratory	21,800		21,800
01-D-16C Balance of facilities	48,900		48,900
01-D-16D High level waste facility	253,700		253,700
01-D-16E Pretreatment facility	287,800		287,800
Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant	**690,000**	**-10,000**	**680,000**
Tank farm activities			
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	273,656	10,000	283,656

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
River protection community and regulatory support	471		471
Total, Tank farm activities	**274,127**	**10,000**	**284,127**
Total, Office of River protection	**964,127**		**964,127**
Idaho National Laboratory:			
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	1,000		1,000
SNF stabilization and disposition - 2012	18,415		18,415
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	193,910		193,910
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	73,514		73,514
Construction			
06-D-401 Sodium bearing waste treatment project, Idaho	31,000		31,000
Total, Construction	**31,000**		**31,000**
Soil and water remediation - 2012	120,510		120,510
Nuclear facility D & D	67,562		67,562
Non-nuclear facility D & D	3,010		3,010
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,683		3,683
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	**512,604**		**512,604**

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites			
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	11,580		11,580
NNSA Service Center	26,122		26,122
Nevada	79,668		79,668
California site support	370		370
Pantex	23,726		23,726
Los Alamos National Laboratory	90,602		90,602
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	**232,068**		**232,068**
Oak Ridge Reservation:			
Solid waste stabilization and disposition - 2012	48,888		48,888
Soil and water remediation - offsites	15,381		15,381
Nuclear facility D & D, E. Tennessee technology park	10,094		10,094
Nuclear facility D & D Y-12	40,000		40,000
Nuclear facility D & D ORNL	21,956		21,956
Science current generation	18,544		18,544
OR reservation community and regulatory support	4,999		4,999
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	**159,862**		**159,862**
Savannah River sites:			
2012 completion projects			
Nuclear facility D&D	3,664		3,664
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	208,233	10,000	218,233

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Construction:			
04-D-423 Container surveillance capability in 235F	21,300		21,300
04-D-414 Container surveillance capability in 235F Project engineering and design	2,935		2,935
Total, construction	**24,235**		**24,235**
Total, 2012 completion projects	**236,132**	**10,000**	**246,132**
2035 completion projects			
SR community and regulatory support	12,542		12,542
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	41,160		41,160
Spent nuclear fuel stabilization and disposition	22,668		22,668
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	85,276	5,000	90,276
Soil and water remediation	103,150	22,000	125,150
Nuclear facility D & D	12,542	8,000	20,542
Total, 2035 completion projects	**277,338**	**35,000**	**312,338**

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Tank farm activities			
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	507,724	35,000	542,724
Construction:			
05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	25,700		25,700
03-D-414 Salt waste processing facility PED, Savannah River	37,500		37,500
Total, Construction	**63,200**		**63,200**
Total, Tank farm activities	**570,924**	**35,000**	**605,924**
Total, Savannah River site	**1,084,394**	**80,000**	**1,164,394**
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant			
Waste isolation pilot plant	132,026		132,026
Central characterization project	23,190		23,190
Transportation	32,940		32,940
Community and regulatory support	25,122		25,122
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	**213,278**		**213,278**
Program direction	291,216	-40,000	251,216
Program support	37,881		37,881

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Safeguards and Security:			
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,324		4,324
Oak Ridge Reservation	22,889		22,889
Fernald	1,216		1,216
West Valley	1,600		1,600
Paducah	8,707		8,707
Portsmouth	15,642		15,642
Richland/Hanford Site	77,836		77,836
Savannah River Site	163,626		163,626
Total, Safeguards and Security	**295,840**		**295,840**
Technology development	21,389		21,389
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	452,000		452,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup	**5,390,312**	**40,000**	**5,430,312**
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	**5,390,312**	**40,000**	**5,430,312**
Office of security and safety performance assurance			
Nuclear safeguards and security	182,548		182,548
Security investigations	40,000		40,000
Program direction	75,949		75,949
Total, Security and safety performance assurance	**298,497**		**298,497**

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Environment, safety & health			
Environment, safety and health (defense)	60,738		60,738
Program direction	20,076		20,076
Total, Environment, safety and health	**80,814**		**80,814**
Office of Legacy Management			
Legacy management	156,790		156,790
Program direction	11,061		11,061
Total, Office of Legacy Management	**167,851**		**167,851**
Nuclear energy			
Infrastructure			
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	75,949		75,949
Total, Infrastructure	**75,949**		**75,949**
Total, Nuclear energy	**75,949**		**75,949**

Department of Energy National Security Programs

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2007 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Defense related administrative support	93,258	-93,258	
Office of hearings and appeals	4,422		4,422
Subtotal, Other defense activities	**720,791**	**-93,258**	**627,533**
Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances			
Less security charge for reimbursable work (NE)	-3,003		-3,003
Total, Adjustments	**-3,003**		**-3,003**
Total, Other Defense Activities	**717,788**	**-93,258**	**624,530**
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	388,080	-55,000	333,080
Total, Department of Energy	**15,818,070**	**-96,837**	**15,721,233**
OTHER ACTIVITIES (Discretionary)			
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	22,260		22,260
Total, Other Activities Discretionary	**22,260**		**22,260**
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053) Discretionary	**15,840,330**	**-96,837**	**15,743,493**

Subtitle A—National Security Programs

National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of $9.3 billion for the Department of Energy in fiscal year 2007 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, an increase of $47.5 million above the budget request. The committee authorizes the following activities: $1.4 billion for directed stockpile work; $1.9 billion for campaigns; $1.7 billion for readiness in the technical base; $209.3 million for secure transportation asset; $135.4 million for nuclear weapons incidence response; $780.2 for safeguards and security; $291.2 million for facilities and infrastructure recapitalization; and, $17.2 million for environmental projects and operations.

Directed stockpile work

The committee recommends $1.4 billion for directed stockpile work, the amount of the budget request. The directed stockpile account supports work directly related to weapons in the stockpile, including day-to-day maintenance as well as research, development, engineering, and certification activities to support planned life extension programs. This account also includes fabrication and assembly of weapons components, feasibility studies, weapons dismantlement and disposal, training, and support equipment.

Campaigns

The committee recommends $1.9 billion for campaigns, 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.

The committee notes that the work breakdown structure, and budget and reporting system for the campaigns, while perhaps appropriate during the early years of the stockpile stewardship program, have become less representative of the work now being conducted within each campaign. The committee is concerned that the current work breakdown structures for each campaign are not clear, and in some cases obscure the content and objectives of each campaign. At a minimum, this lack of clarity diminishes the capability of both the Department and the Congress to perform effective oversight.

The effort by the Department during fiscal years 2005 and 2006 to revamp the work breakdown and budget structure for the advanced simulation and computing campaign will, in the committee's opinion, substantially improve the tracking of progress and make more clear the contribution of each participant in the cam-

paign to the overall objectives of the campaign. The committee encourages the Department to undertake similar efforts to improve the work breakdown and reporting systems for other campaigns.

Readiness in the technical base

The committee recommends $1.7 billion for readiness in the technical base and facilities (RTBF), an increase of $21.7 million above 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 $21.7 million in additional funds should be used to address additional deferred maintenance and infrastructure needs. Specifically, this amount consists of $11.7 million additional for operations of facilities to be used for critical infrastructure and nuclear safety upgrades at the Pantex Plant including replacement of nuclear facility hoists and high pressure fire loop lead-ins. The committee further recommends $10.0 million in additional construction funding for the Highly Enriched Uranium Materials Facility (HEUMF), Project 01–D–124, at the Y–12 National Security Complex. The committee is aware that the Department may need to revise the compliance approach for HEUMF to withstand attacks postulated under the design basis threat and that these changes will have a significant impact to design and construction of the HEUMF. The committee notes that the Department is completing a detailed analysis of these changes and intends to provide the results to the committee before the end of fiscal year 2006. When this analysis is completed, the committee expects the Department to be able to estimate the final total project cost.

Secure transportation asset

The committee recommends $209.3 million for the secure transportation asset, the amount of the budget request. The secure transportation asset is responsible for transportation of nuclear weapons, weapons materials and components, and other materials requiring safe and secure transport. The committee 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 if the Department proceeds with the consolidation of its nuclear materials and urges the Department to budget adequate funding to undertake this important activity.

Safeguards and security

The committee recommends $780.2 million for weapons safeguards and security, an increase of $25.8 million above the budget request. This amount includes additional funding of $11.8 million for security upgrades at the Pantex Plant and $14.0 million for security upgrades at the Y–12 National Security Complex above the budget request.

The committee is encouraged by those aspects of the NNSA's transformation plans for the nuclear weapons complex that would result in the storage of special nuclear material at fewer NNSA

sites. The committee is concerned with the lack of results coming from the Department's nuclear materials consolidation coordinating committee. The Department has been analyzing consolidation opportunities since 2002, but has yet to consolidate the storage of any materials or to issue recommendations to do so. While the Department continues to analyze this issue, the nation continues to invest significant resources to upgrade security at nuclear facilities which may be de-inventoried over the next decade. The committee believes, however, that NNSA has the opportunity, under its transformation initiative, to make real progress in the consolidation of nuclear materials at NNSA sites and encourages NNSA in these efforts. The committee understands, however, that to be fully successful NNSA and the Department must work together.

Facilities and infrastructure

The committee recommends $291.2 for the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (FIRP), the amount of the budget request. FIRP is a capital renewal and sustainability program which was established to reduce the approximately $2.4 billion backlog of NNSA deferred maintenance which developed during the 1980s and 1990s. The fiscal year 2007 budget request for FIRP, coupled with the funding profile in the Future Years Nuclear Security Program (FYNSP), reflects the Department's commitment to achieving the FIRP objective in a timely manner. The committee acknowledges that past levels of appropriated funding have been insufficient to allow the completion of FIRP by the statutory sunset. The committee has recommended a provision to extend FIRP by two years elsewhere in this title.

Environmental projects and operations

The committee recommends $17.2 million for environmental projects and operations, the amount of the budget request. The committee has not supported previous initiatives to transfer responsibility for environmental cleanup from the Environmental Management program to the NNSA. The Environmental Management program was created expressly to address the Department's environmental legacies.

The committee is cautiously supporting the creation of the environmental projects and operations account with the understanding that its purpose is narrowly confined to long term stewardship activities such as groundwater monitoring, reporting and liaison requirements with states and other regulators, and surveillance of contaminated, decommissioned buildings which have not yet been demolished by the Environmental Management program. The committee will review the effectiveness of this approach in future years.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program

The committee recommends $1.7 billion for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program, the amount of the budget request. 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: $268.9

million for nonproliferation and verification research and development; $127.4 million for nonproliferation and international security; $413.2 million for international nuclear materials protection and cooperation; $206.7 million for elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production; $638.0 million for fissile materials disposition, of which $3.6 million is to begin procurement of enriched Boron-10 from domestic sources; and $106.8 million for the global threat reduction initiative.

The committee notes its serious concerns regarding the Russian and United States Fissile Materials Disposition Programs. These concerns are discussed in detail elsewhere in this report.

Separately, the committee notes that the enriched Boron-10 isotope is critical to the process of fabricating weapons-grade plutonium into mixed-oxide fuel. The committee believes the Department of Energy should have a secure and steady supply of Boron-10 for the plutonium disposition program as well as for other purposes. The committee expects that beginning the initial buy of Boron-10 in fiscal year 2007 will help ensure a stable domestic supply at favorable rates for the duration of the plutonium disposition program, assuming the program goes forward as currently planned. The committee urges the Secretary to undertake discussions with the commercial nuclear power industry to establish a plan for a stable supply of Boron-10.

Naval Reactors

The committee recommends $795.1 million for Naval Reactors, the amount of the budget request.

Office of the Administrator

The committee recommends $356.6 million for program direction for the NNSA, a decrease of $30.0 million below the budget request. This account provides program direction funding for all elements of NNSA, except for the Naval Reactors program and the secure transportation asset. The committee notes that the current level of federal staffing of the NNSA is approximately 1,860 full-time equivalent employees. Under the budget request, NNSA federal staffing would grow to 1,943 federal employees. The committee does not support growing the federal payroll for a program which is not likely to experience significant growth over the period of the FYNSP. The committee has, however, recommended funds sufficient for the implementation of government-wide cost of living increases and escalation in the cost of health and pension benefits for current NNSA payroll.

Defense environmental clean-up (sec. 3102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of $5.4 billion for the Department of Energy in fiscal year 2007 for environmental clean-up activities, an increase of $40.0 million above the budget request.

The committee recommends no funds for the new "project management agent" requested in the budget for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant project, resulting in a recommended decrease for this project of $10.0 million. The project structure for environmental clean up of the high-level waste tanks currently in-

volves three federal offices (Department of Energy Headquarters, the Department's Office of River Protection, and the Department's Richland Operations Office) and two government contractors (one to operate the tank waste system and one to construct the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant). The Department has failed to convince the committee that adding a project management agent with unspecified advisory duties is needed or will benefit this already complex project. The committee recommends, instead, that $10.0 million be added to tank farm activities at Hanford for the management of the 177 tanks containing over 50 million gallons of the most toxic waste in the Department's custody.

The committee also recommends a reduction of $40.0 million in program direction. The Department is experiencing significant challenges in managing its largest construction projects within the environmental management program. In the committee's view, the Department has been too eager to adopt cosmetic fixes such as adding new layers of contractors, consultants, and other advisors. These actions, while in some cases helpful and appropriate, are no substitute for better management of projects by the Department's own federal workforce.

The Department has nearly 300 federal employees at its Washington, DC Headquarters working exclusively on the Environmental Management program and has a total of over 1500 federal employees on the program nationwide. The committee agrees that the Department is deficient in project management and certain contracting and technical skills, but believes the Department must first analyze its capability to reassign, retrain or rebalance within its current 1500 employees prior to requesting funds for consultants or additional federal employees. The committee is unpersuaded that the Department has analyzed how it can help itself, first, and urges the Department to undertake such an evaluation.

The committee recommends additional funding of $80,000,000 above the budget request for 2012 and 2035 completion projects and tank farm activities at the Savannah River Site.

Other defense activities (sec. 3103)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $624.5 million for the Department of Energy for other defense activities, $93.3 million below the budget request.

Security and safety performance assurance

The committee recommends $298.5 million for security and safety performance assurance, the amount of the budget request.

Environment, safety and health

The committee recommends $80.8 million for environment, safety and health, the amount of the budget request.

Office of Legacy Management

The committee recommends $167.9 million for the Office of Legacy Management, the amount of the budget request, and $123.2 million above the fiscal year 2006 appropriated level. The Office of Legacy Management is responsible for ensuring pension and ben-

efit continuity to the Department's former contractor work force. This workforce was formerly employed at seven of the Department's sites at which clean up 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 $93.3 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 $4.4 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 $333.1 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, a decrease of $55.0 million below the budget request. The committee notes that the Department of Energy is currently unable to provide a predicted timetable for either the submittal to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission of a license application for the geologic repository or a prediction of when a repository might begin operating. In light of this uncertainty, the committee believes certain transportation activities such as the procurement of long lead transportation hardware and the implementation of emergency preparedness grant programs along predicted shipping routes are premature and unwarranted in fiscal year 2007.

Energy supply

The budget request included $6.1 million for infrastructure security and energy restoration within the Department of Energy's energy supply and conservation account. The committee recommends no funds for these activities. The budget request describes these activities as: assisting states with energy security activities and energy disruption plans; conducting energy security exercises with state and local governments; and, partnering with industry to facilitate in-depth vulnerability assessments for critical energy assets in the oil, gas, and electricity sectors. These responsibilities constitute a coordinated function between the Departments of Energy and Homeland Security related to civilian energy infrastructure

and, in the committee's view, have little, if anything, to do with the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy. The committee does not support using atomic energy defense funds for nondefense activities.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

Notice and wait requirement applicable to certain third party financing arrangements (sec. 3111)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to notify the congressional defense committees 30 days prior to entering into certain alternative financing arrangements. The Department of Energy has referred to such arrangements as alternative financing, third party financing, public-private partnership, privatization, or private capital arrangements. Such arrangements share the common element that they are conducted without the traditional Congressional line-item authorization required for construction projects.

The committee is aware that the Department is developing an internal policy to guide the use of such financing arrangements within the Department and by its contractors on behalf of the Department. The committee directs the Secretary to provide this policy guidance to the congressional defense committees as soon as it is issued for use within the Department.

The committee is concerned that alternative financing arrangements not be seized upon by elements of the Department or its national laboratories as a "quick fix" for the Department's infrastructure needs. While such arrangements may have the potential to be an appropriate means of meeting the Department's mission needs, such arrangements must stand up to rigorous review and analysis, must not obscure accurate budget depiction, and must provide a clear financial advantage to the taxpayer. The committee believes that cases capable of satisfying these criteria will likely be exceedingly rare.

Utilization of international contributions to the Global Threat Reduction Initiative (sec. 3112)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of Energy authority to accept international contributions to the following programs of the Global Threat Reduction Initiative: the International Radiological Threat Reduction subprogram; the Emerging Threats and Gap Materials subprogram; the Reduced Enrichment for Research and Test Reactors subprogram; the Russian Research Reactor Fuel Return subprogram; the Global Research Reactor Security subprogram; and the Kazakhstan Spent Fuel subprogram. The provision would permit the Secretary to: (1) enter into agreements, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, with any person, foreign government or international organization for this purpose; and (2) use such contributions without further authorization or appropriation. The provision would require the Secretary to notify the congressional defense committees: (1) of the receipt of any international contributions for this program within 30 days of their receipt; and (2) of the intended use of any funds received 30 days before they may be utilized. The provision

would also require the Secretary to submit an annual report to the congressional defense committees on the receipt and utilization of amounts received pursuant to this authority for each fiscal year. The provision would require that any funds not used within five years be returned to the contributor. The authority provided by this provision would expire on December 31, 2013.

Utilization of international contributions to the Second Line of Defense Core Program (sec. 3113)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of Energy authority to accept international contributions to the Second Line of Defense Core Program. The provision would permit the Secretary to: (1) enter into agreements, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, with any person, foreign government or international organization for this purpose; and (2) use such contributions without further authorization or appropriation. The provision would require the Secretary to notify the congressional defense committees: (1) of the receipt of any international contributions for this program within 30 days of their receipt; and (2) of the intended use of any funds received 30 days before they may be utilized. The provision would also require the Secretary to submit an annual report to the congressional defense committees on the receipt and utilization of amounts received pursuant to this authority for each fiscal year. The provision would require that any funds not used within five years be returned to the contributor. The authority provided by this provision would expire on December 31, 2013.

The committee notes that this authority is intended for the Second Line of Defense Core Program, and is specifically not intended for the Megaports program.

Extension of Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (sec. 3114)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (FIRP) for two years, until September 30, 2013. The committee acknowledges that appropriated funding levels have been insufficient to address the full scope of deferred maintenance targeted for elimination under the program by the current termination date of September 30, 2011. The committee urges the Department to put forward its best efforts to complete the program within the two-year extension provided.

Two-year extension of authority for appointment of certain scientific, engineering, and technical personnel (sec. 3115)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 4601(c)(1) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2701(c)(1)) to extend excepted service authority for an additional two years, until September 30, 2008. The committee notes that the current excepted service authority has given the Department of Energy hiring flexibility in appointing scientific, engineering, and technical personnel. The committee intends for the Department to

use this authority to continue building the technical expertise and credibility of the Department.

Extension of deadline for transfer of lands to Los Alamos County, New Mexico, and of lands in trust for the Pueblo of San Ildefonso (sec. 3116)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 632 of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105–119) to extend the deadline for completing certain land transfers by the Secretary of Energy to Los Alamos County, New Mexico and to the Secretary of the Interior of lands to be held in trust for the Pueblo of San Ildefonso. The provision would extend the deadline for these transfers by five years, until November 26, 2012, to allow additional time to complete environmental restoration activities which are required under the provision being amended.

Limitation on availability of funds for Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (sec. 3117)

The budget request for defense environmental cleanup included $690.0 million for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant [Project 01–D–416]. The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of Energy from obligating or expending more than a percentage of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant prior to performing certain actions. Prior to obligating or expending more than 30 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the congressional defense committees proof of certification of the earned value management system used to track and report project costs. Prior to obligating or expending more than 60 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the congressional defense committees the final seismic and ground motion criteria approved by the Secretary, and directed by the contracting officer, to be used in the final design of the Pretreatment and High-Level Waste facilities of the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant.

The Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant project is the largest and most complex nuclear-chemical plant project ever undertaken in the United States, and arguably, the world. Since April of 2003, cost estimates for this project have spiraled from $5.8 billion to the current estimate of over $14.0 billion. The Department has directed a number of reviews into the causes of this escalation. The results of these reviews have been provided to the committee and are the basis of the committee's action in the recommended provision. At their most fundamental level, the committee believes the root causes of the cost escalation to be threefold: (1) fundamental project management inadequacies on the part of the Department of Energy; (2) technical uncertainties raised by outside reviewers which have been neither definitively accepted nor rejected by the Department, clouding the project in hesitation and delay; and (3) cost escalation which is inherent in any undertaking of this magnitude but for which the Department and its contractor failed to provide adequate contingency and advance planning.

The committee is disappointed that the Department would undertake the largest project in its history without having a certified earned value management system in place. The "After Action Fact-Finding Review" prepared at the Department's request and issued in January of 2006, found that the project "submitted cost and schedule data into the Headquarters" Project Assessment and Reporting System that were virtually useless and, indeed, misleading." The committee understands that the Department plans to certify the earned value management system for the project by the end of calendar year 2006. The committee recommends this provision in order to focus the Department's commitment to achieving that goal.

The committee is also concerned over the Department's failure to arrive at final seismic and ground motion criteria against which the facilities of the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant will be designed. The Department has undertaken the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant as a concurrent design-construct project. Design of the facility occurs slightly ahead of, but nearly apace with, construction of the facility. In April of 2005—after three years of dialogue with the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board regarding the appropriateness of the seismic criteria applied in the existing design, the necessity of drilling boreholes to validate the criteria, and the need for additional analysis—the Department stated that it had accepted the Board's recommendations and approved new interim seismic criteria for the project. The Department directed the project contractor to adopt the interim seismic criteria and stop impacted construction activities.

The committee is concerned that the Department, since adopting the interim seismic criteria, has lost focus on the necessity of developing final criteria. Planned borehole drilling to validate the interim criteria has not been initiated, planned for, or affirmatively decided upon. According to the Department's "After Action Fact-Finding Review", the additional engineering effort to validate the design and construction against the interim criteria will add an estimated $258.0 million in direct costs. Additionally, because this effort effects activities on the project's critical path, the cost of schedule delay has added another $500.0 million to the project costs. The committee believes that the outlay of funds for design and construction will continue to be an "at risk" expenditure as long as the project proceeds without the establishment of final seismic criteria. For this reason, the committee has recommended a provision requiring the establishment of such criteria.

The committee notes that the shared services, referred to as the "hotel load" of the project, which include project overhead and ongoing costs associated with project management and support, continue as a fixed cost to the project and the taxpayer whether or not meaningful engineering and construction progress is taking place. According to the Department's "After Action Fact-Finding Review", by shifting work downstream beyond July of 2011, the project adds approximately $15.0 million to $20.0 million each month to the cost, over and above the actual construction. In other words, each month's construction of $55.0 to $60.0 million that is shifted later in the schedule pays a premium of 25 to 35 percent in additional hotel load. The committee is concerned that these economic facts,

when coupled with the ongoing delay caused by a lack of risk-informed decision making, may eventually imperil the continued will and ability of Congress to fund this project to completion. The committee believes that the citizens of the State of Washington deserve the timely cleanup of the Hanford site for which they have waited so long. The committee intends for the recommended provision to drive the Department to take actions which are both fundamental and neglectfully overdue.

Limitation on availability of funds for implementation of the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition Program (sec. 3118)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation of fiscal year 2007 funds to implement the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition Program, other than continuation of the research and development associated with the Gas Turbine-Modular Helium Reactor (GT–MHR), until 30 days after the Secretary of Energy provides to the congressional defense committees written recommendations regarding whether and in what manner the program should proceed. The provision would require the recommendations to include: a description of the disposition method Russia has agreed to use; a description of the assistance the United States plans to provide under the program; an estimate of the total cost and schedule of the U.S. assistance to the program; and an explanation of how parallelism is to be defined for purposes of the program and whether such parallelism can be achieved if the U.S. mixed-oxide (MOX) plutonium disposition program continues on the current planned schedule without further delays.

The committee notes its growing concerns regarding the fissile materials disposition program. Under the agreement, the United States and Russia each agreed to dispose of 34 metric tons of surplus weapons-grade plutonium, and both countries planned to dispose of the plutonium by fabricating it into mixed-oxide (MOX) fuel for use in existing nuclear reactors. It has been both executive branch policy and a condition of the Congress that the U.S. and Russian programs would proceed in parallel. This program was delayed for more than two years as the United States and Russia negotiated an agreement on liability protections for U.S. contractors associated with the project. While a liability agreement was finally reached last fall, it has not yet been signed, and Russian officials have stated that the agreement will require ratification by the Russian Duma. Even more troubling is the possibility that now Russia may no longer support the use of MOX fuel for the plutonium disposition program, and the Department of Energy is beginning to explore alternative disposition paths with Russia. Uncertainties concerning Russia's level of commitment raise real questions about the viability and future direction of the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition Program, and of the continued relationship of that program to the U.S. Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition Program, given that these two programs are required to proceed in parallel. In light of these circumstances, the committee believes it is necessary to receive the recommendations required by this provision before fiscal year 2007 funds are obligated for the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition Program.

Limitation on availability of funds for construction of MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility (sec. 3119)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation of fiscal year 2007 funds for construction of the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility until 30 days after the Secretary of Energy provides to the congressional defense committees: (1) an independent cost estimate for the United States Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition Program and facilities; and (2) a written certification that the Department of Energy (DOE) intends to use the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility for U.S. plutonium disposition regardless of the future direction of the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition Program.

The committee notes its growing concerns regarding the fissile materials disposition program. Under the agreement, the United States and Russia each agreed to dispose of 34 metric tons of surplus weapons-grade plutonium, and both countries planned to dispose of the plutonium by fabricating it into mixed-oxide (MOX) fuel for use in existing nuclear reactors. It has been both executive branch policy and a condition of the Congress that the U.S. and Russian programs would proceed in parallel. This program was delayed for more than two years as the United States and Russia negotiated an agreement on liability protections for U.S. contractors associated with the project. Now there are questions as to whether Russia still supports the use of MOX fuel for the plutonium disposition program, and the Department of Energy is beginning to explore alternative disposition paths with Russia. Uncertainties concerning Russia's level of commitment to the program raise real questions about the viability and future direction of the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition Program, and of the continued relationship of that program to the U.S. Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition Program, given that these two programs are required to proceed in parallel.

The committee is further concerned that the U.S. MOX program has experienced significant cost overruns and schedule delays, irrespective of the problems with the Russian program. A December 2005 audit by the DOE Inspector General (IG) concluded that while the original 2002 budget estimate for the U.S. MOX facility was $1.0 billion, the total cost is now estimated at around $3.5 billion, and the plant will not begin producing MOX until 2015, six years later than originally planned. The IG audit was highly critical of DOE's management of the MOX program, asserting that weaknesses in project management and limited administration of the program contributed to cost growth.

In light of these developments, the committee believes it is necessary to have an independent cost estimate for the program, and a certification from the Secretary that the Department will use the MOX facility for plutonium disposition regardless of the future direction of the Russian program, before fiscal year 2007 funds are obligated for construction of the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility.

Technical correction related to authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 2006 (sec. 3120)

The committee recommends a provision that strikes the amount "$9,196,456" and inserts "$9,196,456,000" in section 3101(a) of the

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163).

Items of Special Interest

The role of the Kansas City Plant in the nuclear weapons program

The committee acknowledges the unique role of the Department of Energy's Kansas City Plant within the nuclear weapons complex. The mission of the Kansas City Plant is to provide procurement, production, and life-cycle support of the non-nuclear components for the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile. The Kansas City Plant provides 85 percent of the components of a nuclear warhead while consuming 6 percent of the Department's weapons activities budget.

Under the Stockpile Stewardship Program, the Kansas City Plant makes an essential contribution to the life extension of each nuclear weapon. The Kansas City Plant supports 120 distinct technologies and processes across 42 product lines, including precision assembly and packaging of specialty mechanisms and microelectronics, micro initiation systems, specialty materials, and leading edge technologies like high-speed optical-electronic telemetry systems. The Kansas City Plant is rapidly becoming the only domestic source for many of the non-nuclear technologies needed to support the nuclear weapons complex. The committee believes the Kansas City Plant is therefore a unique national asset providing one-of-a-kind technical expertise to the National Nuclear Security Administration and its national laboratories.

Transparency in budgeting for security requirements

The committee notes that the costs of providing security for the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy and of providing appropriate safeguards for the Department's nuclear materials will exceed $1.3 billion in fiscal year 2007. These costs have increased significantly in response to the threat environment of recent years. To provide greater clarity and exert greater control over these costs, the Department elected to segregate its security costs into a separate budget line. This segregation of costs has allowed the committee to examine more directly the adequacy of the Department's security expenditures.

By the end of calendar year 2008, the Department intends to bring its nuclear facilities into compliance with the design basis threat established in December 2004. In light of this goal, the Department should continue to segregate security costs within the budget requested for fiscal year 2008 so that the committee may have a transparent view of the security expenditures needed to achieve that compliance.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Authorization (sec. 3201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $22.3 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (the Board), the amount of the budget request. The committee is frustrated with the apparent lack of a process to allow for timely resolution of technical issues between the Board and the Department of Energy. The Department is now in a period of renewed construction activity for complex nuclear and nuclear-chemical facilities. The committee is aware of technical differences of opinion between the Board and the Department which remain unresolved, years after first being raised. The resulting technical uncertainty has an adverse effect on project schedules and costs. In some cases, issues raised during pre-conceptual design remain unresolved well into construction. The committee recognizes that because the role of the Board is advisory, the Secretary of Energy is not required to adopt all of the Board's recommendations. Nevertheless, the Secretary should have a well-reasoned and technically defensible basis, if he elects to proceed contrary to the Board's view. In the committee's opinion, both the Department and the Board would benefit from a more structured process for issue resolution which would allow issues to be raised, evaluated, and adjudicated at logical points in the design and construction process.

The committee understands that the Department and the Board are engaged in discussions to develop a process to provide for more timely identification and resolution of technical differences over design standards and other issues at the Department's nuclear facilities. The committee directs the Board and the Department to report jointly to the congressional defense committees on the results of the ongoing efforts to improve the timeliness of issue resolution, including recommendations, if any, for legislation that would strengthen and improve technical oversight of the Department's nuclear design and operational activities. Until such time as this report is submitted, the committee directs the Board to provide to the congressional defense committees quarterly reports to identify and report the status of significant unresolved issues.

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Departmental Recommendations

By letter dated April 3, 2006, the General Counsel of the Department of Defense forwarded to the President of the Senate proposed legislation "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2007, and for other pur-

poses." The transmittal letter and proposed legislation were officially referred as Executive Communication 6284 to the Committee on Armed Services on April 3, 2006.

Executive Communication 6284 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. There was one recorded vote during the course of the markup. The vote, which occurred on the motion to report out the comprehensive original bill and the series of original bills, was unanimous, 24–0. This roll call vote has been made public and is 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 2007.

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.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR CORNYN

While the Committee has produced a good bill that will support members of our military and their families, I strongly oppose the Committee's recommendation to delay by one year production of the Joint Strike Fighter. I share my colleagues' commitment to acquisition reform and am pleased that the Committee bill contains many provisions to improve our acquisition process. We must get acquisition costs under control if we are going to be able to procure the weapons systems our nation needs to meet the threats of the 21st century. However, I am deeply concerned that the Committee's recommendation will undermine the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program in terms of cost increases and schedule slips.

I fully recognize that the JSF program is the largest acquisition program in the history of the Department of Defense. There are legitimate questions regarding the level of concurrency between R&D and procurement in this program that have been subject to criticism by the GAO. The Committee recommendations closely follow those from a recent GAO report on the Joint Strike Fighter, but I would also note that the GAO recommendations have not been subject to a business-case analysis. In fact, implementation of the GAO recommendations could likely cost more and further delay the program.

These are all issues we must address, but I am very concerned that the Committee's mark which recommends, and I quote, "a one-year delay in production," will possibly drive up costs, delay the Initial Operational Capability (IOC) of the aircraft, and adversely affect our international partners.

I commend the Chairman for convening hearings on the JSF alternate engine program so that we would fully understand the DoD legislative proposal to eliminate the alternate engine program. However, I wish we also would have had the same understanding of this proposed delay before the Committee made its recommendations. I strongly believe that we need answers to the following questions before undertaking major changes to the program.

1. Do we know how the proposed one-year delay in production will affect the overall cost of the JSF program?
2. Do we know how the proposed one-year delay in production will affect the Initial Operational Capability (IOC) date of the Joint Strike Fighter?
3. Do we know how the proposed one-year delay in production will affect our international partners?

It is premature to make any changes to the Joint Strike Fighter program without answers to the above questions.

JOHN CORNYN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR NELSON OF FLORIDA

The committee includes a provision that would repeal section 5062(2), title 10 U.S. Code that would require the Navy to have a minimum of twelve operational aircraft carriers in the fleet. I oppose this repeal. I am convinced that as a nation at war we should not increase our strategic risk by reducing our naval aviation capability or increase the time required to respond to crises around the world.

The committee's statement makes the case that, while lifting the 12-carrier minimum requirement, we should not allow our carrier fleet to fall dangerously lower than eleven ships. I believe strongly that the size and capability of our carrier fleet is a matter of highest national concern. Once mothballed, scrapped or a combat loss, a carrier is difficult and expensive to replace. The nation needs twelve carriers for worldwide presence and crisis response. Congress should support a funding program to ensure that we achieve and sustain that level as soon as practical.

As concerned as I am about reducing the size of our carrier fleet, I am equally concerned about the risk of failing to adequately disperse them. Stationing all our Atlantic coast carriers in a single port only compounds the challenges we will face with a smaller fleet. I am not alone in that assessment. The former Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Vernon Clark, told the Armed Services Committee in February 2005 that in his view, "over-centralization of the [carrier] port structure is not a good strategic move * * * the Navy should have two carrier-capable home ports on each coast." Admiral Clark went on to say, "* * * it is my belief that it would be a serious strategic mistake to have all of those key assets of our Navy tied up in one port." As recently as March this year Deputy Secretary of Defense and former Secretary of the Navy, Gordon England, testified to this committee that the Navy needed to disperse its Atlantic coast carriers saying, "My judgment is that [dispersion] is still the situation * * * a nuclear carrier should be in Florida to replace the [USS John F.] Kennedy to get some dispersion." Secretary England explained that, "the concern there was always weapons of mass destruction. Even though carriers were at sea, the maintenance facilities, et cetera, are all still there and the crews * * * so having some dispersion would be of value to the Department of the Navy." At the same hearing Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Edmund Giambastiani, shared his own judgment that we should disperse our carriers. He illustrated his sense of risk to the nation's east coast carriers when he recalled his own visit to Norfolk one Christmas, "where we had five aircraft carriers all sitting next to one another, and that is not something we'd like to routinely do."

I am opposed to cutting our nation's aircraft carrier fleet as a matter of strategic necessity during time of war. The risk, in my

view, is unacceptable. As a matter of protecting our smaller carrier force, I am convinced that the nation must establish a second Atlantic coast nuclear carrier base as quickly as possible. An environmental impact study in 1997 found Naval Station Mayport, Florida, current home of the USS *John F. Kennedy,* suitable to permanently station a nuclear aircraft carrier. The Navy should complete its update of that study as quickly as possible. Additionally, in order not to lose any time once the study is complete, the Navy should include funding in its fiscal year 2008 Future Years Defense Program to begin building the maintenance and support facilities necessary to stationing a nuclear aircraft carrier at Naval Station Mayport. Availability of these funds should naturally be contingent upon but timed in the budget's out-years to coincide with the completion of an updated environmental impact study. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both these vital issues.

BILL NELSON.

○