AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

109TH CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
109–89

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 1815

together with

ADDITIONAL AND DISSENTING VIEWS

[Including committee cost estimate]

MAY 20, 2005.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

109TH CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
109–89

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 1815

together with

ADDITIONAL AND DISSENTING VIEWS

[Including committee cost estimate]

MAY 20, 2005.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

21–300 WASHINGTON : 2005

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS

DUNCAN HUNTER, California, *Chairman*

CURT WELDON, Pennsylvania
JOEL HEFLEY, Colorado
JIM SAXTON, New Jersey
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
TERRY EVERETT, Alabama
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, California
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
JOHN N. HOSTETTLER, Indiana
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
JIM RYUN, Kansas
JIM GIBBONS, Nevada
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
KEN CALVERT, California
ROB SIMMONS, Connecticut
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia
W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
JEFF MILLER, Florida
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
JEB BRADLEY, New Hampshire
MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
THELMA DRAKE, Virginia
JOE SCHWARZ, Michigan
CATHY MCMORRIS, Washington
MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
GEOFF DAVIS, Kentucky

IKE SKELTON, Missouri
JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
LANE EVANS, Illinois
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii
MARTY MEEHAN, Massachusetts
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas
ADAM SMITH, Washington
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
ROBERT ANDREWS, New Jersey
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
STEVE ISRAEL, New York
RICK LARSEN, Washington
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
JIM MARSHALL, Georgia
KENDRICK B. MEEK, Florida
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
TIM RYAN, Ohio
MARK UDALL, Colorado
G.K. BUTTERFIELD, North Carolina
CYNTHIA MCKINNEY, Georgia
DAN BOREN, Oklahoma

ROBERT S. RANGEL, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Explanation of the Committee Amendments	1
Purpose	2
Relationship of Authorization to Appropriations	2
Summary of Authorization in the Bill	2
Summary Table of Authorizations	3
Rationale for the Committee Bill	11
Hearings	14
DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION	15
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT	15
OVERVIEW	15
Aircraft Procurement, Army	17
Overview	17
Items of Special Interest	20
AH–64 modern signal processing unit	20
High-altitude Army National Guard aviation training site	20
UH–60 aircraft wireless intercom system upgrade	20
Missile Procurement, Army	21
Overview	21
Items of Special Interest	24
Advanced precision kill weapon system	24
Patriot system reporting requirements	24
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	24
Overview	24
Items of Special Interest	29
Abrams tank modernization	29
Stryker tire second source qualification	29
Ammunition Procurement, Army	30
Overview	30
Items of Special Interest	33
Kansas army ammunition plant modern munitions enterprise	33
Lake City army ammunition plant	33
M19 Modern demolition initiators	33
Missile propellant/warhead chemical oxidizer recycling	34
Rapid wall breaching kit	34
Small caliber ammunition manufacturer qualification	34
Other Procurement, Army	35
Overview	35
Items of Special Interest	44
AN/ARS–6A technology upgrade	44
Best value procurement practices for tactical wheeled vehicles	44
Cartledge infuser	44
Deployable power generation distribution system	45
Heavy expanded mobility tactical truck light equipment transporter	45
Nonsystem training devices	45
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	46
Overview	46
Items of Special Interest	51
Crashworthy crew chief seats	51
EA–6B modifications	51
Joint primary air training system	51
P–3 modifications	52
Shared reconnaissance pod logistics support	52
T–45 training system	53

Page
Weapons Procurement, Navy 53
Overview 53
Item of Special Interest 57
Tomahawk missile 57
Ammunition Procurement, Navy & Marine Corps 57
Overview 57
Item of Special Interest 60
MN79 anti-personnel obstacle breaching system 60
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy 60
Overview 60
Item of Special Interest 63
Navy shipbuilding programs 63
Other Procurement, Navy 64
Overview 64
Items of Special Interest 73
Joint threat emitter 73
Material handling equipment 73
Mine sweeper re-engining 73
Naval tactical fiber switch system 74
Special Operations swimmer/diver training craft 74
Surveillance towed array sensor system twin-line towed arrays 74
Transportable anti-intrusion pontoon barrier system 74
Ultrasonic maintenance tools 75
National Defense Sealift Fund 75
Overview 75
Item of Special Interest 75
Maritime prepositioning ship lease buyout 75
Procurement, Marine Corps 76
Overview 76
Items of Special Interest 82
Combat casualty care equipment upgrade 82
Family of construction equipment 82
Marines tactical remote sensor system 82
Marines topographic equipment 82
Night vision equipment 83
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force 83
Overview 83
Items of Special Interest 89
A–10 litening advanced targeting pod 89
AN/ARS–6 V12 personnel locator system 89
C–17 89
C–130 modifications 90
F–15E 91
F–16 bomb rack unit–57 91
Global hawk 91
Joint strike fighter 92
KC–130J and C–130J 93
Link 16 support and sustainment 93
Predator unmanned aerial vehicle 94
Senior scout 94
U–2 senior year electro-optical system focal planes 95
Ammunition Procurement, Air Force 96
Overview 96
Missile Procurement, Air Force 98
Overview 98
Other Procurement, Air Force 101
Overview 101
Items of Special Interest 107
Combat survivor radios 107
Digital airport surveillance radar and Department of Defense advanced automations system 107
Force protection surveillance system 108
General information technology 108
Mobile approach control system 109
Point of maintenance and combat ammunition system initiative 109
Procurement, Defense-Wide 110
Overview 110

Page

Items of Special Interest 115
Chemical and biological defense procurement 115
Chemical agents and munitions destruction 115
Force protection 117
Persistent unmanned air vehicle intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance below the brigade level 117
Special Operations Forces intelligence systems 118
Special weapons observation reconnaissance direct action system 118
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 119
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 119
Sections 101-104—Authorization of Appropriations 119
Subtitle B—Army Programs 119
Section 111—Multiyear Procurement Authority for UH–60M/MH–60 Helicopters 119
Section 112—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Apache Modernized Target Acquisition Designation Sights and Pilot Night Vision Sensors 119
Section 113—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Apache Block II Conversion 119
Section 114—Acquisition Strategy for Tactical Wheeled Vehicle Programs 119
Section 115—Limitation on Army Modular Force Initiative 120
Section 116—Contract Requirement for Objective Individual Combat Weapon-Increment One 121
Subtitle C—Navy Programs 121
Section 121—Virginia Class Submarine Program 121
Section 122—LHA Replacement Amphibious Assault Ship Program 121
Section 123—Future Major Surface Combatant, Destroyer Type 121
Section 124—Littoral Combat Ship Program 121
Section 125—Authorization of Two Additional Arleigh Burke Class Destroyers 122
Section 126—Refueling and Complex Overhaul of the U.S.S. *Carl Vinson* 122
Section 127—Report on Propulsion System Alternatives for Surface Combatants 122
Section 128—Aircraft Carrier Force Structure 122
Section 129—Contingent Transfer of Additional Funds for CVN–21 Carrier Replacement Program 123
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs 123
Section 131—Multiyear Procurement Authority for C–17 Aircraft 123
Subtitle E—Joint and Multiservice Matters 123
Section 141—Requirement that all Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicles use Specified Standard Data Link 123
Section 142—Limitation on Initiation of New Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Systems 123
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, & EVALUATION 124
OVERVIEW 124
Army Research, Development, Test, & Evaluation 127
Overview 127
Items of Special Interest 139
Abrams improved track 139
Accelerated development of heavy-fuel turbine engine 139
Advanced amputee treatment research and development 139
Advanced battery technology initiative 140
Advanced carbon nanotechnology 140
Advanced lightweight composite armor materials for ballistic impact and blast protection 140
Advanced weapons technology 141
Aerostat joint project office 141
Applied communications and information networking 141
Armored systems modernization 141
Army medical peer-reviewed applied research and advanced technology development initiative 144
Army space and missile defense architecture analysis program 145
Center for rotorcraft innovation 145
Centers of excellence 145
Combat vehicle electronics 146

Page

Common remote operating weapon station 146
Communications and electronics cost module 146
Distributed common ground system 147
Excalibur XM982 148
Explosive and narcotic detection devices 148
Fire support technology improvement program 148
Flexible display initiative 149
Gas-engine driven air conditioning system demonstrations 149
Geospatial information decision support-single integrated air picture . 149
Handheld detection systems 150
Human systems integration 150
Hydrogen proton exchange membrane 151
Hyperspectral longwave imager for the tactical environment 151
Integrated digital environment service model 151
Joint Common Missile 152
JP–8 soldier fuel cell 152
Lean munitions 153
Leishmaniasis diagnostics 153
Light utility vehicle 153
Lightweight patient monitor with defibrillator 154
M5 high performance fiber for personnel armor systems 154
Mast mounted common remote stabilized sensor system 154
Medium tactical vehicle steering and suspension development 155
Miniature sensor development for small and tactical unmanned aerial vehicles 155
Missile recycling center capability 155
Modeling and analysis of the response of structures 156
Night vision advanced technology 156
Night vision enhanced vision goggle 156
Night vision system air dispensing capability 156
Non-emitting helicopter brownout situational awareness demonstration 157
Patient status monitor 157
Portable and mobile emergency broadband system 157
Powdered metal compaction 158
Pseudofolliculitis Barbae 158
Rugged textile electronic garments 158
Smart responsive nano-composites 159
Strategic materials and strategic manufacturing initiative 159
Tactical wheeled vehicle product improvement program 159
Titanium extraction, mining, and process engineering research 160
Transparent Armor 160
UH–60 maintenance improvement program 160
Navy Research, Development, Test & Evaluation 161
Overview 161
Items of Special Interest 173
Advanced mine detection program 173
Affordable towed array construction 173
Affordable weapon system 173
Air combat environment test and evaluation 174
Airborne reconnaissance systems 174
Aircraft carrier launch and recovery and support equipment modernization 175
Amorphous metal permanent magnet generator set 175
Aviation ship integration center 175
Biomedical research imaging 176
Ceramic air deployed sensor 176
CH–53X heavy lift replacement 176
Common submarine radio room 177
Consolidated undersea situational awareness 177
Cooperative engagement capability 178
Digital shipboard voice communications 178
Hemoglobin-based oxygen carrier 178
High temperature superconducting AC synchronous ship propulsion motor 179
Joint integrated systems technology 179
Marine expeditionary rifle squad 180

Page

Marine mammal research program 180
Metrology 181
Multi-wavelength surface scanning biologics sensor 181
Polyimide macro electromechanical systems 181
"Quick Clot" hemostatic agent 182
Remote ocean surveillance system 182
Retro-reflecting optical communications for special operations 183
Special beam combining fiber lasers 183
Superconducting direct current homopolar motor 183
Surface Warfare Communications Systems 184
Synthetic aperture sonar commonality 184
Tactical E-field buoy development 185
Use of out of service torpedo components for unmanned undersea vehicle systems 185
Virtual at-sea training initiative 185
Warfare Protection Advanced Technology 186
Air Force Research, Development, Test, & Evaluation 186
Overview 186
Items of Special Interest 198
Active feedback flow control technology 198
Advanced engine starter/generator system prototype 198
Advanced spacecraft technology 198
Aerospace propulsion 199
Aerospace propulsion and power technology 199
Affordable lightweight power supply development 199
Applied research in computing enterprise services program 200
Assured access to space 200
B–2 development 200
Ballistic missile technology 201
Biostatic protective clothing 201
C–130 airlift squadrons 201
Commercial communications bandwidth 202
Cost analysis for space acquisitions 202
Counter space systems 202
Defense research science 203
Distributed mission interoperability toolkit program 203
Engineering tool improvement program 203
F–16 block 30 AN/APG–68(V)10 radar upgrade 204
Fibrous three dimensional composites for conformal load-bearing antenna structures 204
Fixed-installation x-ray detection system 205
Global positioning system 205
Global positioning system user equipment 205
High modulus polyacrylonitrile carbon fiber 205
KC–135 replacement program 206
Joint battlespace infosphere security inititive 206
Laser threat warning attack reporting 207
Lasers for advanced manufacturing and defense applications 207
Low profile arresting gear 207
Management of black and white space 208
Manned reconnaissance systems 209
Maui space surveillance system 209
Metals affordability 209
Miniaturized targeting sensor development 209
Missile and space technical collection 210
Multi-disciplinary space technology 210
Nanocrystalline diamond coating 210
Operationally responsive launch 211
Penetrator Study 211
Project Suter 211
Quick-donning oxygen mask 212
Radio frequency identification rapid adoption collaboration initiative . 212
Rocket systems launch program 212
Satellite threat evaluation environment development 213
Single integrated space picture 213
Space based infra-red system high 213
Space cadre 214

Page
Space radar 214
Space situational awareness 216
Space technology 216
Transformational satellite communications system 216
Warfighter pocket computer development 217
Defense-Wide Research, Development, Test, & Evaluation 218
Overview 218
Items of Special Interest 229
Accelerating intelligence analyst education and training 229
Accelerating transition and fielding of advance technologies for emerging critical operational needs of special operations forces 229
Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations 229
Advanced tactical laser program 229
Alternative Fuels 230
Army space and missile defense simulation upgrade 230
Asymmetric protocols for biological defense 231
Ballistic missile defense 231
Boost defense segment 232
Core 233
Midcourse defense segment 233
Missile Defense Advanced Technology 234
Procurement funding and transition of ballistic missile defense systems to services 234
Products 235
System interceptor 235
Technology 236
Terminal defense segment 237
Testing 237
Business management and modernization program 238
Chemical/biological defense research, development, test and evaluation program 238
Chemical/biological defense basic research initiative 239
Chemical/biological defense applied research and advanced technology development initiatives 239
Chemical/biological defense advanced component development and prototyping initiative 239
Combating terrorism technology support 240
Connectory for rapid identification of advanced technology 240
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency 241
Defense integrated military human resources system 241
Defense Manufacturing Technology 242
Defense message system 242
Defense science and technology funding 243
Defense technical information center 244
Emerging/critical interconnection technology 245
Event management visualization and data analysis 245
Force transformation 245
GeoSAR mission enhancements 246
Guardrail common sensor 246
Information assurance 246
Information systems security program 247
Intelligence analyst education and training 247
Large vehicle inspection using magnetic quadrupole resonance 247
M–291 skin decontamination kits 247
Man portable air defense system defense program 248
Medical free electron laser 249
National Defense University technology pilot program 249
Operationally responsive space 249
Project M shock mitigation technology 250
Raincoat 250
Rapid acquisition incentives 251
Scalable active memory processing engines 251
Special operations advanced technology development 251
Special Operations Command small weapons acquisition 252
Special Operations Command tactical tanker fleet 252
Special operations tactical systems development 252
Special operations technology development 253

Page
Tactical exploitation of innovative sensors 253
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense 253
Overview 253
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 256
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 256
Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations 256
Section 202—Amount for Defense Science and Technology 256
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 256
Section 211—Annual Comptroller General Report on Future Combat Systems Program 256
Section 212—Objective Requirements for Non-line-of-sight Cannon System not to be Diminished to Meet Weight Requirements 256
Section 213—Independent Analysis of Future Combat Systems Manned Ground Vehicle Transportability Requirement 256
Section 214—Amounts for Armored Systems Modernization Program 257
Section 215—Limitation on Systems Development and Demonstration of Manned Ground Vehicles Under Armored Systems Modernization Program 257
Section 216—Testing of Internet Protocol Version 6 by the Naval Research Laboratory 257
Section 217—Program to Design and Develop Next-generation Nuclear Submarine 257
Section 218—Extension of Requirements Relating to Management Responsibility for Naval Mine Countermeasures Program 258
Section 219—Single Joint Requirement for Heavy Lift Rotorcraft 259
Section 220—Requirements for Development of Tactical Communications Systems 260
Section 221—Limitation on Systems Development and Demonstration of Personnel Recovery Vehicle 261
Section 222—Separate Program Element Required for Each Significant Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Project 261
Section 223—Small Business Innovation Research Phase III Acceleration Pilot Program 261
Section 224—Revised Requirements Relating to Submission of Joint Warfighting Science and Technology Plan 262
Section 225—Shipbuilding Industrial Base Improvement Program for Development of Innovative Shipbuilding Technologies, Processes, and Facilities 262
Section 226—Renewal of University National Oceanographic Laboratory System Fleet 263
Section 227—Limitation on VXX Helicopter Program 263
Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs 264
Section 231—Report on Capability and Costs for Operational Boost/Ascent-Phase Missile Defense Systems 264
Section 232—Required Flight-Intercept Test of Ballistic Missile Defense Ground-based Midcourse System 264
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE 264
OVERVIEW 264
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 292
Budget Request Adjustments—Readiness 292
Base Services Related Supplies 293
Capital Security Cost Share 293
Civilian Intern Program 293
Distributed Mission Operations 294
Eagle Vision 294
Expansion of Export Control Database 294
Joint Initiatives 294
Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan 295
Military-to-Civilian Conversion Program 295
Navy Ship Disposal 295
Operation Tempo Alignment to Account for the Global War on Terrorism 296
Tank Sonic Dry Clean Filter Systems 296
Utilities Privatization Implementation 296
Information Technology Issues 297
Overview 297
Adjustments to Information Technology 297

Page

Army Knowledge Online Disaster Recovery 298
Enterprise License Agreement 298
High Performance Computing Systems—"Supercomputers" 299
Live Instrumentation for Air and Missile Defense Units 299
Medical Qualification Tracking Visualization and Data Analysis Project 299
Medical Information Systems Architecture 300
Network Device Authentication 300
Radio Frequency Identification in the Medical Supply Chain 300
Servicewide Communication—General Fund Enterprise Business Systems 301
Other Matters 301
Arsenal Support Program Initiative 301
Base Operating Support Budget Shortfalls 301
Budget Justification Documents for Operation and Maintenance 302
Evaluation of Department of Defense Policy Prohibiting the Purchase of Technical Data to Accompany Acquired Systems 302
Food Supplies 303
Naval Oceanographic Command 303
Pine Bluff Arsenal 303
Predator Unmanned Aerial Vehicle 303
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 304
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 304
Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding 304
Section 302—Working Capital Funds 304
Section 303—Other Department of Defense Programs 304
Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions 304
Section 311—Revision of Required Content of Environmental Quality Annual Report 304
Section 312—Pilot Project on Compatible Use Buffers on Real Property Bordering Fort Carson, Colorado 304
Section 313—Repeal of Air Force Report on Military Installation Encroachment Issues 305
Section 314—Payment of Certain Private Cleanup Costs in Connection with Defense Environmental Restoration 305
Subtitle C—Workplace and Depot Issues 305
Section 321—Proceeds From Cooperative Activities with Non-Army Entities 305
Section 322—Public-Private Competition 305
Section 323—Public-Private Competition Pilot Program 305
Section 324—Sense of Congress on Equitable Legal Standing for Civilian Employees 306
Subtitle D—Extension of Program Authorities 306
Section 331—Extension of Authority to Provide Logistics Support and Services for Weapons Systems Contractors 306
Section 332—Extension and Revision of Temporary Authority for Contractor Performance of Security Guard Functions 306
Subtitle E—Utah Test and Training Range 306
Section 341—Definitions 306
Section 342—Military Operations and Overflights, Utah Test and Training Range 306
Section 343—Planning Process for Federal Lands in the Utah Test and Training Range 307
Section 344—Designation and Management of Cedar Mountain Wilderness, Utah 307
Section 345—Identification of Additional bureau of Land Management Land in Utah as Trust Land for Skull Valley Band of Goshutes 307
Section 346—Relation to Other Lands and Laws 307
Subtitle F—Other Matters 307
Section 351—Codification and Revision of Limitation on Modification of Major Items of Equipment Scheduled for Retirement or Disposal ... 307
Section 352—Limitation on Purchase of Investment Items With Operation and Maintenance Funds 307
Section 353—Provision of Department of Defense Support for Certain Paralympics Sporting Events 308
Section 354—Development and Explanation of Budget Models for Base Operations Support Sustainment, and Facilities Recapitalization 308

Page

Section 355—Report on Department of the Army Programs for Prepositioning of Equipment and Other Materiel 309
Section 356—Report Regarding Effect on Military Readiness of Undocumented Immigrants Trespassing Upon Operational Ranges 309
Section 357—Congressional Notification Requirements Regarding Placement of Liquefied Natural Gas Facilities, Pipelines, and Related Structures on Defense Lands 309
Section 358—Report Regarding Army and Air Force Exchange System Management of Army Lodging 309
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS 310
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST 310
Increases in Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized to be on Active Duty for Operational Support 310
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 310
Subtitle A—Active Forces 310
Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces 310
Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels 310
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces 311
Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve 311
Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves 311
Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status) 311
Section 414—Fiscal Year 2006 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Satus Technicians 312
Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized to be on Active Duty for Operational Support 312
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations 313
Section 421—Military Personnel 313
Section 422—Armed Forces Retirement Home 313
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY 313
OVERVIEW 313
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 314
Advanced Civil School Opportunities for Officers of the Armed Forces 314
Comptroller General Review of Financial Management Programs 315
Confidentiality Definition for Domestic Violence 315
Coordinating the Activities of the Department of Defense, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Veterans' Affairs Intended to Assist Wounded and Injured Service Members and Surviving Family Members of Military Deaths 316
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center 316
Department of Defense Disability Evaluation System 316
Family Support, Employment and Transition Assistance Programs for Service Members and Their Families 317
Foreign Area Officers 317
Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal 318
Job Corps Recruits 318
Joint Advertising and Market Research 319
List of Organizations and Agencies Available to Assist Wounded and Injured Service Members and Surviving Family Members of Military Deaths 319
Military Spouse Education and Employment 320
Professional Development and Certification of Military Security Personnel 320
Reserve Component Family Support Programs 321
Review of Department of Defense and Military Service Policies with Regard to the Assignment of Women 321
Simultaneous Service of Family Members in a Combat Zone 322
State and Federal Agency Partnerships to Address the Post-Mobilization Needs of Reservists and National Guardsmen and Their Families 323
Study of Genocide and Its Cultural, Ethical and Moral Impact 323
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 323
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy 323
Section 501—Temporary Increase in Percentage Limits on Reduction of Time-In-Grade Requirements for Retirement in Grade Upon Voluntary Retirement 323

Page

Section 502—Two-Year Renewal of Authority to reduce Minimum Commissioned Service Requirement for Voluntary Retirement as an Officer 324
Section 503—Separation at Age 64 for Reserve Component Senior Officers 324
Section 504—Improved Administration of Transitions Involving Officers in Senior General and Flag Officer Positions 324
Section 505—Consolidation of Grade Limitations on Officer Assignment and Insignia Practice Known as Frocking 324
Section 506—Authority for Designation of a General/Flag Officer Position on the Joint Staff To be Held by Reserve Component General or Flag Officer on Active Duty 325
Section 507—Authority to Retain Permanent Professors at the Naval Academy Beyond 30 Years of Active Commissioned Service 325
Section 508—Authority for Appointment of Coast Guard Flag Officer as Chief of Staff to the President 325
Section 509—Clarification of Time for Receipt of Statutory Selection Board Communications 325
Section 510—Standardization of Grade of Senior Dental Officer of the Air Force With That of Senior Dental Officer of the Army 326
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management 326
Section 511—Use of Reserve Montgomery GI Bill Benefits and Benefits for Mobilized Members of the Selected Reserve and National Guard for Payments for Licensing or Certification Tests 326
Section 512—Modifications to the New Reserve Education Benefit for Certain Active Service in Support of Contingency Operations 326
Section 513—Military Technicians (Dual Status) Mandatory Separation 326
Section 514—Military Retirement Credit for Certain Service by National Guard Members Performed While in a State Duty Status Immediately After the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 326
Section 515—Use of National Guard to Provide Military Support to Civilian Law Enforcement Agencies for Domestic Counter-Terrorism Activities 326
Subtitle C—Education and Training 327
Section 521—Repeal of Limitation on Amount of Financial Assistance Under Reserve Officers' Training Corps Scholarship Programs 327
Section 522—Increased Enrollment for Eligible Defense Industry Employees in the Defense Product Development Program at Naval Postgraduate School 327
Section 523—Payment of Expenses to Obtain Professional Credentials .. 327
Section 524—Authority for National Defense University Award of Degree of Master of Science in Joint Campaign Planning and Strategy .. 327
Section 525—One-year Extension of Authority to Use Appropriated Funds to Provide Recognition Items for Recruitment and Retention of Certain Reserve Component Personnel 328
Section 526—Report on Rationale and Plans of the Navy to Provide Enlisted Members an Opportunity to Obtain Graduate Degrees 328
Section 527—Increase in Annual Limit on Number of Reserve Officers' Training Corps Scholarships Under Army Reserve and National Guard Program 328
Section 528—CAPSTONE Overseas Field Studies Trips to People's Republic of China and Republic of China on Taiwan 328
Section 529—Sense of Congress Concerning Establishment of National College of Homeland Security 328
Subtitle D—General Service Requirements 329
Section 531—Uniform Enlistment Standards for the Armed Forces 329
Section 532—Increase in Maximum Term of Original Enlistment in Regular Component 329
Section 533—Members Completing Statutory Initial Military Service Obligation 329
Section 534—Extension of Qualifying Service for Initial Military Service Under National Call to Service Program 329
Subtitle E—Matters Relating to Casualties 329
Section 541—Requirement for Members of the Armed Forces to Designate a Person to be Authorized to Direct the Disposition of the Member's Remains 329

Page

Section 542—Enhanced Program of Casualty Assistance Officers and Seriously Injured/III Assistance Officers 330
Section 543—Standards and Guidelines for Department of Defense Programs to Assist Wounded and Injured Members 331
Section 544—Authority for Members on Active Duty With Disabilities to Participate in Paralympic Games 331
Subtitle F—Military Justice and Legal Assistance Matters 331
Section 551—Clarification of Authority of Military Legal Assistance Counsel to Provide Military Legal Assistance Without Regard to Licensing Requirements 331
Section 552—Use of Teleconferencing in Administrative Sessions of Courts-Martial 331
Section 553—Extension of Statute of Limitations for Murder, Rape and Child Abuse Offenses Under the Uniform Code of Military Justice 332
Section 554—Offense of Stalking Under the Uniformed Code of Military Justice 332
Section 555—Rape, Sexual Assault, and Other Sexual Misconduct Under the Uniform Code of Military Justice 332
Subtitle G—Assistance to Local Educational Agencies for Defense Dependents Education 333
Section 561—Enrollment in Overseas Schools of Defense Dependents' Education System of Children of Citizens or Nationals of the United States Hired in Overseas Areas as Full-time Department of Defense Employees 333
Section 562—Assistance to Local Educational Agencies That Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees 333
Section 563—Continuation of Impact Aid Assistance on Behalf of Dependents of Certain Members Despite Change in Status of Member ... 333
Subtitle H—Decorations and Awards 333
Section 565—Cold War Victory Medal 333
Section 566—Establishment of Combat Medevac Badge 334
Section 567—Eligibility for Operation Enduring Freedom Campaign Medal 334
Subtitle I—Other Matters 334
Section 571—Extension of Waiver Authority of Secretary of Education With Respect to Student Financial Assistance During a War or Other Military Operation or National Emergency 334
Section 572—Adoption Leave for Members of the Armed Forces Adopting Children 334
Section 573—Report on Need for a Personnel Plan for Linguists in the Armed Forces 334
Section 574—Ground Combat and Other Exclusion Policies 335
TITLE VI—COMPENSATIONS AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS 335
OVERVIEW 335
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 335
Defense Commissary Agency Produce Procurement Test 335
Hooked-on-Fishing/Not-on-Drugs Pilot Program 336
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 336
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 336
Section 601—Increase in Basic Pay for Fiscal Year 2006 336
Section 602—Additional Pay for Permanent Military Professors at United States Naval Academy with Over 36 Years Service 337
Section 603—Basic Pay Rates for Reserve Component Members Selected to Attend Military Service Academy Preparatory Schools 337
Section 604—Clarification of Restriction on Compensation for Correspondence Courses 337
Section 605—Permanent Authority for Supplemental Subsistence Allowance for Low-Income Members With Dependents 337
Section 606—Basic Allowance for Housing for Reserve Members 337
Section 607—Overseas Cost of Living Allowance 337
Section 608—Income Replacement Payments for Reserves Experiencing Extended and Frequent Mobilization for Active Duty Service 338
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special Incentive Pays 338
Section 611—Extension or Resumption of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces 338

Page

Section 612—Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Certain Health Care Professionals 338
Section 613—Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers 339
Section 614—One-year Extension of Other Bonus and Special Pay Authorities 339
Section 615—Expansion of Eligibility of Dental Officers for Additional Special Pay 339
Section 616—Increase in Maximum Monthly Rate Authorized for Hardship Duty Pay 339
Section 617—Flexible Payment of Assignment Incentive Pay 339
Section 618—Active-Duty Reenlistment Bonus 339
Section 619—Reenlistment Bonus for Members of Selected Reserve 339
Section 620—Combination of Affiliation and Accession Bonuses for Service in the Selected Reserve 339
Section 621—Eligibility Requirement for Prior Service Enlistment Bonus 340
Section 622—Increase in Authorized Maximum Amount of Enlistment Bonus 340
Section 623—Discretion of Secretary of Defense to Authorize Retroactive Hostile Fire and Imminent Danger Pay 340
Section 624—Increase in Maximum Bonus Amount for Nuclear-Qualified Officers Extending Period of Active Duty 340
Section 625—Increase in Maximum Amount of Nuclear Career Annual Incentive Bonus for Nuclear-Qualified Officers Trained While Serving as Enlisted Members 340
Section 626-Uniform Payment of Foreign Language Proficiency Pay to Eligible Reserve Component Members and Regular Component Members 340
Section 627—Retention Bonus for Members Qualified in Certain Critical Skills or Satisfying Other Eligibility Criteria 340
Section 628—Availability of Critical-Skills Accession Bonus for Persons Enrolled in Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps Who are Obtaining Nursing Degrees 341
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowance 341
Section 641—Authorized Absences of Members for Which Lodging Expenses at Temporary Duty Location May Be Paid 341
Section 642—Extended Period for Selection of Home for Travel and Transportation Allowances for Dependents of Deceased Member 341
Section 643—Transportation of Family Members Incident to Repatriation of Members Held Captive 341
Section 644—Increased Weight Allowances for Shipment of Household Goods of Senior Noncommissioned Officers 341
Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivors Benefits 342
Section 651—Monthly Disbursement to States of State Income Tax Withheld From Retired or Retainer Pay 342
Section 652—Revision to Eligibility for Nonregular Service Retirement After Establishing Eligibility for Regular Retirement 342
Section 653—Denial of Military Funeral Honors in Certain Cases 342
Section 654—Child Support for Certain Minor Children of Retirement-Eligible Members Convicted of Domestic Violence Resulting in Death of Child's Other Parent 342
Section 655—Concurrent Receipt of Veterans Disability Compensation and Military Retired Pay 342
Section 656—Military Survivor Benefit Plan Beneficiaries Under Insurable Interest Coverage 343
Subtitle E—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits 343
Section 661—Increase in Authorized Level of Supplies and Services Procurement From Overseas Exchange Stores 343
Section 662—Requirements for Private Operation of Commissary Store Functions 343
Section 663—Provision of Information Technology Services for Accommodations Provided by Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities for Wounded Members of the Armed Forces and Their Families 343
Section 664—Provision of and Payment for Overseas Transportation Services for Commissary and Exchange Supplies 343

Page

Section 665—Compensatory Time Off for Certain Nonappropriated Fund Employees ... 344
Subtitle F—Other Matters ... 344
Section 671—Inclusion of Senior Enlisted Advisor for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Among Senior Enlisted Members of the Armed Forces ... 344
Section 672—Special and Incentive Pays Considered for Saved Pay Upon Appointment of Members as Officers ... 344
Section 673—Repayment of Unearned Portion of Bonuses, Special Pays, and Educational Benefits ... 344
Section 674—Leave Accrual for Members Assigned to Deployable Ships or Mobile Units or to Other Designated Duty ... 345
Section 675—Army Recruiting Pilot Program to Encourage Members of the Army to Refer Other Persons for Enlistment ... 345
Section 676—Special Compensation for Reserve Component Members Who Are Also Tobacco Farmers Adversely Affected by Terms of Tobacco Quota Buyout ... 345
TITLE VII—HEALTHCARE ... 345
OVERVIEW ... 345
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 346
Comptroller General Study of the Viability of TRICARE Standard ... 346
Cooperative Activities on Post Traumatic Stress Disorder ... 346
Dental Readiness of the Reserve Components ... 347
Depleted Uranium ... 348
Eligibility for the Reimbursement of Travel Expenses Incurred as a Result of Referral for Medical Specialty Care ... 348
Non-Monetary Benefits Package for the President of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences ... 348
Respiratory Therapists to Serve as Commissioned Officers ... 349
Review of TRICARE Policy Regarding Treatment of Other Health Insurance ... 349
Review of TRICARE Reimbursement Rates for Obstetrics, Gynecology, Pediatrics and Mental Health ... 349
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 350
Subtitle A—TRICARE Program Improvements ... 350
Section 701—Services of Mental Health Counselors ... 350
Section 702—Additional Information Required by Surveys on TRICARE Standard ... 350
Section 703—Enhancement of TRICARE Coverage for Members Who Commit to Continued Service in the Selected Reserve ... 350
Section 704—Study and Plan Relating to Chiropractic Health Care Services ... 351
Section 705—Surviving-Dependent Eligibility Under TRICARE Dental Plan for Surviving Spouses Who Were on Active Duty at Time of Death of Military Spouse ... 352
Section 706—Exceptional Eligibility for TRICARE Prime Remote ... 352
Subtitle B—Other Matters ... 352
Section 711—Authority to Relocate Patient Safety Center; Renaming MedTeams Program ... 352
Section 712—Modification of Health Care Quality Information and Technology Enhancement Reporting Requirement ... 352
Section 713—Correction to Eligibility of Certain Reserve Officers for Military Health Care Pending Active Duty Following Commissioning 353
Section 714—Prohibition on Conversions of Military Medical Positions to Civilian Medical Positions Until Submission of Certification ... 353
Section 715—Clarification of Inclusion of Dental Care in Medical Readiness Tracking and Health Surveillance Program ... 353
Section 716—Cooperative Outreach to Members and Former Members of the Naval Service Exposed to Environmental Factors Related to Sarcoidosis ... 354
Section 717—Early Identification and Treatment of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Disorders ... 354
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS ... 354
OVERVIEW ... 354
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 356
Program Cost Increases ... 356

Page

Procurement of Ball and Roller Bearings 356
Report on Defense Ethics Programs 357
Requirements Identification 357
Use of Streamlined Acquisition Procedures 357
Utilization of Rapid Acquisition Authority 358
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 358
Subtitle A—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs ... 358
Section 801—Requirement for Certification By Secretary of Defense Before Major Defense Acquisition Program May Proceed to Milestone B 358
Section 802—Requirement for Analysis of Alternatives to Major Defense Acquisition Programs 359
Section 803—Authority for Secretary of Defense to Revise Baseline for Major Defense Acquisition Programs 360
Subtitle B—Acquisition Policy and Management 360
Section 811—Applicability of Statutory Executive Compensation Cap Made Prospective 360
Section 812—Use of Commercially Available Online Services for Federal Procurement of Commercial Items 361
Section 813—Contingency Contracting Corps 361
Section 814—Requirement for Contracting Operations To Be Included in Interagency Planning Related to Stabilization and Reconstruction . 362
Section 815—Statement of Policy and Report Relating To Contracting With Employers of Persons With Disabilities 362
Section 816—Study on Department of Defense Contracting With Small Business Concerns Owned and Controlled by Service-Disabled Veterans 363
Section 817—Prohibition on Procurement From Beneficiaries of Foreign Subsidies 363
Subtitle C—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures and Limitations 363
Section 821—Increased Flexibility for Designation of Critical Acquisition Positions in Defense Acquisition Workforce 363
Section 822—Participation by Department Of Defense in Acquisition Workforce Training Fund 364
Section 823—Increase In Cost Accounting Standard Threshold 364
Section 824—Amendments to Domestic Source Requirements Relating to Clothing Materials and Components Covered 364
Section 825—Rapid Acquisition Authority to Respond to Defense Intelligence Community Emergencies 364
TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT 365
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 365
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management 365
Section 901—Restoration of Parity in Pay Levels Among Under Secretary Positions 365
Section 902—Eligibility Criteria for Director of Department of Defense Test Resource Management Center 365
Section 903—Consolidation and Standardization of Authorities Relating to Department of Defense Regional Centers for Security Studies 365
Section 904—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps 366
Subtitle B—Space Activities 366
Section 911—Space Situational Awareness Strategy 366
Section 912—Military Satellite Communications 366
Section 913—Operationally Responsive Space 366
Subtitle C—Chemical Demilitarization Program 367
Section 921—Transfer to Secretary of the Army of Responsibility for Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives Program 367
Section 922—Clarification of Cooperative Agreement Authority Under Chemical Demilitarization Program 368
Subtitle D—Intelligence Related Matters 368
Section 931—Department of Defense Strategy for Open-Source Intelligence 368
Section 932—Comprehensive Inventory of Department of Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-Related Programs and Projects 368
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS 369

Page

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 369
Counter-Drug Activities 369
Overview 369
Items of Special Interest 369
Air Force tanker support 369
Budget requests 370
International support 370
Joint Task Force North 370
Naval Reserve support 371
PACOM operations support 371
Participating nation support 371
Report on Department of Defense role in Afghanistan 371
Southwest Border fence 372
Support to National Security Agency 372
Financial Matters 373
Congressional Budget Justification Material 373
Other Activities 373
Civilian Casualties 373
Counter Terrorism Surveillance Technologies 373
Emergency Response Coordination 374
Homeland Defense and Homeland Security 374
Report on Casualties and Damage Caused by Improvised Explosive Devices 375
Separation and Coordination of Information Operations and Public Affairs 375
Update Future Years Defense Program-Modify Strategic Forces Major Force Program to Reflect New Triad 376
Update to and Guidance for the National Security Strategy 376
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 377
Subtitle A—Financial Matters 377
Section 1001—Transfer Authority 377
Section 1002—Authorizations of Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2005 377
Section 1003—Increase in Fiscal Year 2005 General Transfer Authority 377
Section 1004—Reports on Feasibility and Desirability of Capital Budgeting for Major Defense Acquisition Programs 377
Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards 377
Section 1011—Conveyance, Navy Drydock, Seattle, Washington 377
Section 1012—Conveyance, Navy Drydock, Jacksonville, Florida 377
Section 1013—Conveyance, Navy Drydock, Port Arthur, Texas 378
Section 1014—Transfer of USS Iowa 378
Section 1015—Transfer of Ex-USS Forrest Sherman 378
Section 1016—Limitation on Leasing of Foreign-Built Vessels 378
Subtitle C—Counter-drug Activities 378
Section 1021—Extension of Department of Defense Authority to Support Counter-Drug Civilities 378
Section 1022—Resumption of Reporting Requirement Regarding Department of Defense Expenditures to Support Foreign Counter-Drug Activities 379
Section 1023—Clarification of Authority for Joint Task Forces to Support Law Enforcement Agencies Conduction Counter-Terrorism Activities 379
Subtitle D—Matters Relating to Homeland Security 379
Section 1031—Responsibilities of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense Relating to Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Emergency Response 379
Section 1032—Testing of Preparedness for Emergencies Involving Nuclear, Radiological, Chemical, Biological, and High-Yield Explosives Weapons 379
Section 1033—Department of Defense Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and High-Yield Explosives Response Teams 380
Section 1034—Repeal of Department of Defense Emergency Response Assistance Program 380
Subtitle E—Other Matters 380
Section 1041—Commission on the Long-Term Implementation of the New Strategic Posture of the United States 380

Page

Section 1042—Reestablishment of EMP Commission 381
Section 1043—Modernization of Authority Relating to Security of Defense Property and Facilities 381
Section 1044—Revision of Department of Defense Counterintelligence Polygraph Program 381
Section 1045—Repeal of Requirement for Report to Congress Regarding Global Strike Capability 382
Section 1046—Technical, Clerical, and Conforming Amendments 382
Section 1047—Deletion of Obsolete Definitions in Titles 10 and 32, United States Code 382

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL 382
OVERVIEW 382
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 383
Section 1101—Extension of Eligibility to Continue Federal Employee Health Benefits 383
Section 1102—Extension of Department of Defense Voluntary Reduction in Force Authority 383
Section 1103—Extension of Authority to Make Lump Sum Severance Payments 383
Section 1104—Authority for Heads of Agencies to Allow Shorter Length of Required Service by Federal Employees After Completion of Training 383
Section 1105—Authority to Waive Annual Limitation on Total Compensation Paid to Federal Civilian Employees 384
Section 1106—Transportation of Family Members Incident to Repatriation of Federal Employees Held Captive 384
Section 1107—Permanent Extension of Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation Defense Scholarship Program 384

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS 384
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 384
Annual Report on Threat Posed to the United States by Weapons of Mass Destruction, Ballistic Missiles, and Cruise Missiles 384
Report on Implementation of the American Servicemembers' Protection Act 385
Report on Military and Defense Aspects of the Proliferation Security Initiative 385
Security and Stabilization Assistance 386
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 386
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training 386
Section 1201—Extension of Humanitarian and Civic Assistance Provided to Host Nations in Conjunction with Military Operations 386
Section 1202—Commanders' Emergency Response Program 386
Section 1203—Military Educational Exchanges Between Senior Officers and Officials of the United States and Taiwan 387
Section 1204—Modification of Geographic Restriction Under Bilateral and Regional Cooperation Programs for Payment of Certain Expenses of Defense Personnel of Developing Countries 387
Section 1205—Authority for Department of Defense to Enter Into Acquisition and Cross-servicing Agreements With Regional Organizations of Which the United States is not a Member 388
Section 1206—Two-Year Extension of Authority for Payment of Certain Administrative Services and Support for Coalition Liaison Officers 388
Subtitle B—Nonproliferation Matters and Countries of Concern 388
Section 1211—Report on Acquisition by Iran of Nuclear Weapons 388
Section 1212—Procurement Sanction Against Foreign Persons that Transfer Certain Defense Articles and Services to the People's Republic of China 389
Section 1213—Prohibition on Procurements From Communist Chinese Military Companies 390
Subtitle C—Other Matters 390
Section 1221—Purchase of Weapons Overseas for Force Protection Purposes 390
Section 1222—Requirement for Establishment of Certain Criteria Applicable to On-Going Global Posture Review 390

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION 391

Page

OVERVIEW 391
Funding Overview 391
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST 391
Border Security 391
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 392
Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds 392
Section 1302—Funding Allocations 392
Section 1303—Authority to Obligate Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation Prevention Funds for Nuclear Weapons Storage Security 393
Section 1304—Extension of Limited Waiver of Restrictions on Use of Funds for Threat Reduction in States of the Former Soviet Union 393
Section 1305—Report on Elimination of Impediments to Nuclear Threat-Reduction and Non-Proliferation Programs in the Russian Federation 393

TITLE XIV—CONTRACT DISPUTE ENHANCEMENT 394
OVERVIEW 394
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 394
Subtitle A—General Provisions 394
Section 1411—Definitions 394
Subtitle B—Establishment of Civilian and Defense Boards of Contract Appeals 394
Section 1421—Establishment 394
Section 1422—Membership 395
Section 1423—Chairmen 395
Section 1424—Rulemaking Authority 396
Section 1425—Authorization of Appropriations 396
Subtitle C—Functions of Defense and Civilian Boards of Contract Appeals 396
Section 1431—Contract Disputes 396
Section 1432—Enhanced Access for Small Business 396
Section 1433—Applicability to Certain Contracts 396
Subtitle D—Transfers and Transition, Savings, and Conforming Provisions 397
Section 1441—Transfer and Allocation of Appropriations and Personnel 397
Section 1442—Terminations and Savings Provisions 397
Section 1443—Contract Disputes Authority of Boards 397
Section 1444—References to Agency Boards of Contract Appeals 397
Section 1445—Conforming Amendments 397
Subtitle E—Effective Date; Regulations and Appointment of Chairmen 398
Section 1451—Effective Date 398
Section 1452—Regulations 398
Section 1453—Appointment of Chairmen of Defense Board and Civilian Board 398

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF INCREASED COSTS DUE TO OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM 398
OVERVIEW 398
SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATIONS 398
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 405
Budget Realignment 405
Procurement 405
Operations and Maintenance 405
Military Personnel 406
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 406
Subtitle A—General Increases 406
Section 1501—Purpose 406
Section 1502—Army Procurement 406
Section 1503—Navy and Marine Corps Procurement 406
Section 1504—Defense-Wide Activities Procurement 406
Section 1505—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide Activities 406
Section 1506—Operation and Maintenance 406
Section 1507—Defense Working Capital Funds 406
Section 1508—Defense Health Program 406
Section 1509—Military Personnel 407
Section 1510—Iraq Freedom Fund 407

Page
Section 1511—Classified Programs 407
Section 1512—Treatment as Additional Authorization 407
Section 1513—Transfer Authority 407
Section 1514—Availability of Funds 407
Subtitle B—Personnel Provisions 407
Section 1521—Increase in Active Army and Marine Corps Strength Levels 407
Section 1522—Additional Authority for Increases of Army and Marine Corps Active Duty End Strengths for Fiscal Years 2007 Through 2009 407
Section 1523—Military Death Gratuity Enhancement 408
Section 1524—Permanent Prohibition Against Requiring Certain Injured Members to Pay for Meals Provided by Military Treatment Facilities 408
Section 1525—Permanent Authority To Provide Travel and Transportation Allowances for Dependents to Visit Hospitalized Members Injured in Combat Operation or Combat Zone 408
Section 1526—Permanent Increase in Length of Time Dependents of Certain Deceased Members May Continue to Occupy Military Family Housing or Receive Basic Allowance for Housing 409
Section 1527—Availability of Special Pay for Members During Rehabilitation From Combat-Related Injuries 409
Section 1528—Allowance to Cover Monthly Deduction From Basic Pay for Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance Coverage for Members Serving in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom 409
Subtitle C—Matters Involving Support Provided by Foreign Nations 410
Section 1531—Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations 410
TITLE XVI—CONTRACTORS ON THE BATTLEFIELD REGULATORY ACT 410
OVERVIEW 410
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 410
Section 1601—Short Title 410
Section 1602—Findings 410
Section 1603—Definitions 411
Section 1604—Requirements for Commanders of Combatant Commands Relating to Contractors Accompanying and Not Accompanying the Force 411
Section 1605—Requirements for Contractors Relating to Possession of Weapons 412
Section 1606—Battlefield Accountability 412
DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS 413
PURPOSE 413
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW 413
TITLE XXI—ARMY 431
SUMMARY 431
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST 431
Planning and Design 431
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 431
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 431
Section 2102—Family Housing 431
Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 431
Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army 432
Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2004 Projects 432
TITLE XXII—NAVY 432
SUMMARY 432
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST 433
Planning and Design 433
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 433
Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 433
Section 2202—Family Housing 433
Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 433
Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy 433

Page

Section 2205—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2004 Projects 433
Section 2206—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2005 Projects 433

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE 434
SUMMARY 434
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST 434
Planning and Design 434
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 435
Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 435
Section 2302—Family Housing 435
Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 435
Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force 435

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES 435
SUMMARY 435
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 436
Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 436
Section 2402—Energy Conservation Projects 436
Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies 436

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM 436
SUMMARY 436
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 436
Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 436
Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO 437

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES 437
SUMMARY 437
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 437
Planning and Design, Army National Guard 437
Planning and Design, Air National Guard 437
Planning and Design, Army Reserve 438
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 438
Section 2601—Authorized Guard and Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 438

TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS 438
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 438
Section 2701—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law 438
Section 2702—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2003 Projects 438
Section 2703—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2002 Projects 439
Section 2704—Effective Date 439

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS 439
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 439
Alternative Methods of Providing Access to Fitness Facilities for Service Members and Dependents 439
Employment and Training Programs to Assist Communities Affected by Base Realignment and Closure Actions 440
Facilities-Related Reporting Requirements 440
Facility Projects During the Base Realignment and Closure Process 441
Inclusion of Analysis of Excess Capacity at Military Medical Facilities in GAO Report on DOD's Process and Recommendations for the 2005 BRAC Round 441
Medical Treatment Facility Construction 442
Use of Authorities to Privatize Unaccompanied Housing 443
Use of Electronic Marking Systems to Document Underground Infrastructure Systems 443
Use of Temporary Facilities to Support Long-Term Military Requirements 443
Utilities Privatization 444
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 445

Page

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes 445
Section 2801—Modification of Congressional Notification Requirements for Certain Military Construction Activities 445
Section 2802—Improve Availability and Timeliness of Department of Defense Information Regarding Military Construction and Family Housing Accounts and Activities 445
Section 2803—Expansion of Authority to Convey Property at Military Installations to Support Military Construction 446
Section 2804—Effect of Failure to Submit Required Report on Need for General and Flag Officers Quarters in National Capital Region 446
Section 2805—One-Year Extension of Temporary, Limited Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects Outside the United States 446
Section 2806—Clarification of Moratorium on Certain Improvements at Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico 447
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration 447
Section 2811—Consolidation of Department of Defense Land Acquisition Authorities and Limitations on Use of Such Authorities 447
Section 2812—Report on Use of Utility System Conveyance Authority and Temporary Suspension of Authority Pending Report 447
Section 2813—Authorized Military Uses of Papago Park Military Reservation, Phoenix, Arizona 448
Subtitle C—Base Closure and Realignment 448
Section 2821—Additional Reporting Requirements Regarding Base Closure Process and Use of Department of Defense Base Closure Accounts 448
Section 2822—Termination of Project Authorizations for Military Installations Approved for Closure in 2005 Round of Base Realignments and Closures 448
Section 2823—Expanded Availability of Adjustment and Diversification Assistance for Communities Adversely Affected by Mission Realignments in Base Closure Process 448
Section 2824—Sense of Congress Regarding Consideration of National Defense Industrial Base Interests During Base Closure and Realignment Commission Review of Department of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Recommendations 448
Subtitle D—Land Conveyances 449
Part I—Army Conveyances 449
Section 2831—Modification of Land Conveyance, Engineer Proving Ground, Fort Belvoir, Virginia 449
Section 2832—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Bothell, Washington 449
Part II—Navy Conveyances 449
Section 2841—Land Conveyance, Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar, San Diego, California 449
Part III—Air Force Conveyances 449
Section 2851—Purchase of Build-To-Lease Family Housing, Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska 449
Section 2852—Land Conveyance, Air Force Property, Jacksonville, Arkansas 449
Subtitle E—Other Matters 450
Section 2861—Lease Authority, Army Heritage and Education Center, Carlisle, Pennsylvania 450
Section 2862—Redesignation of McEntire Air National Guard Station, South Carolina, as McEntire Joint National Guard Base 450
Section 2863—Assessment of Water Needs for Presidio of Monterey and Ord Military Community 450

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 450

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 450
OVERVIEW 450
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 463
National Nuclear Security Administration 463
Overview 463
Weapons Activities 463

Page
Directed Stockpile Work ... 463
Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator ... 463
Reliable Replacement Warhead Program ... 463
Stockpile Stewardship Campaigns ... 465
Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities ... 467
Environmental Projects and Operations ... 467
Safeguards and Security ... 468
National Nuclear Security Administration Advisory Committee ... 469
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation ... 469
Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development ... 469
International Materials Protection and Cooperation ... 470
Elimination of Weapons Grade Plutonium Production ... 470
Mixed Oxide Fuel Facility ... 470
Thorium Fuel Project ... 471
Global Threat Reduction Initiative ... 472
Environmental and Other Defense Activities ... 473
Overview ... 473
Environmental Management Authority Transfer ... 473
Hanford Defense Site Acceleration Completion Activities ... 473
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal ... 474
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 475
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations ... 475
Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration ... 475
Section 3102—Defense Environmental Management ... 475
Section 3103—Other Defense Activities ... 475
Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal ... 475
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations ... 475
Section 3111—Reliable Replacement Warhead Program ... 475
Section 3112—Report on Assistance for Comprehensive Inventory of Russian Nonstrategic Nuclear Weapons ... 475
TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD ... 476
OVERVIEW ... 476
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 476
Waste Treatment Plant ... 476
LEGISLATIVE PROVISION ... 476
Section 3201—Authorization ... 476
TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE ... 476
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 476
Sale of Strategic and Critical Materials ... 476
LEGISLATIVE PROVISION ... 477
Section 3301—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds ... 477
Section 3302—Revisions of Fiscal Year 1999 Authority to Dispose of Certain Materials in the National Defense Stockpile ... 477
Section 3303—Revision of Fiscal Year 2000 Authority to Dispose of Certain Materials in the National Defense Stockpile ... 477
TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES ... 477
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 477
Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations ... 477
TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION ... 477
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 477
Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for Maritime Administration for Fiscal Year 2006 ... 477
Section 3502—Payments for State and Regional Maritime Academies ... 478
Section 3503—Improvements to the Maintenance and Repair Reimbursement Pilot Program ... 478
Section 3504—Tank Vessel Construction Assistance ... 479
Section 3505—Improvements to the Maritime Administration Vessel Disposal Program ... 479
Departmental Data ... 480
Department of Defense Authorization Request ... 480
Committee Position ... 481
Communications From Other Committees ... 481
Fiscal Data ... 491
Congressional Budget Office Estimate ... 491
Committee Cost Estimate ... 491
Oversight Findings ... 492

Page

General Performance Goals and Objectives 492
Constitutional Authority Statement 493
Statement of Federal Mandates 493
Roll Call Votes 494
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported 503
Additional Views 504
Additional views of Ike Skelton, Lane Evans, John Spratt, Marty Meehan, Loretta Sanchez, Silvestre Reyes, Jim Cooper, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Jim Langevin, Steve Israel, Tim Ryan, Ellen O. Tauscher, Neil Abercrombie, Adam Smith, Robert A. Brady, Vic Snyder, Rick Larsen, Mark E. Udall, Susan A. Davis, Solomon P. Ortiz, Kendrick B. Meek, Mike McIntyre, Robert E. Andrews, G.K. Butterfield, Gene Taylor 504
Additional views of Ike Skelton, Vic Snyder, John Spratt, Silvestre Reyes, Loretta Sanchez, Ellen O. Tauscher, Rick Larsen, Lane Evans, Dan Boren, Kendrick B. Meek, Jim Cooper, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Jim Langevin, Steve Israel, Marty Meehan, Neil Abercrombie, Adam Smith, Robert A. Brady, Mark E. Udall, Susan A. Davis, Solomon P. Ortiz, Tim Ryan, Robert E. Andrews, G.K. Butterfield 508
Additional views of Ike Skelton, Silvestre Reyes, John Spratt, Loretta Sanchez, Ellen O. Tauscher, Marty Meehan, Neil Abercrombie, Tim Ryan, Kendrick B. Meek, Adam Smith, Robert A. Brady, Vic Snyder, Rick Larsen, Robert E. Andrews, Lane Evans, Jim Langevin, Steve Israel, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Mark E. Udall, Susan A. Davis, Solomon P. Ortiz, Gene Taylor, G.K. Butterfield 511
Additional views of Terry Everett, Curt Weldon, and Mike D. Rogers 515
Additional views of John M. Spratt, Jr. 516
Additional views of Jim Gibbons 518
Additional views of K. Michael Conaway 519
Additional views of Susan A. Davis 521
Dissenting views of Cynthia McKinney 522

109TH CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
109–89

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

MAY 20, 2005.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL AND DISSENTING VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 1815]

[Includes committee cost estimate]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 1815) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

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

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

EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute during the consideration of H.R. 1815. The title of the bill is amended to reflect the amendment to the text of the bill. The remainder of the report discusses the bill, as amended.

PURPOSE

The bill would—(1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for procurement and for research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2006: (a) the personnel strength for each active duty component of the military departments; (b) the personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each reserve component of the armed forces; (c) the military training student loads for each of the active and reserve components of the military departments; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize emergency appropriations for increased costs due to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom; (7) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (8) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (9) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for the Maritime Administration.

RELATIONSHIP OF AUTHORIZATION TO APPROPRIATIONS

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

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

SUMMARY OF AUTHORIZATION IN THE BILL

The President requested budget authority of $441.8 billion for the national defense budget function for fiscal year 2006. Of this amount, the President requested $421.1 billion for the Department of Defense, including $12.1 billion for military construction and family housing. The defense budget request for fiscal year 2006 also included $16.4 billion for Department of Energy national security programs and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The committee recommends an overall level of $441.6 billion in budget authority. This amount represents an increase of approximately $19.5 billion from the amount authorized for appropriation by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375).

In addition, the committee recommends $49.1 billion in budget authority for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2006, in addition to amounts otherwise authorized by this Act, to provide funds for additional costs due to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATIONS

The defense authorization act provides authorization for appropriations but does not generally provide budget authority. Budget authority is provided in appropriations acts. In order to relate the recommendations to the budget resolution, matters in addition to the dollar authorizations contained in this bill must be taken into account. A number of programs in the national defense function are authorized in other legislation. The following table summarizes authorizations included in the bill for fiscal year 2006 and, in addition, summarizes the implications of the committee action for the budget authority totals for national defense (budget function 050).

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	FY 2006 Budget Authority Request	Committee Authorization Change	Committee Budget Authority Change	Committee Authorization Recommendation	Committee Budget Authority Recommendation
PROCUREMENT						
Aircraft Procurement, Army	2,800,880	2,800,880	60,500		2,861,380	2,861,380
Missile Procurement, Army	1,270,850	1,270,850	(27,931)		1,242,919	1,242,919
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,660,149	1,660,149	(58,171)		1,601,978	1,601,978
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,720,872	1,720,872	29,900		1,750,772	1,750,772
Other Procurement, Army	4,302,634	4,302,634	(259,345)		4,043,289	4,043,289
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	10,517,126	10,517,126	(474,600)		10,042,526	10,042,526
Weapons Procurement, Navy	2,707,841	2,707,841	67,200		2,775,041	2,775,041
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	872,849	872,849	(3,079)		869,770	869,770
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	8,721,165	8,721,165	2,058,608	18,000	10,779,773	10,797,773
Other Procurement, Navy	5,487,818	5,487,818	146,500		5,634,318	5,634,318
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,377,705	1,377,705	29,900		1,407,605	1,407,605
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	11,973,933	11,973,933	819,823		12,793,756	12,793,756
Missile Procurement, Air Force	5,490,287	5,490,287			5,490,287	5,490,287
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	1,031,207	1,031,207			1,031,207	1,031,207
Other Procurement, Air Force	14,002,689	14,002,689	66,100		14,068,789	14,068,789
Procurement, Defense-wide	2,677,832	2,677,832	37,614		2,715,446	2,715,446
Defense Production Act Purchases		19,573				19,573
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction	1,405,827	1,405,827	(1,405,827)			
Total Procurement	**78,021,664**	**78,041,237**	**1,087,192**	**18,000**	**79,108,856**	**79,146,429**
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION						
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	9,733,824	9,733,824	43,548		9,777,372	9,777,372
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	18,037,991	18,037,991	(15,851)		18,022,140	18,022,140
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	22,612,351	22,612,351	(204,139)		22,408,212	22,408,212
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	18,803,416	18,803,416	289,389		19,092,805	19,092,805
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	168,458	168,458			168,458	168,458
Total Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	**69,356,040**	**69,356,040**	**112,947**		**69,468,987**	**69,468,987**
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE						
Operation and Maintenance, Army	25,316,595	25,316,595	(932,722)		24,383,873	24,383,873
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	30,759,889	30,759,889	(447,153)		30,312,736	30,312,736

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	FY 2006 Budget Authority Request	Committee Authorization Change	Committee Budget Authority Change	Committee Authorization Recommendation	Committee Budget Authority Recommendation
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	3,804,926	3,804,926	(173,649)		3,631,277	3,631,277
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	31,521,136	31,521,136	(962,001)		30,559,135	30,559,135
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	18,453,469	18,453,469	(77,688)		18,375,781	18,375,781
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,987,382	1,987,382	10,900		1,998,282	1,998,282
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,245,695	1,245,695			1,245,695	1,245,695
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	199,934	199,934	7,500		207,434	207,434
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	2,501,686	2,501,686			2,501,686	2,501,686
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	4,509,719	4,509,719	11,400		4,521,119	4,521,119
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	4,724,091	4,724,091	3,000		4,727,091	4,727,091
Transfer Accounts	1,369,689	1,369,689			1,369,689	1,369,689
Miscellaneous Appropriations	508,331	508,331			508,331	508,331
Total Operation and Maintenance	**126,902,542**	**126,902,542**	**(2,560,413)**		**124,342,129**	**124,342,129**
OTHER PROGRAMS						
Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense	895,741	895,741			895,741	895,741
Defense Health Program	19,791,612	19,791,612	(35,418)		19,756,194	19,756,194
Office of the Inspector General	209,687	209,687	(35,200)		174,487	174,487
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense			1,405,827		1,405,827	1,405,827
National Security Education Trust Fund						
Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery		1,000		(1,000)		
Allowances - Travel Cards				45,000		45,000
Disposal of DoD Real Property		15,000				15,000
Lease of DoD Real Property		12,000				12,000
Total Other Programs	**20,897,040**	**20,925,040**	**1,335,209**	**44,000**	**22,232,249**	**22,304,249**
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS						
Defense Working Capital Funds - Services and Defense-wide	316,340	316,340			316,340	316,340
Defense Working Capital Funds - DECA	1,155,000	1,155,000			1,155,000	1,155,000
National Defense Sealift Fund	1,648,504	1,648,504	48,519		1,697,023	1,697,023
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund						
Armed Forces Retirement Home Fund	58,281				58,281	
Total Revolving and Management Funds	**3,178,125**	**3,119,844**	**48,519**		**3,226,644**	**3,168,363**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	FY 2006 Budget Authority Request	Committee Authorization Change	Committee Budget Authority Change	Committee Authorization Recommendation	Committee Budget Authority Recommendation
MILITARY PERSONNEL						
Total Military Personnel	**108,942,746**	**108,942,746**	**(118,454)**		**108,824,292**	**108,824,292**
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
Military Construction, Army	1,479,841	1,479,841	121,930		1,601,771	1,601,771
Military Construction, Navy	1,029,249	1,029,249	79,928		1,109,177	1,109,177
Military Construction, Air Force	1,069,640	1,069,640	101,698		1,171,338	1,171,338
Military Construction, Defense-wide	1,042,730	1,042,730	(66,066)		976,664	976,664
NATO Security Investment Program	206,858	206,858			206,858	206,858
Base Realignment and Closure II	377,827	377,827			377,827	377,827
Base Realignment and Closure IV	1,880,466	1,880,466	(310,000)		1,570,466	1,570,466
Military Construction, Army National Guard	327,012	327,012	83,612		410,624	410,624
Military Construction, Air National Guard	165,256	165,256	60,471		225,727	225,727
Military Construction, Army Reserve	106,077	106,077	32,348		138,425	138,425
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	45,226	45,226			45,226	45,226
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	79,260	79,260	31,587		110,847	110,847
Military Construction, Foreign Currency Fluctuations				65,000		65,000
Subtotal Military Construction	**7,809,442**	**7,809,442**	**135,508**	**65,000**	**7,944,950**	**8,009,950**
FAMILY HOUSING						
Family Housing Construction, Army	549,636	549,636			549,636	549,636
Family Housing Support, Army	812,993	812,993	(9,000)		803,993	803,993
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	218,942	218,942			218,942	218,942
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps	593,660	593,660	(5,000)		588,660	588,660
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	1,251,108	1,251,108	(14,888)		1,236,220	1,236,220
Family Housing Support, Air Force	766,939	766,939	(11,620)		755,319	755,319
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide	46,391	46,391			46,391	46,391
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund	2,500	2,500			2,500	2,500
Subtotal Family Housing	**4,242,169**	**4,242,169**	**(40,508)**		**4,201,661**	**4,201,661**
Total Military Construction and Family Housing	**12,051,611**	**12,051,611**	**95,000**	**65,000**	**12,146,611**	**12,211,611**
Subtotal Department of Defense - Discretionary	**419,349,768**	**419,339,060**		**127,000**	**419,349,768**	**419,466,060**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	FY 2006 Budget Authority Request	Committee Authorization Change	Committee Budget Authority Change	Committee Authorization Recommendation	Committee Budget Authority Recommendation
DoD MANDATORY PROGRAMS						
Concurrent Receipt Accrual Payment		2,343,000				2,343,000
Restoration of Rocky Mountain Arsenal		9,000		(3,000)		6,000
Allied Contributions and Cooperation Account		600,000		(25,000)		575,000
Trust Funds - Department of Defense		250,000		(3,000)		247,000
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund				(100,000)		(100,000)
Offsetting Receipts		(1,425,000)		180,000		(1,245,000)
Sec 321. Extension of authority to provide logistics support			*			
Sec 501. Reduction in time-in-grade requirements for retirement			*			
Sec 502. Reduction of requirement for voluntary officer retirement			*			
Sec 511. Testing and Licensing or Certification in MGIB-SR			*			
Sec 512. Modify educational assistance for reserves			*			
Sec 513. Dual-status technicians						
Sec 514. National Guard retirement			*			
Sec 527. Double number of ROTC Scholarships			*			
Sec. 605. Supplemental subsistence allowance						
Sec 628. Retroactive nursing student bonus			*			
Sec. 654. Court ordered child support from military retirement			*			
Sec 655. Modification of concurrent receipt for unemployables						
Sec 673. Repayment of unearned portions of bonuses			*			
Sec 701. Mental health counselors under Tricare			*			
Sec 713. Certain reserve component officers eligible for Tricare						
Sec 1011. Dry dock conveyance						
Sec 1012. Dry dock conveyance						
Sec 2804. Expansion of authority to exchange property at			12,000			
Sec 3303a. Revision of authority to dispose of certain materials			(12,000)			
Sec 3402b. Revision of authority to dispose of certain materials						
Subtotal Department of Defense - Mandatory		**1,777,000**		**49,000**		**1,826,000**
TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY (051)	**419,349,768**	**421,116,060**		**176,000**	**419,349,768**	**421,292,060**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	FY 2006 Budget Authority Request	Committee Authorization Change	Committee Budget Authority Change	Committee Authorization Recommendation	Committee Budget Authority Recommendation
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)						
National Nuclear Security Administration						
Weapons Activities	6,630,133	6,630,133	(174,389)		6,455,744	6,455,744
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,637,239	1,637,239	(122,000)		1,515,239	1,515,239
Naval Reactors	786,000	786,000			786,000	786,000
Office of the Administrator	343,869	343,869			343,869	343,869
Subtotal National Nuclear Security Administration	**9,397,241**	**9,397,241**	**(296,389)**		**9,100,852**	**9,100,852**
Environmental and Other Defense Activities						
Defense Site Acceleration Completion	5,183,713	5,183,713	296,389		5,480,102	5,480,102
Defense Environmental Services	831,331	831,331			831,331	831,331
Other Defense Activities	635,998	635,998			635,998	635,998
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	351,447	351,447			351,447	351,447
Subtotal Environmental and Other Defense Activities	**7,002,489**	**7,002,489**	**296,389**		**7,298,878**	**7,298,878**
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activates	**16,399,730**	**16,399,730**			**16,399,730**	**16,399,730**
OTHER ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS						
Energy Programs - Atomic energy defense activities	12,000	12,000			12,000	12,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	22,032	22,032			22,032	22,032
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program - Corps of Engineers		140,000				140,000
Subtotal Other Atomic Energy Defense Programs	**34,032**	**174,032**			**34,032**	**174,032**
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities - Discretionary	**16,433,762**	**16,573,762**			**16,433,762**	**16,573,762**
ATOMIC ENERGY MANDATORY PROGRAMS						
Energy Employees Illness Compensation Fund		760,000		(398,000)		362,000
Energy Employees Compensation - Administration		156,000		(65,000)		91,000
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities - Mandatory		**916,000**		**(463,000)**		**453,000**
TOTAL ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)	**16,433,762**	**17,489,762**		**(463,000)**	**16,433,762**	**17,026,762**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	FY 2006 Budget Authority Request	Committee Authorization Change	Committee Budget Authority Change	Committee Authorization Recommendation	Committee Budget Authority Recommendation
DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)						
Department of Homeland Security						
United States Coast Guard		340,000				340,000
Science and Technology - research, development, acquisitions		339,000				339,000
Administrative and Regional Operations		48,000				48,000
Subtotal Department of Homeland Security		**727,000**				**727,000**
Other Departments						
Department of Justice - salaries and expenses		1,600,000				1,600,000
General Administration - salaries and expenses		17,000				17,000
Department of Transportation - MARAD maritime security programs		156,000				156,000
Intelligence Community Management Account		337,844				337,844
National Science Foundation - research and related activities		68,000				68,000
Selective Service System - salaries and expenses		26,000				26,000
Subtotal Other Departments		**2,204,844**				**2,204,844**
Total Defense Related Activities - Discretionary		**2,931,844**				**2,931,844**
DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES MANDATORY PROGRAMS						
CIA Retirement & Disability		244,600				244,600
Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund		43,000		22,000		65,000
Total Defense Related Activities - Mandatory		**287,600**		**22,000**		**309,600**
TOTAL DEFENSE-RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)		**3,219,444**		**22,000**		**3,241,444**
Subtotal National Defense Function (050) - Discretionary	435,783,530	438,844,666		127,000	435,783,530	438,971,666
Subtotal National Defense Function (050) - Mandatory		2,980,600		(392,000)		2,588,600
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)	**435,783,530**	**441,825,266**		**(265,000)**	**435,783,530**	**441,560,266**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION FOR FY 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	FY 2006 Budget Authority Request	Committee Authorization Change	Committee Budget Authority Change	Committee Authorization Recommendation	Committee Budget Authority Recommendation
Title XV - EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS						
Procurement			3,371,798		3,371,798	3,371,798
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			75,000		75,000	75,000
Operation and Maintenance			30,186,386		30,186,386	30,186,386
Defense Working Capital Funds			1,700,000		1,700,000	1,700,000
Defense Health Program			846,000		846,000	846,000
Iraqi Freedom Fund			1,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000
Classified Programs			2,500,000		2,500,000	2,500,000
Military Personnel			9,390,010		9,390,010	9,390,010
Title XV Total			**49,069,193**		**49,069,193**	**49,069,193**

RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 recognizes the United States is a nation entering its fifth year in the global war on terrorism (GWOT). During that time, the sacrifices of the men and women of the United States armed forces have contributed to a number of critical victories. In the past year alone, the United States has witnessed democratically elected governments taking power in Afghanistan and Iraq, the swearing in of Iraq's first democratically elected assembly and cabinet in over thirty years, an Iraqi security force currently numbering over 160,000 and growing rapidly, plans to transition responsibility for internal security operations to the Iraqis by late 2005, and the capture of Abu Faraj al-Libbi, the alleged third most senior member of al Qaeda. While these developments are highly encouraging, the committee believes that the GWOT will be long and success will require a continuing national commitment.

The committee's top priority is ensuring that the men and women of the armed forces receive the best equipment, weapons systems, and training available to accomplish their mission. To that end, H.R. 1815 would address the structural obstacles that the Department of Defense (DOD) must overcome to expeditiously meet requirements established by combatant commanders engaged in continuing combat and post-conflict operations. While the committee is proud of the adaptability and resilience of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, it believes that more can be done to rapidly field the equipment and systems required to meet the needs of the 21st century military.

Military personnel

The committee continues to be concerned with the size of the force and recommends measures to ensure the size of our armed forces is sufficient to sustain our efforts in the GWOT. For fiscal year 2006, the committee recommends additional active duty growth of 30,000 in the Army and 4,000 in the Marine Corps above the budget request. These recommendations would bring the Army end strength to 512,400 and the Marine Corps to 179,000. In addition, the committee recommends providing the authority to the Secretary of Defense to grow the Army to a total force of 532,400 and the Marine Corps to 184,000.

Recognizing the continuing sacrifices of our armed forces, the committee recommends making permanent several wartime-related pay and benefits that were temporarily established in the recently enacted Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109–13). Principal among these wartime related measures is the increase in death gratuity to $100,000 and an expansion of travel authorizations for families of service members hospitalized in the United States.

Increasing costs of major procurement programs

The committee is deeply concerned with the skyrocketing costs of weapon systems that cannot be explained by inflation or by reduced economies of scale. In many instances, these increases result from the addition of costly, and often unneeded, requirements to

the Department's most expensive platforms. To affect the changes proposed in this bill, both the Department and Congress must accept that current DOD acquisition culture and processes are no longer affordable.

Rampant increases in costs across the procurement spectrum are widely evident. In the fourth quarter of calendar year 2004, the Department reported that costs of major procurement programs increased from $1.37 trillion to $1.47 trillion, a 7.3 percent gain. These costs reflect actual program costs to date, as well as future anticipated costs. In response, the Department must take aggressive action to contain procurement costs. Individual platform designs must seek to achieve a critical balance between maximizing capability and ensuring that the Department can afford to procure a sufficient quantity of platforms to maintain a global military presence.

The committee believes that one of the primary reasons for the increase in weapon systems procurement costs is the proliferation of programs dependent on immature technology. Therefore, the system development and demonstration phase of the acquisition process should not be entered until mature technologies are demonstrated to ensure that costs do not grow and schedules are not delayed.

The committee believes that the Department should examine all platforms performing a specific mission to determine if it is affordable across the joint battlefield. Joint doctrine requires the Department to minimize duplication of efforts, to avoid procuring redundant systems, and to facilitate interoperability. The committee believes that joint operations will dominate the battlefield in the future. While the desire of military departments to develop independent weapons platforms is longstanding, this approach to force structure is no longer sustainable. The committee believes that this fundamental concept should be fully incorporated into DOD's acquisition process.

The committee is particularly concerned by the Navy's rising shipbuilding costs and by recent statements from the Navy's officials that they are uncertain about what to do about the problem. With an annual shipbuilding budget of approximately $10.0 billion, the committee is concerned with the amount of capability and military presence that can be maintained with new weapons systems. For example, the proposed Future Major Surface Combatant (DD(X)), has price estimates of over $3.0 billion per ship. The committee is also concerned with the effect the Navy's procurement strategy will have on the shipbuilding industrial base. These rising costs threaten to undermine the Navy's shipbuilding program, putting future naval capabilities in jeopardy.

This year, the committee asks the fundamental question of how the Navy's appetite for "mega-ships" will affect the industrial base and sustain production rates necessary to deploy an operational fleet of sufficient size to meet global commitments. The committee believes that early designs for many platforms successfully addressed the missions of the global war on terrorism by being light, agile and cost-effective. However, the committee notes with dismay that costly features redundantly supported by other platforms and systems are now contributing to spiraling program costs.

The committee is also concerned with the rising costs of the Army's Future Combat Systems (FCS) and Modularity programs. The combined cost of these programs currently exceeds $99.0 billion in the Future Years Defense Program, an amount well above the expected Army funding profile. The committee notes that between fiscal years 2004 and 2009, the estimated cost of FCS rose from $19.0 billion to $30.3 billion.

In addition, the committee believes that over the past decade the acquisition of space systems has been plagued by cost overruns and schedule delays. The lack of enforcement of internal DOD procurement rules results in systemic problems leading to multiple space acquisition failures. These problems include reliance on immature technology, overdependence on contractors for program management, and a lack of government systems engineering and cost analysis expertise. As a result, H.R. 1815 supports action that lowers the technical risk level associated with space programs and focuses on efforts that improve cost estimates, space acquisition workforce issues, and acquisition processes.

Acquisition reform

The committee believes that the rampant increases in the costs of major defense acquisition programs result, in large part, from the failure of the Department to comply with internal regulations and directives related to acquisition. The intent of DOD Directive 5000.1 "The Defense Acquisition System" and DOD Instruction 5000.2 "Operation of the Defense Acquisition System" is to capture a series of "best practices" derived from years of experience in major systems procurement activities. In particular, DOD Instruction 5000.2 lists numerous criteria designed to ensure technological maturity, approved requirements, and funding for a major defense acquisition program prior to Milestone B approval, which serves as the official start of an acquisition program and entry into the System Development and Demonstration (SDD) phase of the acquisition life-cycle. The committee is concerned that the Department, in large part, ignores these regulations in a rush to advance major defense acquisition programs toward the increased funding associated with the SDD phase of procurement. In fact, the committee is concerned that such behavior has become institutionalized in the Department. Therefore, the committee recommends the implementation of a series of procedural steps to ensure that entry into the SDD phase is not premature.

Beginning in fiscal year 2006, H.R. 1815 would require the Department of Defense to evaluate and monitor changes to its original baseline cost estimates for major defense acquisition programs (MDAPs) continually and to provide the Secretary of Defense and Congress alternatives to pursuing a system that proves to be technologically unachievable or fiscally impractical. H.R. 1815 would hold the Department more accountable for the significant decision to enter the acquisition process for an MDAP and establish strict standards related to accounting and cost management.

The committee is also concerned with the ability of the Department to react rapidly to urgent requirements issued by operational combatant commanders. Recently, the Department took over six months to utilize the rapid acquisition authority created in section 811 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375). This authority allows the Secretary "to waive any provision of law, policy, directive, or regulation" to purchase the equipment that is "urgently needed to eliminate a combat capability deficiency that has resulted in combat fatalities." Between approval of this authority and its utilization in late April 2005 the committee received volumes of information and testimony in hearings describing critical shortfalls for requirements such as armored High Mobility Multi-Wheeled Vehicles; body armor, including small arms protective insert plates; and, improvised explosive device jammers.

In response to these delays, and to other perceived deficiencies in DOD's ability to rapidly meet the needs of today's warfighter, the bill would require the Secretary to create a standing contingency contracting corps. This corps would operate under joint doctrine in wartime and peacetime to meet the needs of commanders on the battlefield. The committee believes that this corps will develop the expertise necessary to utilize such emergency authorities as the section 811 authority, as well as other laws, regulations and directives related to contracting in a combat, post-conflict, or reconstruction environment. The committee believes that this corps will facilitate the rapid acquisition of critically needed goods and services ultimately improving the process by which the needs of the warfighter are met.

Bridge supplemental

The committee recommends authorization of $49.1 billion in funds to be appropriated, and made available upon enactment of this Act, to support the defense activities principally associated with Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). These funds are designated for emergency contingency operations to support the force protection equipment, operational needs, and military personnel requirements of the units deployed and engaged in the global war on terrorism. Included in the force protection recommendation is funding for Up Armored High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles (HMMWV), tactical wheeled vehicle recapitalization, and modernization of the most heavily used vehicles in OIF and OEF, night vision devices, and improvised explosive device jammers. Incorporated in the day-to-day operation recommendation is funding to pay for food, fuel, spare parts, maintenance, transportation, base expenses, as well as costs incurred by stateside installations for increased mobilizations and demobilizations due to OIF and OEF. Over the past three years, the committee has recommended increases in the active component manpower to sustain the full range of capabilities required for the global war on terrorism. The committee recommends funding an active component increase of 30,000 for the Army and 4,000 for the Marine Corps above the budget request and supports benefit increases to the death gratuity and Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance.

HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 results from hearings that began on February 9, 2005, and that were completed on April 15, 2005. The full committee conducted seven sessions. In addition, a total of 19 ses-

sions were conducted by 6 different subcommittees on various titles of the bill.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

OVERVIEW

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $78.0 billion for procurement. This represents a $3.8 billion increase from the amount authorized for fiscal year 2005.

The committee recommends authorization of $79.1 billion, an increase of $1.1 billion from the fiscal year 2006 request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 procurement program are identified in the table below. Major issues are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	PROCURMENT, ARMY										
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		2,800,880		60,500		83,500		(23,000)		2,861,380
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		1,270,850		(27,931)		-		(27,931)		1,242,919
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		1,660,149		(58,171)		31,000		(89,171)		1,601,978
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		1,720,872		29,900		29,900		-		1,750,772
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		4,302,634		(259,345)		72,429		(331,774)		4,043,289
	TOTAL, ARMY		**11,755,385**		**(255,047)**		**216,829**		**(471,876)**		**11,500,338**
	PROCUREMENT, NAVY										
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		10,517,126		(474,600)		326,300		(800,900)		10,042,526
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		2,707,841		67,200		67,200		-		2,775,041
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS		872,849		(3,079)		5,000		(8,079)		869,770
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY		8,721,165		2,058,608		2,774,600		(715,992)		10,779,773
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		5,487,818		146,500		146,500		-		5,634,318
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		1,377,705		29,900		29,900		-		1,407,605
	TOTAL, NAVY		**29,684,504**		**1,824,529**		**3,349,500**		**(1,524,971)**		**31,509,033**
	PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE										
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		11,973,933		819,823		1,002,100		(182,277)		12,793,756
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		1,031,207		-		-		-		1,031,207
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		5,490,287		-		-		-		5,490,287
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		14,002,689		66,100		90,826		(24,726)		14,068,789
	TOTAL, AIR FORCE		**32,498,116**		**885,923**		**1,092,926**		**(207,003)**		**33,384,039**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE										
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		2,677,832		37,614		48,000		(10,386)		2,715,446
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT		[19,573]		-		-		-		[19,573]
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION		1,405,827		(1,405,827)				(1,405,827)		-
	TOTAL, DEFENSE-WIDE		**4,083,659**		**(1,368,213)**		**48,000**		**(1,416,213)**		**2,715,446**
	GRAND TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE		**78,021,664**		**1,087,192**		**4,707,255**		**(3,620,063)**		**79,108,856**

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $2.8 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $2.9 billion, an increase of $60.5 million, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Aircraft Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request QTY.	FY 2006 Authorization Request COST	Committee Change QTY.	Committee Change COST	Committee Increase QTY.	Committee Increase COST	Committee Decrease QTY.	Committee Decrease COST	FY 2006 Committee Authorization QTY.	FY 2006 Committee Authorization COST
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY										
	AIRCRAFT										
	FIXED WING										
1	UTILITY F/W CARGO AIRCRAFT		4,926								4,926
2	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT									-	-
	ROTARY										
3	ARMED RECONNAISSANCE HELICOPTER	10	70,000							10	70,000
4	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	28	108,000							28	108,000
5	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	41	562,160	5	73,500					46	635,660
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(56,510)							-	(56,510)
	HH-60L - ARNG					5	73,500			-	-
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		79,052							-	79,052
7	HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING										-
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT		**767,628**		**73,500**		**73,500**		**-**		**841,128**
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT										
8	GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)		-							-	-
9	ARL MODS (TIARA)		-								
10	AH-64 MODS		580,392		6,000					-	586,392
	Modern Signal Processing Unit						6,000			-	-
11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		19,000								19,000
12	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS		675,065							-	675,065
12	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(23,722)							-	(23,722)
13	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		24,689								24,689
14	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS		13,575							-	13,575
15	OH-58 MODS		-								
16	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS		779							-	779
17	LONGBOW		84,513							-	84,513
17	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)										
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		-								-
19	UH-60 MODS		33,294							-	33,294
19	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)										
20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		-							-	-

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
21	KIOWA WARRIOR		24,478							-	24,478
22	AIRBORNE AVIONICS		106,124		(23,000)					-	83,124
	JTRS Program Reduction								(23,000)		
23	GATM ROLLUP		31,542							-	31,542
24	AIRBORNE DIGITIZATION		-								-
	TOTAL MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		**1,569,729**		**(17,000)**		**6,000**		**(23,000)**		**1,552,729**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
25	SPARE PARTS (AIR)		3,948							-	3,948
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**3,948**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**3,948**
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS										
26	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT		11,200							-	11,200
27	ASE INFRARED CM		211,151							-	211,151
	OTHER SUPPORT										
28	AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL		28,055							-	28,055
29	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,418							-	3,418
30	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		70,436							-	70,436
31	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS		29,352		4,000					-	33,352
	Aircraft Wireless Intercom						4,000			-	-
32	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		62,399							-	62,399
33	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		41,222							-	41,222
34	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET		2,342							-	2,342
35	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS		-							-	-
	TOTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		**459,575**		**4,000**		**4,000**		**-**		**463,575**
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**2,800,880**		**60,500**		**83,500**		**(23,000)**		**2,861,380**

Items of Special Interest

AH–64 modern signal processing unit

The budget request contained $580.4 million for AH–64 modifications, but no funds were requested for the modern signal processing unit (MSPU) initial integration and production for the AH–64.

The MSPU is an embedded digital vibration diagnostic technology already developed by the Army for the AH–64A Apache and the AH–64D Longbow to monitor the tail rotor gearbox, the intermediate gearbox, and the auxiliary power unit (APU) clutch for incipient failures. The MSPU is a direct replacement for the 30-year-old analog signal processing unit which is known to experience high failure rates and shown to be unreliable in detecting incipient gearbox failures. The improved diagnostics of the MSPU will improve flight safety and reduce maintenance test costs.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million to integrate the modern signal processing unit into the AH–64A and AH–64D production line and to procure the MSPU for fielding as spares for both the active Army and National Guard Apache and Longbow aircraft.

High-altitude Army National Guard aviation training site

The committee is aware that the High-altitude Army National Guard (ARNG) Aviation Training Site (HAATS) at Eagle, Colorado, operated by the Colorado Army National Guard, is the primary site for training military aviators operations in all seasoned weather conditions in hostile, high altitude, power limited environments. The training site currently uses UH–1 Huey and OH–58 Kiowa aircraft that are being phased out of the inventory within the future years defense plan. Concurrently, deployments of the Colorado Army National Guard limit the ability of HAATS instructor pilots to obtain the number of flying hours necessary to maintain their instructor status.

The committee is concerned that the combination of these factors could degrade HAATS ability to train pilots in the kinds of high altitude operations that are increasingly relevant in military operations. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to evaluate the type of aircraft available in the Army's inventory most suitable to the performance of HAATS mission, and the most appropriate schedule for assigning these aircraft to HAATS. The Secretary of the Army is directed to provide a report of his findings to the congressional defense committees no later than December 15, 2005.

UH–60 aircraft wireless intercom system upgrade

The budget request contained $29.4 million for aircrew integrated systems, but included no funds for procurement of non-encrypted aircraft wireless intercom system (AWIS) upgrades for active and reserve UH–60 medical evacuation (MEDEVAC) helicopters.

The committee notes there is no integrated or qualified wireless communication system on board UH–60 rotorcraft for use by crewmembers. Consequently, this does not allow onboard medical personnel, while in flight or during ground operations, freedom to use

both hands to perform emergency medical procedures while communicating with the flight crew. Early fielding of non-encrypted AWIS would eliminate the operational hazards and restrictions inherent in the existing tethered system for MEDEVAC crews.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million for non-encrypted AWIS for active and reserve UH–60 MEDEVAC helicopters.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $1.3 billion for Missile Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.2 billion, a decrease of $27.9 million, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Missile Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY										
	OTHER MISSILES										
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM										
1	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY	108	489,700							108	489,700
2	STINGER SYSTEM SUMMARY		-							-	-
3	SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYSTEM SUMMARY:		19,315							-	19,315
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM										
4	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY		80,073							-	80,073
5	APKWS (ADVANCED PRECISION KILL WEAPON SYSTEM)	600	34,055		(27,931)					600	6,124
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(6,124)							-	(6,124)
	Program Delay								(27,931)	-	-
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)									-	-
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM										
7	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	300	57,636							300	57,636
7	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-							-	-
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		-								
9	LINE OF SIGHT ANTI-TANK (LOSAT) SYSTEM SUM									-	-
10	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	800	44,002							800	44,002
10	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(16,795)							-	(16,795)
11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		18,900							-	18,900
12	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	1,026	124,814							1,026	124,814
13	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	900	7,726							900	7,726
14	MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS		20,787							-	20,787
15	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (HIMARS)	35	174,929							35	174,929
16	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	45	58,458							45	58,458
	TOTAL OTHER MISSILES		**1,107,476**		**(27,931)**		**-**		**(27,931)**		**1,079,545**
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES										
	MODIFICATIONS										
17	PATRIOT MODS		77,411							-	77,411
18	STINGER MODS		-								
19	JAVELIN MISSILE MODS		14,007								14,007
20	ITAS/TOW MODS		9,587							-	9,587

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
21	MLRS MODS		14,579							-	14,579
22	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS: (NON AAO)		8,001							-	8,001
23	HELLFIRE MODIFICATIONS		-							-	-
	TOTAL MODIFICATIONS OF MISSILES		**123,585**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**123,585**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
24	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		30,142							-	30,142
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**30,142**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**30,142**
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
25	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		6,156							-	6,156
26	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)		10							-	10
27	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		3,481							-	3,481
28	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		-								
	TOTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		**9,647**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**9,647**
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**1,270,850**		**(27,931)**		**-**		**(27,931)**		**1,242,919**

Items of Special Interest

Advanced precision kill weapon system

The budget request contained $27.9 million for the procurement of the Advanced Precision Kill Weapon System (APKWS).

The committee notes that the APKWS program has been curtailed by the Army. Subsequently, the Army Program Executive Office for Missiles and Space has directed a contract recompetition for APKWS.

Therefore, the committee recommends no funding for procurement of the APKWS, a decrease of $27.9 million.

Patriot system reporting requirements

The Patriot system provides defense against short to medium range theater ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, unmanned aerial vehicles, and other air breathing threats as part of the Ballistic Missile Defense System. The committee notes that the congressional defense committees provided the Department of the Army with $43.4 million in reprogrammed funds in fiscal year 2004 to correct Patriot system deficiencies that contributed to fratricide incidents in Operation Iraqi Freedom. According to the Department of the Army, these corrective actions are scheduled to be completed in fiscal year 2007. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2006, and annually thereafter until all corrective actions are complete, on the status of completing these Patriot system corrective actions. This report should include the results of operational tests conducted to verify that corrective actions have been satisfactorily tested as well as any findings of additional problems that require correction, and funding proposed to address these deficiencies.

The committee also notes that a January 2005 Defense Science Board Task Force report on Patriot system performance highlighted the need for the Department of Defense to identify and correct identification friend or foe (IFF) problems and to improve situational awareness of U.S. air defense systems in order to prevent future fratricide incidents. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on its plan to identify and correct IFF deficiencies and to improve situational awareness of U.S. air defense systems by February 1, 2006. This report should also provide recommendations on how to improve situational awareness of air defense systems when working with allies and the cost associated with correcting these deficiencies.

Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $1.7 billion for Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.6 billion, a decrease of $58.2 million, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army program are identified in

the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY										
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES										
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES										
1	ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD		3,754							-	3,754
2	BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT		37,908							-	37,908
2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-								
3	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)		5,679		16,000					-	21,679
	Full-Crew Interactive Skills Trainer (AB-FIST) - ARNG						16,000			-	-
4	ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES		3,709							-	3,709
5	STRYKER VEHICLES	240	878,449		15,000					240	893,449
	Tire Production - Second Source Qualification						15,000			-	-
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES										
6	CARRIER, MOD		-								
7	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)		-							-	-
8	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, FIST VEHICLE		-							-	-
9	BFVS SERIES (MOD)		45,265							-	45,265
10	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		14,801							-	14,801
11	FAASV PIP TO FLEET		6,439							-	6,439
12	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		443,475							-	443,475
13	SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2		-							-	-
14	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM		-							-	-
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
15	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV)		407							-	407
16	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		10,258							-	10,258
	TOTAL TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		**1,450,144**		**31,000**		**31,000**		**-**		**1,481,144**
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES										
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES										
17	INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY	10,400	32,484							####	32,484
18	ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240 SERIES	1,197	14,148	(1,197)	(14,148)					-	-
	Transfer to Title XV							(1,197)	(14,148)		
19	MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)		80							-	80

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
20	GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	352	8,715							352	8,715
21	MORTAR SYSTEMS		200							-	200
22	M16 RIFLE	14,500	8,000							####	8,000
23	M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE	600	9,656	(600)	(9,656)					-	-
	Transfer to Title XV							(600)	(9,656)		
24	5.56 CARBINE M4	2,106	3,215	(2,106)	(3,215)					-	-
	Transfer to Title XV							(2,106)	(3,215)		
25	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION		-							-	-
26	HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T)	23	46,786							23	46,786
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES										
27	MARK-19 MODIFICATIONS		5,444							-	5,444
28	M4 CARBINE MODS		44,817		(44,817)					-	-
	Transfer to Title XV								(44,817)		
29	SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD)		3,095		(3,095)					-	-
	Transfer to Title XV								(3,095)		
30	MEDIUM MACHINE GUNS (MODS)		7,089		(7,089)					-	-
	Transfer to Title XV								(7,089)		
31	HOWITZER, TOWED, 155MM, M198 (MODS)		-							-	-
32	M119 MODIFICATIONS		1,000							-	1,000
33	M16 RIFLE MODS		1,970		(1,970)					-	-
	Transfer to Title XV								(1,970)		
34	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		5,146							-	5,146
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
35	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		488							-	488
36	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		6,494							-	6,494
37	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		2,655							-	2,655
38	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		5,181		(5,181)					-	-
	Transfer to Title XV								(5,181)		
39	REF SMALL ARMS		-							-	-
	TOTAL WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES		**206,663**		**(89,171)**		**-**		**(89,171)**		**117,492**
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS										
	SPARES										

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
40	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)		3,342							-	3,342
	TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS		**3,342**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**3,342**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		**1,660,149**		**(58,171)**		**31,000**		**(89,171)**		**1,601,978**

Items of Special Interest

Abrams tank modernization

The budget request included no funds for the M1A2 SEP retrofit program. The M1A2 SEP tank is an upgraded, fully digitized, first generation M1A2 Abrams tank which enhances lethality, survivability, and mobility as well as providing improved situational awareness for its crew.

In the past years, the committee has raised explicit concerns regarding the Army's tank modernization program and associated funding. Operation Iraqi Freedom has demonstrated that there are few conflicts where main battle tanks do not play a significant role in ensuring the survivability and offensive firepower of the armed forces. The committee remains resolute in its assessment that the Army should pure fleet its active component heavy forces and selected Army National Guard brigades with the M1A2 SEP tank.

The conversion to 35 heavy armor modular brigade combat teams (BCTs) underscores the need for Abrams tank modernization. The committee understands the Army's modularity initiative puts a premium on not just quantity of equipment such as tanks but also quality of equipment. The committee understands the Army is pursuing a strategy that purports several pure fleet options for these heavy BCTs and notes the most optimal option has 18 heavy BCTs outfitted with the M1A2 SEP tank. The committee notes the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109–13) funds modernization of one 3rd Infantry Division BCT. The committee commends the Army for recognizing the need to equip one of the Army's premier armor units with M1A2 SEP tanks. But there remains a requirement for 180 additional M1A2 SEP tanks just to complete pure fleeting of the 3rd Infantry Division.

The committee is concerned about the Army's plans to resource Abrams tank modernization. Therefore, the committee strongly encourages the Army to procure at least one heavy armor modular brigade combat team of M1A2 SEP tanks annually, beginning in the fiscal year 2007 budget request until a minimum of 18 BCTs are equipped with the M1A2 SEP tank.

Stryker tire second source qualification

The budget request included $878.4 million for the procurement of the Stryker Family of Vehicles and associated costs, but included no funds to qualify a second source for the production of the existing Stryker tire.

The committee recognizes that tires are currently the highest demand item in sustainment and deployment for the Stryker. The majority of tire failures are being caused by wear-out from high operational tempo, from increased pressure due to the weight associated with the addition of Slat add-on armor for protection against rocket propelled grenades (RPGs), and damage from RPG and improvised explosive devices attacks.

The committee suggests qualifying a second source for tire production in order to maintain timely military supply needs and domestic industrial base capabilities. The committee assumes that tires would be purchased from both sources only as needed to supply increased requirements in production, sustainment, and deploy-

ment. The committee understands cost savings could be realized due to competition and that historically second source situations can produce cost savings in unit price up to 25 percent.

The committee recommends $893.4 million, an increase of $15.0 million to qualify a second source supplier for the existing Stryker tires.

AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $1.7 billion for Ammunition Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.8 billion, an increase of $29.9 million, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Ammunition Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request QTY.	FY 2006 Authorization Request COST	Committee Change QTY.	Committee Change COST	Committee Increase QTY.	Committee Increase COST	Committee Decrease QTY.	Committee Decrease COST	FY 2006 Committee Authorization QTY.	FY 2006 Committee Authorization COST
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY										
	AMMUNITION										
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION										
1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		142,363							-	142,363
2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		75,290							-	75,290
3	CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES		4,018							-	4,018
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		110,043							-	110,043
5	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		30,965							-	30,965
6	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		17,618							-	17,618
7	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		142,594							-	142,594
	MORTAR AMMUNITION										
8	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		14,355							-	14,355
9	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		85,250							-	85,250
10	CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ALL TYPES		62,918							-	62,918
	TANK AMMUNITION										
11	CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES		29,421							-	29,421
12	120MM TANK TRAINING, ALL TYPES		145,094							-	145,094
13	CTG, TANK, 120MM TACTICAL, ALL TYPES		52,724							-	52,724
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION										
14	CTG, ARTY, 75MM: ALL TYPES		2,246								2,246
15	CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES		41,873							-	41,873
16	CTG, ARTY, 155MM, ALL TYPES		124,565							-	124,565
17	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982		25,098							-	25,098
18	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T		67,966							-	67,966
	ARTILLERY FUZES										
19	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES		22,926							-	22,926
	MINES										
20	MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES		230							-	230
21	MINES (CONVENTIONAL), ALL TYPES		4,009							-	4,009
22	MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES		4,646							-	4,646
23	ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE ALTERNATIVES		27,876							-	27,876
	ROCKETS										

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
24	SHOULDER FIRED ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		7,810							-	7,810
25	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		156,879							-	156,879
	OTHER AMMUNITION										
26	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		29,719		4,900					-	34,619
	M19						1,900			-	-
	Rapid Wall Breaching Kit						3,000			-	-
27	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		53,107							-	53,107
28	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		26,648							-	26,648
29	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		10,415							-	10,415
	MISCELLANEOUS										
30	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES		8,796							-	8,796
31	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES		18,784							-	18,784
32	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES		2,598							-	2,598
33	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		5,503							-	5,503
34	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		12,765							-	12,765
35	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)		9,101		8,000					-	17,101
	MCAAP Outloading Module						8,000			-	-
36	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES		100							-	100
	TOTAL AMMUNITION		**1,576,313**		**12,900**		**12,900**		**-**		**1,589,213**
	AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT										
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT										
37	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		33,532		10,000					-	43,532
	Flexible LAP						10,000			-	-
38	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		348		5,000					-	5,348
	Lake City AAP						5,000			-	-
39	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES		5,001							-	5,001
40	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION		102,933		2,000					-	104,933
	Energetics Processing Module						2,000			-	-
41	ARMS INITIATIVE		2,745							-	2,745
	TOTAL AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		**144,559**		**17,000**		**17,000**		**-**		**161,559**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		**1,720,872**		**29,900**		**29,900**		**-**		**1,750,772**

Items of Special Interest

Kansas army ammunition plant modern munitions enterprise

The budget request contained $33.5 million for provision of industrial facilities, but included no funds for the flexible load, assemble and pack (LAP) modern munitions enterprise at the Kansas Army Ammunition Plant. In fiscal years 2004 and 2005 Congress appropriated $3.5 million and $6.5 million, respectively, for the flexible LAP modern munitions enterprise.

The committee recognizes there are significant critical challenges making modern munitions during the LAP phase. Transforming an existing, high volume production facility to a flexible LAP installation can support both the latest explosive formulations and smart component assembly needed to meet these critical challenges. The flex-line concept would provide upgrade and modernization of obsolete plant infrastructure and production equipment by taking the manufacturing technologies at the Armament Research Development and Engineering Center and applying them to the Kansas Army Ammunition Plant for implementation. In doing so, the Kansas Army Ammunition Plant would be better able to meet the future needs of smart munitions programs for the Department of Defense.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for continuation of the flexible LAP modern munitions enterprise at the Kansas Army Ammunition Plant.

Lake City army ammunition plant

The budget request contained $144.6 million for ammunition production base support, of which $33.5 million is for the provision of industrial facilities. However, no funds were requested to continue the modernization and transformation program at the 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 $5.0 million to continue the modernization and transformation of the Lake City Army Ammunition Plant during fiscal year 2006.

M19 modern demolition initiators

The budget request contained $29.7 million for demolition munitions (all types), but contained no funds for M19 modern demolition initiators (MDI).

The committee understands the M19 MDI is currently in use by combat engineers for ongoing operations in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. The M19 MDI is smaller and lighter than previous designs and is easier for the soldier to employ. Consequently, it substantially reduces the soldier's time on target, thereby reducing the risk of potential casualties resulting from enemy attack. The committee notes that the budget request contained no funds for the procurement of M19 modern demolition initiators to replace initiators already utilized, thereby reducing the war time reserve available.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $1.9 million for procurement of M19 modern demolition initiators.

Missile propellant/warhead chemical oxidizer recycling

The budget request contained $102.9 million for all conventional munitions demilitarization, but contained no funds for missile recycling capability (MRC) energetics processing module (EPM) commissioning.

The committee notes the MRC EPM project supports Department of Defense sustainability objectives through demilitarization of ammonium perchlorate (AP), cyclotetramethylenetetranitramine (HMX) and cyclotrimethylenetrinitramine (RDX) based rocket motor propellants/warhead chemical oxidizers. Due to the expensive nature of these oxidizers, this is a critical technology to the overall success of the resource, recovery and recycling. The EPM liquefied anhydrous ammonia based demilitarization approach is a key component requirement for the recycling of AP and HMX/RDX materials for reuse in new solid propellants and warheads.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million to fund commissioning of the EPM capability at the Aviation and Missile Research, Development and Engineering Center.

Rapid wall breaching kit

The budget request contained $29.7 million for demolition munitions (all types), but contained no funds for the rapid wall breaching kit (RWBK).

The committee notes that military operations urban terrain (MOUT) missions are extremely dangerous due to field construction of expedient explosive charges and unreliable methods of attachment which expose the assault team to direct enemy fire for unnecessary extended periods of time. The RWBK is a one-man portable, fully integrated and engineered kit containing all the necessary items to complete the breaching mission. The RWBK system is employable within three minutes of target acquisition and does not require extensive training or special skills to operate. The RWBK can reduce the factors of time on target, blast overpressure, and excess collateral damage, resulting in improved safety for the warfighter.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for procurement of the rapid wall breaching kit.

Small caliber ammunition manufacturer qualification

The committee notes that Lake City Army Ammunition Plant (LCAAP) is and should remain the primary Department of the Army qualified manufacturer of small caliber ammunition for Department of Defense use. LCAAP is currently operating at 100 percent capacity for small caliber ammunition production and the current Department of the Army small caliber ammunition requirement is exceeding the domestic-based production rate. The committee believes that in order to alleviate any potential procurement shortfalls of small caliber ammunition due to wartime surge requirements and increased small caliber ammunition qualification training requirements above the maximum rate capability of LCAAP, a second-source, domestic-based manufacturer of small caliber ammunition is needed.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to qualify and secure a second-source, domestic-based manufacturer of small caliber ammunition, exclusively for surge production requirements above the LCAAP capacity.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $4.3 billion for Other Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $4.0 billion, a decrease of $259.3 million, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Other Procurement, Army program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY										
	TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES										
	TACTICAL VEHICLES										
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS		15,867							-	15,867
2	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED		6,049							-	6,049
3	SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS		6,287							-	6,287
4	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)		224,222							-	224,222
5	TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)		-								-
6	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)		449,601							-	449,601
7	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT		7,523							-	7,523
8	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)		207,096		9,000					-	216,096
	HEMTT LET						9,000			-	-
9	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)		-								-
10	MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY		-								-
11	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916		17,063							-	17,063
12	TRUCK, TRACTOR, YARD TYPE, M878 (C/S)		-								
13	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV P		40,710		(40,710)					-	-
	Transfer to Title XV								(40,710)		
14	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM		32,800		(32,800)						-
	Transfer to Title XV								(32,800)		
15	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		11,659							-	11,659
16	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH)		378							-	378
17	TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL		1,950							-	1,950
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES										
18	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN		2,900							-	2,900
19	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		270							-	270
20	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		430							-	430
	TOTAL TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES		**1,024,805**		**(64,510)**		**9,000**		**(73,510)**		**960,295**
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT										
	COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS										
21	WIN - TACTICAL PROGRAM		122,433							-	122,433

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
22	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		4,240							-	4,240
	COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS										
23	SECURED ENROUTE COM PACKAGE		7,582								7,582
24	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)		55,023							-	55,023
25	SHF TERM		23,359							-	23,359
26	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)		1,439							-	1,439
27	GPS - DAGR	13,969	44,730		(22,350)					####	22,380
	Transfer to Title XV								(22,350)		
28	SMART-T (SPACE)		14,607							-	14,607
29	SCAMP (SPACE)		600							-	600
30	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS		12,478							-	12,478
31	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)		7,699							-	7,699
	COMM - C3 SYSTEM										
32	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)		17,358							-	17,358
	COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS										
33	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)		34,837							-	34,837
34	JOINT TACTICA RADIO SYSTEM (JTRS)		-							-	-
35	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		3,240							-	3,240
36	SINCGARS FAMILY		55,511		(55,511)					-	-
	Transfer to Title XV								(55,511)		
37	MULTI-PURPOSE INFORMATION OPERATIONS SYSTEMS		8,602							-	8,602
38	JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS		-							-	-
39	BRIDGE TO FUTURE NETWORKS		41,288							-	41,288
40	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING		6,837							-	6,837
41	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS		8,153							-	8,153
42	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)	1,349	15,729	(1,349)	(11,529)					-	4,200
	AN/ARS-6A						4,200			-	-
	Program Adjustment							(1,349)	(15,729)	-	-
42a	Combat Survivor Radios			1,349	15,729	1,349	15,729			1,349	15,729
43	RADIO, IMPROVED HF FAMILY		28,041							-	28,041
44	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)		8,262							-	8,262
	COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM										
45	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,320							-	1,320

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	INFORMATION SECURITY										
46	TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)		2,994							-	2,994
47	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP		69,734							-	69,734
	COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS										
48	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION		15,661							-	15,661
49	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		33,583							-	33,583
50	ARMY DISN ROUTER		-							-	-
51	ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)		479							-	479
52	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)		2,704							-	2,704
	COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS										
53	INFORMATION SYSTEMS		12,883							-	12,883
54	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)		6,433							-	6,433
55	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM		294,384								294,384
56	LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)		-							-	-
57	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM		28,618							-	28,618
	ELECT EQUIP - NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP)										
58	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)										
59	GENERAL DEFENSE INTEL PROG (GDIP)										
	ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)										
60	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)		21,204							-	21,204
61	JTT/CIBS-M (TIARA)	35	9,862							35	9,862
62	PROPHET GROUND (TIARA)	3	13,006		3,200					3	16,206
	Block 1 Enhancement - 10th Mountain Division						3,200			-	-
63	TUAV		26,000							-	26,000
64	SMALL UAV	100	20,000							100	20,000
65	ARMY COMMON GROUND STATION (CGS) (TIARA)		-							-	-
66	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA)		2,888							-	2,888
67	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)		-							-	-
68	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION SYSTEM (TIARA)		-							-	-
69	DCGS-A (JMIP)		43,543							-	43,543
70	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)		12,648								12,648
71	TROJAN (TIARA)		6,067							-	6,067
72	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)		1,668							-	1,668

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
73	CI HUMINT INFO MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CHIMS) (TIARA)		730							-	730
74	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TIARA) TROJAN SPIRIT	24	16,563							24	16,563
	ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)										
75	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR		-								
76	WARLOCK		-								
77	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		-							-	-
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)										
78	SENTINEL MODS		8,393							-	8,393
79	NIGHT VISION DEVICES		164,674		(164,674)					-	-
	Transfer to Title XV								(164,674)		
80	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	93	42,293							93	42,293
81	LTWT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS)		-							-	-
82	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT	6,917	83,692							6,917	83,692
83	JLENS FAMILY		-								-
84	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP		-							-	-
85	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MMS)		334							-	334
86	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MVS)		-							-	-
87	ENHANCED PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SETTE		6,763							-	6,763
88	PROFILER	1	4,869							1	4,869
89	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		18,027							-	18,027
90	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)	4,506	146,085							4,506	146,085
91	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD	34	12,720							34	12,720
92	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32	55	1,415							55	1,415
93	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		18,877							-	18,877
94	INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - (TIARA)		3,699							-	3,699
95	ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM		2,000							-	2,000
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS										
96	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS		58,339							-	58,339
97	ADV FA TAC DATA SYS (AFATDS)		29,537							-	29,537
98	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, AFATDS		5,104							-	5,104
99	LIGHT WEIGHT TECH FIRE DIRECTION SYS		2,978							-	2,978
100	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM		10,139							-	10,139
101	FAAD C2		26,108							-	26,108

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
102	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS		3,668							-	3,668
103	FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE / LIGHTWEIGHT FED		3,159							-	3,159
104	KNIGHT FAMILY		-							-	-
105	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		1,914							-	1,914
106	LOGTECH		62,256							-	62,256
107	TC AIMS II		31,356							-	31,356
108	ISYSCON EQUIPMENT		-							-	-
109	JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JNMS)		11,885							-	11,885
110	TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER		16,962							-	16,962
111	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	1,244	49,562							1,244	49,562
112	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)		89,017							-	89,017
113	STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM		-							-	-
114	MOUNTED BATTLE COMMAND ON THE MOVE (MBCOTM)		870								870
	ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION										
115	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION		23,722							-	23,722
116	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		152,268							-	152,268
117	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)		30,819							-	30,819
	ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)										
118	AFRTS		2,732							-	2,732
119	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V)		6,381							-	6,381
120	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)		2,895							-	2,895
	ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT		-							-	-
121	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)		438							-	438
	TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		**2,300,970**		**(235,135)**		**23,129**		**(258,264)**		**2,065,835**
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT										
122	RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM, FOX NBC (NBCRS) XM93		-								
123	SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM)		2,904							-	2,904
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT										
124	TACTICAL BRIDGING		26,611							-	26,611
125	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON		5,913							-	5,913
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT										

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
126	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-HST		7,084							-	7,084
127	KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING		-							-	-
128	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (GSTAMIDS		2,962							-	2,962
129	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)		1,617							-	1,617
130	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)		29,786							-	29,786
131	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT		580							-	580
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
132	HEATERS AND ECU'S		3,420							-	3,420
133	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES		1,998							-	1,998
134	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT		4,810							-	4,810
135	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)		-							-	-
136	LAND WARRIOR		35,700							-	35,700
137	MOUNTED WARRIOR		1,600							-	1,600
138	FORCE PROVIDER		-								-
139	AUTHORIZED STOCKAGE LIST MOBILITY SYSTEM (ASL		-							-	-
140	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT		26,553							-	26,553
141	CARGO AERIAL DELIVERY PROGRAM		39,644							-	39,644
142	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (ENG SPT EQ)		3,282							-	3,282
143	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CSS EQ)		-							-	-
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT										
144	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		730							-	730
145	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER		66,055							-	66,055
146	INLAND PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		-							-	-
	WATER EQUIPMENT										
147	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS		8,888							-	8,888
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT										
148	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL		10,686		5,000					-	15,686
	Cartledge Infuser						5,000			-	-
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT										
149	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP)		8,244							-	8,244
150	WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD		252							-	252
151	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)		1,300							-	1,300
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		-								-

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
152	MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING		3,785							-	3,785
153	LOADERS		1,217							-	1,217
154	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED		966							-	966
155	CRANES		-							-	-
156	CRUSHING/SCREENING PLANT, 150 TPH		-							-	-
157	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE)		13,472							-	13,472
158	CONST EQUIP ESP		3,646							-	3,646
159	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)		4,285							-	4,285
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT										
160	LOGISTIC SUPPORT VESSEL (LSV)		-							-	-
161	JOINT HIGH SPEED VEHICLE (JHSV)		15,000							-	15,000
162	HARBORMASTER COMMAND & CONTROL CENTER		600								600
163	CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS		2,000							-	2,000
164	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)		4,988							-	4,988
	GENERATORS										
165	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP		43,067							-	43,067
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT										
166	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)		-							-	-
167	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM		361							-	361
168	MHE EXTENDED SERVICE PROGRAM (ESP)		-		5,500					-	5,500
	Deployable Power Generation Distribution System						5,500			-	-
169	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MHE)		-							-	-
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT										
170	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS (CTC) SUPPORT		60,811							-	60,811
171	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM		184,528		29,800					-	214,328
	Bullet Sensor Live Fire Trainer						5,600			-	-
	Future Soldier Trainer - ARNG						13,700			-	-
	Laser Marksmanship Training Systems - ARNG						7,500			-	-
	Virtual Training Demonstration Project						3,000			-	-
172	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER		63,746							-	63,746
173	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (AVCATT)		71,301							-	71,301
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)										
174	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT		-							-	-

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
175	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)		21,605							-	21,605
176	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)		471							-	471
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
177	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT (REF)		50,000							-	50,000
178	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA-3)		66,614							-	66,614
179	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT		6,224							-	6,224
180	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)		9,379							-	9,379
181	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		2,638							-	2,638
182	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING		9,316							-	9,316
183	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM (MA8975)		2,434		-					-	2,434
	TOTAL OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**933,073**		**40,300**		**40,300**		**-**		**973,373**
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS										
	OPA2										
184	INITIAL SPARES - C&E		33,076							-	33,076
	OPA3										
185	INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP		732							-	732
	TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS		**33,808**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**33,808**
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		9,978							-	9,978
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**4,302,634**		**(259,345)**		**72,429**		(331,774)		**4,043,289**

Items of Special Interest

AN/ARS–6A technology upgrade

The budget request contained $15.7 million to procure combat survivor evader locator (CSEL) radios, but contained no funds for the technology upgrade and modification for the AN/ARS–6 V3 personnel locator system for Army special operations forces (SOF) MH–60 and MH–47 helicopters.

The committee notes that Congress appropriated $2.2 million for procurement of the AN/ARS–6A system for the Army in fiscal year 2005. The committee is aware of the need to modify the Army's AN/ARS–6 V3 system to the updated AN/ARS–6A. Army SOF helicopters routinely perform search and rescue operations with all components of the U.S. armed forces, as well as with the disparate elements of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization member militaries. Many of these organizations are migrating to modern survival radios and beacons such as the CSEL radio, the PRC–112 B/G radio and the 406 emergency locator transmitter (ELT) which are incompatible with current combat search and rescue communications equipment installed on Army SOF aircraft. The AN/ARS–6A upgrade will have the ability to interface and communicate with CSEL, PRC–112B, 406 ELT, and potentially the PRC–112G.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $4.2 million for procurement of the AN/ARS–6A.

Best value procurement practices for tactical wheeled vehicles

The committee strongly encourages the Department of Defense to apply best value procurement practices to the acquisition of critical components installed on tactical wheeled vehicles (TWV). As noted elsewhere in this report, the Army and Marine Corps TWV fleets compose the critical logistical and maneuverable backbone of military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Current operations demand that these vehicles serve as combat systems not just logistical vehicles. The committee is concerned that certain TWV components are procured based on the lowest price rather than more important features such as performance, quality and durability. Given the role of TWVs, the rule of best value should be applied to procurement of select TWV critical components.

Cartledge infuser

The budget request contained $10.7 million for procurement of combat support medical equipment, but included no funds for the Cartledge Infuser.

In battle, trauma causes the majority of casualties to our servicemen and women and death often results from uncontrolled bleeding and reduced oxygen delivery to vital organs. In treating a casualty, medical personnel infuse blood or volume-expanding fluids to rapidly replace lost blood. In cases of severe shock and severe bleeding, however, current devices and infusion techniques are often insufficient. The committee notes the demonstrated effectiveness of the Cartledge Infuser, which is capable of infusing fluids at rates ranging from 20 ml/hour to 1200 mil/minute, giving a surgeon the time necessary to treat the patient.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for procurement of the Cartledge Infuser.

Deployable power generation distribution system

The budget request contained $43.1 million for generators and associated equipment, but contained no funds for the 920kW Deployable Power Generation Distribution System (DPGDS), a joint program to replace older generators for Air Force expeditionary airfields and Army engineer battalions. The budget request would terminate production of DPGDS without filling the Army's requirement.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million to continue production of the 920kW DPGDS in order to address the Army's requirements.

Heavy expanded mobility tactical truck light equipment transporter

The budget request included $207.1 million for the family of heavy tactical vehicles, but included no funds for the heavy expanded mobility tactical truck (HEMTT) light equipment transporter (LET), the M893 A2 LET.

The M893 A2 LET will be the primary vehicle for the engineer battalions of the Army National Guard, who support the Army's modular units of action and Stryker Brigade Combat Teams (SBCTs). Although the Army has begun to deploy Guard engineer battalions to support units of action and SBCTs, the M893 A2 LET is not yet fielded to many units.

The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million to procure the M893 A2 LET for the Army National Guard.

Nonsystem training devices

The budget request contained $184.5 million to procure nonsystem training devices, but included no funds to procure the Laser Marksmanship Training System (LMTS) for the Army National Guard; Bullet Sensor Livefire Trainer for the active force and Army National Guard; Virtual Training Demonstration Project; or the America's Army Future Soldier Trainer (AA–FST) for the active force and Army National Guard. The committee notes that each of these systems provides needed training for military personnel.

The committee recognizes the Army National Guard has immediate, urgent requirements for LMTS to maintain highly effective marksmanship training skills for recent deployments to Operation Iraqi Freedom. The Bullet Sensor Livefire Trainer is a wireless, battery operated, automated, lightweight, portable training tool that provides soldiers with instant, precise and computerized feedback of bullet strikes on paper targets and can maximize training proficiency of the active, guard and reserve components. The Virtual Training Demonstration project initiates an immersive group simulation training demonstration project to provide additional training opportunities for active, reserve, and guard components; and to effectively assess and identify potential resource savings associated with the conduct of virtual training as a supplement to live training. The AA–FST program has proven to be a valuable tool to lower attrition among future soldiers prior to their entry into initial training and the committee notes that phase 2 of the AA–FST program will expand the program to 12 battalion sets for the active force.

The committee recommends $7.5 million for LMTS for the Army National Guard, $5.6 million for the Bullet Sensor Livefire Train-

ers, $3.0 million for the Virtual Training Demonstration project, and $13.7 million for phase 2 of the AA–FST program; an increase of $29.8 million for nonsystem training devices.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $10.5 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $10.0 billion, a decrease of $474.6 million, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Aircraft Procurement, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY										
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT										
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT									-	
1	AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP)		1,707							-	1,707
2	EA-18G	4	318,386							4	318,386
2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(8,211)								(8,211)
3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		26,486								26,486
4	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	38	2,819,314		3,200					38	2,822,514
4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(83,084)							-	(83,084)
	Shared Reconnaissance Pod (SHARP)						3,200			-	-
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		86,105							-	86,105
6	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	9	1,064,516							9	1,064,516
6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(71,214)							-	(71,214)
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		67,274							-	67,274
8	UH-1Y/AH-1Z	10	307,479		50,000					10	357,479
	Non-recurring Engineering						50,000			-	-
9	MH-60S (MYP)	26	571,274							26	571,274
9	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(107,905)							-	(107,905)
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		125,698							-	125,698
11	MH-60R	12	504,690							12	504,690
11	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(69,269)							-	(69,269)
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		119,078							-	119,078
13	E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	2	237,272							2	237,272
13	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(26,320)							-	(26,320)
14	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		38,000							-	38,000
	TOTAL COMBAT AIRCRAFT		**5,921,276**		**53,200**		**53,200**		**-**		**5,974,476**
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT										
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT										
15	UC-35		-							-	-
16	C-40A		10,312							-	10,312
17	C-37		-							-	-
	TOTAL AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		**10,312**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**10,312**

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request QTY.	FY 2006 Authorization Request COST	Committee Change QTY.	Committee Change COST	Committee Increase QTY.	Committee Increase COST	Committee Decrease QTY.	Committee Decrease COST	FY 2006 Committee Authorization QTY.	FY 2006 Committee Authorization COST
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT										
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT										
18	T-48 (T-39 REPLACEMENT)		-							-	-
19	T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	6	239,240	3	58,600					9	297,840
	Additional Aircraft					3	58,600			-	-
20	JPATS		2,411	6	35,000					6	37,411
	Additional Systems					6	35,000			-	-
	TOTAL TRAINER AIRCRAFT		**241,651**		**93,600**		**93,600**		**-**		**335,251**
	OTHER AIRCRAFT										
	OTHER AIRCRAFT										
21	KC-130J	12	1,138,098	(8)	(800,900)					4	337,198
21	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(45,355)							-	(45,355)
	Program Reduction							(8)	(800,900)	-	-
22	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		-		46,000		46,000			-	46,000
23	F-5	9	4,517							9	4,517
	TOTAL OTHER AIRCRAFT		**1,097,260**		**(754,900)**		**46,000**		**(800,900)**		**342,360**
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT										
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT										
24	EA-6 SERIES		120,619		89,400					-	210,019
	Low Band Transmitter						16,400			-	-
	ICAP III						73,000				
25	AV-8 SERIES		34,862							-	34,862
26	ADVERSARY		5,013							-	5,013
27	F-18 SERIES		422,444							-	422,444
28	H-46 SERIES		55,427							-	55,427
29	AH-1W SERIES		7,656							-	7,656
30	H-53 SERIES		14,917		37,100					-	52,017
	Crashworthy Crew Chief Seats						6,500			-	-
	Integrated Mechanical Diagnostics System						9,200			-	-
	T64 Engine Reliability Improvement Program						21,400			-	-

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
31	SH-60 SERIES		12,360							-	12,360
32	H-1 SERIES		7,395							-	7,395
33	EP-3 SERIES		55,120							-	55,120
34	P-3 SERIES		163,348		7,000					-	170,348
	High Resolution Digital Recorders						5,000			-	-
	CURTIS Upgrade for BMUP Aircraft						2,000			-	-
35	S-3 SERIES		751							-	751
36	E-2 SERIES		13,654							-	13,654
37	TRAINER A/C SERIES		14,004							-	14,004
38	C-2A		29,575							-	29,575
39	C-130 SERIES		42,698							-	42,698
40	FLEET ELECTRONIC WARFARE		605							-	605
41	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		19,914							-	19,914
42	E-6 SERIES		11,219							-	11,219
43	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		16,734							-	16,734
44	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		20,762							-	20,762
45	T-45 SERIES		49,980							-	49,980
46	POWER PLANT CHANGES		26,334							-	26,334
47	JPATS SERIES		719							-	719
48	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS		323							-	323
49	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		51,376							-	51,376
50	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		214,202							-	214,202
51	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM		13,752								13,752
52	ID SYSTEMS		7,741							-	7,741
53	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		81,002							-	81,002
	TOTAL MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		**1,514,506**		**133,500**		**133,500**		**-**		**1,648,006**
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
54	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,089,236							-	1,089,236
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**1,089,236**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**1,089,236**
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES										

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
55	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		499,469							-	499,469
56	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		9,508							-	9,508
57	WAR CONSUMABLES		10,437							-	10,437
58	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		15,467							-	15,467
59	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		106,376							-	106,376
60	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,628							-	1,628
61	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		-							-	-
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		**642,885**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**642,885**
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**10,517,126**		**(474,600)**		**326,300**		**(800,900)**		**10,042,526**

Items of Special Interest

Crashworthy crew chief seats

The budget request contained $14.9 million for CH–53 Cargo Helicopter Modifications, but no funds were requested for the crashworthy crew chief seats.

The crashes of CH–53s due to hostile fire and non-hostile fire incidents in Operation Iraqi Freedom demonstrate the need for crashworthy crew chief seats. The installation of crashworthy seats would increase crewmember mission efficiency and effectiveness while significantly reducing the risk of death or injury during a hard landing or controlled crash. Survivability equipment is an essential part of force protection, which is the committee's highest priority.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.5 million for the procurement of crashworthy crew chief seats for the CH–53 aircraft.

EA–6B modifications

The budget request contained $120.6 million for EA–6B modifications, of which $52.2 million was included for improved capabilities (ICAP) III modification kits and associated equipment, and $9.6 million was included for one low-band transmitter pod. The Department of the Navy's fleet of EA–6B aircraft is currently the Department of Defense's only aircraft configured to provide the electronic-jamming capability to deny and degrade the detection of friendly forces by enemy air defense systems.

The ICAP III modification significantly improves the EA–6B's ability to suppress and destroy modern enemy air defenses by accurately identifying the specific emitter type, and by providing the enemy emitter's range and bearing, thereby allowing timely employment of suppression or destruction weapons. The committee notes that the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) has included additional ICAP III modification kits among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2006, and therefore recommends an increase of $73.0 million for seven additional ICAP III modification kits and associated equipment.

The low-band transmitter pod replaces the current ALQ–99 tactical jamming system (TJS) and provides the EA–6B with an expanded jamming capability against the early warning and acquisition radars of modern integrated air defense systems. The low-band transmitter pod also provides significantly improved reliability and maintainability compared to the ALQ–99 TJS. The committee notes that the CNO included the procurement of 11 additional low-band transmitter pods among his highest unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2006, and therefore recommends an increase of $16.4 million for this purpose.

In total, the committee recommends $210.0 million for EA–6B modifications, an increase of $89.4 million.

Joint primary air training system

The budget request contained $2.4 million for Joint Primary Air Training System (JPATS) program support, but included no funds to procure T–6A aircraft or associated ground- based training systems.

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

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy does not plan to continue JPATS procurement until fiscal year 2007, and, continues to believe that JPATS procurement for the Navy would not only reduce procurement costs for both the Navy and the Air Force, but would also reduce operations and maintenance costs.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $37.4 million for JPATS, an increase of $35.0 million for six T–6A aircraft and associated ground-based training systems.

P–3 modifications

The budget request contained $163.3 million for P–3 series modifications, but included no funds for procurement of high resolution digital recorders for P–3C aircraft equipped with the anti-surface warfare improvement program (AIP) upgrade, or for a communications for real-time intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance support (CURTIS) program for block modification upgrade (BMUP) P–3C aircraft.

The AIP upgrade improves the P–3C's surveillance, communications, survivability, and over-the-horizon targeting capabilities through the installation of commercial-off-the-shelf components. The committee understands that current recorders used to record electro-optical, infra-red, and radar on AIP-equipped P–3C aircraft have limited information storage capability, and have high failure rates resulting in the loss of mission-critical intelligence data. To address this situation, the committee believes that AIP-equipped P–3C aircraft should be upgraded with high resolution digital recorders, therefore recommends an increase of $5.0 million for this purpose.

The CURTIS program for BMUP P–3C aircraft would provide improved satellite communication radios and a capability to video-link imagery to ground forces. Additionally, the CURTIS program would allow an operator to fuse intelligence data from all existing systems to provide a more comprehensive picture to operational commanders and ground personnel. Since the committee believes that the CURTIS program would improve the viability of the BMUP P–3C aircraft fleet, it recommends an increase of $2.0 million to procure a CURTIS production demonstration kit and to conduct CURTIS aircraft flight certification.

In total, the committee recommends $170.3 million for P–3 series modifications, an increase of $7.0 million.

Shared reconnaissance pod logistics support

The budget request contained $2.7 billion for 38 F/A–18E and F/A–18F aircraft, but included no funds for the shared reconnaissance pod (SHARP) logistics support.

The SHARP is an electro-optical and infra-red podded system, mounted on the F/A–18E and F/A–18F aircraft, which is capable of collecting long- and medium-range imagery to provide data-linked information to combatant commanders about potential enemy targets. The committee understands that without an increase for

SHARP logistics support, full operational capability of the Department of the Navy's 21 SHARPs will not be achieved, and the committee notes that the Chief of Naval Operations included SHARP logistics support among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2006.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.2 million for SHARP logistics support, and understands that this increase will complete development of maintenance manuals and training products.

T–45 training system

The budget request contained $239.2 million for procurement of six T–45C aircraft and associated training systems. The T–45 training system (TS) is an integrated training system that combines the T–45 aircraft, simulators, and computer-based training for the Navy's intermediate-level undergraduate pilot training.

The committee understands that the quantity of six aircraft budgeted for fiscal year 2006 is less than the most economical minimum sustaining procurement rate, and notes that the Chief of Naval Operations has included the procurement of three additional T–45C aircraft among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2006. The committee also understands that an increase of three aircraft procured in fiscal year 2006 would save approximately $4.0 million in reduced unit costs.

Consequently, the committee recommends $297.8 million for the T–45TS, an increase of $58.6 million for three additional T–45C aircraft.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $2.7 billion for Weapons Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $2.8 billion, an increase of $67.2 million, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Weapons Procurement, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY										
	BALLISTIC MISSILES										
	BALLISTIC MISSILES										
1	TRIDENT II		-							-	-
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-							-	-
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES										-
2	TRIDENT II MODS		932,680							-	932,680
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										-
3	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		3,413							-	3,413
	TOTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES		**936,093**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**936,093**
	OTHER MISSILES										
	STRATEGIC MISSILES										
4	TOMAHAWK	379	353,409	77	67,200					456	420,609
	Additional Missiles					77	67,200			-	-
	TACTICAL MISSILES										-
5	AMRAAM	101	81,507							101	81,507
6	SIDEWINDER	165	37,823							165	37,823
7	JSOW	420	144,449							420	144,449
8	SLAM-ER		-							-	-
9	STANDARD MISSILE	75	145,676							75	145,676
10	RAM	90	86,944							90	86,944
11	HELLFIRE										
12	AERIAL TARGETS		101,882							-	101,882
13	DRONES AND DECOYS		-							-	-
14	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		10,336							-	10,336
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES										-
15	ESSM	116	99,833								99,833
16	STANDARD MISSILES MODS		53,531							-	53,531
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										-
17	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		4,112							-	4,112
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										-

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request QTY.	FY 2006 Authorization Request COST	Committee Change QTY.	Committee Change COST	Committee Increase QTY.	Committee Increase COST	Committee Decrease QTY.	Committee Decrease COST	FY 2006 Committee Authorization QTY.	FY 2006 Committee Authorization COST
18	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		45,410							-	45,410
	TOTAL OTHER MISSILES		**1,164,912**		**67,200**		**67,200**		**-**		**1,232,112**
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT										
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP.										
19	SSTD (TORPEDO DEFENSE)		3,994								3,994
20	ASW TARGETS		24,557							-	24,557
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP										-
21	MK-46 TORPEDO MODS		76,591							-	76,591
22	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS		61,309							-	61,309
23	QUICKSTRIKE MINE		3,018							-	3,018
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										-
24	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		29,234							-	29,234
25	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		13,039							-	13,039
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION										-
26	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		3,188							-	3,188
	TOTAL TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT		**214,930**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**214,930**
	OTHER WEAPONS										
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS										
27	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		22,515							-	22,515
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS										-
28	CIWS MODS		195,648							-	195,648
29	COAST GUARD WEAPONS/CIWS		5,375								5,375
30	GUN MOUNT MODS		84,142							-	84,142
31	PIONEER		1,964							-	1,964
32	CRUISER MODERNIZATON WEAPONS		5,428								5,428
33	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS		1,515								1,515
	OTHER										-
34	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		-							-	-
	TOTAL OTHER WEAPONS		**316,587**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**316,587**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
35	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		75,319							-	75,319
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**75,319**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**75,319**
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**2,707,841**		**67,200**		**67,200**		**-**		**2,775,041**

Item of Special Interest

Tomahawk missile

The budget request contained $353.4 million for 379 tactical tomahawk (TACTOM) missiles.

The TACTOM missile is a long-range, precision-strike cruise missile launched from surface ships or submarines. Currently, TACTOM maximum production capacity is 456 missiles per year.

The committee understands that the Department of the Navy's programmed budget for TACTOM missiles would result in an inventory that is significantly below the Navy's stated Tomahawk requirement inventory level, and believes that an increase to the maximum TACTOM production capacity in fiscal year 2006 is warranted to help restore expenditures from the recent Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $420.6 million for the Tomahawk missile, an increase of $67.2 million for 77 additional TACTOM missiles. The committee believes that this increase should be distributed to procure an additional 57 surface and 20 subsurface TACTOM variants, and understands that this increase will result in a production net savings of at least $10,000 per missile.

AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, NAVY & MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $872.8 million for Ammunition Procurement, Navy & Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $869.8 million, a decrease of $3.1 million, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Ammunition Procurement, Navy & Marine Corps program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy & Marine Corps request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS										
	PROC AMMO, NAVY										
	NAVY AMMUNITION										
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		135,355							-	135,355
2	JDAM	3,400	82,589							3,400	82,589
3	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		35,159		(8,079)					-	27,080
	APKWS - Program Delay								(8,079)	-	-
4	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		23,666							-	23,666
5	PRACTICE BOMBS		56,569							-	56,569
6	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		32,586							-	32,586
7	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS		10,860							-	10,860
8	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		70,174							-	70,174
9	JATOS		4,566							-	4,566
10	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION		25,923							-	25,923
11	EXTENDED RANGE GUIDED MUNITIONS (ERGM)		-							-	-
12	76MM GUN AMMUNITION		-							-	-
13	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER CUN AMMO		1,252								1,252
14	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		40,144							-	40,144
15	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		35,639							-	35,639
16	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		13,910							-	13,910
17	JUDGEMENT FUND		-							-	-
18	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		3,157							-	3,157
	TOTAL PROC AMMO, NAVY		**571,549**		**(8,079)**		**-**		**(8,079)**		**563,470**
	PROC AMMO, MC										
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION										
19	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES		37,452							-	37,452
20	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES		13,731							-	13,731
21	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		38,761		5,000					-	43,761
	MN79						5,000			-	-
22	.50 CALIBER		34,882							-	34,882
23	40 MM, ALL TYPES		58,148							-	58,148

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
24	60MM, ALL TYPES		16,224							-	16,224
25	81MM, ALL TYPES		17,211							-	17,211
26	120MM, ALL TYPES		7,231							-	7,231
27	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		2,118							-	2,118
28	9 MM ALL TYPES		-							-	-
29	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		5,315							-	5,315
30	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		-							-	-
31	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		31,810							-	31,810
32	EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE		5,738							-	5,738
33	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		2,353							-	2,353
34	FUZE, ALL TYPES		3,648							-	3,648
35	NON LETHALS		1,127							-	1,127
36	AMMO MODERNIZATION		7,350							-	7,350
37	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		18,201							-	18,201
	TOTAL PROC. AMMO, MC		**301,300**		**5,000**		**5,000**		**-**		**306,300**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS		**872,849**		**(3,079)**		**5,000**		**(8,079)**		**869,770**

Item of Special Interest

MN79 anti-personnel obstacle breaching system

The budget request contained $38.8 million for linear charges (all types), including $32.0 million for procurement of the MN79 Anti-Personnel Obstacle Breaching System (APOBS).

The APOBS is a two-man, portable, rocket propelled mine and obstacle clearing line charge system designed to clear a footpath through anti-personnel mines and wire obstacles during assault-breaching operations. The APOBS system is one of the first systems to fully comply with the insensitive munitions requirements and is also being tested for use on unmanned ground vehicles and robotic platforms to further enhance assault-breaching capabilities and warfighter protection. Lastly, the committee understands an APOBS shortage exists in war and training reserve stockpiles.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to sufficiently fund procurement requirements of the APOBS.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $8.7 billion for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $10.8 billion, an increase of $2.1 billion, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY										
	OTHER WARSHIPS										
	OTHER WARSHIPS										
1	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		564,913							-	564,913
2	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	1	2,398,118							1	2,398,118
2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(760,420)							-	(760,420)
3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		763,786							-	763,786
4	SSGN CONVERSION		334,322							-	334,322
4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(47,806)							-	(47,806)
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		-							-	-
6	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS		2,572,341							-	2,572,341
6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(1,078,778)							-	(1,078,778)
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		20,000							-	20,000
8	SSN ERO		-							-	-
9	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		39,524							-	39,524
10	SSBN ERO	1	364,636							1	364,636
10	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(134,443)							-	(134,443)
11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		62,248							-	62,248
12	DD(X)		220,222								220,222
12	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(220,222)								(220,222)
13	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		715,992		(715,992)				(715,992)	-	-
14	DDG-51		225,427	2	2,500,000					2	2,725,427
14	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-							-	-
	Additional ships					2	2,500,000			-	-
15	DDG MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		-							-	-
	TOTAL OTHER WARSHIPS		**6,039,860**		**1,784,008**		**2,500,000**		**(715,992)**		**7,823,868**
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS										
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS										
16	LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP		197,769							-	197,769
17	LPD-17	1	1,344,741							1	1,344,741
17	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-							-	-
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		-							-	-

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
19	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		150,447		267,600					-	418,047
	Program Increase						267,600				
	TOTAL AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS		**1,692,957**		**267,600**		**267,600**		**-**		**1,960,557**
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM										
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST										
20	LCU(X)		-		7,000					-	7,000
	Aft-ramp Range Retriever Craft (ARC)						7,000			-	-
21	OUTFITTING		426,987							-	426,987
22	SERVICE CRAFT		56,255							-	56,255
23	LCAC SLEP	6	110,583							6	110,583
24	MINE HUNTER		-							-	-
25	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		394,523							-	394,523
25	SSN-774		[182,713]							-	[182,713]
25	LPD		[66,810]								[66,810]
26	POWER UNIT ASSEMBLY FACILITY		-								-
	TOTAL AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAMS		**988,348**		**7,000**		**7,000**		**-**		**995,348**
	TOTAL SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY		**8,721,165**		**2,058,608**		**2,774,600**		**(715,992)**		**10,779,773**

Item of Special Interest

Navy shipbuilding programs

The committee is greatly concerned about the dramatic increase in Navy shipbuilding costs, the viability of the Navy's future force structure, and the ambiguity and volatility in the Navy's shipbuilding plans.

The spiraling growth in the costs of modern military systems has reached a point where it directly places at risk the ability of the United States to field weapons platforms in sufficient numbers to support U.S. military strategy and national security requirements. Nowhere, is this risk more apparent than in naval shipbuilding. Admiral Vern Clark, Chief of Naval Operations, when testifying before the committee on the fiscal year 2006 budget request for the Department of the Navy stated, "As we seek greater combat capability and greater operational efficiencies through upgraded power, propulsion, and computing technologies, we find a ratio of cost growth beyond our seeming control, which may not be fully explainable solely by reduced economies of scale." The committee agrees that general inflation, raw material cost increases, and reduced overhead absorption due to shipbuilding rate decreases cannot fully explain the dramatic increase in shipbuilding costs.

Admiral Clark, in his posture statement before the House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense stated, "We need to partner with Congress and industry to regain our buying power. Acquisition and budget reforms, such as multi-year procurement, economic order quantity, and other approaches help to stabilize the production path, and in our view, reduce the per unit cost of ships and increase our shipbuilding rate." The committee does not agree that creative financing methodologies that delay recognizing the true cost of shipbuilding or that provide ever-increasing amounts of funding to cover the explosion in ship costs are responsible actions. Incremental funding, advanced procurement, multi-year procurement, and various creative shipyard work allocation arrangements have failed to control the cost growth of vessel classes such as the Virginia class submarine, the replacement amphibious assault ship (LHA(R)), the future major surface combatant ship (DD(X)), and the future aircraft carrier CVN–21.

The committee believes the lack of discipline in both the requirements development process and the systems design and demonstration phase process are the largest contributors to the spiraling cost growth in naval vessels. The capabilities defined in the requirements development process must be constrained by an appropriate amount of overmatch capability, acknowledgement that some missions may be better served by other platforms in the joint battle space and by costs that permit the continued deployment of sufficient naval force structure. With the cost of a destroyer having potentially grown to be greater than 50 percent of the cost of the Nimitz class aircraft carrier, this class of new ships is simply not affordable. Further, the latest reports indicate that the CVN–21 aircraft carrier may cost as much as $13.0 billion.

The committee supports increased funding for naval shipbuilding. However, the committee recognizes that fiscal constraints will not permit the continued funding of dramatically more expensive vessels that will only further reduce force structure of the fleet

and expedite the atrophy of our shipbuilding capability. Accordingly, the committee has included in this Act provisions that constrain the unit cost of the Virginia class submarine, the DD(X), the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS), and the LHA(R). Further, these provisions are intended to force the Navy to assess the trade-off between military requirements and affordability and to stabilize ship designs prior to construction. In the interim, the committee recommends that the construction of two additional Arleigh Burke class (DDG–51) destroyers be authorized with funds, in part, from the cost savings derived from the aforementioned alterations to the DD(X) program.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $5.5 billion for Other Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $5.6 billion, an increase of $146.5 million, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Other Procurement, Navy program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY										
	SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT										
1	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE		8,644							-	8,644
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE		22,208		5,000					-	27,208
	Mine Sweeper Re-engining						5,000			-	-
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT										-
3	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		30,747		15,000					-	45,747
	Integrated Bridge System						15,000			-	-
	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT										-
4	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT		918							-	918
	PERISCOPES										-
5	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP		76,613							-	76,613
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT										-
6	DDG MOD		2,998								2,998
7	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT		31,710							-	31,710
8	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD		2,852							-	2,852
9	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		32,889							-	32,889
10	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		19,912		4,500					-	24,412
	High Performance Metal Fiber Brush						4,500			-	-
11	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		175,572							-	175,572
12	SUBMARINE BATTERIES		26,575							-	26,575
13	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		70,429							-	70,429
14	DSSP EQUIPMENT		12,718							-	12,718
15	CG-MODERNIZATION		135,253							-	135,253
16	LCAC		19,953							-	19,953
17	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT		12,372							-	12,372
18	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		134,019		13,800					-	147,819
	Aircraft Carrier Elevator Modifications						5,700			-	-
	CVN Propeller Replacement						5,600			-	-
	Ultrasonic Maintenance Tools						2,500			-	-
19	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS		897							-	897
20	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM		13,672							-	13,672

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT										-
21	REACTOR POWER UNITS		373,865							-	373,865
22	REACTOR COMPONENTS		222,596							-	222,596
	OCEAN ENGINEERING										-
23	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT		8,592							-	8,592
	SMALL BOATS										-
24	STANDARD BOATS		15,671		6,000					-	21,671
	Special Operations Swimmer/Diver Training Craft					24	6,000			-	-
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT										-
25	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT		3,126							-	3,126
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT										-
26	OPERATING FORCES IPE		25,657							-	25,657
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT										-
27	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS		135,252							-	135,252
28	LCS MODULES		36,811								36,811
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT										-
29	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT		-							-	-
	TOTAL SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**1,652,521**		**44,300**		**44,300**		**-**		**1,696,821**
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT										
	SHIP RADARS										
30	RADAR SUPPORT		-							-	-
31	TISS		-							-	-
	SHIP SONARS										-
32	SPQ-9B RADAR		5,913		4,000					-	9,913
	AN/SPQ-9B Radar Transmitter Upgrade						4,000			-	-
33	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM		25,520							-	25,520
34	SSN ACOUSTICS		226,914		4,000					-	230,914
	Rapid COTS insertion						4,000			-	-
35	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		13,962							-	13,962
36	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		12,263							-	12,263
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT										-
37	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM		27,332							-	27,332

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
38	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE (SSTD)		22,898							-	22,898
39	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		65,334		3,700		3,700			-	69,034
40	SURTASS		3,848	2	14,900					2	18,748
	Twin-Line Towed Arrays					2	14,900			-	-
41	TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER		5,270		5,600					-	10,870
	P-3 TCDL						5,600			-	-
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT										-
42	AN/SLQ-32		25,053							-	25,053
43	INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS		3,787							-	3,787
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT										-
44	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT		62,721							-	62,721
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT										-
45	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG		92,806							-	92,806
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT										-
46	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM		-							-	-
47	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY		16,474							-	16,474
48	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT		91,511							-	91,511
49	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)		59,226							-	59,226
50	ADVANCED TACTICAL DATA LINK (ATDLS)		14,102							-	14,102
51	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	3	84,045							3	84,045
52	SHALLOW WATER MCM		2,277								2,277
53	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)		14,715							-	14,715
54	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV		4,366							-	4,366
55	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		3,285							-	3,285
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT										-
56	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT		62,027							-	62,027
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT										-
57	MARINE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL (MATCALS)		19,584							-	19,584
58	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		7,307							-	7,307
59	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM		17,388							-	17,388
60	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM		18,446							-	18,446
61	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,870							-	3,870
62	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM		7,733							-	7,733

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
63	FACSFAC / AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		3,609							-	3,609
64	ID SYSTEMS / IFF		24,915							-	24,915
65	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS (TAMPS)		7,857							-	7,857
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT										-
66	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT		27,901							-	27,901
67	DIMHRS		-							-	-
68	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS		20,422							-	20,422
69	RADIAC		9,783							-	9,783
70	GPETE		6,944							-	6,944
71	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY		4,381							-	4,381
72	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION		5,995							-	5,995
73	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		19,721							-	19,721
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS										-
74	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS		2,597							-	2,597
75	PORTABLE RADIOS		10,058								10,058
76	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		253,960							-	253,960
77	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M		15,248							-	15,248
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS										-
78	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT		2,162		2,500					-	4,662
	Fixed Submarine Broadcast System LF Awase Upgrade						2,500			-	-
79	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT		127,409							-	127,409
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS										-
80	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS		71,754							-	71,754
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS										-
81	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		2,950							-	2,950
82	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS		1,274							-	1,274
83	NSIPS		-							-	-
84	JEDMICS		-							-	-
85	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS		59,208							-	59,208
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT										-
86	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		96,201							-	96,201
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT										-
87	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		22,281							-	22,281

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request QTY.	FY 2006 Authorization Request COST	Committee Change QTY.	Committee Change COST	Committee Increase QTY.	Committee Increase COST	Committee Decrease QTY.	Committee Decrease COST	FY 2006 Committee Authorization QTY.	FY 2006 Committee Authorization COST
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT										-
88	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT		31,377							-	31,377
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT										-
89	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT		-							-	-
	TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		**1,847,984**		**34,700**		**34,700**		**-**		**1,882,684**
	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
	SONOBUOYS										
90	SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES		58,422							-	58,422
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										-
91	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		46,622		10,000					-	56,622
	Joint Threat Emitter						10,000			-	-
92	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		7,860							-	7,860
93	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT		11,984							-	11,984
94	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT		27,042							-	27,042
95	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		25,129							-	25,129
96	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		1,434							-	1,434
97	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT		26,946							-	26,946
98	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES		38,036							-	38,036
99	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT	8	18,152							8	18,152
100	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		6,458							-	6,458
	TOTAL AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**268,085**		**10,000**		**10,000**		**-**		**278,085**
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT										
101	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM		6,057							-	6,057
102	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT		11,077							-	11,077
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT										-
103	NATO SEASPARROW		38,442							-	38,442
104	RAM GMLS		17,488		12,000					-	29,488
	Phalanx SeaRAM						12,000			-	-
105	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM		33,428							-	33,428
106	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		98,881		2,900					-	101,781

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	Fiber Switch System						2,900			-	-
107	SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		-							-	-
108	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		75,075								75,075
109	SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIP		-							-	-
110	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS		8,645							-	8,645
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										-
111	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP		108,106							-	108,106
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										-
112	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS		138,180							-	138,180
113	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,836							-	4,836
114	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,603							-	4,603
115	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,232							-	7,232
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										-
116	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP		28,403							-	28,403
117	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		3,978							-	3,978
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE										-
118	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM		40,436							-	40,436
119	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		10,618							-	10,618
120	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		31,760							-	31,760
	TOTAL ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**667,245**		**14,900**		**14,900**		**-**		**682,145**
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
121	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		1,796							-	1,796
122	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		2,049							-	2,049
123	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		31,033							-	31,033
124	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		14,320							-	14,320
125	TACTICAL VEHICLES		44,383							-	44,383
126	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		149,702							-	149,702
127	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		11,736							-	11,736
128	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION		26,459							-	26,459
129	PHYSICAL SECURITY VECHICLES		1,200							-	1,200
	TOTAL CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**282,678**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**282,678**

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
130	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		12,946		11,000					-	23,946
	Six-ton Loaders					66	11,000			-	-
131	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		15,872		8,000					-	23,872
	Serial Number Tracking System						8,000			-	-
132	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		5,785							-	5,785
133	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS		73,383							-	73,383
	TOTAL SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**107,986**		**19,000**		**19,000**		**-**		**126,986**
	PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
	TRAINING DEVICES										
134	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		15,984		8,000					-	23,984
	Laser Marksmanship Training System - Naval Reserve						8,000			-	-
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT									-	-
135	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		60,768		9,100					-	69,868
	Man Overboard ID Program						9,100			-	-
136	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		426							-	426
137	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		8,772							-	8,772
139	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,925		4,500					-	12,425
	Envelop Proteclive Covers						4,500			-	-
140	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		31,773							-	31,773
141	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		17,755							-	17,755
142	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		238,276		2,000					-	240,276
	Transportable Anti-Intrusion Pontoon Barrier System						2,000			-	-
	OTHER										-
145	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		-							-	-
	TOTAL PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**381,679**		**23,600**		**23,600**		**-**		**405,279**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
146	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		268,741							-	268,741

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**268,741**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**268,741**
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		10,899								10,899
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**5,487,818**		**146,500**		**146,500**		**-**		**5,634,318**

Items of Special Interest

Joint threat emitter

The budget request contained $46.6 million for weapons range support equipment but included no funds to procure the joint threat emitter (JTE).

The JTE is an advanced, mobile, rapidly reprogrammable electronic warfare threat simulator that generates all known ground-based electronic warfare threats. The committee notes that the budget request includes JTE procurement by the Department of the Air Force, understands that the Department of the Navy's Fallon Training Range requires upgraded threat simulations which can be met by the JTE, and believes that JTE unit costs can be reduced for both Departments by providing an increase for Department of the Navy JTE procurement.

Therefore, the committee recommends $56.6 million for weapons range support equipment, an increase of $10.0 million for procurement of the JTE.

Material handling equipment

The budget request contained $12.9 million for materials handling equipment (MHE), of which $1.2 million was included to procure seven C–130 transportable scoop loaders with six-ton MHE capability for the Naval Construction Force (NCF) Seabees.

The scoop loader with six-ton MHE capability is versatile, demonstrates commonality with Marine Corps MHE, and provides NCF Seabees the capability to reliably, safely, and cost effectively meet critical reconstruction mission requirements in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The committee is aware the NCF Seabees are in the process of recapitalizing their fleet of construction equipment and MHE. The committee supports this initiative and notes that the high operational tempo coupled with the harsh environment of Iraq has consequently resulted in some equipment becoming uneconomical to either repair or to rebuild through service life extension programs or recapitalization programs. The committee understands construction equipment and MHE constitute the backbone of the NCF Seabees.

The committee recommends $23.9 million for materials handling equipment, an increase of $11.0 million for 66 transportable scoop loaders with six-ton MHE capability in order to accelerate the replacement of obsolete, worn out MHE.

Mine sweeper re-engining

The budget request contained no funding in ship propulsion equipment to re-engine ships one and two of the mine sweeper MCM–1 class.

The committee notes that except for ships one and two, ships of the mine sweeper MCM–1 class have been base-lined with upgraded diesel engines. The committee is aware that re-engining has improved performance and simplified the logistics tail and fleet maintenance by having common engines.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to re-engine the first two ships of the class.

Naval tactical fiber switch system

The budget request contained $98.9 million for AEGIS support equipment, but included no funds to replace the existing high speed data switches at the AEGIS Computer Center (ACC), AEGIS Training and Readiness Center (ATRC), and Surface Combat Systems Center (SCSC).

The committee is aware that high speed switches at these three centers are critical enablers which allow for rapidly reconfigurable training, simulation, and testing on all 84 AEGIS combat system configurations. The existing switch systems represent single point failure modes, which due their age and limitations could substantially degrade readiness.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $2.9 million for the upgrade of switches at ACC, ATRC, and SCSC to the Naval Tactical Fiber Switch System.

Special operations swimmer/diver training craft

The budget request contained $15.7 million for standard boats, but included only $1.8 million to procure special operations swimmer/diver training craft. The committee understands that the Navy requires a total of 64 new craft to replace today's aging training craft fleet and accommodate the increased training requirements of the Naval Special Warfare Command.

The committee recommends $21.7 million for standard boats, an increase of $6.0 million for the procurement of an additional 24 special operations swimmer/diver training craft.

Surveillance towed array sensor system twin-line towed arrays

The budget request contained $3.8 million for Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System (SURTASS) procurement, but included no funds for procurement of SURTASS twin-line towed arrays.

SURTASS is the mobile, tactical and strategic arm of the Navy's undersea surveillance capability that provides deep ocean and littoral acoustic detection and cueing for tactical weapon platforms against diesel and nuclear submarines, as well as surface vessels in any given area of operations worldwide. The committee notes that the limited number of thin-line towed array operational spares affects the preventive maintenance capability of the Navy's towed array maintenance and support infrastructure and the operational capability of the anti-submarine warfare tactical-auxiliary general ocean surveillance ships for collection of undersea acoustic data. The committee also notes that the Chief of Naval Operations identified the procurement of additional TB–29A twin-line array ship sets as a priority unfunded requirement.

The committee recommends $18.7 million for SURTASS procurement, including $14.9 million for the procurement of two TB–29A twin-line towed array ship sets.

Transportable anti-intrusion pontoon barrier system

The budget request contained $238.3 million for procurement of physical security equipment for the Navy.

The committee notes that the need exists for a transportable barrier system that can be used to protect U.S. Navy ships and other government assets while in port at home and abroad, and the absence of such systems in general use throughout the fleet. The com-

mittee is aware of the development by a Navy-industry team of a concept for such a transportable barrier system, and plans for development and evaluation of the system. The committee believes that such a system could significantly improve the safety and security of our ships and port facilities.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for development and evaluation of the transportable anti-intrusion pontoon barrier system.

Ultrasonic maintenance tools

The budget request contained no funds for ultrasonic maintenance tools.

The committee is aware that the introduction of ultrasonic maintenance tools throughout the Navy has the potential to reduce maintenance man-hours by eliminating several time consuming maintenance procedures that are used to locate leaks, find bearing anomalies, and identify clogged fuel injectors.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million for ultrasonic maintenance tools.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $1.6 billion for National Defense Sealift Fund. The committee recommends authorization of $1.7 billion, an increase of $48.5 million, for fiscal year 2006.

Item of Special Interest

Maritime prepositioning ship lease buyout

The budget request, within the National Defense Sealift Fund, contained $749.8 million to exercise purchase options on 13 Maritime Prepositioning Ships (MPS). Because of the continuing need for these ships beyond the original 25-year lease term, the committee recommends the purchase of six ships in this fiscal year, at a total cost of $414.0 million. The committee also recommends a $103.0 million increase to the Navy's operation and maintenance account for the purpose of continuing the "capital hire payments" on the seven ships that are not being purchased. The committee expects that the Navy will exercise these options to purchase the following ships: MV SGT William R. Button, MV 1st LT Jack Lummus, MV 1st LT Baldomero Lopez, MV PFC Dewayne T. Williams, SS Maj Stephen W. Pless, and MV 2nd Lt John P. Bobo. The committee also expects that the funds provided in this Act will not be used to purchase fewer than the six ships enumerated above. The purchase of these ships will provide the Navy with the newest vessels within the total complement of Maritime Prepositioning ships, and ultimately provide the Navy with the greatest capability until the new Marine Prepositioning Force (Future) ships come on line.

While the Navy negotiated for purchase options on all 13 of the MPS, the exact option price is the greater of the termination value, which is set forth in the lease, and the current fair market value. The contract language provides that the "fair market value shall

mean the price that a willing purchaser, that is not the charterer (Navy) or an affiliate of the charterer would pay to purchase the vessel in an arm's-length transaction." If negotiations do not result in an agreement on the buy-out value, the market value is determined by an arbitration panel made up of three appraisers. The committee understands, on the first ships in the purchase process, that the appraised market value will be determined before the end of September 2005.

The committee expects, in the event that these appraised market values exceed in any significant way the termination values in the leases, that the Navy will withdraw its purchase notifications to the owners, and the congressional defense committees will be notified immediately of the Navy's future plans with respect to the MPS.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $1.4 billion for Procurement, Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $1.4 billion, an increase of $29.9 million, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Procurement, Marine Corps program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Marine Corps request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS										
	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES										
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES										
1	AAV7A1 PIP		26,134							-	26,134
2	EXPEDITIONARY FIGHTING VEHICLE		30,359							-	30,359
3	LAV PIP		59,699							-	59,699
4	HIMARS		-							-	-
5	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (IRV)		-							-	-
6	MODIFICATION KITS (ARMOR AND FIRE SUPPORT)		-							-	-
7	M1A1 FIREPOWER ENHANCEMENTS	126	33,454							126	33,454
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS										-
8	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	6	5,965							6	5,965
9	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	77	178,364							77	178,364
10	MODIFICATION KITS (INFANTRY WEAPONS)		-							-	-
11	MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		-							-	-
12	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM	15	176,795							15	176,795
13	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION		7,743							-	7,743
	WEAPONS										-
14	MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM	15,909	23,604							####	23,604
	OTHER SUPPORT										-
15	MODIFICATION KITS		10,638							-	10,638
16	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		5,357							-	5,357
17	OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR		-							-	-
	TOTAL WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES		**558,112**		-		-		-		**558,112**
	GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT										
	GUIDED MISSILES										
18	LOW ALTITUDE AIR DEFENSE		1,997							-	1,997
19	JAVELIN		-							-	-
20	PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS) (MYP)		-							-	-
21	HIMARS ROCKETS		-							-	-
22	COMPLEMENTARY LOW ALTITUDE WEAPON SYSTEM		442							-	442
23	PREDATOR (SRAW)		-							-	-

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	OTHER SUPPORT										
24	MODIFICATION KITS		-							-	-
	TOTAL GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT		**2,439**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**2,439**
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT										
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS										
25	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER		952							-	952
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT										
26	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		25,749							-	25,749
27	AUTO TEST SYSTEMS		-							-	-
28	GENERAL PURPOSE TOOLS & TEST SYSTEMS		-							-	-
29	CALIBRATION FACILITIES		-							-	-
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)										-
30	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		23,757							-	23,757
31	MODIFICATION KITS		23,611							-	23,611
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)										-
32	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		-							-	-
33	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		2,043							-	2,043
34	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		13,058							-	13,058
35	MAGTF CSSE &SE		-							-	-
36	MULTIPLE ROLE RADAR SYSTEM		-							-	-
37	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS		14,837							-	14,837
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)										-
38	RADAR SYSTEMS		12,167							-	12,167
39	RADAR SET AN/TPS-59		-							-	-
40	TRANSITION SWITCH MODULE		-							-	-
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)										
41	TACTICAL REMOTE SENSOR SYSTEM		-							-	-
42	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEMS		33,460							-	33,460
43	SMALL UNIT REMOTE SCOUTING SYSTEM (SURSS)		-							-	-
44	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		65,973		10,700					-	76,673
	Tactical Remote Sensor System (TRSS)						8,900			-	-
	Topographic Production Capability Components (TPCC)						1,800			-	-

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
45	MOD KITS (INTEL)		-							-	-
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)										-
46	VISUAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS (VIS)		-							-	-
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)										
47	COMPLEMENTARY LOW ALTITUDE WEAPONS SYSTEM		-							-	-
48	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		20,795	715	10,000					715	30,795
	Close Quarters Battle Sight					715	10,000			-	-
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)										
49	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		48,589							-	48,589
50	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		17,255							-	17,255
51	RADIO SYSTEMS		28,972							-	28,972
52	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		54,324							-	54,324
53	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		17,805							-	17,805
54	MOD KITS MAGTF C41		-							-	-
	TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		**403,347**		**20,700**		**20,700**		**-**		**424,047**
	SUPPORT VEHICLES										
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES										
55	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	24	775							24	775
56	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		11,776							-	11,776
	TACTICAL VEHICLES										-
57	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	1,310	97,988							1,310	97,988
58	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS		-							-	-
59	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT		-							-	-
60	LIGHTWEIGHT PRIME MOVER		3,445							-	3,445
61	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP		28,366							-	28,366
62	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		6,906							-	6,906
	OTHER SUPPORT										-
63	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		3,748							-	3,748
	TOTAL SUPPORT VEHICLES		**153,004**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**153,004**

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT										
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT										
64	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		3,450							-	3,450
65	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE		-							-	-
66	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		21,887							-	21,887
67	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		5,338							-	5,338
68	DEMOLITION SUPPORT SYSTEMS		-							-	-
69	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		12,153							-	12,153
70	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		16,105							-	16,105
71	EOD SYSTEMS		71,185							-	71,185
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT										-
72	AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT		-							-	-
73	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		5,064							-	5,064
74	GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP (GMEE)		10,914							-	10,914
75	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		21,132							-	21,132
76	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		3,421							-	3,421
	GENERAL PROPERTY										-
77	INCIDENT RESPONSE SYSTEMS		-							-	-
78	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		2,459		5,200					-	7,659
	Combat Casualty Care Equipment Upgrade						5,200			-	-
79	EOD EQUIPMENT		-							-	-
80	TRAINING DEVICES		17,722							-	17,722
81	CONTAINER FAMILY		3,721							-	3,721
82	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		19,745		4,000					-	23,745
	Mobile Helipad System						4,000			-	-
83	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)		3,786							-	3,786
84	BRIDGE BOATS		-							-	-
85	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN		5,405							-	5,405
	OTHER SUPPORT										-
86	MODIFICATION KITS		-							-	-
87	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		10,412							-	10,412
88	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (M)		-							-	-
	TOTAL ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT		**233,899**		**9,200**		**9,200**		**-**		**243,099**

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
89	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		26,904							-	26,904
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**26,904**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**26,904**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		**1,377,705**		**29,900**		**29,900**		**-**		**1,407,605**

Items of Special Interest

Combat casualty care equipment upgrade

The budget request contained $2.5 million for procurement of field medical equipment, but included no funds for the upgrade of combat casualty care equipment.

The committee notes that the U.S. Marine Corps combat casualty care equipment upgrade program provides improved field medical equipment to meet requirements highlighted by today's combat operations and littoral warfare. It permits Navy Medical Department corpsmen supporting Fleet Marine Force battalions to move quickly to stabilize and evacuate casualties during the critical "golden hour" after initial traumas, thereby vastly improving survival rates and recovery times. The program procures state-of-the-art, lightweight, standard litters and litter load carriage tools, pelvic stabilization devices, tactical airway tools, trauma gloves, and other kits, and on-board, life-saving medical kits for tactical vehicles.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.2 million for the combat casualty care equipment upgrade program.

Family of construction equipment

The budget request contained $19.7 million for family of construction equipment, but contained no funds for procurement of the Mobi-Mat Helipad System.

The Mobi-Mat Helipad System is a commercial-off-the-shelf 55′ x 100′ helicopter landing pad made out of 12 rolls/panels of a lightweight, patented, polyester mesh that is anchored to the ground and is designed to reduce sand clouds and foreign object damage by creating a safe landing platform for all types of aircrafts, including rotorcraft. The committee recognizes this system decreases maintenance costs of rotorcraft engines and rotor blades while also enhancing the safety, reliability, and performance of rotorcraft operating in harsh, desert environments. The committee notes this system is being used extensively and successfully in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Therefore, the committee recommends $23.7 million, an increase of $4.0 million to replace worn out Mobi-Mat Helipad Systems.

Marines tactical remote sensor system

The budget request contained $18.4 million for the Tactical Remote Sensor System (TRSS).

The committee recognizes the importance of TRSS to provide state-of-the-art ground surveillance for continuous, unattended, all-weather detection, location and monitoring of enemy activity. The committee notes the product improvement plan for TRSS to replace inventories of obsolete sensors with those that autonomously provide better classification of targets and enemy activity. The committee also notes TRSS is an unfunded Marine Corps requirement.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.9 million for TRSS product improvement.

Marines topographic equipment

The budget request contained no funding for the Topographic Production Capability Components (TPCC), an unfunded Marine Corps requirement.

The committee recognizes the importance of TPCC to provide geographic and geospatial analysis and production to marines on the move, and to the Joint Task Force Commander and the Marine Component Commander through a system of highly transportable modular systems. The committee notes that the continuous deployment of intelligence battalions in support of the global war on terrorism has reduced the equipment life of the topographic gear. Additionally, the committee notes that marines rely on TPCC products more and more, and this has lead to an increasing requirement for TPCC systems in the field.

Therefore, the committee recommends $1.8 million for the Marine Corps TPCC program.

Night vision equipment

The budget request contained $20.8 million for night vision equipment, but included no funds to procure the Close Quarters Battle Sight (CQBS) system.

The Marine Corps mission needs statement states the M4 Close Quarter Battle (CQB) Weapon must be capable of effective employment in all environments. The CQBS system is a day/night weapon sight that can be outfitted on the M4 CQB. The CQBS employs thermal technology which increases the effectiveness of the M4 CQB in all weather conditions, to include the penetration of light foliage, smoke, dust, and camouflage. The committee understands that the CQBS augments M4 CQB capability and acts as a critical combat enabler for marines participating in the global war on terrorism.

The committee notes 54 CQBS systems were procured by the Marine Corps in fiscal year 2005 for use in an initial operational assessment. The committee recognizes the initial findings of this operational assessment have exceeded the Marine Corps expectations and the Marine Corps now requires additional funds to expand this initial operational assessment to a more realistic testbed, to include further testing of the CQBS thermal capability.

The committee supports this expansion and therefore, the committee recommends $30.8 million for night vision equipment, an increase of $10.0 million to procure an additional 715 CQBS systems to expand the ongoing operational assessment.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $12.0 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $12.8 billion, an increase of $819.8 million, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Aircraft Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE										
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT										
	TACTICAL FORCES										
1	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		152,377		(152,377)				(152,377)	-	-
2	F/A-22 RAPTOR	24	3,680,902							24	3,680,902
2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(494,280)							-	(494,280)
3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		576,877							-	576,877
4	F-15E		108,316		65,000					-	173,316
	Program Increase						65,000				
4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(108,316)							-	(108,316)
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		-							-	-
	TOTAL COMBAT AIRCRAFT		**3,915,876**		**(87,377)**		**65,000**		**(152,377)**		**3,828,499**
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT										
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT										
6	C-17A (MYP)	15	3,260,816							15	3,260,816
6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(469,957)							-	(469,957)
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		445,423							-	445,423
8	C-17 ICS		-							-	-
	OTHER AIRLIFT									-	-
9	C-40		-							-	-
10	C-130J		235,770	9	645,000					9	880,770
10	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(136,787)							-	(136,787)
	Additional Aircraft					9	645,000			-	-
11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		-		90,000		90,000			-	90,000
	TOTAL AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		**3,335,265**		**735,000**		**735,000**		**-**		**4,070,265**
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT										
	UPT TRAINERS										
12	INTRO TO FLIGHT/AIRMANSHIP PROGRAM		-							-	-
	OPERATIONAL TRAINERS										
13	JPATS	54	333,307							54	333,307

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request QTY.	FY 2006 Authorization Request COST	Committee Change QTY.	Committee Change COST	Committee Increase QTY.	Committee Increase COST	Committee Decrease QTY.	Committee Decrease COST	FY 2006 Committee Authorization QTY.	FY 2006 Committee Authorization COST
	TOTAL TRAINER AIRCRAFT		**333,307**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**333,307**
	OTHER AIRCRAFT										
	HELICOPTERS										
14	V-22 OSPREY	2	244,659							2	244,659
14	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(10,866)							-	(10,866)
15	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		10,525							-	10,525
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT										
16	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C		571							-	571
	OTHER AIRCRAFT										
17	TARGET DRONES		82,907							-	82,907
18	GLOBAL HAWK	5	398,423	(1)	(29,900)					4	368,523
18	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(70,764)							-	(70,764)
	Program Reduction							(1)	(29,900)	-	-
19	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		69,993							-	69,993
20	PREDATOR UAV	9	125,566	6	85,000					15	210,566
	Additional Vehicles					6	85,000			-	-
	TOTAL OTHER AIRCRAFT		**851,014**		**55,100**		**85,000**		**(29,900)**		**906,114**
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT										
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT										
21	B-2A		59,134							-	59,134
22	B-1B		27,875							-	27,875
23	B-52		145,025							-	145,025
24	F-117		17,221							-	17,221
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT										
25	A-10		52,159							-	52,159
26	F-15		151,518							-	151,518
27	F-16		380,960							-	380,960
28	F-22 RAPTOR		53,992							-	53,992
29	T/AT-37		-							-	-
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT										
30	C-5		71,137							-	71,137

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
31	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		20,000							-	20,000
32	C-9		-							-	-
33	C-17A		260,826							-	260,826
34	C-21		3,924							-	3,924
35	C-32A		194							-	194
36	C-37A		382							-	382
37	C-141		-							-	-
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT										
38	GLIDER MODS		3,174							-	3,174
39	T-6		6,143							-	6,143
40	T-1		181							-	181
41	T-38		202,694							-	202,694
42	T-41 AIRCRAFT		-							-	-
43	T-43		2,014							-	2,014
	OTHER AIRCRAFT										
44	KC-10A (ATCA)		21,937							-	21,937
45	C-12		6,295							-	6,295
46	C-20 MODS		488							-	488
47	VC-25A MOD		978							-	978
48	C-40		194							-	194
49	C-130		185,651		63,900					-	249,551
	APN-241 - C-130 Fleet AFR						19,700			-	-
	LAIRCM - HC/C-130 Fleet - AFR						32,000			-	-
	Senior Scout Shelter - C-130 - ANG						7,000			-	-
	Senior Scout Satellite Antenna - C-130 - ANG						5,200			-	-
50	C-130J MODS		5,988							-	5,988
51	C-135		88,748							-	88,748
52	COMPASS CALL MODS		27,421							-	27,421
53	C-29A MODS		3,816							-	3,816
54	DARP		85,470							-	85,470
55	E-3		49,292		2,700					-	51,992
	Rotary Coupler Improvement Program						2,700			-	-
56	E-4		85,342							-	85,342

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
57	E-8		15,506							-	15,506
58	H-1		32,418							-	32,418
59	H-60		50,497		3,000					-	53,497
	AN/ARS-6 V12 - ANG						3,000			-	-
60	OTHER AIRCRAFT		70,953							-	70,953
61	PREDATOR MODS		30,286							-	30,286
62	CV-22 MODS		102							-	102
	OTHER MODIFICATIONS										
63	CLASSIFIED PROJECTS		-							-	-
	TOTAL MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT		**2,219,935**		**69,600**		**69,600**		**-**		**2,289,535**
	AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS										
64	AIRCRAFT INITIAL SPARES + REPAIR PARTS		204,038							-	204,038
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**204,038**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**204,038**
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES										
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
65	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		124,420							-	124,420
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT										
66	B-1		13,466							-	13,466
67	B-2A		7,304							-	7,304
68	B-2A		22,111							-	22,111
69	B-52		21,162							-	21,162
70	C-130		20,502							-	20,502
71	F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		13,170							-	13,170
72	F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		17,833							-	17,833
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS										
73	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		22,360							-	22,360
	WAR CONSUMABLES										
74	WAR CONSUMABLES		24,058		5,300					-	29,358
	F-16 BRU-57						5,300			-	-
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES										
75	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		644,155		35,400					-	679,555

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	A-10 Litening Advanced Targeting Pod					24	35,400			-	-
76	DEPOT MODERNIZATION		115,525							-	115,525
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS										
77	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		-							-	-
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - SOF										
78	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - SOF		-							-	-
	DARP										
79	DARP		68,432		6,800					-	75,232
	U-2 Dragonlady						6,800				
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		**1,114,498**		**47,500**		**47,500**		**-**		**1,161,998**
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**11,973,933**		**819,823**		**1,002,100**		**(182,277)**		**12,793,756**

Items of Special Interest

A–10 litening advanced targeting pod

The budget request included $644.2 million for other production charges, but contained no funds for the Litening advanced targeting pod. The committee is aware that the Litening advanced targeting pod has been used extensively in the global war on terrorism for precision targeting, and that the Air Force is seeking to maximize the procurement of advanced targeting pods and accelerate pod delivery to meet urgent requirements. The A–10 has been one of the weapon systems most heavily called upon for close air support during recent combat operations, yet many of the Air Force Reserve A–10s do not have advanced targeting pods. The Litening advanced targeting pod is the Air Force's preferred solution for upgrading the precision targeting capabilities of the A–10.

The committee recommends $35.4 million for 24 pods for Air Force Reserve A–10s.

AN/ARS–6 V12 personnel locator system

The budget request contained $50.5 million for modifications of the HH–60 helicopter, but included no funds for the AN/ARS–6 version 12 (V12) personnel locator system (PLS) modification for MH–60 combat search and rescue helicopters of the Air National Guard (ANG).

The committee notes that Congress appropriated $2.8 million in fiscal year 2004 for the AN/ARS–6 V12 PLS modification for the ANG MH–60 rotorcraft as part of a two phased approach. The $2.8 million in the first phase provided the necessary resources to integrate, test, evaluate and certify the new AN/ARS–6 V12 PLS aboard the MH–60 helicopter, as well as modify six Air National Guard MH–60 helicopters. The second phase would leverage $3.0 million to complete integration and procure the necessary AN/ARS–6 V12 PLS units to outfit the remaining 12 ANG MH–60 helicopters. The current version, the AN/ARS–6 V3, is unable to communicate with newer combat survival radios/beacons such as the combat survivor evader locator radio, the PRC–112 family of radios, and the 406 emergency locator transmitter.

Therefore, the committee recommends $53.5 million for HH–60 modifications, an increase of $3.0 million to meet an unfunded requirement of the Air National Guard for MH–60 AN/ARS–6 V12 PLS upgrades.

C–17

The C–17 is a strategic cargo aircraft, capable of rapid delivery to main operating bases, or directly to forward bases in the deployment area. The aircraft is also capable of performing tactical airlift and airdrop missions when required. The C–17 is currently procured under a multiyear procurement contract, in which the funding for the last aircraft is planned to be appropriated in fiscal year 2007 with the last deliveries under the existing contract scheduled for fiscal year 2008. The budget request includes $2,709.9 billion for 15 C–17 aircraft and $445.4 million for advance procurement of the final 12, of the current 60-aircraft multiyear procurement contract. The Department of the Air Force currently plans for an inventory of 180 C–17 aircraft.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 108–491) accompanying the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), the committee strongly urged the Department of the Air Force to budget for continued C–17 procurement through a multiyear procurement program to procure at least 42 additional C–17 aircraft. The Commander of the U.S. Transportation Command testified to the Projection Forces Subcommittee on March 17, 2004, that at least 42 additional C–17 aircraft will be required to meet future airlift needs. To maintain the current 15-per year production rate beyond fiscal year 2007 for additional C–17 aircraft, the Department of the Air Force requires authorization for a follow-on multiyear contract beginning in fiscal year 2006.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision (Section 131) that authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into a multiyear contract beginning in fiscal year 2006 for 42 additional C–17 aircraft in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code.

C–130 modifications

The budget request contained $185.7 million for C–130 modifications, of which $7.2 million was for the procurement and installation of the large aircraft infra-red counter-measures (LAIRCM) system on active duty C–130 aircraft, but included no funds to procure or install the LAIRCM system on the Air Force Reserve Command's (AFRC) HC–130 and C–130 fleets. Additionally, $4.3 million of the C–130 modifications budget request was for procurement and installation of the APN–241 radar on Air Force Special Operations Command C–130s, but the budget request included no funds to procure or install the APN–241 on the AFRC's C–130 aircraft fleet.

The LAIRCM system consists of ultra-violet missile warning sensors, a missile tracking system, small laser turret assemblies, and processors to detect, track and counter incoming infra- red (IR)-guided missiles. The committee notes that the LAIRCM system provides a significantly improved defensive capability for large aircraft to counter the IR man-portable air defense system threats, and believes that this capability should be installed on the AFRC's HC–130 and C–130 fleets as soon as possible. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $32.0 million for procurement and installation of the LAIRCM system on the AFRC's HC–130 and C–130 fleets.

The AN/APN–241 is a weather and navigation radar that replaces the 1950's-era AN/APN–59 radar currently installed on the AFRC's C–130 aircraft fleet. The committee understands that the AN/APN–59, in addition to being obsolete, has a mean-time-between-failure (MTBF) rate of 50 hours and is very costly to maintain, while the AN/APN–241 radar has significantly improved performance capabilities, and has a MTBF rate of 1000 hours. The committee also understands that procurement and installation of the AN/APN–241 radar is the second highest C–130 unfunded priority for the AFRC. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $19.7 million for this purpose.

In total, the committee recommends an increase of $51.7 million for C–130 modifications.

F–15E

The budget request contained no funds for the procurement of F–15E aircraft.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–287) appropriated $110.0 million for the procurement of two additional F–15E aircraft, but understands that the Department of the Air Force requires additional funds for this purpose.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $65.0 million for F–15E procurement, understands that an additional $65.0 million will be required to complete the procurement of two F–15Es, and encourages the Department of the Air Force to budget for this amount in future budget requests.

F–16 bomb rack unit–57

The budget request contained $24.1 million for war consumables, but included no funds to procure the F–16 bomb rack unit (BRU)–57 for the Air National Guard (ANG).

The BRU–57 allows the F–16 aircraft to carry and employ four one thousand pound precision guided munitions (PGMs), twice as many as its current capabilities. The committee understands that the ANG has identified a requirement to equip its F–16 fleet with the BRU–57, and believes that this action will enhance the value of the F–16 ANG units that are deployed as part of the Air Force's Air Expeditionary Forces.

The committee recommends $29.4 million for war consumables, an increase of $5.3 million for procurement of the F–16 BRU–57 for the ANG.

Global hawk

The budget request contained $398.4 million in Air Force aircraft procurement for the Global Hawk unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) program.

The committee is extremely concerned with the elevated costs of the Global Hawk UAV program, which has resulted in a recent congressional notification of an overall cost overrun of 18 percent. Since 2001, the Air Force has restructured the Global Hawk program twice and these poorly designed restructurings have resulted in significant cost growth, which is three times higher now than before the program restructure.

The committee strongly supports the Global Hawk program and believes that it is an essential element of our national intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capability. However, this program must be finally brought under proper management control.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to implement program management controls that: limit program execution to the approved requirements and contains further unapproved requirements growth, stabilizes the vehicle and sensor design such that significant changes are not required, executes the program within the approved baseline budget and schedule, and focuses the government and industry management's attention on production efficiency of air frames and sensors. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the Secretary's implementation of program management controls by October 1, 2005. Additionally,

the committee directs the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees a quarterly earned value management report.

The committee recommends $368.5 million for the procurement of four Global Hawk air vehicles and one ground station, a decrease of one vehicle and $29.9 million.

Joint strike fighter

The budget request contained $152.4 million for Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) advance low-rate initial production procurement. This amount would fund the long-lead procurement items necessary to build five conventional take-off and landing (CTOL) Air Force variants, which would be fully funded in fiscal year 2007 and planned for use in tactics and training development.

The JSF program is an aircraft system development and demonstration program which is developing a family of three strike fighter aircraft for the Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps. About 70 percent of the parts for all three fighter variants will be common. The Air Force CTOL variant will replace the F–16 and A–10 fleets; the Navy variant, or aircraft carrier version (CV), will complement the F/A–18E/F; and the Marine Corps variant, or short take-off, vertical landing (STOVL) version, will replace the AV–8B and the F/A–18C/D fleets.

During the past year, the JSF program has addressed a projected weight growth problem in all three JSF variants by making design changes. The extra weight in the March 2004 JSF designs would have significant performance implications because the JSF in that weight configuration would not meet many key performance parameters identified as necessary for JSF variants to accomplish their planned missions. While the committee is encouraged that the Department of Defense has identified those weight problems and has aggressively addressed those issues during the past year, it notes that the first JSF flight, now scheduled for late August 2006, will not be constructed with the redesigned, lower-weight JSF production configuration which has been developed during the past year. Instead, the committee understands that the first STOVL variant will be the first JSF to fly with reduced-weight configuration in early fiscal year 2008 and the first reduced-weight CTOL variant is scheduled to fly by mid-year in fiscal year 2008. Since the Department will not know until early fiscal year 2008 whether its efforts to reduce weight will actually result in the JSF meeting required performance parameters, the committee believes that the obligation of funds to begin low-rate initial production in fiscal year 2007 is premature and, accordingly, the authorization of advance procurement funds for this effort in fiscal year 2006 is also premature.

Therefore, the committee recommends no funds for JSF advance procurement, a decrease of $152.4 million.

Additionally, the committee understands that during the preparation of the fiscal year 2006 budget request that there were efforts by some within the military services to eliminate planned budgets for the JSF competitive engine development program. Despite those views, the committee also understands that the Secretary of Defense ensured that the engine program was nominally funded. The committee believes that a two-engine source for the single-engine JSF would be the most cost effective and operationally effective en-

gine solution during the JSF's service life, and therefore expects that the Secretary, along with Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force, will remain committed to the development of competitive engines for the JSF.

KC–130J and C–130J

In the appropriation Aircraft Procurement, Navy, the budget request contained $1,092.7 million for 12 KC–130J aircraft for the Marine Corps, but included no funds for advance procurement of KC–130J aircraft in fiscal year 2007. In the appropriation Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, the budget request contained $99.0 million for logistics support of the Air Force's C–130J fleet, but included no funds for either procurement of C–130J aircraft or for advance procurement of C–130Js in fiscal year 2007.

Through fiscal year 2005, both the C–130J and KC–130J aircraft were procured through a 62-aircraft, six-year multiyear procurement contract authorized by section 131 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), beginning in fiscal year 2003. Because the multiyear contract requires the procurement of four KC–130Js and nine C–130Js in fiscal year 2006 and a fiscal year 2006 payment for advance procurement of four KC–130Js and nine C–130Js in fiscal year 2007, the KC–130J and C–130J budget request would break an existing multiyear contract after the third year, of the planned six-year contract, and terminate production of all C–130J and KC–130J aircraft variants after fiscal year 2006. While the committee notes that both multiyear cancellation costs and C–130J production termination costs are unknown at this time, it understands that estimates for these costs are not included in KC–130J and C–130J budgets beyond fiscal year 2006.

The committee understands that the budget requests for both the C–130J and KC–130J were finalized late in the Department of Defense's (DOD) budget preparation process. However, the committee notes that requirements for the number of C–130Js have yet to be determined in the DOD's Mobility Capability Study (MCS), planned for completion later in fiscal year 2005 and in DOD's Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), scheduled for release in early fiscal year 2006, and believes that a decision on whether to cancel the KC–130J and C–130J multiyear contract, or to terminate C–130J production, should be informed by the results of both the MCS and QDR, and budgeted accordingly.

Consequently, the committee recommends that the KC–130J and C–130J multiyear contract proceed as previously planned for fiscal year 2006, and recommends the following budget request adjustments: in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, an increase of $645.0 million for nine C–130J aircraft, an increase of $90.0 million for advance procurement of nine C–130Js in fiscal year 2007; and, in Aircraft Procurement, Navy, a decrease of $800.9 million and eight KC–130J aircraft, and an increase of $46.0 million for advance procurement of four KC–130J aircraft in fiscal year 2007.

Link 16 support and sustainment

The budget request included $157.6 million in PE 27434F for Link 16 support and sustainment. In fiscal year 2005, Congress appropriated $3.4 million for the Link 16 Pocket J program. Pocket

J provides a deployable Link 16 capability that fills gaps in Link 16 air space command and control coverage within the continental United States or in austere, remote locations.

The committee supports the Pocket J program and its capability to provide ground-based Link 16 coverage in support of North American Aerospace Defense (NORAD) air operations center command and control aircraft for homeland air defense. The committee views the production and deployment of Pocket J units to establish local Link 16 coverage over major U.S. cities and other potential targets as an urgent need in addressing the core homeland defense mission of airspace command and control.

The committee is concerned with the Air Force's lack of funding for this program, and believes that an efficient production line for Pocket J equipment should match the requirements set forth by both Air Force Air Combat Command and Electronic Systems Command. Further, Pocket J is intended to be interoperable with the joint tactical radio system (JTRS). However, JTRS development and procurement should not constrain the development and production of the Pocket J program. Currently, NORAD has no other system to provide Link 16 situational awareness data link capability until the Federal Aviation Administration radio sites are JTRS equipped in 2020 or later.

The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to initiate Pocket J production at an efficient rate until the required Link 16 coverage is established that will address threats to both cities and high-valued targets across the United States.

Predator unmanned aerial vehicle

The budget request contained $125.6 million for the Predator unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV), including $31.6 million for the MQ–1 Predator A UAV and $25.0 million for two fully-equipped MQ–9 Predator B systems.

The committee recognizes the proven, leap-ahead technological advantage provided by the Predator A and Predator B UAVs. The committee notes the particular advantage provided by Predator B in terms of greater payload, speed, and altitude. The committee applauds the success achieved by recent collaboration between the Air Force and the contractor to improve system performance. The committee recognizes such efforts as a necessary aspect of advanced acquisition system development. The committee urges the Air Force to build upon such recent success and rapidly take steps to improve, refine, and streamline operational tactics, techniques, and procedures. The committee urges greater usage and availability of Predator A assets and recommends an acceleration of the more capable Predator B system.

The committee recommends $210.6 million for Predator unmanned aerial vehicles, an increase of $85.0 million for six additional, fully-equipped, Predator B UAV aircraft and related support.

Senior scout

The budget request contained $185.7 million for the C–130 aircraft, but contained no funding for Senior Scout's increased response capabilities.

The Senior Scout system is an intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance suite of equipment configured in a shelter capable of installation in non-dedicated C–130E/H aircraft. The system provides capabilities to exploit, geo-locate and report signals of interest to air and ground component commanders. The program is funded through the tactical cryptologic unit program through the Air Force. It supplies three, C–130 capable roll-on-roll-off sheltered systems ground Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS) components to the 169th intelligence squadron (IS), Utah, Air National Guard (ANG). The squadron has been deployed numerous times since September 11, 2001. The Senior Scout is supported solely by the 169th IS, which is a repository of uniquely skilled ANG linguists and a core component of the Air Force's airborne linguist pool. The Senior Scout system package can be deployed with these skilled linguists and analysts with the system installed on any premodified aircraft within 24 hours. The committee believes that this type of SIGINT approach to tactical warfighting in the global war on terrorism is the right method in the global war on terrorism.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million for the manufacturing of an additional Senior Scout sheltered system for increased capability and enhanced response to the global war on terrorism and the war on drugs.

The committee understands the value of "Reach-Back" ground facilities to the C–130 Senior Scout capability. This capability provides a ground facility with the ability to simultaneously handle multiple airborne missions and a variety of "Reach-Back" applications, including remote operator workstations, live audio, and digital mission data distribution and storage. This real-time, beyond line-of-sight capability for Senior Scout will help alleviate critical operational tempo loads on the limited number of high-demand specialty operators.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.2 million to fund a new satellite antenna and associated software that would enhance dissemination of wider bandwidth data streams for the "Reach-Back" capability for the Senior Scout system.

U–2 senior year electro-optical system focal planes

The budget request contained $68.4 million for the U–2 systems, but contained only $0.8 million for the senior year electro-optical reconnaissance system–2 (SYERS–2) sustainment.

The committee notes that the global war on terrorism has increasingly relied on the near real-time imagery capability of the SYERS–2 system to provide multi-band spectral imaging for targeting precision munitions. The unfunded request reflects the notable deficiency in visible focal plane arrays (FPA) acquisition for the SYERS–2 system, as well as the depot repair needed for the equipment for continued persistent surveillance to the warfighter.

The committee recommends $75.2 million, for the purchase and sustainment of SYERS–2 FPAs, an increase of $6.8 million.

AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $1.0 billion for Ammunition Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $1.0 billion, the budget request, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Ammunition Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE										
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE										
	ROCKETS										
1	SMALL ARMS		-							-	-
	ROCKETS										
2	ROCKETS		36,302							-	36,302
	CARTRIDGES										
3	CARTRIDGES		160,530							-	160,530
	BOMBS										
4	PRACTICE BOMBS		14,278							-	14,278
5	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		240,231							-	240,231
6	SENSOR FUZED WEAPONS	302	120,379							302	120,379
7	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	8,000	223,285							8,000	223,285
8	WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISPE		-							-	-
	FLARE, IR MJU-7B										
9	CAD/PAD		21,212							-	21,212
10	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL		2,958							-	2,958
11	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		4,354							-	4,354
12	INITIAL SPARES		-							-	-
13	SPARES		-							-	-
14	MODIFICATIONS		892							-	892
15	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		3,948							-	3,948
	FUZES										
16	FLARES		143,620							-	143,620
17	FUZES		53,176							-	53,176
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE		**1,025,165**		-		-		-		**1,025,165**
	WEAPONS										
	SMALL ARMS										
18	SMALL ARMS		6,042							-	6,042
	TOTAL WEAPONS		**6,042**		-		-		-		**6,042**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		**1,031,207**		-		-		-		**1,031,207**

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $5.5 billion for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $5.5 billion, the budget request, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Missile Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE										
	BALLISTIC MISSILES										
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC										
1	MISSILE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,027							-	2,027
2	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC		41,635							-	41,635
	TOTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES		**43,662**		-		-		-		**43,662**
	OTHER MISSILES										
	TACTICAL										
3	JASSM	300	150,238							300	150,238
4	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON		971							-	971
5	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	196	44,963							196	44,963
6	AMRAAM	166	120,668							166	120,668
7	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	378	38,135							378	38,135
8	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	512	59,052							512	59,052
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES										
9	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS/POL PREVENTION		1,225							-	1,225
10	POLLUTION PREVENTION ACTIVITY		895							-	895
	TOTAL OTHER MISSILES		**416,147**		-		-		-		**416,147**
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES										
	CLASS IV										
11	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE		3,251							-	3,251
12	MM III MODIFICATIONS		672,633							-	672,633
13	AGM-65D MAVERICK		233							-	233
14	AGM-88C HARM		38							-	38
15	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE		24,764							-	24,764
	TOTAL MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES		**700,919**		-		-		-		**700,919**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
	MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS										
16	MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS		85,094							-	85,094

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**85,094**		-		-		-		**85,094**
	OTHER SUPPORT										
	SPACE PROGRAMS										
17	ADVANCED EHF		607,271							-	607,271
17	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(78,293)							-	(78,293)
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		-							-	-
19	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES		22,300							-	22,300
20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		50,217							-	50,217
21	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		9,575							-	9,575
22	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	3	305,732							3	305,732
22	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(29,646)							-	(29,646)
23	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT		42,000							-	42,000
24	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(S		67,175							-	67,175
25	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE)		42,713							-	42,713
26	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM		-							-	-
27	TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS (SPACE)		66,180							-	66,180
28	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH	5	838,347							5	838,347
29	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)		111,166							-	111,166
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS										
30	DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM		320,606							-	320,606
31	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		-							-	-
32	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES		-							-	-
33	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		-							-	-
34	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		26,250							-	26,250
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		1,842,872							-	1,842,872
	TOTAL OTHER SUPPORT		**4,244,465**		-		-		-		**4,244,465**
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**5,490,287**		-		-		-		**5,490,287**

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $14.0 billion for Other Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $14.1 billion, an increase of $66.1 million, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Other Procurement, Air Force program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE										
	VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT										
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES										
1	ARMORED VEHICLE		503							-	503
2	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		14,399							-	14,399
	CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES										
3	TRUCK, STAKE/PLATFORM		-							-	-
4	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X		-							-	-
5	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X		-							-	-
6	TRUCK MAINT/UTILITY/DELIVERY		-							-	-
7	TRUCK CARRYALL		-							-	-
8	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		13,058							-	13,058
9	HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)		3,257							-	3,257
10	TRUCK TRACTOR, OVER 5T		-							-	-
11	CAP VEHICLES		821							-	821
12	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (CARGO + UTIL)		-							-	-
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES										
13	TRUCK TANK, 1200 GAL		-							-	-
14	TRUCK TANK FUEL R-11		-							-	-
15	HMMWV, ARMORED		2,190							-	2,190
16	TRUCK REFUSE		-							-	-
17	HMWWV, UP-ARMORED		11,058							-	11,058
18	TRACTOR, A/C TOW, MB-4		-							-	-
19	TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE		-							-	-
20	TRUCK HYDRANT FUEL		-							-	-
21	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		-							-	-
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT										
22	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEH		21,414							-	21,414
23	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (FIRE FIGHTING EQUIP)		-							-	-
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT										
24	TRUCK, F/L 6,000 LB		-							-	-
25	TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB		-							-	-
26	HALVERSEN LOADER		16,311							-	16,311

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
27	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		-							-	-
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT										
28	LOADER, SCOOP		-							-	-
29	LOADER, SCOOP, W/BACKHOE		-							-	-
30	TRUCK, DUMP 5CY		-							-	-
31	RUNWAY SNOW REMOVAL & CLEANING		22,026							-	22,026
32	CRANE, 7-50 TON		-							-	-
33	MODIFICATIONS		-							-	-
34	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (VEH)		10,546							-	10,546
	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTM										
35	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		-							-	-
	TOTAL VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT		**115,583**		-		-		-		**115,583**
	ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP										
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)										
36	COMSEC EQUIPMENT		58,176							-	58,176
37	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)		2,399							-	2,399
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS										
38	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		4,744							-	4,744
39	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP		1,523							-	1,523
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS										
40	TRAFFIC CONTROL/LANDING		16,795		34,600					-	51,395
	Mobile Approach Control System - ANG						34,600			-	-
41	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM		51,919		7,500					-	59,419
	DASR/DAAS						7,500			-	-
42	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPRO		76,752							-	76,752
43	WEATHER OBSERVE/FORECAST		35,723							-	35,723
44	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL		44,690							-	44,690
45	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX		23,009							-	23,009
46	TAC SIGINT SUPPORT		-							-	-
47	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM		416							-	416
	SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS										
48	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		110,997		10,500					-	121,497

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	Science and Engineering Lab Data Integration						5,000			-	-
	Automatic Asset Following System						3,200			-	-
	Cluster Computer Initiative						2,300			-	-
49	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL		11,891							-	11,891
50	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL		9,488							-	9,488
51	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY		35,910		3,000					-	38,910
	Force Protection Surveillance System						3,000			-	-
52	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES		36,096		2,500					-	38,596
	Joint Threat Emitter						2,500			-	-
53	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY		20,545							-	20,545
54	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		4,517							-	4,517
55	GCSS-AF FOS		12,738							-	12,738
56	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS		41,709							-	41,709
57	AIR OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)		21,816							-	21,816
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS										
58	BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE		374,926							-	374,926
59	USCENTCOM		31,059							-	31,059
60	AUTOMATED TELECOMMUNICATIONS		-							-	-
	DISA PROGRAMS										
61	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE		3,689							-	3,689
62	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE		9,096							-	9,096
63	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE		9,396							-	9,396
64	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK		51,778							-	51,778
65	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE		114,189							-	114,189
66	MILSATCOM SPACE		28,720							-	28,720
67	SPACE MODS SPACE		25,063							-	25,063
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE										
68	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		131,120							-	131,120
	SATELLITE TERMINALS										-
	INTEGRATED COMM										-
	NETWORK										-
	TACTICAL CONTROL PARTY										-
	JTRS										-

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	BATTLEFIELD AIR OPS										-
69	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	2,046	24,726	(2,046)	(24,726)					-	-
	Program Adjustment							(2,046)	(24,726)	-	-
69a	Combat Survivor Radios			2,046	24,726	2,046	24,726			2,046	24,726
70	RADIO EQUIPMENT		7,458							-	7,458
71	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)		5,871							-	5,871
72	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT		3,193							-	3,193
73	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		107,007							-	107,007
74	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		3,662							-	3,662
	MODIFICATIONS										
75	COMM ELECT MODS		24,714							-	24,714
	TOTAL ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		**1,577,520**		**58,100**		**82,826**		**(24,726)**		**1,635,620**
	OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
	TEST EQUIPMENT										
76	BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE		-							-	-
77	PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY		-							-	-
78	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (TEST EQUIPMENT)		-							-	-
	PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIPMENT										
79	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		11,965							-	11,965
80	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (SAFETY + RESCUE)		-							-	-
	DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT										
81	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT		14,617		8,000					-	22,617
	Point of Maintenance Initiative						8,000			-	-
82	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (DEPOT PLANT)		-							-	-
	ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT										
83	FLOODLIGHTS SET TYPE NF2D		-							-	-
84	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (ELECTRICAL EQUIP)		-							-	-
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
85	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT		23,188							-	23,188
86	MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT		14,695							-	14,695
87	ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS		-							-	-
88	AIR BASE OPERABILITY		5,463							-	5,463

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
89	PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		-							-	-
90	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT		5,324							-	5,324
91	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		23,370							-	23,370
92	AIR CONDITIONERS		-							-	-
93	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		28,693							-	28,693
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS										
94	PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES		-							-	-
95	TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ		-							-	-
96	DARP RC-135		21,507							-	21,507
97	DARP, MRIGS		147,952							-	147,952
98	SELECTED ACTIVITIES		-							-	-
99	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		270,788							-	270,788
100	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE		14,631							-	14,631
101	MODIFICATIONS		-							-	-
102	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		-							-	-
999	CLASSIFIED		11,697,053							-	11,697,053
	TOTAL OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP		**12,279,246**		**8,000**		**8,000**		**-**		**12,287,246**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
103	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		30,340							-	30,340
104	REPLENSHIMENT SPARES		-							-	-
	TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS		**30,340**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**30,340**
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**14,002,689**		**66,100**		**90,826**		**(24,726)**		**14,068,789**

Items of Special Interest

Combat survivor radios

The budget request contained a total of $55.3 million for 4,910 combat survivor evader locator (CSEL) radios for the Department of Defense (DOD). Of this total, $15.7 million was included in the appropriation Other Procurement, Army in a line entitled "Combat Survivor Evader Locator (CSEL)" for 1,349 CSEL radios; $2.0 million was in the appropriation Other Procurement, Navy in a line entitled "Communications Items Under $5M" for 202 CSEL radios; $12.9 million was also included in the appropriation Other Procurement, Navy in a line entitled "Aviation Life Support" for 1,313 CSEL radios; and $24.7 million was included in the appropriation Other Procurement, Air Force in a line entitled "Combat Survivor Evader Locator" for 2,046 CSEL radios.

The CSEL radio provides combat forces with secure, encrypted, low probability of exploitation, two-way, over the horizon, near real-time, data-burst communications with precise location and non-secure, unencrypted line-of-site voice and beacon capability to support survival evasion, and personnel recovery operations. While the committee supports the procurement of CSEL radios to meet current and future survivor communications, it understands that there are requirements for approximately 40,000 survivor radios, but only a third of these have thus far been met since CSEL procurement began in fiscal year 2001. Since CSEL radios may not be available to some units scheduled for combat deployments, the committee understands that alternate survival radios are being procured by obligating funds appropriated for operations and maintenance, and the committee believes that procurement funds should also be made available for either the CSEL, or an alternate survival radio, to meet immediate user requirements.

To reflect a more responsive survival radio procurement program in the Department, the committee recommends that line item titles in both the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force be changed as follows: a decrease of $15.7 million in the appropriation Other Procurement, Army in the line entitled "Combat Survivor Evader Locator (CSEL)" and a corresponding $15.7 million increase in a new line entitled "Combat Survivor Radios;" and a decrease of $24.7 million in the appropriation Other Procurement, Air Force in the line entitled "Combat Survivor Evader Locator" and a corresponding $24.7 million increase in a new line entitled "Combat Survivor Radios." For the Department of the Navy, the committee believes that funds budgeted in Other Procurement, Navy for CSEL radios could be obligated for either the CSEL or alternate survival radios.

Digital airport surveillance radar and Department of Defense advanced automations system

The budget request included $51.9 million for the national airspace system including $42.4 million for the Digital Airport Surveillance Radar (DASR) and $7.4 million for the Department of Defense Advanced Automation System (DAAS). These systems are being procured to replace Vietnam era air traffic control and air surveillance systems at defense locations in coordination with the

air traffic control modernization program of the Federal Aviation Administration.

The committee is aware that accelerating the deployment of DAAS and DASR will improve military operations and homeland defense, increase interoperability between military and civilian aviation systems, and reduce operations and maintenance costs.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million for DAAS and DASR deployment to one additional facility, and directs that priority be given to facilities with aircraft assigned to United States Strategic Command.

Force protection surveillance system

The budget request contained $35.9 million for various types of Air Force physical security systems, but included no funds for the force protection surveillance system (FPSS).

The FPSS consists of a tactical communications intercept system, a near real-time video surveillance system, and a tactical internet communications system for dissemination of surveillance information. The committee notes that Congress appropriated an increase of $1.0 million for fiscal year 2005, and believes that additional FPSSs should be acquired.

Therefore, the committee recommends $38.9 million for Air Force physical security systems, an increase of $3.0 million for the acquisition, deployment and integration of the FPSS into mission planning systems and surveillance platforms.

General information technology

The budget request contained $111.0 million for general information technologies, but included no funds for the science and engineering lab data integration (SELDI) program, the automatic asset following system (AAFS), or for the cluster computing initiative.

The Air Force Material Command's science and engineering lab captures, analyzes and disseminates lab test data to the Air Force's engineering and system overhaul operations. The SELDI program facilitates this mission by providing a maintenance and logistics information management tool that allows more rapid lab data access affecting overhaul operations, provides accident investigators with immediate access to lab results of failed components, enables component failure trend analysis, and implements a new acoustic signature sensors to ensure the proper chemical composition of materials and equipment. For fiscal year 2005, the committee recommended an increase of $8.0 million for the SELDI program, notes that $4.9 million was appropriated, and continues to believe its implementation would improve operational aircraft readiness, increase flight safety and reduce support costs. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for this purpose.

The AAFS has been developed as an effective tool for asset following operations, providing real-time, long-range data communication for the safety, security, management, and control of aircraft and vehicle fleet operations. The AAFS consists of a satellite transceiver, antennas, a control display unit, and application software. The committee understands that AAFS is already used throughout the United States, and believes that this capability could be applied to military forces engaged in homeland security operations, especially in the Air National Guard or Army National Guard.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.2 million for the AAFS.

The cluster computing initiative would replace the Air Force Flight Test Center's current personal computers (PCs) and high performance computers (HPCs) with a more flexible computer architecture that would reduce maintenance and support costs. The committee understands that the cluster computer upgrade would also increase safety through improved test results, and that this upgrade is a priority for the Air Force Flight Test Center to support upcoming tests programs on the F–35, F/A–22, F–16 and B–52 mid-life extension. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $2.3 million for the cluster computing initiative. In total, the committee recommends $121.5 million for general information technologies, an increase of $10.5 million.

Mobile approach control system

The budget request contained $16.8 million for air traffic control and landing systems, but included no funds to procure a mobile approach control system (MACS).

The MACS provides military forces with next-generation mobile air traffic control services, day and night, in all weather conditions, to military and civilian aircraft, and will replace the aging TPN–19 and MPN–14K landing control centers employed by the Department of the Air Force combat communications squadrons and Air National Guard (ANG) air traffic squadrons. The committee understands that during Operation Enduring Freedom, the Air Force's Air Combat Command (ACC) received 10 requests for the MACS, but only 6 could be met; and that during Operation Iraqi Freedom, ACC received 12 requests for the MACS but could only provide for 7. Additionally, the committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included MACSs for the ANG among his top four unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommends $51.4 million for air traffic control and landing systems, an increase of $34.6 million for two MACSs for the ANG, and encourages the Department to assign these MACSs to the 235th and 241st Air Traffic Control Squadrons.

Point of maintenance and combat ammunition system initiative

The budget request contained $14.6 million for mechanized material handling equipment, but included no funds for the point of maintenance and combat ammunition system initiative (OMX/CAS).

The POMX/CAS is an automatic data collection program developed by the Air Force Materiel Command's Automatic Identification Technology Program Office which streamlines mission critical data collection to reduce the burden on flight line personnel. The committee has supported POMX/CAS in prior years, notes that Congress appropriated increases for fiscal years 2004 and 2005, and believes that its implementation at additional Department of the Air Force installations will increase the timeliness and accuracy of maintenance date collection.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $22.6 million for mechanized material handling equipment, an increase of $8.0 million for the POMX/CAS.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2006 contained $2.7 billion for Procurement, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends authorization of $2.7 billion, an increase of $37.6 million, for fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2006 Procurement, Defense-Wide program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table.

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE										
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT										
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD										
1	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		98,045		(10,386)					-	87,659
	MANPADS Defense Program								(10,386)	-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA										
2	CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM		-							-	-
3	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM		7,790							-	7,790
4	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PGM		-							-	-
5	DEFENSE COUNTERDRUG PROGRAM (NSA)		-							-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS										
6	WHS MOTOR VEHICLES		-							-	-
7	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		26,307							-	26,307
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA										
8	DRUG INTERDICTION		-							-	-
9	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		27,072							-	27,072
10	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM		8,912							-	8,912
11	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM		5,498							-	5,498
12	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,686							-	2,686
13	TELEPORT PROGRAM		98,320							-	98,320
14	GLOBAL INFORMATION GRID		-							-	-
15	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		33,491							-	33,491
16	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS NETWORK		25,568							-	25,568
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA										
17	INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS		-							-	-
18	DEFENSE HUMINT INTELLIGENCE (HUMINT) PROGRAM		-							-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA										
19	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		8,328							-	8,328
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA										
20	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M		1,496							-	1,496
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS										
21	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		42,473							-	42,473

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA										
22	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		7,496							-	7,496
	NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY										
23	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NGA		-							-	-
	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY										
24	VEHICLES		200							-	200
25	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		16,319							-	16,319
	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY										
26	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		780							-	780
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS										
27	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS		6,521							-	6,521
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODDE										
28	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS		1,500							-	1,500
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA										
29	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		12,068							-	12,068
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DTSA										
30	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		407							-	407
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, CIFA										
31	TSCM EQUIPMENT		-							-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NDU										
32	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY		-							-	-
	TOTAL MAJOR EQUIPMENT		**431,277**		**(10,386)**		**-**		**(10,386)**		**420,891**
	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND										
	AVIATION PROGRAMS										
33	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT		129,748							-	129,748
34	SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS		13,897							-	13,897
35	MC-130H AIR REFUELING SYSTEM		18,268							-	18,268
36	MH-47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM		83,737							-	83,737
37	MH-60 SOF MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		29,629							-	29,629
38	MC-130H, COMBAT TALON II		66,288							-	66,288
39	CV-22 SOF MOD	2	117,923							2	117,923
40	AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION		-							-	-

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
41	C-130 MODIFICATIONS		67,270							-	67,270
42	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT		1,045							-	1,045
	SHIPBUILDING										
43	ASDS ADVANCE PROCUREMENT		71,694							-	71,694
44	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS)		12,350							-	12,350
45	MK8 MOD1 SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE		2,151							-	2,151
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS										
46	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT		38,126							-	38,126
47	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION		11,158							-	11,158
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS										
48	COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS		69,898							-	69,898
49	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		27,642		18,000					-	45,642
	Joint Threat Warning System - Air					16	10,000			-	-
	SOF Intelligence Systems - SOTVS						8,000			-	-
50	SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS		119,372							-	119,372
51	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		-							-	-
52	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODS		2,275							-	2,275
53	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES		16,511							-	16,511
54	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS		17,732							-	17,732
55	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		5,114							-	5,114
56	SPECIAL PROGRAM		-							-	-
57	TACTICAL VEHICLES		4,541							-	4,541
58	USSOCOM REQUIREMENTS - TITLE IX		-							-	-
59	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM GDIP		-							-	-
60	SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT		1,088							-	1,088
61	DRUG INTERDICTION		-							-	-
62	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		22,271							-	22,271
63	SPECIAL OPERATIONS MISSION PLANNING ENVIRONMENT		-							-	-
64	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS		233,824		10,000					-	243,824
	Special Weapons Observation Reconnaissance Direct Action System						10,000				
65	PSYOP EQUIPMENT		46,649							-	46,649
	TOTAL SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND		**1,230,201**		**28,000**		**28,000**		**-**		**1,258,201**

Title I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request		Committee Change		Committee Increase		Committee Decrease		FY 2006 Committee Authorization	
		QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST	QTY.	COST
	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE										
	CBDP										
66	INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION		198,045							-	198,045
67	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION		97,183							-	97,183
68	DECONTAMINATION		2,950							-	2,950
69	JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM		62,341							-	62,341
70	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION		31,841							-	31,841
71	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE		258,299		20,000					-	278,299
	M22 Automatic Chemical Agent Detection Alarm						20,000				
	TOTAL CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE		**650,659**		**20,000**		**20,000**		**-**		**670,659**
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		365,695							-	365,695
	TOTAL CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		**365,695**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**365,695**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		**2,677,832**		**37,614**		**48,000**		**(10,386)**		**2,715,446**
	DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES										
	DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES										
1	DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES		[19,573]							-	[19,573]
	TOTAL DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES		**-**		**-**		**-**		**-**		**-**
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION										
	OPERATIONS AND MAINTANCE										
1	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M		1,241,514		(1,241,514)				(1,241,514)		-
	RDT&E										
2	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDT&E		47,786		(47,786)				(47,786)		-
	PROCUREMENT										
3	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION- PROC		116,527		(116,527)				(116,527)		-
	TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION		**1,405,827**		**(1,405,827)**		**-**		**(1,405,827)**		**-**
	TOTAL, DEFENSE-WIDE		**4,083,659**								**4,083,659**

Items of Special Interest

Chemical and biological defense procurement

The budget request contained $650.7 million for chemical and biological defense (CBD) procurement, including $198.0 million for procurement of installation force protection equipment, $97.2 million for individual protection equipment, $3.0 million for decontamination equipment, $62.3 million for the joint biological defense program, $31.8 million for collective protection equipment, and $258.3 million for contamination avoidance equipment.

The committee notes that limited funding for fielding the M22 automatic chemical agent detection alarm (ACADA) in the active and reserve components, forces units to use the obsolescent M8 chemical agent alarm, which is prone to false alarms. Congress added funds in fiscal years 2004 and 2005 to accelerate the fielding of the M22 ACADA.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for procurement of the M22 ACADA.

Chemical agents and munitions destruction

The budget request contained $1.4 billion for chemical agents and munitions destruction, including $1.2 billion for operation and maintenance, $47.8 million for research, development, test and evaluation, and $116.5 million for procurement. The budget request included no funds for construction of chemical agent and munitions destruction facilities.

The committee notes that to date more than 11,200 tons of lethal chemical agents and munitions, almost 36 percent of the total U.S. stockpile, have been safely destroyed in 4 operational chemical demilitarization facilities, and that 2 additional demilitarization facilities are scheduled to become operational in fiscal year 2005. The committee notes, however, that the budget request represents a decrease of $49.1 million (3.6 percent) from the amount contained in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–287) appropriation, despite the increased level of activity planned for the program in fiscal year 2006.

During the Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee's hearing on April 6, 2005, the Department of Defense witnesses testified that based on current cost and schedule estimates the United States will not achieve the schedule for destruction of the stockpile mandated by the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) Treaty (S. Res. 75–105). Worst-case cost estimates for destruction of the stockpile range from $26.8 billion to $37.3 billion and estimates of the time required to complete destruction of the stockpile range from 2021 to 2030. The committee notes that the increased costs result primarily from the increased time required to destroy the stockpile at all of the stockpile sites, and that current planning estimates for construction and operation of Assembled Chemical Weapon Alternative (ACWA) demilitarization facilities at Pueblo, Colorado and Blue Grass, Kentucky significantly exceed the program baseline. The committee also notes that in January 2005, following a Defense Acquisition Board review of the program, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)) directed assessment of alternatives that, if adopted, might permit the programmed cost and CWC

schedule to be achieved. On March 23, 2005, the USD(AT&L) directed actions to implement the program within certified baseline estimates ($1.5 billion for Pueblo and $2.0 billion for Blue Grass) and on April 15, 2005, released the remainder of the fiscal year 2005 funds for the ACWA program to the project manager. The committee has been advised informally of requirements for additional military construction funding for Blue Grass Army Depot and recommends that the Department of Defense initiate a formal reprogramming request for those funds. The committee directs that the USD(AT&L) submit a report to the congressional defense committees by June 30, 2005, on the results of the assessment of alternatives and any recommendations for adjustments in the budget request or other actions required to reduce costs and increase the probability of achieving the CWC-mandated destruction schedule.

The committee further notes the ongoing review of proposals for disposal at a commercial hazardous waste water disposal facility of the hydrolysate that will result from the neutralization of the bulk VX agent at Newport, Indiana. The committee believes that the United States must proceed as rapidly as possible in destroying the stockpile to ensure the overall maximum safety of our citizenry and meet our international treaty commitments, but must also proceed objectively and deliberately in ensuring that the disposal of the hydrolysate in a commercial hazardous waste disposal facility would not compromise the public health and safety of the citizens or the environment near such a facility. The committee directs that the Army, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proceed expeditiously in a follow-on review and resolution of the remaining issues relating to the process for disposing of the effluent from the treated hydrolysate.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army not to proceed with any action to transport or relocate VX hydrolysate (other than those small quantities necessary for laboratory evaluation of the disposal process) from the Newport Chemical Depot until:

(1) The health and environmental concerns raised by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in their April 2005 report "Review of the U.S. Army Proposal for Off-Site Treatment and Disposal of Caustic VX Hydrolysate from the Newport Chemical Agent Disposal Facility" have been addressed in a manner so that both the CDC and the EPA conclude that the process would not result in substantial ecological risk or risk to human health; and

(2) The Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that sending the VX hydrolysate off-site for treatment would result in significant cost and schedule savings compared to on-site disposal of the hydrolysate.

In addressing the issue of cost and schedule savings, the Secretary shall conduct and provide to the congressional defense committees a detailed cost-benefit analysis of both off-site treatment of the hydrolysate and on-site treatment methods, including chemical oxidation, wet-air oxidation, electrochemical oxidation, supercritical-water oxidation, solvated-electron technology, gas-phase chemical reduction, plasma arc technology, and biodegradation.

Elsewhere in this report the committee has recommended a provision that would transfer management of the ACWA program from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to the Secretary of the Army.

The committee recommends $47.8 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction research, development, test and evaluation; $116.5 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction procurement; and $1.2 billion for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction operations and maintenance.

Force protection

The committee is aware of the continued need to strengthen force protection measures to better protect troops against indirect fire attack. The committee expects the Department of Defense (DOD) to focus its force protection efforts on identified threats facing troops in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, including but not limited to rocket propelled grenades, mortars, and artillery. The committee notes there are commercially available products designed for use as security forces buildings, overhead cover systems, blast resistant barriers, and mobile container housing units which have been tested by U.S. military testing facilities. These products have been proven to withstand .50 caliber armor-piercing rounds, low-yield bomb blasts, and 120 millimeter artillery rounds and should be considered for deployment as force protection measures.

Similarly, the committee notes that in fiscal years 2004 and 2005, Congress appropriated $1.0 million for Rapid Deployment Fortification Wall (RDFW) research and development as part of the Marine Corps Improved Expedient Fortification Construction program. The RDFW is an expandable, stackable, modular wall made of resilient, lightweight, environmentally-responsible plastic that can augment sandbags. Further, the RDFW can enhance force protection while decreasing the manpower hours needed to expedite construction of fortifications. The committee encourages DOD's use of RDFW to complement traditional sandbag fortifications and other technologies currently in use. Combat forces should be supported with a complete force protection strategy and the Department should consider newly demonstrated capabilities in support of this strategy.

Persistent unmanned air vehicle intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance below the brigade level

The committee is concerned about the lack of persistent unmanned air vehicle (UAV) intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capability below the brigade level and the resulting negative impact on force protection.

The committee believes this ISR deficiency is the result of several factors including inadequate bandwidth and spectrum allocation, insufficient numbers of ground stations, and the lack of trained personnel. Force protection would be greatly enhanced by persistent aerial ISR. Therefore, until the UAV technology and personnel gaps are filled, the Secretary of Defense is encouraged to employ interim solutions for this mission.

Before the advent of UAVs, manned slow-speed forward air control (FAC) aircraft demonstrated the value of on-station tactical ob-

servers, trained in fire support and air control. An interim manned FAC would provide tactical commanders with valuable intelligence information, persistent surveillance, and on-scene coordination not fully available with the present ISR capabilities.

The committee encourages the Secretary to consider options to meet the urgent interim requirement needed for a day and night capable platform that can perform the persistent ISR function for units on the move and in forward areas.

Special Operations Forces intelligence systems

The budget request contained $27.6 million for Special Operations Forces (SOF) intelligence systems, but included only $4.5 million to initiate procurement of Joint Threat

Warning Systems-Air (JTWS–A) for Air Force Special Operations Command (AFSOC) aircraft and contained only $2.2 million to procure the Special Operations Tactical Video System/Reconnaissance, Surveillance, and Target Acquisition System (SOTVS/RSTA).

The committee understands that the JTWS–A provides AFSOC aircrews operating over hostile territory with modern, direct threat warning, replacing existing, unreliable threat warning systems currently in use.

The committee recognizes that remote surveillance capabilities and unattended ground sensors are increasingly important to the conduct of special operations missions. Modern equipment such as the SOTVS/RSTA is more capable, survivable, and portable than earlier systems; and is an important force multiplier for small, forwarded deployed special operating forces teams.

The committee believes that accelerated procurement of these systems will add significantly to special forces tactical capabilities and notes that both of these items are on the unfunded priority list of the Commander, Special Operations Command.

The committee recommends $45.6 million for SOF intelligence systems, an increase of $10.0 million for the procurement of an additional 16 JTWS–A and an increase of $8.0 million for additional SOTVS/RSTA.

Special weapons observation reconnaissance direct action system

The budget request contained $233.8 million for Special Operations Forces (SOF) operational enhancements, but included no funds for the Special Weapons Observation Reconnaissance Direct Action System (SWORDS). The committee understands that the SWORDS mobile weapons system is an innovative small robot armed with standard issue automatic weapons, allowing special forces operators to engage the enemy at a standoff distance of approximately 1,000 meters. The committee understands that the system has been successful in its initial deployment in Afghanistan.

The committee recommends $243.8 million for SOF operational enhancements, an increase of $10.0 million for the procurement of additional SWORDS mobile weapons systems.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sections 101–104—Authorization of Appropriations

These sections would authorize the recommended fiscal year 2006 funding levels for all procurement accounts.

SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

Section 111—Multiyear Procurement Authority for UH–60M/MH–60 Helicopters

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into a multiyear contract, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, beginning with the fiscal year 2007 program year, for procurement of up to 461 helicopters in the UH–60M configuration, and, acting as the executive agent for the Department of the Navy in the MH–60S configuration.

Section 112—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Apache Modernized Target Acquisition Designation Sights and Pilot Night Vision Sensors

This section would authorize the Army to enter into multiyear contracts for the procurement of Modernized Target Acquisition Designation Sights and Pilot Night Vision Sensors.

Section 113—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Apache Block II Conversion

This section would authorize the Army to enter into multiyear contracts for the procurement of Apache Block II conversions.

Section 114—Acquisition Strategy for Tactical Wheeled Vehicle Programs

This section would require the Army and the Marine Corps to enter into a joint service program for the procurement of a new vehicle class of tactical wheeled vehicles. The committee understands the Army is actively engaged in implementing a revised tactical wheeled vehicle (TWV) modernization and recapitalization strategy with the intent to recapitalize, modernize and eventually replace its existing light, medium, and heavy tactical wheeled vehicles with either a new next generation vehicle class or more capable recapitalized tactical wheeled vehicles that have integrated new technologies and incorporated lessons learned from operations involving the global war on terrorism. The committee supports Army investment into its TWV fleet. Cost reduction strategies, reliability and maintainability improvement initiatives, and life cycle support recommendations are encouraged by the committee.

The committee is aware that costs of Department of Defense weapons systems, including non-developmental platforms such as tactical wheeled vehicles continue to escalate and note the benefit competition can bring to weapon systems and vehicle platforms. The committee recognizes a major component of this TWV strategy

involves a competition in calendar year 2006, defined as a watershed event by the Army.

The committee directs that should the Army or the Marine Corps as a result of this competition, choose to award a new non-developmental production contract for a new vehicle class of TWV other than those referenced above as modifications, upgrades or product improvements to the existing fleet, the contract should be executed as a joint service program between the Army and the Marine Corps. This joint service program should be validated and approved by the Joint Requirement Oversight Council and the Secretary of Defense.

The committee believes its imperative for the Department to take advantage of economies of scale in production of particular platforms that provide essentially the same function for ground force combat service support and logistic missions.

Section 115—Limitation on Army Modular Force Initiative

This section would set forth a $3.0 billion limitation on acquisition obligations by the Army towards the Modular Force Initiative in fiscal year 2006 until receipt by the congressional defense committees of a report outlining the specific requirements as stated in this provision. The committee understands the Army's force restructuring plan referred to as "Army Modularity" will require dramatic increases in its budget for personnel and equipment.

To date, the Department of Defense has announced that $48.0 billion has been budgeted for the Army for modularity for fiscal years 2005–2011. Minimal information has been provided to the congressional defense committees on defined requirements and budget detail. Further, the Army planned to fund the first two years of its modularity requirement through emergency supplemental appropriations, limiting the ability of the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services to exercise their oversight responsibilities. However, the committee was recently advised by the Army that the fiscal year 2006 budget request includes $788.0 million in its procurement request for modularity.

This section would limit the Army's ability to obligate funds authorized for procurement to not more than $3.0 billion until 30 days after submitting a report to the congressional defense committees for its modularity program. This report would include:

(1) The programs and the acquisition objectives for those programs;

(2) The budget included for modularity in the fiscal year 2007 Future Years Defense Program;

(3) The unfunded requirements, as applicable, that would preclude meeting the acquisition objective; and

(4) The acquisition plan for Army modularity funded in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005.

The conference report (H. Rept. 109–72) accompanying the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109–13) directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by September 1, 2005, to the congressional defense committees detailing DOD's long-range plan for executing and funding modularity to include ac-

quisition requirements. The committee encourages the Department to include the reporting requirements as required in this provision in its September 2005 report.

Section 116—Contract Requirement for Objective Individual Combat Weapon—Increment One

This section would require the Secretary of Army to award the contract for procurement of the Objective Individual Combat Weapon (OICW), Increment One using full and open competition. In addition, before appropriated funds are obligated, the Secretary shall provide a report to the congressional defense committees that certifies this contract was conducted using full and open competition.

The committee believes the Secretary of Army should examine the requirement for the OICW, Increment One to determine whether this is a developmental or non-developmental item and to determine accordingly the appropriate period for review for requests for proposals.

SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

Section 121—Virginia Class Submarine Program

This section would limit the total amount obligated or expended for procurement of five Virginia class submarines designated as SSN–779, SSN–780, SSN–781, SSN–782, and SSN–783.

Section 122—LHA Replacement Amphibious Assault Ship Program

This section would require that the total amount obligated or expended for the procurement of each ship of the replacement amphibious assault ship (LHA(R)) program may not exceed $2.0 billion. Also, this section limits the obligation or expenditure of funds for the LHA(R) program until the Secretary of Defense certifies that the Joint Requirements Oversight Council has approved a detailed operational requirements document and there exists a stable design for the LHA(R) class of vessels.

Section 123—Future Major Surface Combatant, Destroyer Type

This section would require that the total amount obligated or expended for the procurement of the future major surface combatant, destroyer type (DD(X)) may not exceed $1.7 billion each, and authorizes $700.0 million for technology development and demonstration for this class of vessel. Further, this section establishes acquisition plan requirements for the DD(X).

Section 124—Littoral Combat Ship Program

This section would require that the total amount obligated or expended for the procurement of each ship for the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program, including the amounts for the mission models, may not exceed $400.0 million. Further, this section limits the acquisition of additional LCSs until the Secretary of Defense submits the results of an operational evaluation of the first four LCSs and certifies that a stable design exists for this class of vessels.

Section 125—Authorization of Two Additional Arleigh Burke Class Destroyers

This section would authorize $2.5 billion for the construction of two additional Arleigh Burke class destroyers under a single, competitively awarded contract.

Section 126—Refueling and Complex Overhaul of the U.S.S. Carl Vinson

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract and commence overhaul of the U.S.S. Carl Vinson (CVN–70) nuclear aircraft carrier during fiscal year 2006 with funding provided in fiscal years 2006 and 2007.

Section 127—Report on Propulsion System Alternatives for Surface Combatants

This section would direct the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the assessment of alternative propulsion methods for surface combatants. Operations and support costs, which include the cost of personnel, maintenance, and other costs such as fuel, represent a higher percentage of the total life cycle costs for Navy ships than research, development and procurement costs. Therefore, it is critical that the Navy make every effort to design future ships that are cost-effective to operate so that it can develop a force structure that is affordable and sustainable over the long term. In recent years, the Navy has used conventional propulsion systems that rely on fossil fuel for its surface combatants and nuclear propulsion systems for its submarines and most aircraft carriers. However, the committee is concerned that some of the assumptions and factors that have guided past Navy decisions on propulsion systems may require reassessment as the Navy looks to design an affordable force that is capable of meeting future security challenges. For example, technological advances have enabled greater efficiency in both nuclear and conventional propulsion systems in recent years. Moreover, oil prices have risen significantly in the past few years and global markets are likely to face future difficulties in meeting global demands for oil, particularly considering the explosive growth in some developing nations' economies.

The committee is aware that the Chief of Naval Operations guidance for 2005 directed the Naval Sea Systems Command to work with the Office of Naval Research to study and develop proposals for alternative propulsion methods for surface combatants. The committee supports the need for this study and directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report explaining the Navy's methodology, conclusions and recommendations of the study by the submission of the President's Budget for Fiscal Year 2007, required by section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

Section 128—Aircraft Carrier Force Structure

This section would mandate the Secretary of Defense to maintain a minimum force structure of 12 aircraft carriers. This section would further direct the Secretary to take all the necessary steps to maintain the USS John F. Kennedy in a fully mission capable

status. Additionally, the committee would recommend authorization of $60.0 million for the operation and maintenance of the USS John F. Kennedy.

The committee believes that the Navy's aircraft carrier force structure must be maintained at 12 in order to meet potential global commitments. The committee notes that in order for the USS John F. Kennedy to be maintained at full operational capability, the Navy must reschedule the recently cancelled shipyard overhaul, and directs the Navy to do so. In the interim, the committee expects the Navy to take full advantage of routine maintenance outside a shipyard to maintain the USS John F. Kennedy as capable as possible until it enters the shipyard.

Section 129—Contingent Transfer of Additional Funds for CVN–21 Carrier Replacement Program

This section would transfer $86.7 million for additional funding for construction of CVN–21 from Defense-wide Operation and Maintenance to Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy if the Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation certifies that such additional funds are sufficient to move CVN–21 construction start from fiscal year 2008 to fiscal year 2007.

SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Section 131—Multiyear Procurement Authority for C–17 Aircraft

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into a multiyear contract, beginning with the fiscal year 2006 program year, for procurement of up to 42 additional C–17 aircraft.

SUBTITLE E—JOINT AND MULTISERVICE MATTERS

Section 141—Requirement that all Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicles Use Specified Standard Data Link

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to ensure that all tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force are equipped with the standard tactical UAV data link known as the Tactical Common Data Link (TCDL) and configured to data formats consistent with the architectural standard for tactical UAVs, known as STANAG 4586. This provision applies to the Pioneer UAV, Shadow UAV, and other UAV types as determined by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. The committee would further direct the Secretary of each military department to submit a report to Congress providing the Secretary's certification as to whether or not all tactical UAVs are in compliance with the standard data link.

Section 142—Limitation on Initiation of New Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Systems

This section would preclude procurement of new unmanned aerial vehicle systems by the military services without the written approval of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, & EVALUATION

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $69.4 billion for research, development, test, & evaluation (RDT&E). The committee recommends $69.4 billion, an increase of $112.9 million to the budget request.

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY					
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	307,594	19,500	19,500		327,094
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	671,302	202,400	202,400		873,702
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	756,359	255,425	255,425		1,011,784
		TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	364,973	275,648	275,648		640,621
		TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	5,225,675	(778,225)	2,420,404	(3,198,629)	4,447,450
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	1,092,650	7,000	7,000		1,099,650
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,315,271	61,800	80,100	(18,300)	1,377,071
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY	9,733,824	43,548	3,260,477	(3,216,929)	9,777,372
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY					
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	448,295	(4,000)		(4,000)	444,295
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	597,914	52,000	52,000		649,914
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	729,852	141,400	141,400		871,252
		TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	3,276,391	168,300	168,300		3,444,691
		TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	8,877,891	(558,241)	128,500	(686,741)	8,319,650
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	756,949				756,949
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	3,350,699	184,690	188,800	(4,110)	3,535,389
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY	18,037,991	(15,851)	679,000	(694,851)	18,022,140
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE					
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	340,817	5,500	5,500		346,317
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	851,703	51,400	51,400		903,103
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	787,646	61,600	61,600		849,246
		TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	2,754,339	(501,339)	24,500	(525,839)	2,253,000
		TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	5,071,490	248,835	248,835		5,320,325
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	950,506	6,500	6,500		957,006
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	11,855,850	(76,635)	144,400	(221,035)	11,779,215
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE	22,612,351	(204,139)	542,735	(746,874)	22,408,212

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE					
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	222,069	10,000	10,000		232,069
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	2,018,084	45,400	45,400		2,063,484
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,790,486	55,400	92,200	(36,800)	2,845,886
		TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	7,747,046	130,000	245,000	(115,000)	7,877,046
		TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	578,988	(89,116)	3,000	(92,116)	489,872
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	808,795	73,395	86,575	(13,180)	882,190
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	4,637,948	64,310	64,310		4,702,258
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE-WIDE	18,803,416	289,389	546,485	(257,096)	19,092,805
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE	168,458				168,458
		TOTAL, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	69,356,040	112,947	5,028,697	(4,915,750)	69,468,987

ARMY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, & EVALUATION

Overview

The budget request contained $9.7 billion for Army research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $9.8 billion, an increase of $43.5 million to the budget request.

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY					
		BASIC RESEARCH					
0601101A	1	In-House Laboratory Independent Research	20,542				20,542
0601102A	2	Defense Research Sciences	137,898	13,000			150,898
0601102A		Chemical Mechanical Planarization			2,000		
0601102A		Desert Research Institute Terrain Analysis			5,000		
0601102A		Advanced Carbon Nanotechnology			6,000		
0601103A	3	University Research Initiatives	67,201	2,000			69,201
0601103A		Smart Responsive Nanocomposites			2,000		
0601104A	4	University and Industry Research Centers	81,953	4,500			86,453
0601104A		Modeling and Analysis of the Response Structures			1,000		
0601104A		Centers of Excellence			3,500		
0601105A	5	Force Health Protection					
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**307,594**	**19,500**	**19,500**		**327,094**
		APPLIED RESEARCH					
0602105A	6	Materials Technology	17,559	9,000			26,559
0602105A		Advanced Lightweight Composite Armor			4,000		
0602105A		Ballistic Shields Technology			1,000		
0602105A		Cutting Tools for Aerospace Materials			2,000		
0602105A		Ceramic Armor Technology			2,000		
0602120A	7	Sensors and Electronic Survivability	32,147	5,000			37,147
0602120A		Advanced Detection of Explosives			5,000		
0602122A	8	TRACTOR HIP	7,804				7,804
0602211A	9	Aviation Technology	34,295	10,000			44,295
0602211A		Center for Rotorcraft Innovation			10,000		
0602270A	10	EW Technology	19,129	9,000			28,129
0602270A		Silver Fox UAV			5,000		
0602270A		Xenon Light Source for Non Lethal Deterrence from Small UAVs			2,000		
0602270A		Unattended Ground Sensors			2,000		
0602303A	11	Missile Technology	62,524	5,500			68,024

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0602303A		Missile Recycling Capability			1,500		
0602303A		MEMS and Nanoscale Devices			4,000		
0602307A	12	Advanced Weapons Technology	21,139	10,000			31,139
0602307A		Applied Weapons Technology			10,000		
0602308A	13	Advanced Concepts and Simulation	16,013	10,000			26,013
0602308A		Institute for Creative Technologies			10,000		
0602601A	14	Combat Vehicle and Automotive Technology	64,883	19,500			84,383
0602601A		Advanced Electric Drive			3,500		
0602601A		Hydrogen Proton Exchange Membrane Fuel Cell			10,000		
0602601A		Light Utility Vehicle			6,000		
0602618A	15	Ballistics Technology	49,163				49,163
0602622A	16	Chemical, Smoke and Equipment Defeating Technology	2,519				2,519
0602623A	17	Joint Service Small Arms Program	5,703				5,703
0602624A	18	Weapons and Munitions Technology	37,824	23,400			61,224
0602624A		Active Coatings Technology			7,400		
0602624A		Strategic Materials/Strategic Manufacturing Initiative			8,000		
0602624A		Titanium Extraction, Mining and Process Engineering Research			8,000		
0602705A	19	Electronics and Electronic Devices	39,554	40,900			80,454
0602705A		CO2 Heating and Cooling			2,000		
0602705A		E-Beam Reticle and Litho Inspection			10,000		
0602705A		Flexible Display Initiative			11,400		
0602705A		JP-8 Soldier Fuel Cell			4,000		
0602705A		Nanofluidic Electronic Bio Sensor Technology			3,500		
0602705A		Advanced Battery Technology Initiative			10,000		
0602709A	20	Night Vision Technology	23,823	6,000			29,823
0602709A		UAV MINISENS			6,000		
0602712A	21	Countermine Systems	19,293	8,000			27,293
0602712A		Explosive and Narcotic Detection Devices			8,000		
0602716A	22	Human Factors Engineering Technology	17,482	5,500			22,982
0602716A		MANPRINT			5,500		
0602720A	23	Environmental Quality Technology	16,417				16,417

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0602782A	24	Command, Control, Communications Technology	21,787				21,787
0602783A	25	Computer and Software Technology	3,590				3,590
0602784A	26	Military Engineering Technology	47,046				47,046
0602785A	27	Manpower/Personnel/Training Technology	15,207				15,207
0602786A	28	Warfighter Technology	21,707	15,600			37,307
0602786A		MRE-Neutraceuticals			3,500		
0602786A		M5 High Performance Fibers for Personnel Armor Systems			5,000		
0602786A		Soldier Systems Center			4,600		
0602786A		Antimicrobial-Nano Technology			2,500		
0602787A	29	Medical Technology	74,694	25,000			99,694
0602787A		Advanced Amputee Treatment			10,000		
0602787A		Peer-Reviewed Applied Research Initiative			15,000		
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**671,302**	**202,400**	**202,400**		**873,702**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT					
0603001A	30	Warfighter Advanced Technology	63,754				63,754
0603002A	31	Medical Advanced Technology	45,160	24,200			69,360
0603002A		Peer-Reviewed Advanced Technology Development Initiative			15,000		
0603002A		Lightweight Patient Monitor with Defibrillator			3,500		
0603002A		Patient Status Monitor			3,500		
0603002A		Rugged Textile Electronic Garments			2,200		
0603003A	32	Aviation Advanced Technology	48,318	92,830			141,148
0603003A		Light-weight Heavy Fuel Turbine Engines			6,900		
0603003A		Laser Peening Rotorcraft Transmission Gears			1,200		
0603003A		Helicopter Nanocrystaline Diamond Rotor Blades			2,000		
0603003A		Multilayered Sacrificial Filament Laminates			1,600		
0603005A		Portable Reconfigurable Tooling System			2,000		
0603003A		Vectored Thrust Ducted Propeller Demostrator			9,500		
0603003A		Joint Heavy Lift			10,000		
0603003A		Light-weight Armored Window Technology			1,500		
0603003A		Reconnaissance Platforms and Sensors (transfer from RDA 93)			58,130		

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0603004A	33	Weapons and Munitions Advanced Technology	74,927	8,000			82,927
0603004A		Precision Molded Aspheric Optics			5,000		
0603004A		Miniaturized Spectrometer ID System			3,000		
0603005A	34	Combat Vehicle and Automotive Advanced Technology	142,866	18,495			161,361
0603005A		Armored Composite Cab			5,000		
0603005A		Composite Material Development			2,000		
0603005A		Detonation System Technology Pilot Program			1,700		
0603005A		Logistical Fuel Processors			4,100		
0603005A		Soldier Weapon Detection and Location Sensor			945		
0603005A		Abrams Improved Track			4,750		
0603006A	35	Command, Control, Communications Advanced Technology	12,066	2,000			14,066
0603006A		CECM			2,000		
0603007A	36	Manpower, Personnel and Training Advanced Technology	6,783				6,783
0603008A	37	Electronic Warfare Advanced Technology	45,322	15,100			60,422
0603008A		Advanced Antenna Technologies			2,000		
0603008A		Applied Communications and Information Networking			7,000		
0603008A		Portable and Mobile Emergency Broadband System			6,100		
0603009A	38	TRACTOR HIKE	8,777				8,777
0603015A	39	Next Generation Training & Simulation Systems	19,982	4,000			23,982
0603015A		Desert Research Institute CAVE			4,000		
0603020A	40	TRACTOR ROSE	4,956				4,956
0603103A	41	Explosives Demilitarization Technology	9,865	6,000			15,865
0603103A		Missile Recycling Center Capability			6,000		
0603105A	42	Military HIV Research	6,842				6,842
0603125A	43	Combating Terrorism, Technology Development	6,306				6,306
0603238A	44	Global Surveillance/Air Defense/Precision Strike Technology Demonstration	12,111				12,111
0603270A	45	EW Technology / FCS	16,801				16,801
0603313A	46	Missile and Rocket Advanced Technology	70,066	5,000			75,066
0603313A		UAV Gunfire Detection System			5,000		
0603322A	47	TRACTOR CAGE	15,406				15,406
0603606A	48	Landmine Warfare and Barrier Advanced Technology	25,327				25,327

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0603607A	49	Joint Service Small Arms Ammo	6,581				6,581
0603654A	50	Line-Of-Sight Technology Demonstration					
0603710A	51	Night Vision Advanced Technology	51,761	50,900			102,661
0603710A		Cerberus Sensor Suite			7,000		
0603710A		HyLITE			9,200		
0603710A		Low Altitude IED Detection			7,500		
0603710A		Enhanced Night Vision Goggle			12,200		
0603710A		Portable Infrared Target Detection and Location Reporting System			1,000		
0603710A		Soldier Mobility and Rifle Tracking System			4,000		
0603710A		Helo Wire Detection and Obstacle Avoidance			4,000		
0603710A		Unmanned Aircraft Operational Awareness System			1,000		
0603710A		Personal Miniature Thermal Vision			5,000		
0603728A	52	Environmental Quality Technology Demonstrations	12,606	11,500			24,106
0603728A		Army Range Transformation- Start			10,000		
0603728A		Turboexpander			1,500		
0603734A	53	Military Engineering Advanced Technology	7,301	7,000			14,301
0603734A		Gas Engine Air Conditioning			7,000		
0603772A	54	Advanced Tactical Computer Science and Sensor Technology	42,475	10,400			52,875
0603772A		Bi-directional English-Arabic Translation System			2,900		
0603772A		X-band Interferometric Radar			2,500		
0603772A		C4ISR IDESM			5,000		
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**756,359**	**255,425**	**255,425**		**1,011,784**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES					
0603024A	55	Unique Item Identification	1,500				1,500
0603303A	55a	Reconnaissance Platforms and Sensors (Transfer from RDA 93)		47,203	47,203		47,203
0603304A	55b	Robotic Ground Systems (Transfer from RDA 93)		86,445	86,445		86,445
0603305A	56	Army Missile Defense Systems Integration (Non Space)	14,573	7,500			22,073
0603305A		Technology Transfer for Improved Medical Imaging			2,500		
0603305A		Next Generation Interceptors Material Research			5,000		
0603308A	57	Army Missile Defense Systems Integration (Space)	9,284				9,284

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0603327A	58	Air and Missile Defense Systems Engineering	83,063	12,000			95,063
0603327A		Architecture Analysis Program			5,000		
0603327A		GIDS-SIAP			7,000		
0603619A	59	Landmine Warfare and Barrier - Adv Dev					
0603627A	60	Smoke, Obscurant and Target Defeating Sys-Adv Dev	5,733				5,733
0603639A	61	Tank and Medium Caliber Ammunition					
0603645A	61a	Manned Ground Vehicles (Transfer from RDA 93)		100,000	100,000		100,000
0603653A	62	Advanced Tank Armament System (ATAS) / STRYKER	26,712	15,000			41,712
0603653A		Common Remote Stabilized Sensor System			15,000		
0603747A	63	Soldier Support and Survivability	3,393				3,393
0603766A	64	Tactical Electronic Surveillance System - Adv Dev	18,907				18,907
0603774A	65	Night Vision Systems Advanced Development	6,885				6,885
0603779A	66	Environmental Quality Technology	5,166	2,500			7,666
0603779A		Aberdeen Proving Ground Asbestos Conversion Facility			2,500		
0603782A	67	Warfighter Information Network-Tactical	131,081				131,081
0603790A	68	NATO Research and Development	4,902				4,902
0603801A	69	Aviation - Adv Dev	6,249				6,249
0603802A	70	Small Arms Improvement (Weapons and Munitions -Adv Dev)					
0603804A	71	Logistics and Engineer Equipment - Adv Dev	13,375				13,375
0603805A	72	Combat Service Support Control System Evaluation and Analysis	10,659				10,659
0603807A	73	Medical Systems - Adv Dev	10,134	5,000			15,134
0603807A		Leishmaniasis			1,500		
0603807A		Pseudofollicullitis Barbae			1,000		
0603002A		Glioblast 13 Compound			2,500		
0603827A	74	Soldier Systems - Advanced Development	10,595				10,595
0603850A	75	Integrated Broadcast Service (JMIP/DISTP)	2,762				2,762
0603856A	76	SCAMP Block II					
0603869A	77	Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) Concepts					
		TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**364,973**	**275,648**	**275,648**		**640,621**

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0604201A	78	Aircraft Avionics	23,451	3,000			26,451
0604201A		Helo Situational Awareness			3,000		
0604220A	79	Armed, Deployable OH-58D	13,964				13,964
0604223A	80	Comanche					
0604270A	81	EW Development ATIRCM	32,179				32,179
0604280A	82	Joint Tactical Radio	156,665				156,665
0604321A	83	All Source Analysis System	7,973				7,973
0604328A	84	TRACTOR CAGE	16,099				16,099
0604329A	85	JT Common Missile					
0604601A	86	Infantry Support Weapons /OICW	34,627	8,000			42,627
0604601A		CROWS Light			8,000		
0604604A	87	Medium Tactical Vehicles/FMTV	1,886	10,000			11,886
0604604A		Medium Tactical Vehicle Suspension Development			10,000		
0604609A	88	Smoke, Obscurant and Target Defeating Sys-SDD					
0604611A	89	JAVELIN					
0604622A	90	Family of Heavy Tactical Vehicles	3,415				3,415
0604633A	91	Air Traffic Control	4,508				4,508
0604642A	92	Light Tactical Wheeled Vehicles					
0604645A	93	Armored Systems Modernization Program	3,065,629	(3,065,629)		(3,065,629)	
0604645A	93a	FCS Common Operating Environment (Transfer from RDA 93)		2,322,200	2,322,200		2,322,200
0604646A	94	Non-Line of Sight Launch System	231,554				231,554
0604647A	95	Non-Line of Sight Cannon	107,587	50,000			157,587
0604647A		Program Increase			50,000		
0604710A	96	Night Vision Systems	26,449	6,000			32,449
0604710A		Unattended Ground Sensors			6,000		
0604713A	97	Combat Feeding, Clothing, and Equipment	3,383				3,383
0604715A	98	Non-System Training Devices	61,090				61,090
0604716A	99	Terrain Information					
0604726A	100	Integrated Meteorological Support System					
0604741A	101	Air Defense Command, Control and Intelligence - SDD	29,012				29,012
0604742A	102	Constructive Simulation Systems Development	40,572				40,572

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0604746A	103	Automatic Test Equipment Development	54				54
0604760A	104	Distributive Interactive Simulations (DIS)	22,057				22,057
0604766A	105	Tactical Surveillance Systems		2,504			2,504
0604766A		Unattended Sensors (Transfer from RDA 93)			2,504		
0604768A	106	Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS)					
0604770A	107	Joint Surveillance/Target Attack Radar System					
0604778A	108	Positioning Systems Development (SPACE)					
0604780A	109	Combined Arms Tactical Trainer (CATT) Core	37,471				37,471
0604783A	110	Joint Network Management System	5,092				5,092
0604801A	111	Aviation					
0604802A	112	Weapons and Munitions / APKWS / GAMRAAM	87,034				87,034
0604804A	113	Logistics and Engineer Equipment - SDD	13,353	1,000			14,353
0604804A		Personal Water Disinfection			1,000		
0604805A	114	Command, Control, Communications Systems	393,062	(133,000)			260,062
0604805A		JTRS Program Reduction				(133,000)	
0604807A	115	Medical Materiel/Medical Biological Defense Equipment - SDD	5,627	4,000			9,627
0604807A		Battlefield Respirator and Ventilator			4,000		
0604808A	116	Landmine Warfare/Barrier - SDD	80,560				80,560
0604814A	117	Artillery Munitions	113,368	10,000			123,368
0604814A		Excaliber XM982			10,000		
0604817A	118	Combat Identification	2,973				2,973
0604818A	119	Army Tactical Command & Control Hardware & Software	66,980				66,980
0604819A	120	LOSAT					
0604820A	121	Radar Development / Sentinel	5,080				5,080
0604822a	122	General Fund Enterprise Business System (GFEBS)	71,119				71,119
0604823A	123	Firefinder	46,061				46,061
0604827A	124	Soldier Systems -Warrior Dem/Val	57,818	3,700			61,518
0604827A		Nomad C2 Display			3,700		
0604854A	125	Artillery Systems	5,476				5,476
0604865A	126	Patriot PAC-3 Theater Missile Defense Acquisition					
0604869A	127	Patriot/MEADS Combined Aggregate Program (CAP)	288,785				288,785

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0605013A	128	Information Technology Development	63,662				63,662
		TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**5,225,675**	**(778,225)**	**2,420,404**	**(3,198,629)**	**4,447,450**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
0604256A	129	Threat Simulator Development	23,796				23,796
0604258A	130	Target Systems Development	10,855				10,855
0604759A	131	Major T&E Investment	64,498				64,498
0605103A	132	Rand Arroyo Center	23,800				23,800
0605301A	133	Army Kwajalein Atoll	154,535				154,535
0605326A	134	Concepts Experimentation Program	31,653				31,653
0605502A	135	Small Business Innovative Research					
0605601A	136	Army Test Ranges and Facilities	369,943				369,943
0605602A	137	Army Technical Test Instrumentation and Targets	62,687	7,000			69,687
0605602A		Mobile Optical Tracking System			7,000		
0605604A	138	Survivability/Lethality Analysis	38,306				38,306
0605605A	139	DOD High Energy Laser Test Facility	17,688				17,688
0605606A	140	Aircraft Certification	2,748				2,748
0605702A	141	Meteorological Support to RDT&E Activities	8,829				8,829
0605706A	142	Materiel Systems Analysis	15,517				15,517
0605709A	143	Exploitation of Foreign Items	4,710				4,710
0605712A	144	Support of Operational Testing	75,993				75,993
0605716A	145	Army Evaluation Center	57,305				57,305
0605718A	146	Simulation & Modeling for Acq, Rqts, & Tng (SMART)	9,437				9,437
0605801A	147	Programwide Activities	54,269				54,269
0605803A	148	Technical Information Activities	32,237				32,237
0605805A	149	Munitions Standardization, Effectiveness and Safety	16,922				16,922
0605857A	150	Environmental Quality Technology Mgmt Support	4,014				4,014
0605898A	151	Management Headquarters (Research and Development)	12,908				12,908
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,092,650**	**7,000**	**7,000**		**1,099,650**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0603778A	152	MLRS Product Improvement Program	114,297				114,297
0102419A	153	JT Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense (Aerostat Joint Program Office)	106,420	2,000			108,420
0102419A		MEMS Demonstration			2,000		
0203610A	154	Domestic Preparedness Against Weapons of Mass Destruction					
0203726A	155	Adv Field Artillery Tactical Data System	16,064	5,000			21,064
0203726A		Fire Support Technology Improvement Program			5,000		
0203735A	156	Combat Vehicle Improvement Programs	12,030	5,000			17,030
0203735A		Combat Vehicle Electronics			5,000		
0203740A	157	Maneuver Control System - Tactical C2	44,903				44,903
0203744A	158	Aircraft Modifications/Product Improvement Programs	409,103	3,900			413,003
23747A		Black Hawk- Nomad			3,900		
0203752A	159	Aircraft Engine Component Improvement Program	2,066				2,066
0203758A	160	Digitization	12,343				12,343
0203759A	161	Force XXI Battle Command, Brigade and Below (FBCB2)	20,201				20,201
0203801A	162	Patriot Product Improvement (Missile/Air Defense Product Improvement Program)	16,188				16,188
0203802A	163	Other Missile Product Improvement Programs	23,560				23,560
0203806A	164	TRACTOR RUT					
0203808A	165	TRACTOR CARD	6,797				6,797
0208010A	166	Joint Tactical Communications Program (TRI-TAC)	24,906				24,906
0208053A	167	Joint Tactical Ground System	12,854				12,854
0208058A	168	Joint High Speed Vessel (JHSV)	3,261				3,261
0301359A	169	Special Army Program					
0301555A	170	Classified Programs					
0301556A	171	Special Program					
0303028A	172	Security and Intelligence Activities	2,992				2,992
0303140A	173	Information Systems Security Program	22,903				22,903
0303141A	174	Global Combat Support System	79,752				79,752
0303142A	175	SATCOM Ground Environment (SPACE)	58,659				58,659
0303142A	176	WWMCCS/Global Command and Control System	13,647				13,647
0303158A	177	Joint Command and Control Program (JC2)	1,696				1,696
0305114A	178	Traffic Control, Approach and Landing System/JPALS					

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0305204A	179	Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicles	139,610				139,610
0305206A	180	Airborne Reconnaissance Systems	5,398				5,398
0305208A	181	Distributed Common Ground Systems	91,587	(18,300)			73,287
0305208A		Program Reduction				(18,300)	
0702239A	182	Avionics Component Improvement Program	994				994
0708045A	183	End Item Industrial Preparedness Activities	68,505	14,200			82,705
0708045A		Smart Machine Platform			4,500		
0708045A		Affordable Modular Manufacturing Process			3,200		
0708045A		Lean Munitions			4,500		
0605790D8Z		Powdered Metal Compaction Initiative			2,000		
1001018A	184	NATO Joint STARS	569				569
0607XXX	184a	Tactical Wheeled Vehicle Product Improvement Program		50,000	50,000		50,000
XXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	3,966				3,966
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**1,315,271**	**61,800**	**80,100**	**(18,300)**	**1,377,071**
		TOTAL, RDT&E, ARMY	**9,733,824**	**43,548**	**3,260,477**	**(3,216,929)**	**9,777,372**

Items of Special Interest

Abrams improved track

The budget request contained $142.9 million in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive advanced technology programs, of which, no funds were included for the Abrams Improved Track program. The Abrams Improved Track program expects to reduce life cycle costs of the M1 Abrams Main Battle Tank platform by 20 percent.

The committee is aware the M1 Abrams Main Battle Tank platform, on average puts seven to eight years of operational use on a vehicle in a single year deployment to Iraq. The committee notes in some cases tanks have put on more than 1,000 miles of operational use per month in Operation Iraqi Freedom. The committee understands this higher level of operational tempo requires additional maintenance costs and also recognizes the M1 Abrams Main Battle Tank will continue to be the primary combat vehicle in the Army's inventory until at least 2050. The committee understands the Abrams Improved Track program can generate better cost savings, and increase reliability, availability, and maintainability of the M1 Abrams Main Battle Tank fleet.

Therefore, the committee recommends $147.5 million for PE 63005A, an increase of $4.8 million, to complete the final phase of development for the Abrams Improved Track program.

Accelerated development of heavy-fuel turbine engine

The budget request contained $48.3 million in PE 63003A for aviation advanced technology, but included no funds to accelerate development of light-weight heavy fuel turbine engines.

The committee notes that the modern battlefield mandates use of heavy fuel engines to simplify logistics and increase safety. The lightweight turbine engine offers advantages for aerial vehicles. In addition, the modern turbine engine coupled to emerging electrical generator technology offers the near-term ability to reduce size and weight of ground power generators by an order of magnitude.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63003A to accelerate development of the heavy fuel turbine engine.

Advanced amputee treatment research and development

The budget request contained $74.7 million in PE 62787A for medical technology applied research, but included no funds to continue the program in clinical and applied collaborative research in amputee treatment, prosthetics, and rehabilitation.

The committee commends the Army for its efforts to initiate a collaborative applied and clinical prosthetic research activity in order to provide the best possible care for patients who have experienced combat injuries resulting in traumatic amputation. Established by the Army Surgeon General, the Amputee Care Center and the Army Amputee Patient Care Program at Walter Reed Army Medical Center provide state-of-the-art treatment and are the center of a multi-site, coordinated complex of facilities, which involve regional military medical centers, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other military and civilian treatment facilities. The goal of the program is to ensure that amputee patients receive the kind of care that will allow them to lead lives unconstrained

by their amputation. The committee notes that a sustained research effort is necessary to achieve the goals of the program and strongly encourages the Secretary of the Army to provide funding in the program for that purpose in future budget requests.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62787A to continue the Army program in clinical and applied collaborative research in amputee treatment, prosthetics, and rehabilitation.

Advanced battery technology initiative

The budget request contained $39.6 million in PE 62705A for applied research in electronics and electronic devices.

The committee continues to note continuing requirements for small, light-weight, efficient, and portable battery and non-battery power sources for U.S. forces and of on-going applied research and development activities of the military departments that address these requirements. The committee is aware of a number of emerging battery and non-battery power technologies that have the potential for meeting the requirements of the military services, including alkaline and lithium batteries, fuel cells and other technologies. The committee recommends that such technologies be considered for potential funded research and development under the services' on-going programs on the basis of technical merit, cost-effectiveness, and the potential of a particular technology to meet service needs.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62705A for the portable battery power technology initiative.

Advanced carbon nanotechnology

The budget request contained $137.9 million in PE 61102A for defense research sciences, but included no funding for advanced carbon nanotechnology.

The committee is aware that advanced carbon nanotechnology has the potential for significant advances in the development of new sensors.

The committee recommends $143.9 million in PE 61102A for defense research sciences, an increase of $6.0 million for a multi-institution, peer reviewed program for development of advanced carbon nanotechnology.

Advanced lightweight composite armor materials for ballistic impact and blast protection

The budget request contained $17.6 million in PE 62105A for materials technology, but included no funding for advanced lightweight composite armor materials for ballistic impact and blast protection.

The committee is aware of the increasing ballistic and blast threat to vehicles on the battlefield. The committee notes that an integrated analytical, development, manufacturing and testing program is required to develop new higher performance, light weight composites for vehicle and personal armor.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62105A for advanced lightweight armor materials.

Advanced weapons technology

The budget request contained $21.1 million in PE 62307A for advanced weapons technology.

The committee understands the need to carry out applied research in support of existing and future missile defense technologies. The committee is specifically aware of the need to conduct research on systemic issues common to Terminal High Altitude Area Defense, Patriot Advanced Capability-3/Medium Extended Air Defense System, Ground-based Midcourse Defense, and future systems in areas such as radar and radio frequency sensors, electronics and micro-fabrication, optical sensors, and composite material and structures.

The committee recommends $31.1 million in PE 62307A, an increase of $10.0 million for missile defense applied technology research conducted by the Army Space and Missile Defense Command.

Aerostat joint project office

The budget request contained $106.4 million in PE 12419A for the Aerostat Joint Project Office.

The committee understands the critical role that the Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor (JLENS) program plays in cruise missile defense. The committee further understands that the Micro Electro Mechanical (MEMS) demonstration radar system is an important risk reduction effort in the JLENS acquisition strategy.

The committee recommends $108.4 million in PE 12419A, an increase of $2.0 million for MEMS demonstration radar system project completion and additional critical technology demonstration.

Applied communications and information networking

The budget request contained $45.3 million in PE 63008A for electronic warfare advanced technology, but included no funding for applied communications and information networking (ACIN).

The committee realizes that the goal of ACIN is to revolutionize military doctrine and methods by enhancing high-value military systems with rapidly advancing commercial information technologies and innovative applications of those technologies.

The committee supports the application of state-of-the art commercial technology to improve military systems and recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63008A for ACIN.

Armored systems modernization

The budget request included $3.1 billion in PE 64645A for armored systems modernization, including $105.3 million for reconnaissance platforms and sensors; $86.4 million for unmanned ground vehicles; $2.5 million for unattended sensors; $61.6 million for sustainment; $2.3 billion for system of systems engineering and program management; and $549.2 million for manned ground vehicles, as part of approximately $3.9 billion total amount requested for the Future Combat Systems (FCS) program in over 50 program elements.

The Army had allocated $19.0 billion for FCS research and development during fiscal years 2004 through 2009. Last year the Army added two years to the System Development and Demonstration

(SDD) Phase and increased the cost to $22.0 billion. Now the Army has delayed the program to 2016 and increased the development costs to $30.3 billion. Additionally, the program has been restructured into four spirals that are designed to field incremental capability into the current force. Because of its size and importance to the Army, FCS would dominate the Army's investment accounts and priorities over the next decade. The announcement that modularity will be undertaken during the same time period as FCS development has caused concern because the combined costs of $30.3 billion in the Future Years Defense Program for FCS and $69.0 billion for modularity are well above the expected Army funding profile.

Under the FCS system-of-systems approach all 18 systems are developed simultaneously, even though major differences exist in the developmental and fielding timelines of these systems. Originally, there were 157 development programs, referred to as "complementary programs," funded outside of the armored systems modernization-FCS program element. These "complementary programs," described by the Army as necessary to completely field FCS are in most instances the on-going technology development that should have been completed for FCS before entry into SDD. The complementary programs and projects are just as much FCS program-related as the projects within the armored systems modernization program element. Although the FCS hallmark is network centric war fighting, armored systems modernization-FCS program element itself contains no project for a network. The network is formed by the Warfighter Information Network Tactical (WIN–T) and the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS). Both of these systems are being developed outside of the FCS program structure as complementary programs. Further, JTRS has already been restructured due to schedule and cost overruns and now faces another restructure with an additional 24 month schedule delay and cost increase.

The committee has numerous concerns with the FCS program:

(1) The Office of the Secretary of Defense approved FCS entry into SDD in May 2003 without established program requirements, a network architecture or mature technologies. The Department of Defense historical acquisition record indicates that proceeding into SDD with unproven technology, will likely result in schedule slips and substantial cost overruns. And in fact, the FCS program has already been restructured at least three times. In a prepared statement for the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on March 16, 2005, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) indicated: "The FCS is at significant risk for not delivering required capability within budgeted resources. * * * The program's level of knowledge is far below that suggested by best practices or Department of Defense policy: Nearly 2 years after program launch and with $4.6 billion invested, requirements are not firm and only 1 of over 50 technologies are mature. As planned, the program will attain the level of knowledge in 2008 that it should have had in 2003. * * * To make FCS an effective acquisition program different approaches must be considered, including (A) setting the first stage of the program to demonstrate military capability, mature technology, and firm requirements; and

(B) bundling its other capabilities into advanced technology demonstrations until they can be put in a future stage * * *;"

(2) FCS program requirements have yet to be established. Under the current organizational construct, the GAO indicates there are as many as 10,000 individual program and project requirements;

(3) Many of the FCS systems, including unmanned systems and sensors, have parallel research and development programs outside of FCS in the Army, other services, and/or the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD). As an example, between what the Army classifies as FCS and non-FCS program elements, there are at least 10 unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) projects in development. This does not include UAV programs being developed for the Army by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency;

(4) Technology maturity varies among the various systems and in most cases does not support being considered ready for SDD;

(5) How the FCS concept would provide for survivability against the asymmetrical threat that our military services have experienced in the global war on terrorism, remains to be demonstrated;

(6) The manned vehicle concepts are at least five tons heavier than what the Army has established as its manned vehicle weight requirement; and

(7) No current cost estimate exists for the FCS program. With the added cost of modularization, it is questionable whether both FCS and modularization are affordable.

The committee believes that the Army would benefit from a restructured FCS program that establishes a vision and future forces architecture for the Army as a whole. It is not productive to have a vision of two future Armies, one FCS-Army and the rest of the Army. Even under the best of circumstances, with everything going as planned and resources being available to fund all of the Army's extensive needs, by 2025, only 20 percent of the modularized Army would include FCS units. WIN–T, JTRS, UAV programs, ground sensors, and common operating environment, should be interoperable with the whole Army, not just the FCS-Army. Projects and supporting technology should be developed and demonstrated first and not based on a program schedule where the Army is trying "to invent on a schedule."

The committee further believes that FCS should be defined by what is currently described as the system-of-systems common operating environment, program management, and sustainment, the largest current FCS project. The remaining projects should be combined with program elements of similar purpose and/or commensurate with their requirements and technology maturity. Further, the Department of the Army should establish the command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance information technology architecture for the future force and mandate adherence to this architecture in the development of new systems as well as modification of legacy systems.

Accordingly, the committee directs that:

(1) A new program element, PE 64782A, be designated FCS common operating environment within SDD and comprised of

the current projects F55 and F61, with an authorization of $2.3 billion, the budget request;

(2) A new program element, PE 63645A, be designated armored systems modernization within the advanced component development and prototype budget activity, comprised of the current project designated F57, with an authorization of $100.0 million, a reduction of $449.2 million;

(3) A new program element, PE 63303A, be designated reconnaissance platforms and sensors within the advanced component development and prototypes budget activity, comprised of Project F52, class I and IV reconnaissance platforms and sensors, with an authorization of $47.2 million, the budget request;

(4) Class II and III reconnaissance platforms and sensors be incorporated into PE 63003A, with an authorization of $58.1 million, the budget request;

(5) Project F54, unattended sensors, be incorporated into PE 64766A, Tactical Surveillance Systems, with an authorization of $2.5 million, the budget request; and

(6) A new program element, PE 63304A, be designated robotic ground systems within the advanced component development and prototypes budget activity, comprised of Project F53, unmanned ground vehicles, with an authorization of $86.4 million, the budget request.

Army medical peer-reviewed applied research and advanced technology development initiative

The budget request contained $74.7 million in PE 62787A for applied research in medical technology and $45.2 million in PE 63002A for medical advanced technology development.

The committee notes that the primary goal of medical research and development in the Department of Defense is to sustain medical technology to effectively protect and improve the survivability of U.S. armed forces in a variety of settings including, but not limited to: conventional battlefields, areas of low-intensity conflict, and military operations other than war. Operations of U.S. forces in the global war on terrorism have placed a premium on the need for a range of medical technologies in the areas of infectious diseases, combat casualty care, military operational medicine, and health hazards for materials, that are the core applied technology for the Army's military technology applied research program. Changing military threats on the world's battlefields and homeland security requirements place more emphasis on the need for responsive technology options that could address the threat; the ability to quickly assess, develop, and demonstrate the technology; and then, the ability to rapidly insert or deploy the technology to the field. The committee also notes the wealth of new concepts from the nation's medical science and technology base and the recommendations that the committee receives for exploitation of particular technologies for addressing emerging medical requirements. The committee endorses the Army's peer-reviewed medical technology research and development program in which emerging medical technologies and concepts compete for funding on the basis of peer-reviewed technical merit and the contribution that the technology would, if implemented, make to the health and well being of the armed forces.

The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 62787A and an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63002A, for the Army medical technology peer-reviewed applied research and advanced technology development programs, respectively.

Army space and missile defense architecture analysis program

The budget request contained $83.1 million in PE 63327A for Army air and missile defense systems engineering, but included no funding for the Army space and missile defense (ASMD) architecture analysis program.

The committee places a priority on the development of a transformational capability. The committee recognizes the contributions of the ASMD architecture analysis program towards providing critical analytical, modeling and simulation tools supporting advanced concepts and architectures for the Army's integrated air and missile defense systems program.

The committee recommends $88.1 million in PE 63327A, an increase of $5.0 million for the ASMD architecture analysis program.

Center for rotorcraft innovation

The budget request included $34.3 million in PE 62211A for Aviation and Applied Research and Technology, but included no funds for the Center for Rotorcraft Innovation (CRI).

The Center for Rotorcraft Innovation is a joint effort between the rotorcraft industry, academic research centers and government partners to increase rotorcraft research in the United States. CRI will expand collaborative rotorcraft research and development already underway between the rotorcraft industry and its government partners in the National Rotorcraft Technology Center, and will focus its new research efforts on dual-use technologies that have national security and homeland defense applications. CRI is the only effort of its kind and will be a catalyst for the long-term growth of the U.S. rotorcraft industry.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62211A for the CRI.

Centers of excellence

The budget request contained $82.0 million in PE 61104A for university and industry research centers and $1.9 million for university centers of excellence.

The committee notes the current Army effort to harness university research expertise for Army-unique science and technology problems. The committee further notes the Army initiative to partner university researchers at Historically Black Colleges and Universities/Minority Institutions (HBCU/MI) with Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Battle Labs for the acceleration of research to actual technology demonstration. The committee notes current priorities include efforts to improve tactical mobility, reduce logistics infrastructure, and increase rotorcraft survivability. The committee supports such efforts yet urges further advances in the cognitive research areas of modeling and simulation, data fusion, and human systems integration.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 61104A for university centers of excellence to support human sys-

tems integration modeling, simulation, data fusion, and related efforts.

Combat vehicle electronics

The budget request contained $12.0 million in PE 23735A for combat vehicle improvements, but included no funding to develop standardized next generation electronics architectures for current combat vehicle programs.

The committee is aware that current combat vehicles face accelerated component obsolescence issues.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 23735A to develop standardized next generation electronics architectures for current and future combat vehicle programs.

Common remote operating weapon station

The budget request contained $34.6 million in PE 64601A for infantry support weapons but included no funds for the Common Remote Operating Weapon Station (CROWS) Light development program. The budget request also contained $56.4 million in PE 63640M but included no funds for the CROWS program.

The CROWS system is a tactical vehicle mounted, stabilized remote weapon station system that provides day and night target detection, recognition, and engagement at long distances while allowing the soldier to remain protected by an armored vehicle; accurate shoot on-the-move capability, and one-shot-one-hit accuracy that minimizes collateral damage. The committee notes that the United States Central Command issued an urgent needs statement for additional CROWS systems in December 2004. The committee applauds the Army's expeditious manner in satisfying this urgent requirement and notes CROWS has proven its capability successfully and effectively in Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF). As such the committee feels CROWS could also prove just as effective for marines operating in Iraq, and recommends providing six systems for test and evaluation by the Marine Corps.

The committee recognizes certain combat support and combat service support (CS/CSS) vehicle platforms cannot support the weight and size of the currently fielded CROWS system.

To address this need, the committee understands the Army has developed a reduced weight and size configuration of CROWS called CROWS Light. The committee supports this effort and believes this system can enhance force protection, survivability, and lethality of CS/CSS units performing critical convoy operations in OIF.

The committee recommends $42.6 million in PE 64601A, an increase of $8.0 million to complete the development, testing, and accelerate fielding of CROWS Light systems and recommends $58.4 million in PE63640M, an increase of $2.0 million for CROWS test and evaluation by the Marine Corps.

Communications and electronics cost module

The budget request contained $12.1 million in PE 63006A for the research and development of Command, Control, Communications Advanced Technology.

The committee believes that the Communications and Electronics Cost Module (CECM) is a critical component to realize the Depart-

ment of the Army's service-wide planned force restructure and to support appropriate homeland security response issues. The CECM is part of an advanced solution project that accelerates collaborative, near real-time trade-off analysis of prospective system design changes. In addition, the CECM allows decision makers to have affordable analysis, while addressing program managers' concerns throughout the program lifecycle. The CECM simultaneously integrates cost estimation, computer aided design activities, and work breakdown structures in a collaborative, web-enabled, efficient, and secure environment, thus reducing the cycle time in the decision process from the beginning and throughout the acquisition lifecycle.

The committee recommends $14.1 million in PE 63006A for the research and development of Command, Control, Communications Advanced Technology, an increase of $2.0 million for the development of the CECM.

Distributed common ground system

The budget request contained $156.7 million for the research and development of the Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS).

The committee notes that the DCGS program is beginning to address how data is processed from various sources. The committee believes this is a critical element in the data enterprise integration of all DCGS. Without a clear plan that addresses all DCGS capabilities, to include access, exploitation, and dissemination of information and data from other sources, DCGS will not be able to fully maximize its intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance processing capabilities. In addition, the committee is concerned that without a unified development structure built on a validated Capability and Maturity Model (CMM) standard that strictly controls DCGS requirements and correlates software with fewer defects, DCGS will continue to be a pretext for the services to buy new hardware.

Given the technical, developmental, and management challenges, the committee believes that DCGS should reevaluate its software development and data management structure to determine if the present organizational configuration will be able to support the transition to DCGS. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense through the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration, and the DCGS council to submit a report by February 15, 2006, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence addressing the standards for all legacy hardware and software implementation into the joint DCGS architecture; how the processes, key practices and common features in software will mature jointly; and how current and planned data will be handled regardless of the source or asset. Additionally, this report must include a fielding plan for all DCGS.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the following for the research and development of the DCGS program: $73.3 million in PE 35208A, a decrease of $18.3 million, and $32.4 million for PE 35208F, a decrease of $8.0 million, $12.3 million in PE 35208N, $1.8 million in PE 35208BQ, $3.7 million in PE 35208G, and $1.0 million in PE 35208L.

Excalibur XM982

The budget request contained $113.4 million in PE 64814A, artillery munitions, but included no funds for Excalibur XM982 life cycle improvements.

The committee recognizes the potential benefits provided through studies of manufacturing technologies and methodologies to help lower production costs without sacrificing stated performance requirements of a weapon system. In fiscal year 2005, Excalibur XM982 lifecycle improvement program efforts were able to reduce the production cost of each projectile by 14.1 percent. The fiscal year 2006 cost reduction efforts would build upon previous work and expand into the potential production cost reduction of the canard actuation system and insensitive munitions design improvements for the base and warhead of the projectile identified in the lean design review. Cost reduction efforts will be expanded to the Excalibur XM982 common guidance capability, which is a system commonality in other weapons development programs.

Therefore, the committee recommends $123.4 million in PE 64814A, an increase of $10.0 million for the Excalibur XM982 lifecycle improvement program.

Explosive and narcotic detection devices

The budget request contained $19.3 million in PE 62712A, countermine systems, but included no funds for continued development of explosive and narcotic detection devices for vehicles and cargo containers proceeding through entry control points at various, worldwide Department of Defense facilities.

The committee notes the significance of improving capabilities of future force protection equipment. There are two detection devices currently under development which have the potential to be used for detecting trace amounts of explosives and narcotics on the inside and outside of vehicles and cargo containers. These devices should be able to complement and enhance current force protection equipment in place, or substitute when needed, for explosive and narcotic detecting canines that are unavailable to perform these duties.

Therefore, the committee recommends $27.3 million in PE 62712A, an increase of $8.0 million for continued development of explosive and narcotic detection devices.

Fire support technology improvement program

The budget request contained $16.1 million in PE 23726A for advanced field artillery tactical data systems, but included no funds for the Fire Support Technology Improvement (FSTI) program.

The FSTI program will examine and exploit emerging technologies that could improve artillery fire support efficiency and performance.

The committee recognizes the need for more rapid precision engagement of artillery targets requires artillery battle management systems that can enable soldiers to rapidly geo-reference and analyze relevant imagery and/or information; determine the status of the possible firing elements; issue fire commands; and effectively conduct battle damage assessments all in real time. The committee is aware this program's purpose is to identify gaps and develop solutions to assimilate multi-source (satellite, aircraft, and unmanned

aerial vehicle) imagery and information, and accomplish rapid georeferencing and shooting of precision artillery engagements.

The committee recommends $21.0 million in PE 23726A, an increase of $5.0 million for the continuation of the FSTI program.

Flexible display initiative

The budget request contained $39.6 million in PE 62705A for electronics and electronic devices, but included no funding for the flexible display initiative.

The committee is aware that new flexible display technology has the potential to provide the military with technology to fabricate high definition displays on rugged conformable, flexible substrates. The committee notes that the United States Display Consortium coordinates these efforts with over 80 companies, using investments from both the public and private industry to accelerate the development of technologies and products needed by the Army, other military services, and various national security agencies.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $11.4 million in PE 62705A for the flexible display initiative.

Gas-engine driven air conditioning system demonstrations

The budget request contained $7.3 million in PE 63734A for military engineering, but included no funding for unitary gas-engine driven air conditioning (GEDAC) system demonstrations.

The committee is aware that GEDAC use on bases in the southwest has the potential to save significant electric power and reduce water usage. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63734A for GEDAC system demonstrations.

Geospatial information decision support-single integrated air picture

The budget request included $150.3 million in PE 63327A, PE 632879N, PE 27434F, PE 27443F, and PE 20631M for the development of the Single Integrated Air Picture (SIAP). This program seeks to provide a common aerial view of the battlespace for the warfighter.

The committee supports technologies and capabilities that provide the warfighter with a single integrated air, ground, space, and maritime picture that is the product of fused, common, continual, and accurate data. However, the committee is concerned that SIAP only addresses the air picture, and could become another stove-pipe system that will not interoperate with the ground, space, or maritime pictures. The committee supports the development of one true common operational picture that will provide the warfighter with an unambiguous, real-time picture of the battlespace.

The committee is aware that the Army has requirements to provide a consistent, accurate, and timely understanding of how space assets and capabilities affect the battlespace. Meeting this requirement demands tools that fuse geospatial and operational data for air defense and satellite control. The Geospatial Information Decision Support (GIDS) for SIAP is an intelligent software tool for warfare commanders that receives tactical information from multiple real-time ground, air, and space-based tactical data sources to provide a comprehensive battlespace picture. The committee under-

stands GIDS–SIAP will also be extended to support Army tactical missile defense needs.

The committee believes GIDS–SIAP may build the bridge between SIAP and an integrated common operational picture. However, the committee notes that this is not the final or all-encompassing solution to developing a true common operational picture.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2006, on a formal acquisition strategy to clearly define the development and service-level implementation of SIAP, and a coordinated investment strategy for developing all common tactical pictures such as the air, ground, maritime, and space views.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $157.3 million for the research and development of SIAP, an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63327A, for the evaluation of software and field demonstration of GIDS–SIAP.

Handheld detection systems

The budget request contained $74.9 million in PE 63004A for weapons and munitions advanced technology but contained no funding for the miniaturized spectrometer identification system.

The committee is concerned with the well-being of uniformed personnel due to the pending threat of chemical weapons. The committee supports efforts to develop handheld sensing equipment to improve timely detection of evolving and existing threats.

Therefore, the committee recommends $77.9 million in PE 63004A, an increase of $3.0 million to develop the miniaturized spectrometer identification system.

Human systems integration

The budget request contained $17.5 million in PE 62716A for human factors engineering applied research, $68.5 million in PE 63236N for warfighter sustainment advanced technology development, and $79.4 million in PE 62202F for applied research in human effectiveness.

The committee recognizes human systems integration initiatives provide a means for reducing total lifecycle costs of weapons programs, and strongly supports efforts to consider human systems integration issues early in the acquisition cycle. The committee believes that further institutionalization and standardization of human systems integration methodologies and modeling tools are needed. The committee also remains concerned about the level of support and coordination of these initiatives within each of the military departments and throughout the Department of Defense (DOD). The committee urges the Department to complete a comprehensive review and critical assessment of human systems integration based upon the perspectives of the acquisition, personnel, and operations and management communities. The committee expects that such a review would include a review of acquisition programs that utilize such initiatives, and an assessment of the relative level of support within each military department.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million in PE 62716A for the development of manpower and personnel integration tools for modeling and predicting soldier and system performance; an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63236N to develop cog-

nitive and physiological research data under the Navy's system engineering, acquisition and personnel integration program; and an increase of $3.5 million in PE 62202F for the development of new training algorithms for the human performance integration tool program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review and assessment of human systems integration programs within the Department and to submit a report of the results to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2005. Further, committee recommends that a panel of experts at the National Defense University collaborate, consult and independently review the DOD's assessment and submit a report of the results to the congressional defense committees within six months of initiation.

Hydrogen proton exchange membrane

The budget request contained $64.9 million in PE 62601A for combat vehicle and automotive technology, but included no funding for the hydrogen proton exchange membrane (PEM) ambient pressure fuel cell medium/heavy duty vehicle demonstration program.

The committee is aware that the hydrogen PEM fuel cell is to demonstrate zero emission, ambient pressure, highly efficient hydrogen fuel cell powered vehicles in various operating situations and conditions. The committee notes that this development supports the government's objective of tripling fuel economy while reducing harmful emissions.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62601A for the hydrogen proton exchange membrane (PEM) ambient pressure fuel cell medium/heavy duty vehicle demonstration program.

Hyperspectral longwave imager for the tactical environment

The budget request contained $51.8 million in PE 63710A for night vision but included no funding for hyperspectral longwave imager for the tactical environment (HyLITE).

The committee is aware that recent operations have both demonstrated the need for a day/night hyperspectral day/night sensor and provided a basis for improvements to the prototype HyLITE.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $9.2 million in PE 63710A for HyLITE.

Integrated digital environment service model

The budget request contained $42.5 million in PE 63772A for the development of Advanced Tactical Computer Science and Sensor Technology.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has a myriad of individual systems that have been designed, produced, and fielded to respond to specific threats, mission requirements, and information needs. The committee notes there is no single method or system to track and evaluate the interoperability characteristics of these systems, or to ensure system-of- systems configuration will work together in the battlespace.

The command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance Integrated Digital Environment Service Model (C4ISR–IDESM) seeks to provide the information technology infrastructure, applications, and support services nec-

essary to configure and manage enterprise data. The C4ISR–IDESM uses the internet on a subscription basis as needed to conduct C4ISR interoperability analysis.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $47.5 million in PE 63772A, an increase of $5.0 million for research and development of C4ISR–IDESM.

Joint Common Missile

The budget request included no funds for the Joint Common Missile (JCM) program.

The committee notes that the budget request for fiscal year 2005 projected a requirement of $271.3 million for fiscal year 2006. The committee also understands the JCM was one of the first weapon systems to be validated by the joint requirements process instituted by the Secretary of Defense and the first program approved by the Department of Defense Joint Requirements Oversight Committee through the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS) process. Further, the committee notes that the JCM is currently the only air-to-ground missile with the potential to fulfill the six critical capability gaps identified in the JCIDS analysis, such as targeting time sensitive moving targets, mitigation of collateral damage, and targeting diverse target sets. Thus far, the Department of the Army and Department of the Navy have invested $406.4 million in research and development for the JCM.

Therefore, the committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense to reevaluate the cancellation of the Joint Common Missile program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Congressional defense committees by December 31, 2005, that contains a Joint Requirements Oversight Council memorandum explaining how the Department of Defense will mitigate the capability gaps identified in the JCIDS analysis; a current and forecasted inventory of all air to ground missiles remaining in war reserve stockpiles; an explanation of compliance strategy and associated costs for the Department to comply with the insensitive munitions requirements of current air to ground missiles; and lastly, provide a cost comparison analysis of continuing the Joint Common Missile program versus JCM termination and continued procurement of legacy air to ground missiles to fulfill mission requirements.

JP–8 soldier fuel cell

The budget request contained $39.6 million in PE 62705A for electronics and electronic devices, but included no funding for JP–8 soldier fuel cell.

The committee is aware that light, compact, high-capacity power sources to power a variety of devices are essential to success on the modern battlefield. The committee notes that an effort is on-going to modify a commercial fuel cell to run on standard, readily available JP–8 fuel.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62705A for development of the JP–8 soldier fuel cell.

Lean munitions

The budget request contained $68.5 million in PE 78045A for manufacturing science and technology, but included no funds for the third phase of the Lean Munitions project.

The committee notes that the Army Armaments Research, Development and Engineering Command (ARDEC) is responsible for 90 percent of the munitions produced and utilized by the U.S. Army. The committee further notes that the Army's increased operational tempo and transformation plans support the need to reduce the time and cost for development and production of munitions used by our armed forces. The committee believes that the use of a standards-based, model-driven design and manufacturing lifecycle support environment would enable faster and lower cost production and sustainment of current and future munitions systems.

The committee understands that the third phase of the Lean Munitions project will focus on enterprise-wide integration and utilization of three-dimensional, model-based, standardized product data. Further, the Lean Munitions project will be expanded from a pilot demonstration to a full-scale production of machined parts, integration ARDEC's design and manufacturing lifecycle support environment, and implementation of the Lean business process into the supply chain.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million in PE 78045A to continue the Lean Munitions project.

Leishmaniasis diagnostics

The budget request contained $10.1 million in PE 63807A for medical systems advanced development.

The committee notes that over 700 U.S. troops have been diagnosed with cutaneous leishmaniasis since the start of Operation Iraqi Freedom and soldiers serving in Afghanistan have been infected with visceral leishmaniasis, a more serious form of the disease that can cause organ damage and death. In addition, all blood donations from military personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan were stopped because of the potential transmission of the parasite from infected donors to non-infected recipients.

The committee believes that it is important to have a safe and effective method of early diagnosis. The Army has had under development a diagnostic skin test for leishmaniasis that is designed to be inexpensive, easy use and ideally suited for routine use in areas where limited medical services are available. This test is an important component of the overall Department of Defense program to develop effective Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved diagnostic and treatment products for leishmaniasis. The diagnostic test is in advanced development and has been successfully tested in humans in Phase I safety trials. The committee notes, however, that the program has not been included in the budget request because of funding limitations.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63807A to continue development of the leishmaniasis skin test.

Light utility vehicle

The budget request contained $64.8 million in PE 62601A for combat vehicle and automotive technology, but included no funding for the light utility vehicle.

The committee is aware the Army requires a low-cost, light utility vehicle (LUV) that would provide soldiers with enhanced mobility, lethality and survivability compared to the current high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle and understands that the design and development of a LUV demonstrator could be accelerated due to previous research in LUV technology by the National Automotive Center.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 62601A to continue the design, development, and delivery of a LUV demonstrator.

Lightweight patient monitor with defibrillator

The budget request contained $45.2 million in PE 63002A for medical advanced technology development.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 3002A to continue development of advanced capabilities in a compact, lightweight, full-featured patient monitor with defibrillator that will enable military caregivers to provide intensive care monitoring and treatment in locations and situations that would be otherwise inhibited by the size and weight of the current technology in the field.

M5 high performance fiber for personnel armor systems

The budget request contained $21.7 million in PE 62786A for warfighter technology, but included no funding for M5 high performance fiber.

The committee notes that M5 fiber, based on independent evaluation, offers the possibility of a new generation of lighter and more effective body and vehicle armor as well as similar improvement in heat resistant clothing.

The committee recognizes the urgency to provide improved personnel protection and recommends $26.7 million in PE 62786A, an increase of $5.0 million to hasten development, evaluation and small-scale field testing of M5 fiber based armor and other applications.

Mast mounted common remote stabilized sensor system

The budget request contained $26.7 million in PE 63653A for advanced tank armament systems to support the development of the Family of Stryker vehicles, but included no funds to complete the development of the Mast Mounted Common Remote Stabilized Sensor System (CRS3).

The Stryker Brigade Combat Team mission requirement states the need for a high performance mast mounted CRS3 on the Stryker Reconnaissance Vehicle and the Stryker Fire Support Vehicle. The committee is aware $2.1 million was appropriated in the National Defense Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 107–248) for a mast mounted CRS3 technology demonstrator. The committee understands the next phase of development is a fully qualified and tested mast mounted CRS3 and notes additional funding would accelerate development of the mast mounted CRS3 by two years.

The committee understands a mast mounted CRS3, when fielded, increases soldier survivability, allows soldier to operate the sensor package inside the armored vehicle without degrading sensor performance, and allows soldiers to target from a defilade position.

Therefore, the committee recommends $41.7 million in PE 63653A, an increase of $15.0 million for accelerated mast mounted CRS3 development for the Stryker Brigade Combat Teams.

Medium tactical vehicle steering and suspension development

The budget request contained $1.9 million in PE 64604A for the continued development of medium tactical truck technologies and enhancements.

The committee is aware the United States Army Tank-Automotive and Armaments Command initiated an advanced steering and suspension modification program in fiscal year 2004 for its medium truck fleet. The committee supports the continued modernization of the Army's medium truck fleet through advancements in suspension and steering and further notes these modifications can provide improved mission mobility, increased vehicle maneuverability in confined areas, and allow for greater vehicle control over extreme terrains such as those found in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 64604A to continue the development, simulation, testing, and validation of the advanced medium truck steering and suspension program.

Miniature sensor development for small and tactical unmanned aerial vehicles

The budget request contained $23.8 million in PE 62709A for night vision technology, but included no funding for miniaturized hyperspectral and coherent imaging sensors for small and tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV).

The committee notes the urgent need for better sensors for small and tactical UAVs and recommends $29.8 million in PE 62709A, an increase of $6.0 million for miniaturized hyperspectral and coherent imaging sensors for small and tactical UAVs.

Missile recycling center capability

The budget request contained $9.9 million in PE 63103A for explosive demilitarization technology, but contained no funds for the Missile Recycling Center capability at Letterkenny Munitions Center (LEMC).

The committee notes that Congress appropriated funding for the tactical missile reuse and demilitarization capability at LEMC in fiscal year 2004. Fiscal year 2006 funding would furnish the LEMC with the capability to reduce the usage of open burn and detonation techniques procedures, as directed by Greening the Government Through Waste Prevention, Recycling, and Federal Acquisition (Executive Order 13101), for disposing of tactical missiles. The additional funding will add a new module for processing warheads from the multiple launch rocket system and will support demilitarization of larger tactical missiles received from other U.S. military services.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million for Missile Recycling Center capability at LEMC.

Modeling and analysis of the response of structures

The budget request contained $82.0 million in PE 61104A for university and industry research centers, but included no funding for modeling and analysis of the response of structures (MARS).

The committee notes that MARS computer simulations will provide accurate vulnerability assessments that can be used to improve warfighter protection, enhance survivability, and facilitate rapid repair of structures.

The committee recommends $83.0 million in PE 61104A, an increase of $1.0 million for MARS.

Night vision advanced technology

The budget request contained $51.8 million in PE 63710A for night vision advanced technology initiatives, of which $0.5 million was included for the Soldier Mobility and Rifle Targeting System (SMaRTS) demonstration program.

The committee recognizes SMaRTS technology provides soldiers with an improved lightweight, low power, helmet mounted thermal and visible sensor, with a helmet mounted display and thermal weapon sight. SMaRTS significantly improves the warfighter's fight-on-the-move capability while conducting mobile military operations in urban terrain (MOUT) in many different environmental conditions where night vision goggles alone fail to provide the complete solution as required by the warfighter. The committee expects SMaRTS technology to be a critical combat enabler and expects it to improve soldier survivability in MOUT operations in all environments.

The committee recommends $55.8 million in PE 63710A, an increase of $4.0 million to continue system component definition, modeling, and design of the SMaRTS demonstration program.

Night vision enhanced vision goggle

The budget request contained $51.8 million in PE 63710A for night vision advanced technology, but included no funds to accelerate development of night vision fusion technology.

The committee recognizes that night vision capability has provided our armed forces a significant advantage over their adversaries. The committee notes that while older technology has become available to others, state-of-the-art in night vision, pixel level digital fusion of light intensification and infrared images offers a very significant advantage over previous night vision devices. The committee understands that this technology will provide vital survivability and operational enhancements.

The committee recommends an increase of $12.2 million in PE 63710A to accelerate development and fielding of enhanced night vision pixel level, digital fusion of light intensification and infrared image technology.

Night vision system air dispensing capability

The budget request contained $51.8 million in PE 63710A for night vision systems, but included no funding for unattended ground sensor air deployment from air foils or unmanned aerial vehicles.

The committee believes that in the future it will be highly advantageous to dispense unattended ground sensors from unmanned aerial vehicles.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63710A for development and testing of unmanned aerial sensor dispensing.

Non-emitting helicopter brownout situational awareness demonstration

The budget request included $23.5 million in PE 64201A for aircraft avionics, but included no funds for a non-emitting helicopter brownout situational awareness demonstration. The committee is aware that helicopter accidents continue to occur due to brownout conditions and operations over water. While a variety of technologies exist to solve this problem, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not yet demonstrated an effective and affordable solution using non-emitting technologies. The committee believes that affordable and relatively mature technologies exist to demonstrate this capability.

Therefore, the committee has included an increase of $3.0 million in PE 64201A for a non-emitting helicopter brownout situational awareness demonstration. The committee directs that these funds be used for a competitive evaluation using a helicopter platform. If the evaluation is successful in demonstrating improved capabilities and affordable technologies, the committee encourages the insertion of this capability into existing programs to improve flight handling qualities in degraded visual environments.

Patient status monitor

The budget request contained $45.2 million in PE 63002A for medical advanced technology development.

The committee notes advances in patient status monitoring technology that provide on-body sensing of physiological conditions, such as heart rate, blood pressure, and temperature via a series of wireless relays for patient monitoring and detection of a critical or life threatening event. Potential applications of the technology include the monitoring of a deployed individual or groups of individuals who might be subject to catastrophic physiological events, such as military and public safety personnel, and those with acute cardiovascular disease.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 63002A to accelerate the development and evaluation of wireless-remote patient status monitoring technology.

Portable and mobile emergency broadband system

The budget request contained $45.3 million in PE 63008A for electronic warfare advanced technology, but included no funding for the portable and mobile emergency broadband system.

The committee notes that the portable and mobile emergency broadband system, based on emerging commercial technology, will allow rapid establishment of emergency communications networks.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.1 million in PE 63008A to complete critical development of the portable and mobile emergency broadband system.

Powdered metal compaction

The budget request contained $68.5 million in PE 78045A for manufacturing science and technology.

The committee notes the production of high quality, low cost net and near-net shaped parts for a variety of defense products uses traditional compacted metal powder processes in a 75 year-old process that is costly and complex. In many cases the resulting density and tensile strength of the finished parts are not sufficient to allow them to be used in many aerospace, ground vehicle, and weapons system applications.

The committee notes that the combustion driven compaction (CDC) process in which an electrically-ignited, combustible gas mixture is used to drive the press overcomes many of the problems of the current compacted powder technology. The CDC process technology is simple and controllable, capable of providing compacted metal parts that are useable in defense applications, and appears to have the potential for creating a major step forward in defense manufacturing technology in terms of performance and affordability.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 78045A for a powdered metal compaction initiative to continue the development and implementation of combustion driven compaction technology for defense applications.

Pseudofollicullitus Barbae

The budget request contained $10.1 million in PE 63807A for medical systems advanced development, but included no funding for the development of a treatment for pseudofollicullitus barbae.

The committee recognizes the importance of the development of a treatment for pseudofollicullitus barbae, particularly as it affects military personnel deployability rates.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 63807A for pseudofollicullitus barbae research.

Rugged textile electronic garments

The budget request contained $45.2 million in PE 63002A for medical advanced technology development, but included no funds for continuation of the development of rugged textile electronic garments for combat casualty care.

The committee continues to note advances in sensor technology, textile electronics, information management, and medical science have increased the potential for remote diagnosis, monitoring, and treatment of a range of medical conditions. Positive results from combat casualty care and electronic textiles research suggest that major improvements can be made in the survival of wounded soldiers through the use of these technologies in an integrated system. Congress has supported the development and assessment of the application of advanced textile electronic garments to combat casualty care. The committee notes that the plan for the third year of the program emphasizes the integration of advanced sensor technologies into apparel that will provide a "wear and forget" physiological status monitoring capability.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.2 million in PE 63002A to complete the final year of the rugged textile electronic garment program.

Smart responsive nano-composites

The budget request contained $67.2 million in PE 61103A for University Research Initiatives, but included no funding for smart responsive nano-composites.

The committee is aware that there is a multitude of design possibilities for nano-structured, nature-simulating materials capable of responding to outside stimuli.

The committee recommends $69.2 million in PE 61103A, an increase of $2.0 million to develop a smart responsive nano-structured material, which combines detection of toxins and alarm-release with self-cleaning and self-repairing material.

Strategic materials and strategic manufacturing initiative

The budget request contained $37.8 million in PE 62624A for weapons and munitions technology, but included no funding for the strategic materials strategic manufacturing initiative (SM2i).

The committee notes that titanium is important for weight reduction of weapons systems. The committee is aware that SM2i will link the Army's efforts to establish a reliable low-cost domestic source of titanium with advanced domestic manufacturing capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 62624A for SM2i.

Tactical wheeled vehicle product improvement program

The Army is preparing to make a significant capital investment in its tactical wheeled vehicle (TWV) fleet as a direct result of modularity and extreme usage rates from ongoing operations in the global war on terrorism. The Army requires the flexibility to rapidly evaluate and integrate readily available technology into TWV platforms as part of its recapitalization and modernization effort for TWVs. The committee expects these technologies to have a real-time impact and effect on existing TWVs by providing increased capability in the areas of performance. The committee report (H. Rept. 108–491) accompanying the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) requires all Department of Defense manned ground systems must be assessed for adequacy in survivability and suitability against asymmetrical, unconventional threats. As such, the committee expects at the minimum, the incorporation of lessons learned from Operation Iraqi Freedom as a specific component of the TWV Product Improvement Program (PIP).

The Army's TWV recapitalization and modernization strategy will require proof-of-concept modifications and commercial-off-the-shelf proven capabilities in the key performance areas of force protection, survivability, reliability, distribution and mission enhancements and safety. The committee realizes the degree of complexity of integrating new technologies and commercial modifications into specific TWV platforms. The committee is also aware this process of "spiraling" technologies into current TWV platforms marks the first time that this has occurred as the historical trend has been to categorize the TWV fleet as a non-developmental item. The committee disagrees with this historical non-developmental item categorization of the TWV fleet and commends the Army and the Program Executive Officer for Combat Support and Combat Service Support for devising a modernization and recapitalization strategy

for the TWV fleet that includes readily available technology platform insertions. The committee supports the Army's effort and the committee believes a TWV PIP can augment and accelerate the spiraling of these needed, readily available technologies into specific TWV platforms.

Therefore, the committee recommends $50.0 million in fiscal year 2006 for the TWV PIP. The committee expects this additional funding will be prioritized and distributed accordingly across the families of light, medium and heavy tactical wheeled vehicles and to also include the family of tactical trailers. Given the noted complexity of the TWV recapitalization and modernization strategy, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2006, describing in detail the Army's plan for integrating these product improvement modifications into the current TWV fleet. The committee expects the report to provide specific cost estimates and specific platform modifications.

Titanium extraction, mining, and process engineering research

The budget request contained $44.7 million in PE 62624A for weapons and munitions technology, but included no funding for titanium extraction, mining, and process engineering research (TEMPER).

The committee is aware that the TEMPER initiative is intended to enhance U.S. industrial capability for the efficient production of inexpensive titanium for military systems. The committee notes that titanium offers weight and performance advantages and that the process must be developed to produce titanium at a reasonable cost in order to realize those advantages in future military systems.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 62624A for TEMPER.

Transparent armor

The budget request contained $48.3 million in PE 63003A for aviation advanced technology, but contained no funding for advanced lightweight armored window technology.

The committee recognizes the unique threat confronting air crews operating rotary aircraft in forward deployed areas. The committee is supportive of efforts to rapidly field advanced technologies to enhance the protection of military personnel. The committee understands that significant opportunities exist to facilitate the transition of technologies from research and development to testing and fielding, particularly in the area of self-protection. The effort to develop transparent, lightweight armor is one such opportunity, as it offers the promise of improving rotary aircraft survivability.

The committee therefore, recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63003A for lightweight armored window technology.

UH–60 maintenance improvement program

The budget request contained $409.1 million in PE 23744A, aircraft modifications/product improvement programs, but included no funds for a maintenance improvement program for the UH–60 Black Hawk helicopter.

The committee notes the benefits of streamlining maintenance practices in order to reduce aircraft downtime for scheduled main-

tenance and to expedite return of the weapon system to the warfighter. The Nomad Expert Technician System (NETS), along with commercially developed software, combines to form the Nomad Aircraft Maintenance Improvement Program (NAMIP). The NETS is a maintenance productivity tool composed of a wireless, integrated, belt-mounted control module and a heads-up display mounted on a standard type baseball cap. This display allows maintenance personnel to view technical data and procedures concerning maintenance tasks without leaving their point of task. Secondly, commercially available software can adapt existing UH–60 maintenance data to integrate with the NETS displays. As a result, the NAMIP has the potential to significantly increase output productivity and reduce aircraft downtime for UH–60 maintenance facilities Army wide.

Therefore, the committee recommends $413.0 million in PE 23744A, an increase of $3.9 million for test and evaluation of the UH–60 NAMIP at Corpus Christi Army Depot and the Army National Guard Aviation Classification Repair Activity Depot.

NAVY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Overview

The budget request contained $18.0 billion for Navy research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $18.0 billion, a decrease of $15.9 million from the budget request.

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY					
		BASIC RESEARCH					
0601103N	1	University Research Initiatives	75,910				75,910
0601152N	2	In-House Laboratory Independent Research	15,500				15,500
0601153N	3	Defense Research Sciences	356,885	(4,000)			352,885
0601153N		Ocean Sciences				(4,000)	
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**448,295**	**(4,000)**		**(4,000)**	**444,295**
		APPLIED RESEARCH					
0602114N	4	Power Projection Applied Research	94,148	13,000			107,148
0602114N		Fire Lidar			2,000		
0602114N		High Performance Frequency Modulated Fiber Optic Link			5,000		
0602114N		Retroreflecting Optical Communications for Special Operations			6,000		
0602123N	5	Force Protection Applied Research	101,650	10,000			111,650
0602123N		Secure Infrastructure Technology			6,000		
0602123N		Thin Film Battery Technology			4,000		
0602131M	6	Marine Corps Landing Force Technology	37,590				37,590
0602233N	7	Human Systems Technology					
0602234N	8	Materials, Electronics and Computer Technology					
0602235N	9	Common Picture Applied Research	57,693				57,693
0602236N	10	Warfighter Sustainment Applied Research	82,856	10,700			93,556
0602236N		Composite Ceramic UUV			2,500		
0602236N		Marine Mammal Research Program			2,200		
0602236N		Virtual Clinical Learning Laboratory			3,000		
0602236N		Partnership Simulation Laboratory			3,000		
0602271N	11	RF Systems Applied Research	47,302	4,800			52,102
0602271N		Maritime Identification and Surveillance Technology			4,800		
0602435N	12	Ocean Warfighting Environment Applied Research	49,793	12,500			62,293
0602435N		Integrated Ocean Observing System			12,500		
0602651M	13	Joint Non-Lethal Weapons Applied Research	6,000				6,000
0602747N	14	Undersea Warfare Applied Research	71,362	1,000			72,362

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0602747N		High Power and Energy Storage System			1,000		
0602782N	15	Mine and Expeditionary Warfare Applied Research	49,520				49,520
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**597,914**	**52,000**	**52,000**		**649,914**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT					
0603114N	16	Power Projection Advanced Technology	82,538	30,700			113,238
0603114N		DP-2 Thrust Vectoring System			8,000		
0603114N		High Power Free Electron Laser			4,700		
0603114N		Laser Radar			6,000		
0603114N		Low Cost Terminal Imaging Seeker			5,000		
0603114N		Low Power Terascale UAV Processing Engine			7,000		
0603123N	17	Force Protection Advanced Technology	71,488	44,500			115,988
0603123N		Advanced Material Systems for LCS			8,000		
0603123N		Seapower 21 Autonomous Technologies			5,000		
0603123N		Fast Ship Compact Waterjet			4,000		
0603123N		4th Generation Permanent Magnet Motor			2,000		
0603123N		High Temperature Superconducting AC Synchronous Motor			4,000		
0603123N		High Temperature Superconducting Generator			5,000		
0603123N		Project M			8,500		
0603123N		Superconducting Direct Current Homopolar Motor			5,000		
0603123N		UAV Imagery			3,000		
0603235N	18	Common Picture Advanced Technology	60,589	6,000			66,589
0603235N		Consolidated Undersea Situational Awareness			6,000		
0603236N	19	Warfighter Sustainment Advanced Technology	68,540	9,000			77,540
0603236N		Virtual At-Sea Training Initiative			3,000		
0603236N		SEAPRINT			6,000		
0603271N	20	RF Systems Advanced Technology	75,070	12,900			87,970
0603271N		Polyimide Macro Electromechanical Systems			7,400		
0603271N		Remote Ocean Surveillance System			3,000		
0603271N		Spectral Beam Combining Fiber Lasers			2,500		
0603640M	21	Marine Corps Advanced Technology Demonstration (ATD)	56,434	9,000			65,434

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0603640M		Advanced Mine Detection			3,000		
0603640M		Common Remote Operating Weapon Station (CROWS)			2,000		
0603640M		Mobile Fire Support System Dragon Fire II			4,000		
0603651M	22	Joint Non-Lethal Weapons Technology Development	2,394				2,394
0603706N	23	Medical Development					
0603727N	24	Joint Experimentation (Navy Technical Information Presentation System in PB)	187,943				187,943
0603729N	25	Warfighter Protection Advanced Technology	16,068	6,300			22,368
0603729N		Naval Special Warfare Performance and Injury Prevention Program			2,600		
0603729N		Anti-Oxidant Micronutrient Program			3,700		
0603747N	26	Undersea Warfare Advanced Technology	27,603				27,603
0603757N	27	Joint Warfare Experiments					
0603758N	28	Navy Warfighting Experiments and Demonstrations	49,288	23,000			72,288
0603758N		Littoral Support Craft-Experimental			23,000		
0603782N	29	Mine and Expeditionary Warfare Advanced Technology	31,897				31,897
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**729,852**	**141,400**	**141,400**		**871,252**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES					
0603207N	30	Air/Ocean Tactical Applications	27,094	2,700			29,794
0603207N		3-D Sonar for UUV			2,700		
0603216N	31	Aviation Survivability	6,255	5,500			11,755
0603216N		Ceramic Air Deployed Sensor			2,500		
0603216N		Reduced Risk Ordnance			3,000		
0603237N	32	Deployable Joint Command and Control	41,464				41,464
0603254N	33	ASW Systems Development	7,050	8,000			15,050
0603254N		Tactical E-field Buoy Development			8,000		
0603261N	34	Tactical Airborne Reconnaissance / UAV CONOPS	3,938				3,938
0603382N	35	Advanced Combat Systems Technology	30,166				30,166
0603502N	36	Surface and Shallow Water Mine Countermeasures	122,122				122,122
0603506N	37	Surface Ship Torpedo Defense	47,039	5,000			52,039
0603506N		AN/WSQ-11 ATT and Tripwire			5,000		
0603512N	38	Carrier Systems Development (CVN-21)	167,823	8,000			175,823

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0603512N		Aviation Ship Integration Center			8,000		
0603513N	39	Shipboard System Component Development	22,150	4,900			27,050
0603513N		Amorphous Metal Permanent Magnet Generator Set			1,500		
0603513N		Integrated Fight Through Power			3,400		
0603525N	40	PILOT FISH	141,369				141,369
0603527N	41	RETRACT LARCH	82,717				82,717
0603536N	42	RETRACT JUNIPER	54,887				54,887
0603542N	43	Radiological Controls	1,845				1,845
0603553N	44	Surface ASW	17,343	15,700			33,043
0603553N		Medium N Off-board Distributed Acoustic Sensor			3,700		
0603553N		Receive-While-Transmit Sonar			12,000		
0603559N	45	SSGN Design (SSGN Conversion in PB)	24,020				24,020
0603561N	46	Advanced Submarine System Development	162,953	24,000			186,953
0603561N		Large Aperture Bow and Low Cost Conformal Arrays			5,000		
0603561N		Twin-line Thin Line Towed Array			19,000		
0603562N	47	Submarine Tactical Warfare Systems	7,125				7,125
0603563N	48	Ship Concept Advanced Design	11,899	5,000			16,899
0603563N		Security Video Distribution System			5,000		
0603564N	49	Ship Preliminary Design & Feasibility Studies	27,021	4,000			31,021
0603564N		AGOR Ocean Class Research Ship Preliminary Design			4,000		
0603570N	50	Advanced Nuclear Power Systems (CVN-21)	168,373				168,373
0603573N	51	Advanced Surface Machinery Systems					
0603576N	52	CHALK EAGLE	116,230				116,230
0603581N	53	Littoral Combat Ship (LCS)	576,454	12,000			588,454
0603581N		High Strength Composite Material			12,000		
0603582N	54	Combat Systems Integration	76,975				76,975
0603609N	55	Conventional Munitions	36,940				36,940
0603611M	56	Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle (EFV/AAAV)	253,675				253,675
0603612M	57	Marine Corps Mine/Countermeasures Systems - Adv Dev: Mine Detector	3,265				3,265
0603635M	58	Marine Corps Ground Combat/Support System	500	7,500			8,000
0603635M		Urban Operations Environment Lab			5,500		

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0603635M		Marine Expeditionary Rifle Squad (MERS)			2,000		
0603654N	59	Joint Service Explosive Ordnance Development	34,418				34,418
0603658N	60	Cooperative Engagement	88,135				88,135
0603713N	61	Ocean Engineering Technology Development	24,620				24,620
0603721N	62	Environmental Protection	21,977				21,977
0603724N	63	Navy Energy Program	1,595				1,595
0603725N	64	Facilities Improvement	4,158				4,158
0603734N	65	CHALK CORAL	52,769				52,769
0603739N	66	Navy Logistic Productivity	8,909				8,909
0603746N	67	RETRACT MAPLE	308,708				308,708
0603748N	68	LINK PLUMERIA	81,723				81,723
0603751N	69	RETRACT ELM	57,036				57,036
0603755N	70	Ship Self Defense	9,592				9,592
0603764N	71	LINK EVERGREEN	58,153				58,153
0603787N	72	Special Processes	47,908				47,908
0603790N	73	NATO Research and Development	10,335				10,335
0603795N	74	Land Attack Technology / AWS	14,195	66,000			80,195
0603795N		Affordable Weapon System			60,000		
0603795N		Extended Range Guided Munition			5,000		
0603795N		76mm Gun Testing			1,000		
0603851M	75	Nonlethal Weapons	43,981				43,981
0603857N	76	Joint Combat ID Evaluation Team	15,696				15,696
0603860N	77	Joint Precision Approach and Landing Systems	39,260				39,260
0603879N	78	Single Integrated Air Picture (SIAP) System Engineer (SE)	36,721				36,721
0603889N	79	Counterdrug RDT&E Projects					
0604272N	80	Tactical Air Directional Infrared Countermeasures (TADIRCM)	9,956				9,956
0604327N	81	Hard and Deeply Buried Target Defeat System (HDBTDS) Program					
0604707N	82	Space and Electronic Warfare (SEW) Architecture/Engineering Support	44,469				44,469
0604787N	83	Joint Warfare Transformation Programs	23,385				23,385
		TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**3,276,391**	**168,300**	**168,300**		**3,444,691**

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION					
0604212N	84	Other Helo Development	81,112	10,000			91,112
0604212N		Joint Heavy Lift			10,000		
0604214N	85	AV-8B Aircraft - Eng Dev	15,556				15,556
0604215N	86	Standards Development	84,308	6,800			91,108
0604215N		Metrology			6,800		
0604216N	87	Multi-Mission Helicopter Upgrade Development	48,144				48,144
0604218N	88	Air/Ocean Equipment Engineering	4,558				4,558
0604221N	89	P-3 Modernization Program	7,401				7,401
0604230N	90	Naval Coastal Warfare (Warfare Support System)	2,275				2,275
0604231N	91	Tactical Command System	51,177	7,000			58,177
0604231N		Air Combat Environment Test and Evaluation			3,000		
0604231N		Multi-Wavelength Aerosolized Biologics Sensor			4,000		
0604234N	92	Advanced Hawkeye	629,682				629,682
0604245N	93	H-1 Upgrades	42,012				42,012
0604261N	94	Acoustic Search Sensors	29,522				29,522
0604262N	95	V-22A	206,376				206,376
0604264N	96	Air Crew Systems Development	10,902				10,902
0604269N	97	EA-18G	409,097				409,097
0604270N	98	EW Development	42,667				42,667
0604273N	99	VHXX Executive Helo Development	935,932				935,932
0604280N	100	Joint Tactical Radio System - Navy (JTRS-Navy)	250,766				250,766
0604300N	101	DD(X) Systems Engineering (SC-21 Total Sip System Engineering)	1,114,791	(414,800)			699,991
0604300N		Program Reduction				(414,800)	
0604307N	102	Aegis Combat System Engineering	216,313	12,000			228,313
0604307N		Advanced Radar Technology Integrated System Testbed			12,000		
0604311N	103	LPD-17 Class System Integration	11,443				11,443
0604312N	104	JASSM					
0604329N	105	Small Diameter Bomb (SDB)	9,965				9,965
0604366N	106	Standard Missile Improvements	145,634				145,634
0604373N	107	Airborne MCM	54,659				54,659

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0604503N	108	SSN-688 and Trident Mods (Submarine Systems Development)	95,499	15,500			110,999
0604503N		Affordable Towed Array			6,000		
0604503N		Common Submarine Radio Room			9,500		
0604504N	109	Air Control	10,151				10,151
0604507N	110	Enhanced Modular Signal Processor	1,079				1,079
0604512N	111	Shipboard Aviation Systems	33,029	6,500			39,529
0604512N		Aircraft Carrier Launch and Recovery Support Equipment			6,500		
0604518N	112	Combat Information Center Conversion	6,908				6,908
0604558N	113	Virginia Class Design Development	155,807	20,000			175,807
		Multi-mission Modules			20,000		
0604561N	114	SSN-21 Developments	2,928				2,928
0604562N	115	Submarine Tactical Warfare System	40,690				40,690
0604567N	116	Ship Contract Design/ Live Fire T&E (CVN-21)	55,672				55,672
0604574N	117	Navy Tactical Computer Resources	2,220				2,220
0604601N	118	Mine Development	15,392				15,392
0604603N	119	SLAM-ER					
0604610N	120	Lightweight Torpedo Development	31,826				31,826
0604618N	121	Joint Direct Attack Munition					
0604654N	122	Joint Service Explosive Ordnance Development	8,880				8,880
0604703N	123	Personnel, Training, Simulation, and Human Factors	3,097				3,097
0604721N	124	Battle Group Passive Horizon Extension System	18,456				18,456
0604727N	125	Joint Standoff Weapon Systems	13,517				13,517
0604755N	126	Ship Self Defense (Detect & Control)	45,931				45,931
0604756N	127	Ship Self Defense (Engage: Hard Kill)	46,026				46,026
0604757N	128	Ship Self Defense (Engage: Soft Kill/EW)	24,012				24,012
0604761N	129	Intelligence Engineering	5,002				5,002
0604771N	130	Medical Development	7,202	20,700			27,902
0604771N		Biomedical Research Imaging			5,000		
0604771N		Hemoglobin-Based Oxygen Carrier			8,000		
0604771N		Navy Cancer Vaccine Research Program			5,000		
0604771N		Quick Clot Hemostatic Agent			2,700		

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0604777N	131	Navigation/ID System	52,717				52,717
0604784N	132	Distributed Surveillance System	54,256	26,000			80,256
0604784N		Submarine Advanced Deployable System			26,000		
0604800N	133	Joint Strike Fighter (JSF)	2,393,013				2,393,013
0604910N	134	Smart Card Program	715				715
0605013M	135	USMC Information Technology Development	19,150	4,000			23,150
0605013M		Automated Manifest System - Tactical			4,000		
0605013N	136	Information Technology Development	60,859				60,859
0605014N	137	Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System (DIMHRS)					
0605172N	138	Multinational Information Sharing (MNIS)	33,557				33,557
0605212N	139	CH-53X RDTE	271,941	(271,941)			
0605212N		Program Restructure				(271,941)	
0605500N	140	Multi-mission Maritime Aircraft (MMA)	964,067				964,067
0508713N	141	Navy Standard Integrated Personnel System (NSIPS)					
		TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**8,877,891**	**(558,241)**	**128,500**	**(686,741)**	**8,319,650**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
0604256N	142	Threat Simulator Development	23,918				23,918
0604258N	143	Target Systems Development	52,963				52,963
0604759N	144	Major T&E Investment	39,682				39,682
0605152N	145	Studies and Analysis Support - Navy	9,629				9,629
0605154N	146	Center for Naval Analyses	49,891				49,891
0605155N	147	Fleet Tactical Development	2,266				2,266
0605502N	148	Small Business Innovative Research					
0605804N	149	Technical Information Services	714				714
0605853N	150	Management, Technical & International Support	44,847				44,847
0605856N	151	Strategic Technical Support	3,451				3,451
0605861N	152	RDT&E Science and Technology Management	63,508				63,508
0605862N	153	RDT&E Instrumentation Modernization	1,632				1,632
0605863N	154	RDT&E Ship and Aircraft Support	77,131				77,131
0605864N	155	Test and Evaluation Support	320,133				320,133

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0605865N	156	Operational Test and Evaluation Capability	13,101				13,101
0605866N	157	Navy Space and Electronic Warfare (SEW) Support	2,829				2,829
0605867N	158	SEW Surveillance/Reconnaissance Support	13,030				13,030
0605873M	159	Marine Corps Program Wide Support	28,224				28,224
0804758N	160	Service Support to JFCOM, JNTC	10,000				10,000
0909999N	161	Financing for Cancelled Account Adjustments					
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**756,949**				**756,949**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
0603660N	162	Advanced Development Projects					
0603661N	163	Retract Violet					
0101221N	164	Strategic Sub & Weapons System Support	90,022	4,000			94,022
0101221N		Common Acoustic Sensor Initiative			4,000		
0101224N	165	SSBN Security Technology Program	44,063	2,700			46,763
0101224N		Common Submarine Radio Room			2,700		
0101226N	166	Submarine Defensive Warfare Systems	8,527				8,527
0101402N	167	Navy Strategic Communications/E-6B	31,443				31,443
0203761N	168	Rapid Technology Transition (RTT)	24,653				24,653
0204136N	169	F/A-18 Squadrons	88,720				88,720
0204152N	170	E-2 Squadrons	2,256				2,256
0204163N	171	Fleet Telecommunications (Tactical)	32,694				32,694
0204229N	172	Tomahawk Weapons System	20,342				20,342
0204311N	173	Integrated Surveillance System	23,453	6,000			29,453
0204311N		IUSS Common Processor			6,000		
0204413N	174	Amphibious Tactical Support Units	4,768				4,768
0204571N	175	Consolidated Training Systems Development	42,248				42,248
0204574N	176	Cryptologic Direct Support	1,422				1,422
0204575N	177	Electronic Warfare (EW) Readiness Support	13,987				13,987
0205601N	178	HARM Improvement / AARGM	90,832				90,832
0205604N	179	Tactical Data Links	86,364				86,364
0205620N	180	Surface ASW Combat System Integration	4,519	10,000			14,519

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0205620N		Acoustic Window Applications			10,000		
0205632N	181	MK-48 ADCAP	21,619				21,619
0205633N	182	Aviation Improvements	81,546				81,546
0205658N	183	Navy Science Assistance Program	3,917				3,917
0205675N	184	Operational Nuclear Power Systems	64,054				64,054
0206313M	185	Marine Corps Communications Systems	237,081	4,890			241,971
0206313M		Reconnaissance, Surveillance and Targeting Vehicle			9,000		
0206313M		Joint Tactical Radio System Program Reduction				(4,110)	
0206623M	186	Marine Corps Ground Combat/Supporting Arms Systems	48,409	16,400			64,809
0206623M		Expeditionary Fire Support System			3,500		
0206623M		Multi-Role Intermediate Support Craft			9,500		
0206623M		Ultrasonic Consolidation of Embedded Sensors			3,400		
0206624M	187	Marine Corps Combat Services Support	10,476				10,476
0207161N	188	Tactical Air Intercept Missiles	9,384				9,384
0207163N	189	Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM)	3,584				3,584
0301303N	190	Maritime Intelligence					
0301323N	191	Collection Management					
0301327N	192	Technical Reconnaissance and Surveillance					
0303109N	193	Satellite Communications (SPACE)	541,980	9,200			551,180
0303109N		JIST-NET			9,200		
0303140N	194	Information Systems Security Program	28,660				28,660
0303158N	195	Joint Command and Control Program (JC2)	5,000				5,000
0304111N	196	Special Activities					
0305149N	197	COBRA JUDY	121,261				121,261
0305160N	198	Defense Meteorological Satellite Program	9,122				9,122
0305188N	199	Joint C4ISR Battle Center (JBC)	55,326				55,326
0305192N	200	Joint Military Intelligence Programs	4,290				4,290
0305204N	201	Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicles	99,349	10,500			109,849
0305204N		Joint Operational Test Bed System			10,500		
0305205N	202	Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicles					
0305206N	203	Airborne Reconnaissance Systems	27,918	5,000			32,918

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0305206N		Passive Collision Avoidance and Reconnaissance			5,000		
0305207N	204	Manned Reconnaissance Systems	21,322				21,322
0305208N	205	Distributed Common Ground Systems	12,354				12,354
0307207N	206	Aerial Common Sensor (ACS) (JMIP)	133,642				133,642
0308601N	207	Modeling and Simulation Support	6,812				6,812
0702207N	208	Depot Maintenance (Non-IF)	10,012				10,012
0708011N	209	Industrial Preparedness	57,753	4,000			61,753
0708011N		Gas Turbine Diagnostic System			2,000		
0708011N		M-65 Bismalemide Carbon Fiber Prepreg Resin Qualification			2,000		
0708730N	210	Maritime Technology (National Shipbuilding Research Program)		100,000			100,000
0708730N		Shipbuilding Industrial Base Investment Fund			100,000		
XXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	1,125,515				1,125,515
XXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs		12,000	12,000		12,000
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**3,350,699**	**184,690**	**188,800**	**(4,110)**	**3,535,389**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY	**18,037,991**	**(15,851)**	**679,000**	**(694,851)**	**18,022,140**

Items of Special Interest

Advanced mine detection program

The budget request contained $56.4 million in PE 63640M for the Marine Corps advanced technology demonstration, but included no funding for the advanced mine detection program.

The committee is aware that the Marine Corps urgently needs a backpack advanced mine detection capability with minimal false alarm rates. The committee notes that the Office of Naval Research has been working to develop an advanced mine detection system based on quadrupole resonance technology that has the potential to meet Marine Corps requirements.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63640M to complete development of a quadrupole resonance technology advanced backpack mine detection system.

Affordable towed array construction

The budget request contained $95.5 million in PE 64503N for submarine system equipment development, including $4.5 million to continue the development of affordable towed array technology.

The affordable towed array construction program employs fiber optic thinline arrays to provide reliability improvements by reducing system complexity, eliminating wet end electronics, enhancing littoral capability and incorporating robust array construction methods. The committee believes that accelerating the development and fielding of fiber optic towed array technology using improved construction methods and process would provide increased performance, reliability and operational capabilities at reduced costs and earlier introduction into the fleet.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 64503N to accelerate the development and introduction into the fleet of fiber optic thinline arrays.

Affordable weapon system

The budget request contained $14.2 million in PE 63795N for land attack technology advanced component development and prototypes.

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

The committee notes that the ONR program has been successful in all respects. In less than four years, the AWS program demonstrated the use of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) components to construct a 400–600 mile range, subsonic (180–220 knot), "loitering, 200 pound payload, precision strike missile with global position system/inertial navigation system guidance and control and a data link." The missile has both line-of-sight and satellite data links for interaction with ground stations and forward observers and is reprogrammable in flight. In operational use the missile would be launched from CONEX-type containers that hold between 6 and 20 missiles and could be carried on land, sea, or air plat-

forms. The initiative has demonstrated that the COTS approach can reduce costs by an order of magnitude from traditional cruise missiles. The current missile cost in large scale production, exclusive of warhead, is estimated to be approximately $65,000.

Based on the results of the AWS advanced technology demonstration, the Department of Defense and the Navy transitioned the AWS from the technology base to an accelerated advanced component development and prototype program to demonstrate the ability to produce the missile at the projected cost, produce up to 100 missiles and launch and fire control equipment for developmental and operational testing, and support user evaluation of the AWS for potential use by the fleet. The Navy is also assessing the operational requirement and concepts of operation for the system and those other activities that would be necessary to establish AWS as a program of record. The current schedule includes completion of an operational evaluation of the system during the third quarter of fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommends an increase of $60.0 million in PE 63795N to continue the development of the AWS, support developmental and operational testing and fleet evaluation of the system. Of the amount provided, up to $30.0 million may be used to continue low rate initial production of the system. The committee directs that funds to continue low rate initial production of the system will not become available for obligation until successful completion of the AWS operational evaluation.

Air combat environment test and evaluation

The budget request contained $51.2 million in PE 64231N for major test and evaluation investment.

The committee notes that in order to meet increasingly complex asymmetric threats, U.S. armed forces are transforming from a strategy based on threats to a strategy based on capabilities, and that this transformation requires sophisticated modeling, simulation, and analysis at research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E) and training range facilities operated by the military departments. The Air Combat Environment Test and Evaluation Facility (ACETEF) is a ground test facility whose primary purpose is to test installed aircraft systems in an integrated multi-spectral warfare environment using state-of-the-art simulation and simulation technology. The facility supports the systems development process from early mission needs and requirements development through operational testing and training. The robust and flexible modeling and simulation architecture has made possible other RDT&E and related capabilities, such as distributed or co-located battlegroup mission rehearsal for naval and joint forces.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 64231N to accelerate improvements in high-fidelity simulation capabilities at the ACETEF.

Airborne reconnaissance systems

The budget request contained $27.9 million in PE 35206N for airborne reconnaissance systems, but included no funding for passive collision avoidance and reconnaissance (PCAR).

The committee is aware that unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) must fly in regions that make them a potential hazard to commer-

cial and other manned aircraft. The committee notes that PCAR will sense an impending collision and allow the UAV to safely avoid approaching aircraft.

Therefore, to improve safety of UAV operations, the committee recommends $32.9 million in PE 35206N, an increase of $5.0 million for PCAR.

Aircraft carrier launch and recovery and support equipment modernization

The budget request contained $33.0 million in PE 64512N for shipboard aviation systems development, but included no funds for development of the aircraft carrier launch and recovery (ALRE) and support equipment (SE) modernization program.

The ALRE/SE modernization program would develop modernization strategies for existing ALRE/SE systems to reduce the human error and operating costs while improving safety and reliability. The committee understands that state-of-the-art ALRE/SE technologies and design tools are being developed for the Department of the Navy's CVN–21 future carrier, and believes that application of these technologies to the Navy's existing aircraft carrier fleet could substantially reduce operating costs for the remainder of their useful life.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $39.5 million in PE 64512N, an increase of $6.5 million, for ALRE/SE modernization program. The committee expects that $2.0 million would be for ALRE systems modernization; $2.5 million would be for development of prognostic, health monitoring, and condition-based maintenance systems; and $2.0 million would be for upgrading ALRE/SE technical data packages.

Amorphous metal permanent magnet generator set

The budget request contained $22.2 million in PE 63513N for shipboard systems advanced component development and prototypes.

The committee understands that generator sets employing amorphous metal permanent magnets have the potential to greatly increase power output, while reducing the size and weight of the generator set. Such generator technology also holds the potential for reducing lifecycle costs by increasing fuel efficiency and reducing logistics supports costs. Congress provided $1.5 million in fiscal year 2005 for development of an amorphous metal permanent generator.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 63513N to continue the development and demonstration of an amorphous metal permanent magnet generator set for potential use on U.S. Navy combatants and other ships.

Aviation ship integration center

The budget request contained $167.8 million in PE 63512N for carrier systems advanced technology development and prototyping, but included no funds for the Aviation Ship Integration Center.

The Aviation Ship Integration Center supports the development and conceptualization of fully integrated advanced technology designs for future aircraft carriers. The center identifies, tests, and integrates transformational design changes and products for avia-

tion capable ships and component systems, and permits the identification and resolution of potential problems early in the development cycle, thereby reducing overall engineering costs and facilitating the introduction of transformational initiatives in the CVN–21 carrier.

The committee notes that additional funding is required to expand and complete several key initiatives by the shipbuilder and appropriate government sponsors:

(1) Identification of and experimentation with design changes that can reduce cost or improve net centric warfare capabilities;

(2) Integrate and test communications, command, control, computers, and intelligence components to ensure joint interoperability;

(3) Design flexible, modular compartments for decision centers aboard ships.

(4) In coordination with the Navy's systems commands, develop and implement leading edge modeling and simulation capabilities that allow warfighters and engineers to collaborate effectively on aircraft carrier design issues; and

(5) Implement a technical framework for facilities, networks, and simulations that will be compatible with evolving Department of Defense initiatives such as the joint distributed engineering plant and joint national training capabilities.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63512N for the Aviation Ship Integration Center.

Biomedical research imaging

The budget request contained $7.2 million in PE 64771N for medical development and demonstration, but included no funds for biomedical research imaging.

The committee continues to note the progress being made in the use of advanced imaging technology in biomedical research. The committee believes that these findings have important implications for advances in real-time medical diagnosis and treatment for the armed forces and for the application of advanced data fusion technologies in other areas.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 64771N to continue development of the applications of advanced imaging technology in biomedical research.

Ceramic air deployed sensor

The budget request contained $6.3 million in PE 63216N for aviation survivability, but included no funding for ceramic air-deployed sensor.

The committee recognizes the need to develop low-cost air deployable sensors and understands that ceramic composites may offer potential to reduce sensor costs.

Therefore, the committee recommends $8.8 million in PE 63216N, an increase of $2.5 million for ceramic air deployed sensor.

CH–53X heavy lift replacement

The budget request included $272.0 million in PE 65212N and $2.5 million in PE 64212N for the CH–53X heavy lift replacement

(HLR) program. The budget request also included $6.0 million in PE 63003A for the Joint Heavy Lift (JHL) program.

As noted elsewhere in this report (sec. 219), the JHL program as currently structured and funded is a joint program in name only. The committee believes that Navy and Marine Corps future missions and required capabilities are not that different and the Secretary of Defense must ensure the JHL program is structured to meet the needs of the Army and Marine Corps.

Therefore, the committee recommends no funding in PE 65212N for HLR, a reduction of $272.0 million; $12.5 million in PE 64212N, an increase of $10.0 million for JHL; and $16.0 million in PE 63003A, an increase of $10.0 million for JHL.

Common submarine radio room

The budget request contained $95.5 million in PE 64503N for submarine system equipment development and $44.1 million in PE 11224N for the SSBN security technology program.

The committee notes that the radio room on many of today's ships uses outdated, and in some cases, obsolete technologies. As a result, the systems that support ship communications in the radio room are labor intensive, require heavy and costly maintenance, suffer from operator overload and require large numbers of highly skilled operators. The Navy developed the Common Submarine Radio Room (CSRR) in the Virginia Class submarine program and plans to standardize radio rooms across all submarine classes using the CSRR model. CSRR will reduce the cost, training, and maintenance in submarine radio rooms; and, through increased use of automation, will permit the reduction of personnel required to stand watch in the radio room. In the future, the CSRR concept may be extended to the surface fleet.

The committee recommends an increase of $9.5 million in PE 64503N and an increase of $2.7 million in PE 11224N for the Navy's unfunded requirement for the CSRR.

Consolidated undersea situational awareness

The budget request contained $60.6 million in PE 63235N for common picture advanced technology development, but included no funds to continue development of the consolidated undersea situational awareness system (CUSAS).

The committee notes that CUSAS is a decision-support system would provide knowledge superiority to undersea warfare (USW) forces through the use of advanced, interactive, decision support software. Developed initially under the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, CUSAS offers significant improvements in situational awareness for fleet operators through the use of high fidelity, two- and three-dimensional presentations, augmented with real-time, intelligent agent-based, tactical recommendations.

The committee notes the progress in the development of CUSAS. Over the past year, CUSAS tactical interfaces with existing submarine combat systems, and a preliminary collision avoidance capability have been developed and evaluated. The system has demonstrated the capability to interface with, process, and display all sources of sensor and intelligence data onboard a U.S. submarine. The committee believes that successful development of the CUSAS decision support system will provide a capability that would signifi-

cantly assist submarine commanders to make rapid and informed decisions in critical combat operations.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63235N to continue development of CUSAS.

Cooperative engagement capability

The conference report (H. Rept. 105–736) accompanying the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) directed the Secretary of the Navy to report to the congressional defense committees, at least quarterly, on cooperative engagement capability and combat direction system interoperability problems and planned solutions.

The committee notes that the Navy has complied with this direction and has described a broad scope of actions taken to improve interoperability between the cooperative engagement capability and surface ship combat direction systems. The Navy's reports reflect substantial success in addressing the issues that were of concern to the conferees in 1998, and moreover, the establishment of long-range organizational procedures and a system of reliable evaluations and reviews to ensure the readiness of deploying strike groups. Accordingly, the committee agrees to terminate the quarterly reporting requirement effective October 1, 2005.

Digital shipboard voice communications

The committee applauds the Navy's efforts to explore the transition of all shipboard communications to a digital format. The committee understands that the use of this technology will save significant space and weight aboard the Navy's combat vessels by converging voice, video, and data traffic into a common network infrastructure. Even so, the committee recognizes that before the Navy selects all digital and Voice over internet protocol (VoIP) communications systems as the fleet standard, issues in quality of service and bandwidth consumption must be addressed. The committee also understands that the Department of Defense and the Navy are reluctant to move to VoIP before a universally recognized commercial standard technical solution is adopted. While the committee understands this reluctance, the committee believes that the lack of a commercial standard should not impede the adoption of promising VoIP systems, if the overall benefit of digital shipboard communications is demonstrated. To that end, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to explore options to partner with U.S. industry to develop a universally recognized VoIP technical standard.

Hemoglobin-based oxygen carrier

The budget request contained $7.2 million in PE 64771N for medical system development and demonstration, but included no funds specifically to continue the development of hemoglobin-based oxygen carrier technology.

The committee notes that there is currently no effective method of providing front-line resuscitative treatment (i.e. immediate oxygen-carrying support) for acute blood loss to wounded soldiers on the battlefield and civilian trauma victims in an out-of-hospital setting. The single major cause of death in potentially salvageable battlefield casualties is hemorrhage and blood loss, and early intervention to treat hemorrhage provides the greatest opportunity for

reducing mortality and morbidity. Although blood transfusion is not practical in far forward or out-of-hospital settings, hemoglobin-based oxygen carriers have the characteristics of stability at room temperature that overcome many of the medical and logistical problems associated with red blood cell transfusion.

In fiscal year 2002 Congress initiated a program for evaluation of hemoglobin-based oxygen carriers for the treatment of trauma casualties. Based on the progress in the program the U.S. Naval Medical Research Center is directing a clinical development and trials program to evaluate the safety and efficacy of a particular hemoglobin-based oxygen carrier. The program is designed to serve as the basis for approval by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration and subsequent licensing of the product for military and civilian trauma applications.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 64771N to continue the program for development and clinical trials of hemoglobin-based oxygen carriers for treatment of trauma casualties.

High temperature superconducting AC synchronous ship propulsion motor

The budget request contained $71.5 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology development, including $23.8 million for development of surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical and electrical advanced technology and to continue development of a 36.5 megawatt class, high temperature superconducting alternating current (AC) synchronous motor.

The committee notes that development of component technologies for the all electric warship is one of the major goals of the Navy's science and technology program. To this end the Navy has pursued the development of several different technologies for ship main propulsion electric motors, including permanent magnet motors, high temperature superconducting AC synchronous motor technology, and low temperature superconducting direct current homopolar motor technology. The committee notes that permanent magnet motor technology is more mature and represents a potential near-term candidate for a ship main propulsion motor. However, the committee also notes that superconducting motor technology presents a number of advantages with respect to size and power density that, if realized, would make that technology potentially advantageous for certain applications.

In fiscal year 2003, the Navy awarded a contract for development and demonstration of high temperature, superconducting AC synchronous motor technology in a 36.5 megawatt propulsion motor and drive system that would be designed to be compatible with Navy electric warship concepts and performance requirements, and would be available to begin Navy evaluation in fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63123N to continue development and demonstration of the high temperature superconducting AC synchronous motor.

Joint integrated systems technology

The budget request contained $542.0 million in PE 33109N for satellite communications (SATCOM). The Joint integrated satellite communications (JIST–NET) is a web-based SATCOM planning

and management technology that utilizes the Department of Defense's existing internet protocol router to expand the flexibility and efficiency of military SATCOM across a broad spectrum of radio frequencies. The committee believes that developmental systems like JIST–NET, based on common standards are critical to increased SATCOM efficiency and maximizing the utilization of available spectrum resources across legacy and follow-on SATCOM.

The committee recommends $551.2 million in PE 33109N, an increase of $9.2 million to continue the JIST–NET program for development of a uniform web-based architecture for SATCOM mission planning and resource allocation.

Marine expeditionary rifle squad

The budget request contained $0.5 million in PE 63635M for Marine Corps ground combat support systems but included no funds for the development of the Marine Expeditionary Rifle Squad (MERS) program.

The MERS program focuses on the holistic, system level integration of all items worn, consumed or carried by the marine infantry rifle squad. The program's near-term efforts address integration issues resulting from the rapid fielding of urgently needed weapons and equipment to infantry squads currently operating in Operation Iraqi Freedom and the program's long term objective strategy provides marine infantry rifle squads with fully integrated future equipment systems.

The committee understands the importance and the heightened capabilities fully integrated equipment systems bring to marines operating in combat theaters of operations. The committee is aware that certain non-integrated equipment components can interfere with individual marines' ability to conduct their missions effectively, causing marines to develop ad hoc solutions to in effect generate an integrated equipment solution. The committee understands MERS is designed to prevent these problems from occurring by providing an integrated solution set to the marine rifle squad before deployment to a combat zone.

Therefore, the committee recommends $2.5 million in PE 63635A to continue the phase development strategy of the MERS program.

Marine mammal research program

The budget request contained $82.9 million in PE 62236N for warfighter sustainment applied research, but included no funds for continuation of the marine mammal research program.

The committee notes continuing public concern about the effect of sound on the behavior and well-being of marine mammals and continues to support research in these areas. The marine mammal research program investigates the effects of noise on dolphin hearing and dolphin biosonar capabilities, joint visual and acoustic surveys of the behavior of humpback whales, and also supports research in bioacoustical oceanography.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.2 million in PE 62236N to continue the program for research in marine mammal behavior, the effects of sound on marine mammals, and bioacoustical oceanography.

Metrology

The budget request contained $84.3 million in PE 64215N for standards development, including $1.4 million for calibration standards development. The budget request supports Navy lead service responsibilities in the Department of Defense (DOD) Joint Services metrology research and development program.

The DOD's metrology research and development program develops new measurement standards and capabilities to support the development, test, evaluation, and maintenance of emerging military systems. The committee notes that continued shortfalls in the metrology budgets of all the military departments have led to the erosion of critical calibration standards development and measurement services to the detriment of the development and support of new weapons systems. Recent efforts to improve research and development funding are helping, but a backlog of projects exists for fiscal year 2005 and is expected to continue to climb higher in fiscal year 2006 without outside support. The committee believes, however, initiation of the most critical unfunded projects in fiscal year 2006, particularly those in the chemical/biological and improvised explosive device detection areas, would significantly benefit the Department and the readiness of U.S. forces.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $91.1 million in PE 64215N, an increase of $6.8 million for calibration standards development.

Multi-wavelength surface scanning biologics sensor

The budget request contained $51.2 million in PE 64231N for development and demonstration of Navy tactical command systems.

The committee notes on-going research in the use of multi-wavelength excitation spectral technology for the detection and identification of biologic agents that are not discernible with conventional sensors. The current program under the advanced sensor applications program (ASAP), PE 63714D, which is being completed with fiscal year 2005 funding, has successfully developed the capability to detect bio-spores on contaminated surfaces using two-dimensional fluorescence that spectrally resolves the target in both excitation and emission dimensions. The committee notes the Navy's intention to capitalize on the success of the ASAP program and adapt the sensor technology to develop a networked capability for detection of biological agent plumes, which would be created by distribution of a biological agent as an aerosol. The committee further notes that the new work will provide a critical sensor input to the Naval Simulation System and will also enhance ongoing joint program work in predictive plume modeling.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64231N to continue the development and demonstration of two-dimensional fluorescence spectral sensing technology for real-time detection and identification of aerosolized pathogens.

Polyimide macro electromechanical systems

The budget request contained $75.1 million for RF Systems Advanced Technology in PE 63271N, but included no funds for polyimide macro electromechanical systems (PMEMS).

Cost and weight considerations are driving reduced performance communications arrays on future Navy shipbuilding programs. The

committee believes this is unacceptable in light of new architectural and advanced manufacturing techniques that will reduce the cost and weight of phased array antennas.

By using advanced flexible materials and packaging, PMEMS phase shifting and power/signal distribution offers a technology path at significantly reduced cost over conventional module based phased array designs. The committee believes that this "disruptive" technology will dramatically reduce the cost of phased arrays for multiple applications and frequency bands. A PMEMS Hybrid 2–D scanned Phased Array for an extremely high frequency (EHF) satellite communication antenna costs one tenth that of a Conventional 2–D scanned array—about $88.0 million in savings per shipset. Inherently lighter, the PMEMS Hybrid array promises additional weight savings when significantly reduced power and cooling requirements are factored. In February 2005, the PMEMS technology was evaluated favorably by the Applied Physics Lab and the Office of Naval Research. In March, the committee learned that the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition plans to initiate a PMEMS effort in fiscal year 2005 to demonstrate the technology in a shipboard environment with the goal of having it available for incorporation into the Navy's shipbuilding program sooner, rather than later. The committee agrees with this effort and an expedited schedule.

Accordingly, the committee recommends authorization of $82.5 million in PE 63271N, an increase of $7.4 million to continue the PMEMS EHF Transmit and Receive sub-array antenna demonstration program.

"Quik Clot" hemostatic agent

The budget request contained $7.2 million in PE 64771N for medical development, but included no funds for the Quick Clot hemostatic agent.

The committee notes the effectiveness of the Quik Clot hemostatic agent in its ability when applied to a battlefield wound to rapidly cause the bleeding wound to clot and stop further loss of blood. The committee is aware that when the agent is applied to a wound, an exothermic reaction takes place, which is uncomfortable to the patient and can burn the damaged tissue. The committee understands that although Quik Clot is effective on surface wounds, it has not been developed or approved for internal use.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.7 million in PE 64771N for development of a new generation of Quik Clot, that will make the agent suitable for internal use and will mitigate its undesirable thermal characteristics.

Remote ocean surveillance system

The budget request contained $75.1 million in PE 63271N for radio frequency systems advanced technology development.

The committee notes continued progress in the development of high contrast, high resolution multi-spectral sensors and image processing technology that indicate potential capabilities for detection of objects in the ocean in real-time, at various depths, and with relatively high search rates. Realization and employment of these technologies in littoral areas, estuaries, and ports would provide the capability for a remote ocean surveillance system to pro-

vide real-time capabilities for mine detection and avoidance, force protection, and identification and dissemination of information on the surface and sub-surface threat to ports and harbors.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63271N to continue the proof-of-concept development and demonstration of multi-spectral sensor and image processing technology for a remote ocean surveillance system.

Retro-reflecting optical communications for special operations

The budget request contained $94.1 million in PE 62114N for power projection applied research.

The committee notes that the Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) has conducted extensive research in the use of modulated retro-reflectors, which could eliminate the need for an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) to carry a laser for downlink communications Under the current program, NRL has demonstrated high power, high efficiency compact lasers and miniature retro-reflectometers, which can modulate a laser signal with data from the air vehicle as that signal is reflected back to the source, and laser interrogators to transmit and receive the signal. NRL has also demonstrated the high-speed modulation required for downloading data from new high data rate sensors, the type that might be carried on UAVs, as well as demonstrating the use of the technology in ship-to-shore communications. The committee understands that the next step in the program is the development of a miniaturized, gimbaled laser interrogator for airborne platforms.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62114N to continue the development of retro-reflecting optical communications for special operations applications.

Spectral beam combining fiber lasers

The budget request contained $75.1 million in PE 63271N for radio frequency systems advanced technology development.

The committee notes that high power lasers based on fiber laser technology might be capable of providing U.S. armed forces the same operational advantages as solid-state lasers, but could offer potential breakthroughs in reduced size, weight, complexity, and cooling requirements. The committee is informed that recently demonstrated technology for spectral beam combining fiber lasers, in which the outputs of a number of low power fiber optic lasers are combined into a single, high quality laser beam, could permit the construction of high power lasers from an array of lower power fiber laser elements at a significantly lower cost than conventional high power lasers.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 63271N for advanced development and evaluation of the technology for spectral beam combining fiber lasers.

Superconducting direct current homopolar motor

The budget request contained $71.5 million in PE 63123N for force protection advanced technology development, including $23.8 million for advanced development of surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and electrical systems, but did not include any funds to continue development and demonstration of an advanced

main propulsion 36.5 megawatt prototype superconducting direct current (DC) homopolar motor.

The development of component technologies for the all-electric warship is one of the major goals of the Navy's science and technology program. To this end the Navy has pursued the development of several different technologies for ship main propulsion electric motors. The committee notes that superconducting motor technology presents a number of advantages with respect to size and power density that make that technology potentially advantageous for certain applications. The committee also notes that low temperature superconducting DC homopolar motor technology has the potential technical advantages of being smaller, lighter, and quieter than alternating current (AC) electric motors, and, if realized, would make the superconducting DC homopolar motor a potentially more suitable alternative for use in submarines or in other ship applications where these attributes are desired.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63123N to continue the program for development of a prototype 36.5 megawatt superconducting DC homopolar motor for ship main propulsion.

Surface warfare communications systems

The committee is concerned that the Navy may be procuring surface ship internal secure voice communications equipment that does not fully integrate the ship's internal and external communications systems, critically limiting interoperability with other ships and allied forces. This situation may require sailors to retransmit voice communications that could be seamlessly received, resulting in delay and possible inaccurate data retransmission. Such delay in combat could cost lives and endanger the ship, an unacceptable circumstance when better technology is readily available. The committee firmly believes that any secure voice system should be fully competed and be compliant with the Navy's network centric ForceNet concept. The committee urges the Secretary of the Navy to correct this situation as soon as possible by directing the commander of the Naval Sea Systems Command to consider communications integration and interoperability as a requirement in the procurement of secure voice communications equipment for the fleet.

Synthetic aperture sonar commonality

The Navy is developing synthetic aperture sonar (SAS) for application in undersea warfare against mines and against submarines. Currently, different processors are in development for different systems, and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency has expressed interest in one variant of the candidate processors. The committee believes that the processors for these systems should be standardized to the maximum possible extent. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to assess the feasibility of establishing commonality in SAS processors and the ability to achieve a best option or blend of the best capabilities which could then be defined as the common SAS processor. The Secretary shall submit a report of the results of the assessment to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2006.

Tactical E-field buoy development

The budget request contained $7.0 million in PE 63254N for advanced component development and prototypes for anti-submarine warfare systems, including the continued development and evaluation of nonlinear dynamics and stochastic resonance (NDSR) for acoustic, magnetic, and other anti-submarine warfare sensor and signal processing applications.

The committee notes the continuing progress in the application of nonlinear dynamics science and technology to non-acoustic shallow water anti-submarine warfare and the potential for greatly improving anti-submarine warfare systems performance as a result of significantly increased electromagnetic detection ranges, enhanced sonar target discrimination, and improved signal processing. One result of this program has been the establishment of the effectiveness of E-field sensors using state-of-the-art sensor technology coupled with nonlinear signal processing.

The committee believes that an air-launched tactical E-field buoy patterned after the Air Deployed Active Receiver sonobuoy has great potential for real-time target detection and classification.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63254N to continue the program for accelerated component and prototype design, development, and testing of a tactical E-field buoy for littoral anti-submarine warfare.

Use of out of service torpedo components for unmanned undersea vehicle systems

The committee is aware that the Navy has explored the possibility of using out of service torpedo components as major elements of new Unmanned Undersea Vehicles (UUVs), including components of the Mark 46 and Mark 50 torpedoes. UUV systems must operate in the harsh undersea environment, presenting several complex engineering challenges. The committee supports the approach of using proven, pre-engineered systems and components in UUV programs. Another out of service torpedo system, the Mark 44, may also hold potential for use in UUV systems. Use of the Mark 44 torpedo body and electrical propulsion system, combined with modern low cost guidance units and sensors could provide a quick, near term demonstration capability at low cost. The committee directs the Navy to evaluate use of the Mark 44 as a low cost UUV demonstration capability, and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on its analysis and findings by February 1, 2006.

Virtual at-sea training initiative

The budget request contained $68.5 million in PE 63236N for warfighter sustainment advanced technology development.

The committee recognizes the benefits of the Department of the Navy's program to develop a technological solution to maintain fleet readiness in the area of live fire targeting and ordnance delivery. The Office of Naval Research's Virtual-at-Sea-Training (VAST) initiative is an encouraging technology solution, which uses the application of modeling and simulation for simulation-based training, experimentation, mission planning and rehearsal, and system analysis and acquisition.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63236N for continued development of the VAST initiative.

Warfare protection advanced technology

The budget request contained $16.1 million in PE 63729N for warfare protection advanced technology, but included no funding for the Naval Special Warfare Performance and Injury Program. This program shows promise in developing an injury prevention model that will permit Navy special operating forces personnel to maintain their required peak physical conditioning while mitigating the risk of musculoskeletal injury.

The committee recommends $18.7 million in PE 63729N, an increase of $2.6 million for Naval Special Warfare Performance and Injury Prevention Program.

AIR FORCE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Overview

The budget request contained $22.6 billion for Air Force research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $22.4 billion, a decrease of $204.1 million from the budget request.

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE					
		BASIC RESEARCH					
0601102F	1	Defense Research Sciences	223,894	5,500			229,394
0601102F		Space Education Consortium			5,500		
0601103F	2	University Research Initiatives	105,029				105,029
0601108F	3	High Energy Laser Research Initiatives	11,894				11,894
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**340,817**	**5,500**	**5,500**		**346,317**
		APPLIED RESEARCH					
0602102F	4	Materials	74,156	5,000			79,156
0602102F		High Modulus Polyacrylonitrile Carbon Fiber			5,000		
0602201F	5	Aerospace Vehicle Technologies	96,679	3,000			99,679
0602201F		Active Feedback Flow Control			3,000		
0602202F	6	Human Effectiveness Applied Research	79,442	5,000			84,442
0602202F		IMPRINT			3,500		
0602202F		Satellite Threat Evaluation Environment			1,500		
0602203F	7	Aerospace Propulsion	107,523	16,500			124,023
0602203F		Advanced Engine Starter/Generator Prototype			3,500		
0602203F		Engineering Tool Improvement Program			6,500		
0602203F		Affordable Lightweight Power Supply Development			2,500		
0602203F		Aerospace Propulsion Vehicle Center			4,000		
0602204F	8	Aerospace Sensors	93,263	3,000			96,263
0602204F		Compact Optical Receiver for Loitering Stand-off Weapons			3,000		
0602500F	9	Multi-disciplinary Space Technology	81,339	6,000			87,339
0602500F		Upper Stage Engine Technology			6,000		
0602601F	10	Space Technology	84,540	9,000			93,540
0602601F		Elastic Memory Composites			4,000		
0602601F		PMEMS			5,000		
0602602F	11	Conventional Munitions	58,058				58,058
0602605F	12	Directed Energy Technology	37,709				37,709
0602702F	13	Command Control and Communications	93,316	3,900			97,216

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0602702F		Joint Battlespace Infosphere			3,900		
0602805F	14	Dual Use Science and Technology Program					
0602890F	15	High Energy Laser Research	45,678				45,678
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**851,703**	**51,400**	**51,400**		**903,103**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT					
0603112F	16	Advanced Materials for Weapon Systems	36,714	18,800			55,514
0603112F		Lasers for Defense Applications			4,800		
0603112F		Metals Affordability Initiative			14,000		
0603203F	17	Advanced Aerospace Sensors	35,157				35,157
0603205F	18	Flight Vehicle Technology					
0603211F	19	Aerospace Technology Dev/Demo	25,133	4,000			29,133
0603211F		Fibrous 3D Composites			4,000		
0603216F	20	Aerospace Propulsion and Power Technology	77,268	2,000			79,268
0603216F		Solid Boost Power Technology			2,000		
0603231F	21	Crew Systems and Personnel Protection Technology	29,775	3,500			33,275
0603231F		Warfighter Pocket Computer			3,500		
0603270F	22	Electronic Combat Technology	23,923				23,923
0603311F	23	Ballistic Missile Technology		10,000			10,000
0603311F		Guidance Systems Development			6,000		
0603311F		Range Safety Upgrade			4,000		
0603333F	24	Unmanned Air Vehicle Dev/Demo					
0603400F	25	Joint Unmanned Combat Air Systems (J-UCAS)	77,800				77,800
0603401F	26	Advanced Spacecraft Technology	60,915	12,000			72,915
0603401F		Free Space Optical Communications Node			4,000		
0603401F		Position Intelligence Networking Technology (Pinpoint)			4,000		
0603401F		Satellite Simulation Toolkit			3,000		
0603401F		Streaker SLV			1,000		
0603444F	27	Maui Space Surveillance System (MSSS)	5,848	5,000			10,848
0603444F		High Accuracy Network Determination System			5,000		
0603500F	28	Multi-disciplinary Advanced Development Space Technology	53,437	2,500			55,937

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0603500F		Threat Warning Attack Reporting			2,500		
0603601F	29	Conventional Weapons Technology	18,660				18,660
0603605F	30	Advanced Weapons Technology	26,955				26,955
0603723F	31	Environmental Engineering Technology					
0603789F	32	C3I Advanced Development	30,125	3,800			33,925
0603789F		Massively Parallel Optical Inter-connects for Battlefield Info Exchange			3,800		
0603801F	33	Special Programs	280,135				280,135
0603850F	34	Integrated Broadcast Service					
0603924F	35	High Energy Laser Advanced Technology Program	5,801				5,801
0207423F	36	Advanced Communications Systems					
0401840F	37	AMC Command and Control System					
0804757F	38	Joint National Training Center					
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**787,646**	**61,600**	**61,600**		**849,246**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES					
0603260F	39	Intelligence Advanced Development	4,580				4,580
0603287F	40	Physical Security Equipment	21,937	5,000			26,937
0603287F		X-Ray Energy Detection System			5,000		
0603421F	41	NAVSTAR Global Positioning System III	87,364				87,364
0603430F	42	Advanced EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	665,257				665,257
0603432F	43	Polar MILSATCOM (SPACE)	2,185				2,185
0603434F	44	National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite Sys (SPACE)					
0603438F	45	Space Control Technology	14,205				14,205
0603742F	46	Combat Identification Technology	51,893				51,893
0603790F	47	NATO Research and Development	3,973				3,973
0603791F	48	International Space Cooperative R&D	574				574
0603845F	49	Transformational SATCOM (TSAT)	835,769	(400,000)			435,769
0603845F		Program Reduction				(400,000)	
0603850F	50	Integrated Broadcast Service	15,344				15,344
0603851F	51	Intercontinental Ballistic Missile	44,672				44,672
0603854F	52	Wideband Gapfiller System RDT&E (Space)	93,858				93,858

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0603858F	53	Space-Based Radar	225,839	(125,839)			100,000
0603858F		Program Reduction				(125,839)	
0603859F	54	Pollution Prevention	2,735				2,735
0603860F	55	Joint Precision Approach and Landing Systems	11,211				11,211
0604015F	56	Next Generation Bomber	25,135				25,135
0604327F	57	Hard and Deeply Buried Target Defeat System (HDBTDS) Program		4,000			4,000
0604327F		Penetrator Study			4,000		
0604400F	58	Joint Unmanned Combat Air Systems (J-UCAS)	272,300				272,300
0604731F	59	Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle (UCAV)					
0604855F	60	Operationally Responsive Launch	23,480	15,500			38,980
0604855F		TACSAT-3/JWS-2			13,500		
0604855F		Blue MAJIC			2,000		
0604856F	61	Common Aero Vehicle (CAV)	27,394				27,394
0207423F	62	Advanced Communications Systems	969				969
0305178F	63	National Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System (NPOESS)	323,665				323,665
		TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**2,754,339**	**(501,339)**	**24,500**	**(525,839)**	**2,253,000**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION					
0603840F	64	Global Broadcast Service (GBS)	18,283				18,283
0604012F	65	Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System (JHMCS)	2,912				2,912
0604222F	66	Nuclear Weapons Support	15,154				15,154
0604226F	67	B-1B	132,496				132,496
0604233F	68	Specialized Undergraduate Flight Training	8,593				8,593
0604239F	69	F-22	76,203				76,203
0604240F	70	B-2 Advanced Technology Bomber	285,205	20,000			305,205
0604240F		B-2 Development			20,000		
0604261F	70a	Personnel Recovery System (Transfer from RDAF 137a)		113,825	113,825		113,825
0604270F	71	EW Development	82,587				82,587
0604280F	72	Joint Tactical Radio	124,225				124,225
0604287F	73	Physical Security Equipment	11,153				11,153
0604329F	74	Small Diameter Bomb (SDB)	85,988				85,988

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0604421F	75	Counterspace Systems	24,651	2,000			26,651
0604421F		Space Control Test Capabilities			2,000		
0604429F	76	Airborne Electronic Attack	120,985				120,985
0604441F	77	Space Based Infrared System (SBIRS) High EMD	756,630				756,630
0604479F	78	Milstar LDR/MDR Satellite Communications (SPACE)					
0604600F	79	Munitions Dispenser Development	21,738				21,738
0604602F	80	Armament/Ordnance Development	7,786				7,786
0604604F	81	Submunitions	5,475				5,475
0604617F	82	Agile Combat Support	10,173	3,800			13,973
0604617F		Biostatic Protective Clothing			3,800		
0604618F	83	Joint Direct Attack Munition					
0604706F	84	Life Support Systems	7,315	5,000			12,315
0604706F		Integrated Oxygen Mask and Goggle System			5,000		
0604735F	85	Combat Training Ranges	6,122				6,122
0604740F	86	Integrated Command & Control Applications (IC2A)	161	3,000			3,161
0604740F		Distributed Mission Interoperability Toolkit			3,000		
0604750F	87	Intelligence Equipment	1,369				1,369
0604754F	88	Tactical Data Link Infrastructure					
0604762F	89	Common Low Observables Verification System (CLOVerS)	8,692				8,692
0604800F	90	Joint Strike Fighter (JSF)	2,474,763				2,474,763
0604851F	91	Intercontinental Ballistic Missile	32,415				32,415
0604853F	92	Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program	26,093				26,093
0605011F	93	RDT&E for Aging Aircraft	24,384				24,384
0605807F	94	Test and Evaluation Support	50,000				50,000
0207256F	95	Joint Unmanned Combat Air System					
0207434F	96	Link-16 Support and Sustainment	157,677				157,677
0207443F	97	Family of Interoperable Operational Pictures (FIOP)	29,296				29,296
0207450F	98	Multi-Sensor C2 Aircraft (MC2A)	397,011				397,011
0207701F	99	Full Combat Mission Training	26,423				26,423
0305176F	100	Combat Survivor Evader Locator					
0401318F	101	CV-22	39,532	2,000			41,532

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0401318F		Nanocrystalline Diamond Coating			2,000		
	101a	KC-135 Tanker Replacement		99,210			99,210
		Transfer from RDAF 219			99,210		
		TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**5,071,490**	**248,835**	**248,835**		**5,320,325**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
0604256F	102	Threat Simulator Development	32,546				32,546
0604759F	103	Major T&E Investment	55,339				55,339
0605101F	104	RAND Project Air Force	28,354				28,354
0605306F	105	Ranch Hand II Epidemiology Study	4,188				4,188
0605502F	106	Small Business Innovation Research					
0605712F	107	Initial Operational Test & Evaluation	34,615				34,615
0605807F	108	Test and Evaluation Support / Eglin AFB Range	642,665				642,665
0605860F	109	Rocket Systems Launch Program (SPACE)	13,773	4,500			18,273
0605860F		Ballistic Missile Range Safety Technology			4,500		
0605864F	110	Space Test Program (STP)	48,157				48,157
0605976F	111	Facilities Restoration and Modernization - Test and Evaluation Support	60,561				60,561
0605978F	112	Facilities Sustainment - Test and Evaluation Support	26,238	2,000			28,238
0605978F		Low Profile Arresting Gear			2,000		
0305193F	113	Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO)					
0804731F	114	General Skills Training	331				331
0909900F	115	Financing for Expired Account Adjustments					
0909980F	116	AC-130U Claim					
1001004F	117	International Activities	3,739				3,739
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**950,506**	**6,500**	**6,500**		**957,006**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
0605024F	118	Anti-Tamper Technology Executive Agency	7,827				7,827
0605798F	119	Defense Technology Analysis					
0101113F	120	B-52 Squadrons	22,784				22,784
0101120F	121	Advanced Cruise Missile	1,989				1,989

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0101122F	122	Air-Launched Cruise Missile (ALCM)	2,250				2,250
0101313F	123	Strat War Planning System - USSTRATCOM	29,134				29,134
0101314F	124	Night Fist - USSTRATCOM	5,013				5,013
0101815F	125	Advanced Strategic Programs	9,875				9,875
0102326F	126	Region/Sector Operation Control Center Modernization Program	18,237				18,237
0203761F	127	Warfighter Rapid Acquisition Process (WRAP) Rapid Transition Fund	30,093				30,093
0207028F	128	Joint Expeditionary Force Experiment					
0207131F	129	A-10 Squadrons	51,835				51,835
0207133F	130	F-16 Squadrons	155,666	8,000			163,666
0207133F		F-16 AN/APG-68(V)10 AFRC			8,000		
0207134F	131	F-15E Squadrons	124,647				124,647
0207136F	132	Manned Destructive Suppression	9,394				9,394
0207138F	133	F-22 Squadrons	403,517				403,517
0207141F	134	F-117A Squadrons	13,600				13,600
0207161F	135	AIM 9 Product Improvement	15,639				15,639
0207163F	136	Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM)	33,262				33,262
0207224F	137	Combat Rescue and Recovery	113,825	(113,825)			
0207224F		Transfer to RDAF 70a				(113,825)	
0207247F	138	AF TENCAP	10,829				10,829
0207248F	139	Special Evaluation Program	276,219	43,400			319,619
0207248F		Program Increase			43,400		
0207253F	140	Compass Call	4,650				4,650
0207268F	141	Aircraft Engine Component Improvement Program	153,265				153,265
0207277F	142	Eagle Vision	1,737				1,737
0207325F	143	Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile (JASSM)	66,997				66,997
0207410F	144	Air and Space Ops Center	68,099				68,099
0207412F	145	Battle Control System	9,289				9,289
0207417F	146	Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS)	121,565				121,565
0207423F	147	Advanced Communications Systems / TACP	28,938				28,938
0207424F	148	Evaluation and Analysis Program					
0207433F	149	Advanced Program Technology	300,673				300,673

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0207438F	150	Theater Battle Management (TBM) C4I	40,472				40,472
0207445F	151	Fighter Tactical Data Link	122,160				122,160
0207446F	152	Bomber Tactical Data Link	144,863				144,863
0207448F	153	C2ISR Tactical Data Link	14,838				14,838
0207449F	154	Command and Control (C2) Constellation	41,071				41,071
0207581F	155	Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (Joint STARS)	78,084				78,084
0207590F	156	Seek Eagle	19,510				19,510
0207591F	157	Advanced Program Evaluation	290,589				290,589
0207601F	158	USAF Modeling and Simulation	30,541				30,541
0207605F	159	Wargaming and Simulation Centers	6,369				6,369
0207697F	160	Distributed Training and Exercises	4,222				4,222
0208006F	161	Mission Planning Systems	138,475				138,475
0208021F	162	Information Warfare Support	15,204				15,204
0301310F	163	National Air Intelligence Center					
0301314F	164	COBRA BALL					
0301315F	165	Missile and Space Technical Collection		5,000			5,000
0301315F		MASINT Support to DCGS			5,000		
0301324F	166	FOREST GREEN					
0301396F	167	GDIP Collection Management					
0301398F	168	Management Headquarters GDIP					
0302015F	169	E-4B National Airborne Operations Center (NAOC)	18,909				18,909
0303131F	170	Minimum Essential Emergency Communications Network (MEECN)	57,344				57,344
0303140F	171	Information Systems Security Program	109,292				109,292
0303141F	172	Global Combat Support System	20,555				20,555
0303150F	173	Global Command and Control System	3,541	11,000			14,541
0303150F		Command and Control Service Level Management			10,000		
0303150F		Applied Research in Computing Enterprise Services			1,000		
0303158F	174	Joint Command and Control Program (JC2)	5,200				5,200
0303601F	175	MILSATCOM Terminals	273,974				273,974
0304111F	176	Special Activities					
0304260F	177	Airborne SIGINT Enterprise (JMIP)	78,920				78,920

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0304311F	178	Selected Activities					
0305099F	179	Global Air Traffic Management (GATM)	7,139				7,139
0305110F	180	Satellite Control Network (SPACE)	29,143				29,143
0305111F	181	Weather Service	28,675				28,675
0305114F	182	Air Traffic Control, Approach, and Landing System (ATCALS)					
0305116F	183	Aerial Targets	6,641				6,641
0305124F	184	Special Applications Program					
0305128F	185	Security and Investigative Activities	491				491
0305142F	186	Applied Technology and Integration					
0305148F	187	Air Force Tactical Measurement and Signature Intelligence (MASINT) Systems/Pr					
0305159F	188	Defense Reconnaissance Support Activities (SPACE)					
0305160F	189	Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (SPACE)	3,908				3,908
0305164F	190	NAVSTAR Global Positioning System (User Equipment) (SPACE)	125,778	5,000			130,778
0305164F		Combat Effectiveness Tests			5,000		
0305165F	191	NAVSTAR Global Positioning System (Space and Control Segments) / OCS	188,301				188,301
0305172F	192	Combined Advanced Applications					
0305174F	193	Space Warfare Center	411				411
0305182F	194	Spacelift Range System (SPACE)	48,854				48,854
0305193F	195	Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO)	3,618				3,618
0305202F	196	Dragon U-2 (JMIP)	10,158				10,158
0305205F	197	Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicles					
0305206F	198	Airborne Reconnaissance Systems	51,769	7,000			58,769
0305206F		Project Suter			7,000		
0305207F	199	Manned Reconnaissance Systems / COBRA BALL	8,101	4,000			12,101
0305207F		EAN-105E Development			4,000		
0305208F	200	Distributed Common Ground Systems / RAS-1R	40,402	(8,000)			32,402
0305208F		Program Reduction				(8,000)	
0305219F	201	Predator UAV (JMIP)	61,007				61,007
0305220F	202	Global Hawk UAV (JMIP)	308,533				308,533
0305221F	203	Network-Centric Collaborative Target (TIARA)	8,647				8,647
0305887F	204	Electronic Combat Intelligence Support	978				978

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0305906F	205	NCMC - TW/AA System	85,222				85,222
0305910F	206	SPACETRACK (SPACE)	151,102	36,000			187,102
0305910F		Space Based Surveillance System			30,000		
0305910F		S Band Upgrade			6,000		
0305913F	207	NUDET Detection System (SPACE)	32,783				32,783
0305917F	208	Space Architect	12,878				12,878
0307141F	209	NASS, IO Technology Integration & Tool Dev	15,182				15,182
0308699F	210	Shared Early Warning (SEW)	3,295				3,295
0401115F	211	C-130 Airlift Squadron	233,028	10,000			243,028
0401115F		C-130 Weight and Balance			5,000		
0401115F		C-130 AIRCAT			5,000		
0401119F	212	C-5 Airlift Squadrons	226,479				226,479
0401130F	213	C-17 Aircraft	165,762				165,762
0401132F	214	C-130J Program	6,681				6,681
0401133F	215	Aeromedical Evacuation	2,077				2,077
0401134F	216	Large Aircraft IR Countermeasures (LAIRCM)	55,743				55,743
0401218F	217	KC-135s	1,498				1,498
0401219F	218	KC-10s	13,472				13,472
0401221F	219	KC-135 Tanker Replacement	99,210	(99,210)			
0401221F		Transfer to RDAF 101a				(99,210)	
0408011F	220	Special Tactics/Combat Control	2,156				2,156
0702207F	221	Depot Maintenance (Non-IF)	1,408				1,408
0702239F	222	Avionics Component Improvement Program					
0702806F	223	Acquisition and Management Support	3,404				3,404
0708011F	224	Industrial Preparedness	36,934	10,000			46,934
0708011F		RFID Rapid Adoption Collaboration Initiative			10,000		
0708012F	225	Logistics Support Activities					
0708026F	226	Productivity, Reliability, Availability, Maintain. Prog Ofc (PRAMPO)					
0708610F	227	Logistics Information Technology (LOGINT)	44,503				44,503
0708611F	228	Support Systems Development	10,316	5,000			15,316
0708611F		Heavy Duty Hybrid Electric Vehicle			5,000		

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0804757F	229	Joint National Training Center	2,924				2,924
0808716F	230	Other Personnel Activities	111				111
0901202F	231	Joint Personnel Recovery Agency	978				978
0901212F	232	Service-Wide Support (Not Otherwise Accounted For)					
0901218F	233	Civilian Compensation Program	7,445				7,445
0901220F	234	Personnel Administration	16,383				16,383
0901538F	235	Financial Management Information Systems Development	17,531				17,531
XXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	6,069,810				6,069,810
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**11,855,850**	**(76,635)**	**144,400**	**(221,035)**	**11,779,215**
		TOTAL. RDT&E, AIR FORCE	**22,612,351**	**(204,139)**	**542,735**	**(746,874)**	**22,408,212**

Items of Special Interest

Active feedback flow control technology

The budget request contained $96.7 million in PE 62201F for aerospace vehicle technologies, but included no funds for advancement of intelligent aerospace systems (AIAS).

AIAS focuses on the concept and development of valuable simulation tools for Air Force engineers and scientists for assessment of proposed future Air Force weapons systems. AIAS incorporates active feedback flow control (AFFC) technology for simulation and modeling tools in the evaluations of unsteady aerodynamic, turbulence, thermal and noise studies. Currently there are no universal, validated tools available for the new weapon systems development program designer interested in using AFFC concepts at the beginning stages of design. AFFC tools are highly relevant for a broad spectrum of designs and development such as on-board intelligence for maneuvering missiles/projectiles and on-board intelligence for unmanned air vehicles/micro-unmanned air vehicles utilizing neurobiological inspired computational processes.

Therefore, the committee recommends $99.7 million in PE 62201F, an increase of $3.0 million for AIAS in the development of AFFC.

Advanced engine starter/generator system prototype

The budget request contained $107.5 million in PE 62203F, aerospace propulsion, but included no funds for the development of an advanced engine starter/generator (AESG) system for future aircraft.

The committee notes that existing engine starter/generator systems on current and future designed aircraft are physically heavy and expensive to procure and sustain. The AESG contains design and technology advancements in power-electronics and high-speed-machinery. Subsequently, the AESG has the potential to provide future aircraft with a high-powered, engine starter/generator system that is 30 percent less in weight and 28 percent lower in lifecycle cost.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 62203F for development of an advanced engine starter/generator system.

Advanced spacecraft technology

The budget request contained $60.9 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology, but contained no funds for the intelligent free space optical communications node, precision navigation and position-intelligent networking technology (PINPOINT), satellite simulation toolkit (SST), or Streaker small launch vehicle (SLV).

The committee is concerned about the developmental risk of the transformational communications architecture, and notes that any laser-based satellite communications system will also require a radio-frequency (RF) capability. The committee believes additional risk-mitigation development is warranted for RF and laser-capable routers and low-cost adaptive switching.

The committee notes that as satellite technology advances, there is a greater requirement for satellites to more accurately determine

their position and attitude in absolute terms. Such accuracy will be necessary for advances in satellite flying formation and arrays of small satellites that will work cooperatively to perform mission requirements. PINPOINT fuses global positioning satellite transmissions and wideband ranging with a network communication system for precise satellite navigation.

The committee recognizes SST provides value to the acquisition and development of space systems via coherent systems engineering and virtual prototyping.

The committee notes that the Streaker SLV has the potential to provide affordable responsive launch for small satellites.

The committee recommends $72.9 million in PE 63401F, an increase of $12.0 million as follows: $4.0 million to develop an intelligent free space optical communications node, $4.0 million to develop PINPOINT, $3.0 million for SST, and $1.0 million for the Streaker SLV.

Aerospace propulsion

The budget request contained $107.5 million in PE 62203F for aerospace propulsion, but contained no funds for the Advanced Vehicle Propulsion Center.

The committee notes funding for the center will upgrade modeling and simulation tools necessary to produce the vehicle and propulsion technology efforts for future space and missile programs.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62203F, for the Advanced Propulsion Vehicle Propulsion Center.

Aerospace propulsion and power technology

The budget request contained $77.3 million in PE 63216F for aerospace propulsion and power technology, but contained no funds for solid boost power technology.

The committee believes continued investment in solid boost power technology is important to future propulsion systems.

The committee recommends $79.3 million for PE 63216F, an increase of $2.0 million for solid boost power technology.

Affordable lightweight power supply development

The budget request contained $107.5 million in PE 62203F for applied research in aerospace propulsion, including $30.1 million for aerospace power technology.

The committee notes the need of U.S. armed forces for efficient and robust power sources. Fuel cells, which are lighter than conventional batteries or generator power supplies, offer a high potential for reducing vehicle fuel consumption, the weight of the subsistence and combat load carried by individual soldiers, marines, sailors, and airmen in the field, environmental pollution, and an enemy's ability to detect combat vehicles. The committee further notes advances in technology and the potential for development of durable and cost-effective high temperature proton exchange membrane fuel cells that would address these operational requirements.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62203F for applied research in lightweight proton exchange membrane fuel cells.

Applied research in computing enterprise services program

The budget request contained $3.5 million in PE 33150F for development of global command and control systems, but included no funds for the applied research in computing enterprise services (ARCES) program.

The committee notes the ARCES program leverages existing systems using data fusion techniques to create new warfighting capabilities and to create network-aware software systems that optimize communication bandwidth. For fiscal year 2005, the committee understands that the ARCES program is researching solutions related to encoding techniques, dynamic information sharing between warfighters, and information security; and notes that the Congress appropriated an increase of $1.8 million for this purpose. For fiscal year 2006, the committee understands that the ARCES research program would improve intelligence gathering and sharing, reduce the total cost of military equipment ownership, lower the cost of developing future command and control systems, and extend the life cycle of existing legacy command and control systems.

Therefore, the committee recommends $4.5 million in PE 33150F, an increase of $1.0 million to continue the ARCES program.

Assured access to space

The committee believes that national security demands success in achieving assured access to space. The committee is interested in understanding all options for achieving assured access to space. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense in conjunction with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to evaluate and submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 28, 2006, on the viability of a shuttle-derived system or any other launch system alternative that may provide increased confidence in achieving assured access to space. The evaluation should consider at a minimum industrial base issues, mission type, launch rate, reliability, infrastructure investment, and total cost.

B–2 development

The budget request contained $285.2 million in PE 64240F for B–2 systems development, but included no funds to upgrade system processors. The B–2 is the Department of Defense's most advanced long-range strike aircraft, capable of global force projection in a highly defended target environment.

The committee understands that the B–2's existing on-board processing and memory capacity is inadequate to accommodate future upgrades, and believes that they should be improved to accommodate the following future upgrades: extremely high frequency satellite communications; improved target acquisition; precision and moving target engagement; pre- and post-strike assessment; global air traffic management; and other intelligence; surveillance and reconnaissance improvements.

Therefore, the committee recommends $305.2 million for B–2 systems development, an increase of $20.0 million to upgrade system processors, and encourages the Department of the Air Force to complete funding for this upgrade in its Future Years Defense Program.

Ballistic missile technology

The budget request contained no funds for PE 63311F for ballistic missile technology. This program element has traditionally provided funding for developing, integrating, and demonstrating advanced guidance, navigation, and control technologies for ballistic missiles, space launch vehicles, and next generation strategic systems. This program element has also traditionally funded upgrades for range safety instrumentation. The committee notes that this program element was funded at $11.6 million in fiscal year 2005 and believes that such efforts should be continued.

The committee recommends $10.0 million for PE 63311F, an increase of $10.0 million, of which $6.0 million is for guidance system development and $4.0 million is for range safety upgrades.

Biostatic protective clothing

The budget request contained $10.2 million in PE 64617F for agile combat support but included no funds for the development of biostatic protective clothing.

The committee understands that the capabilities of biostatic protective clothing include a thermally efficient wicking concept made with an extruded continuous filament yarn which has the potential for superior moisture management. The committee further understands that early biostatic protective clothing prototypes have been tested and found to resolve some shortcomings associated with clothing used by those military personnel currently deployed to combat theaters of operation.

Consequently, the committee recommends $14.0 million in PE 64617F, an increase of $3.8 million for biostatic protective clothing.

C–130 airlift squadrons

The budget request contained $233.0 million in PE 41115F for C–130 development programs, but included no funds for the real-time measurement weight and balance system or for development of the automated inspection, repair, corrosion and aircraft tracking (AIRCAT) system.

The committee understands that current C–130 weight and balance calculations are based on historical survey data, rather than on actual weights flown for each mission. Further, the committee notes that miscalculated weights were a likely factor in a recent C–130 aircraft accident and in a recent commercial passenger-carrying aircraft accident. The committee understands that a real-time measurement weight and balance system could be developed that would improve aircraft safety by measuring the actual aircraft weight and center of gravity of a C–130 aircraft, thereby improving safety and cost savings. In fiscal year 2005, the committee recommended an increase of $3.0 million and notes that $2.0 million was appropriated for this system. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to qualify a real-time weight and balance system on the C–130 aircraft.

The AIRCAT system would develop tools for collection and analysis of data for the purpose of instituting a condition-based maintenance (CBM) program on the C–130 aircraft. The committee understands CBM techniques are used in many aviation activities because they improve fleet maintenance planning and management, improve safety through a better awareness of flight worthiness,

and reduce total ownership costs. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for this purpose.

The committee recommends $243.0 million in PE 41115F, a total increase of $10.0 million.

Commercial communications bandwidth

The committee recognizes the important contribution commercial satellite communications systems provide to military operations. The need for commercial bandwidth to supplement military systems will remain a requirement into the future. As a result, the committee believes a long-term commitment to the appropriate use of commercial satellite communications capacity is in the U.S. government's best interest. The committee believes a multi-year procurement strategy with the use of annual contract options would provide sufficient commitment to industry and provide the government ample flexibility to terminate work as necessary. The committee recommends use of this alternative to procure commercial bandwidth to support military operations for those cases where it is the most efficient and effective procurement method.

Cost analysis for space acquisitions

The committee is alarmed by the number of space acquisition programs experiencing unexpected cost growth over the past decade. Virtually every major space acquisition program has experienced or sits dangerously close to a Nunn-McCurdy breach. The committee believes the Air Force may have prevented this cost growth if they had incorporated quality independent cost analysis.

The committee is troubled about the Department of the Air Force's ability to provide objective, credible, and competent cost estimates for its space acquisition process and has therefore asked the Government Accountability Office to assess the Department's cost analysis capability. The committee is concerned that this is representative of the general state of Department of Defense acquisition policy, acquisition management, the defense industrial base and related matters.

The committee notes the Department of the Air Force has neither a formal training program nor a career development program for its cost analysts, and a minimal number of cost analysts work in the Space and Missile Systems Center (SMC) program offices. The role of the financial management cost estimation organization at SMC has declined. At a strategic level, the Air Force Cost Analysis Agency has insufficient resources—funding, personnel, and data—to develop and sustain a robust cost analysis capability that will meet the demands of future Air Force space acquisition. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to take the steps necessary to address the deficiencies in the area of cost analysis.

Counter space systems

The budget request contained $24.7 million in PE 64421F for counter space systems, but contained no funds for space control test capabilities.

The committee recognizes the proposed utility that space control test capabilities could have for command and control, modeling and simulation, and testing of space control systems. However, the committee is concerned that this system is currently designed for one

specific space control program with a questionable future. The committee believes not enough planning has been performed on how this system could incorporate the space control systems currently in development.

The committee recommends $26.7 million in PE 64421F for counter space systems, an increase of $2.0 million for space control test capabilities, and directs that these additional funds be used to explore incorporating the capabilities of the Rapid Attack and Identification Detection and Reporting System and the Counter Communication System.

Defense research science

The budget request contained $223.9 million in PE 61102F for defense research science, but contained no funds for the Space Education Consortium at the Network Information and Space Security Center (NISSC).

The committee believes strongly in the development of our nation's space professionals and that towards this purpose, the partnership between academia, industry, and the government must continue to evolve. The committee recognizes that a key component of this partnership is the Space Education Consortium at the NISSC.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million in PE 61102F, for the establishment of the Space Education Consortium at the NISSC.

Distributed mission interoperability toolkit program

The budget request contained $0.2 million in PE 64740F for development of integrated command and control applications, but included no funds for the distributed mission interoperability toolkit (DMIT) program.

The DMIT is a suite of software tools that enables on-demand, trusted, interoperability among and between air mission command, control, communication, computer and intelligence (C4I) systems and mission simulator models. The committee understands that the DMIT program leverages best practices from the commercial sector including the use of open architectures, existing and emerging web standards, and state-of-the-art technologies to provide a more efficient translation of air mission tasks from C4I systems into a format compatible with mission simulator formats. Furthermore, the committee notes that Congress appropriated an increase of $5.6 million in fiscal year 2005 for this purpose.

The committee recommends $3.2 million in PE 64740F, an increase of $3.0 million for continuation of the DMIT program.

Engineering tool improvement program

The budget request contained $107.5 million in PE 62203F, aerospace propulsion, but included no funds for the engineering tool improvement program (ETIP).

The committee notes Congress has appropriated funding for the ETIP since fiscal year 2003. The ETIP improves upon existing modeling and simulation tools as well as supports the development of new modeling and simulation tools. These modeling and simulation tools address spacecraft component interactions such as solid rocket motor heat transfer, insulation performance, plume dispersion

and liquid rocket engine power balance. The ETIP will be used to develop the integrated reusable launch vehicle analysis tool that determines weight, size and performance of future two-stage-to-orbit vehicle concepts. The ETIP directly supports efforts toward land based strategic deterrents and operationally responsive spacelift.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $6.5 million in PE 62203F for the ETIP.

F–16 block 30 AN/APG–68(V)10 radar upgrade

The budget request contained $155.7 million in PE 27133F for development of new capabilities for the F–16 series aircraft, of which $47.6 million would be for development of the AN/APG–68(V)10 radar for block 50 F–16 aircraft, but included no funds for the development of the AN/APG–68(V)10 radar for integration into the Air Force Reserve Command's (AFRC) block 30 F–16 aircraft.

The AN/APG–68(V)10 radar upgrade program would provide improved performance and savings compared to the block 30 F–16's existing AN/APG–68(V)5 radar. The committee understands that the AN/APG–68(V)10's increased reliability features combined with newer, more available digital parts will significantly decrease annual operations and support costs. Additionally, the committee understands that the AN/APG–68(V)10 will provide the block 30 F–16 with high-resolution synthetic aperture radar maps that would allow the employment of precision-guided munitions in all-weather conditions.

To save annual operating costs and to provide improved radar capabilities, the committee recommends $163.7 million in PE 27133F, an increase of $8.0 million for the development and integration of the AN/APG–68(V)10 radar into the AFRC's block 30 F–16 aircraft.

Fibrous three dimensional composites for conformal load-bearing antenna structures

The budget request contained $25.1 million in PE 63211F, aerospace technology development and demonstration, but included no funds for fibrous three-dimensional composites for conformal load-bearing antenna structures (CLAS).

The committee notes that three-dimensional fibrous woven composite structures are a key enabling technology to the incorporation of CLAS on future weapons systems sensor antennas. Three-dimensional fibrous woven composite structures incorporate unitized structural design methodologies which show the potential to reduce cost, part count, joint stress concentrations, manufacturing time and weight. CLAS has the potential to provide future weapons systems used for fighter interdiction, cruise missile detection, detection and tracking of moving ground targets under trees, missile boost phase intercept support, and air traffic control for unmanned aerial vehicles with more capable sensor antennas.

Therefore, the committee recommends $29.1 million for PE 63211F, an increase of $4.0 million for three-dimensional fibrous woven composite structures for CLAS.

Fixed-installation x-ray detection system

The budget request contained $21.9 million in PE 63287F, physical security equipment, but included no funds for development of a fixed-installation x-ray detection system.

The committee notes the increasing requirement of force protection measures against all acts of future terrorism for worldwide Department of Defense personnel and installations. The committee supports advanced technological development of a fixed-installation, high energy transmission, commercial x-ray system that operates in excess of three mega-electron volts and combines Compton scattering technology with integrated radiological threat detection. This technology could result in a more effective and efficient method of detecting devices containing explosives and weapons of mass destruction. Furthermore, this system has the potential to increase expedited throughput at installation entry points while simultaneously decreasing system manpower support requirements, thereby increasing overall force protection for the warfighter.

Therefore, the committee recommends $26.9 million in PE 63287F, an increase of $5.0 million for development of a fixed-installation, high energy transmission x-ray detection system.

Global positioning system

The budget requested $87.4 million in PE 63421F for Global Positioning System (GPS).

The committee recognizes the significance of GPS to both the civil and military communities and therefore the impact from loss of this capability. The committee is concerned with the increasingly sophisticated threats against GPS. The committee believes this may warrant an earlier than planned introduction of the operational capability of GPS III.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to explore and submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 28, 2006, on the merit of truncating the planned purchases of the GPS IIF satellites and the accelerated introduction of the GPS III satellites.

Global positioning system user equipment

The budget requested $125.8 million in PE 35164F for Global Positioning System (GPS) user equipment, but contained only $5.4 million for testing of Joint GPS Combat Effectiveness (JGPSCE) through the Joint Navigation Warfare Center.

The committee recognizes the increased proliferation of jamming technology aimed at GPS and notes JGPSCE testing is designed to abate this threat. The committee believes the Department of Defense should continue to remain several steps ahead of foreign adversaries in addressing this threat.

The committee recommends $130.8 million in PE 35164F, an increase of $5.0 million for increased support of the JGPSCE tests.

High modulus polyacrylonitrile carbon fiber

The budget request contained $74.2 million in PE 62102F, materials, but included no funds for high modulus polyacrylonitrile (PAN) carbon fiber.

The committee notes that high modulus PAN carbon fiber research and development is in line with and supportive of the Air

Force's initiatives for advanced composite parts development and carbon fiber sourcing. High modulus PAN carbon fiber is in demand by composite manufacturers for the production of military aircraft, as well as components of missiles and satellites where there is a need for material stiffness at a relatively low weight. Currently only one manufacturer of high modulus PAN carbon fiber exists and is located overseas. The committee urges the Department of Defense to secure a domestic-based manufacturer of high modulus PAN carbon fiber.

Therefore, the committee recommends $79.2 million for PE 62102F, an increase of $5.0 million for the development and certification of a domestic-based manufacturer of high modulus PAN carbon fiber.

KC–135 replacement program

The budget request contained $99.2 million for the KC–135 replacement program.

In committee report (H. Rept. 108–106) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) and committee report (H. Rept. 108–491) accompanying the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), the committee expressed concern that a substantial portion of the Air Force's KC–135 air refueling tanker fleet will reach simultaneous maturity, and will require substantial investment to operate, maintain, and eventually replace this fleet. The committee notes that the average age of the KC–135 air refueling tanker fleet is 44 years, and understands that the KC–135 fleet has accumulated significantly more flying hours during the past four years to support aerial refueling missions in Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Noble Eagle. To address this concern, the committee notes that section 8132 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–287) appropriated $100.0 million in a tanker replacement transfer fund for this purpose, and further notes that the Department of the Air Force plans to begin a systems development and demonstration program to replace the KC–135 fleet in fiscal year 2006.

The committee strongly encourages the Department of the Air Force to use the appropriated funds provided in fiscal year 2005, and its authorized and appropriated funds for fiscal year 2006, to proceed apace in the KC–135 tanker replacement program during fiscal year 2006 to ensure that the United States retains a strong and sustainable aerial refueling capability.

Joint battlespace infosphere security initiative

The budget request contained $93.3 million in PE 62702F, command control and communications, but included no funds for the joint battlespace infosphere (JBI) security initiative.

The committee recognizes the potential JBI could provide to integrate data from numerous global information management sources for Joint Task Force operations relying upon the net-centric concept. JBI builds on the base of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) software which is enhanced to enable system survivability, scalability and performance demanded by the Department of Defense. Current implementation of COTS public key infrastructure,

multi-level security guards, and firewalls are not sufficient to guarantee the level of trustworthiness required with a net-centric information enterprise. In order to transition JBI functionality to the warfighter, it must be able to provide a secure, trusted information management system. Additional funding would enable software testing, validation, and submission of the JBI system for certification.

Therefore, the committee recommends $97.2 million for PE 62702F, an increase of $3.9 million for the JBI security initiative, in support of an unfunded Air Force priority.

Laser threat warning attack reporting

The budget request contained $53.4 million in PE 63500F for multi-disciplinary advanced development space technology, but contained no funds for Laser Threat Warning Attack Reporting (LTWAR) for space.

The committee believes the nation has an obligation to protect and defend its space assets. Given the potential for laser threats to those assets, the committee believes that there must be increased research and development of warning sensors that would provide notice of laser intrusion or attack.

The committee recommends $55.9 million in PE 63500F, an increase of $2.5 million for LTWAR.

Lasers for advanced manufacturing and defense applications

The budget request contained $36.7 million in PE 63112F, advanced materials for weapons systems, but included no funds for lasers for advanced manufacturing and defense applications (LAMDA).

The committee notes the potential for the LAMDA program to provide an expanded capability to meet manufacturing and materials testing requirements at the Air Force Research Laser Hardened Materials Evaluation Laboratory while simultaneously providing a mechanism for transferring defense technology to the commercial marketplace. LAMDA also demonstrates the capacity to provide new capabilities for wide-ranging national defense applications such as micro-fabrication for missile defense, rapid prototyping and repair capability for weapon systems sustainment and laser materials interaction testing for survivability of U.S. weapons systems.

Therefore, the committee recommends for PE 63112F, an increase of $4.8 million for LAMDA, in support of an unfunded Air Force priority.

Low profile arresting gear

The budget request contained $26.2 million in PE 65978F for sustained activities at Air Force test and evaluation facilities.

The committee notes that a number of airports are used by both commercial and military aircraft, and that the installation of arresting gear equipment required by military aircraft may cause interference with commercial flights. To address this problem, one initiative is the introduction of a low profile arresting system that will minimize physical interference and obstructions to commercial aircraft. The system is designed to remove runway side obstructions, meet the requirements of the Air Force's airfield obstruction

reduction initiative, increase operational safety, and reduce maintenance costs compared to the legacy arresting gear systems currently in use.

The committee recommends $28.2 million in PE 65978F, an increase of $2.0 million for test and evaluation of the low profile arresting gear.

Management of black and white space

The committee remains convinced that the integration of black (classified) and white (unclassified) space activities enhances national security. The creation of a closer relationship between the black and white space communities benefits the nation by avoiding unnecessary redundancy in systems, reducing barriers necessary to effective information sharing, leveraging the capability of both communities, and facilitating much needed communications about common issues. As such, the committee encourages continued focus on the following areas:

(1) Continued integration of black and white space programs: The committee commends the recent decision by the Secretary of Defense and the Director, Central Intelligence to produce a single system for the military and intelligence communities in the Space Radar Program and encourages the two organizations to seek additional opportunities for joint research and development, information sharing, and program management;

(2) Requirements: In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), Congress required the Department of Defense (DOD) to develop a space science and technology (S&T) strategy to set goals and a process for achieving those goals. In a report to Congress entitled "New Department of Defense Space Science and Technology Strategy Provides Basis for Optimizing Investments, but Future Versions Need to be More Robust," the Government Accountability Office found that DOD's plan should contain stronger links to DOD's requirements generating processes, identifying additional measures for assessing progress in achieving strategic goals, and explicitly covering all efforts related to space S&T. The committee believes it is necessary to ensure there are mechanisms in place to develop such links within and between black and white space. The committee believes this includes both partnership and coordination of funding of space S&T efforts;

(3) Space Control: Given the military's reliance on space systems, it is imperative to develop a plan to protect and defend our space assets, but one that does not limit our ability to operate in space as required. The committee encourages cooperation between black and white space systems development to ensure all appropriate measures are taken to ensure data integrity and hardware survivability. The committee expects the Administration will consider the policy implications of its space control plans and begin a necessary and continued dialogue with Congress;

(4) Systems Architecture and Horizontal Integration: The committee believes there is significant value in the development of a community-wide architecture for a horizontal integration of intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, and com-

munications systems. The fate of recent classified and unclassified programs in this area suggests that much more work must be performed before achieving program stability; and

(5) Space Acquisitions: The national security space acquisition performance over the past decade has been unacceptable. Both classified and unclassified space programs have suffered unrealistic baselines, idealistic cost estimates, inadequate technology development before systems design, and insufficient government systems engineering oversight and expertise. Despite suggestions that reforms have been enacted to address the inadequacies of the acquisition system, the committee remains unconvinced that sufficient progress has been achieved. Management structures and processes must be put into place to address these problems and return the national security space acquisitions culture to one that pursues visionary perspectives and achieves success in high risk endeavors.

Manned reconnaissance systems

The budget request contained $8.1 million in PE 35207F for Manned Reconnaissance Systems.

The committee notes the potential of the EAN–105E phased array SIGINT antenna to significantly enhance mission performance of the Rivet Joint aircraft.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 35207F to complete range and flight testing of this antenna on the RC–135 test-bed aircraft.

Maui space surveillance system

The budget request contained $5.8 million in PE 63444F for the Maui space surveillance system, but included no funding for the High Accuracy Network Determination System (HANDS).

The committee recognizes that the HANDS capability would reduce the potential for collisions of space assets by reducing errors in the current space-object maintenance catalog.

The committee recommends $10.8 million in PE 63444F, an increase of $5.0 million for HANDS.

Metals affordability

The budget request included $36.7 million in PE 63112F for advanced materials for weapon systems.

The committee supports the continued government-industry collaboration provided through the Metals Affordability Initiative, providing significant improvements in the manufacturing of specialty metals for aerospace applications for the private and government sectors of the aerospace industry.

The committee recommends an additional $14.0 million in PE 63112F for the Metals Affordability Initiative.

Miniaturized targeting sensor development

The budget request contained $93.3 million in PE 62204F for electro-optical sensor and related development but contained no funding specifically for a compact, ultra-sensitive optical receiver to improve smart and loitering stand-off weapons targeting.

The committee strongly supports efforts to develop improved sensors with gains in size, weight, power-consumption requirements,

and capability. The committee recognizes the potential battlefield applications facilitated by developing more intelligent and precise sensors, particularly as they may be utilized in unmanned systems. The committee supports further development of opto-electronic technologies with the aim of producing smaller, lighter, and less costly capabilities.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62204F specifically to develop a compact ultra-sensitive optical receiver to improve smart and loitering stand-off weapons targeting.

Missile and space technical collection

The committee is aware of the work the National Air and Space Intelligence Center (NASIC) is conducting in the MASINT field and its value to the warfighter at the strategic, operational, and tactical intelligence levels.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for NASIC to develop a capability that would facilitate the use of data collected by airborne platforms and sensors for MASINT applications.

Multi-disciplinary space technology

The budget request contained $81.3 million in PE 62500F for multi-disciplinary space technology, but contained no funds for development of upper stage engine technology.

The committee believes access to space is a national security issue and notes that investment in upper stage engine technology would advance liquid rocket technology for that purpose.

The committee recommends $87.3 million in PE 62500F, an increase of $6.0 million for upper stage engine technology.

Nanocrystalline diamond coating

The budget request contained $39.5 million in PE 41318F for CV–22 development, but included no funds for nanocrystalline room temperature diamond coating. The CV–22 is a Special Operations Forces (SOF) variant of the V–22 vertical lift, multi-mission tiltrotor aircraft and will provide a capability to insert, extract, and re-supply special operation forces into politically or militarily denied areas.

The committee understands that nanocrystalline room temperature diamond coating technology has been developed with characteristics that offer promise for significantly improved anti-icing protection on aircraft surfaces such as the radome on the CV–22 aircraft. The committee further understands that this coating material has applications for protection against surface erosion caused by sand and other abrasive materials encountered in potential CV–22 operating locations, and that application of nanocrystalline room temperature diamond coating technology may result in future savings by reducing costs for replacement of expensive aircraft components and surfaces.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $41.5 million in PE 41318F, an increase of $2.0 million for development of the nanocrystalline room temperature diamond coating technology.

Operationally responsive launch

The budget request contains $23.5 million in PE 64855F for operationally responsive launch, but contained no funds to accelerate the TACSAT–3/Joint Warfighting Space-2 (JWS–2) demonstration or for Blue MAJIC.

The committee believes the TACSAT–3/JWS–2 demonstration would provide three significant opportunities. First, it would move the Department of Defense closer to providing rapid augmentation and reconstitution of space capabilities. Second, the demonstration would assess the potential capability of on-orbit assets dedicated to operational and tactical commanders. And third, the demonstration would allow the Department to analyze the ability of small satellites to provide niche capabilities as well as complement and supplement larger satellites.

The committee understands the importance of blue force tracking in the effort to reduce fratricide and increase force protection. The committee recognizes Blue MAJIC will provide the field commander a significant tool to improve blue force tracking. The committee also realizes that Blue MAJIC will pursue a strategy that furthers the employment of responsive launch and integrates current technology into operations.

The committee recommends $39.0 million in PE 64855F for operationally responsive launch, an increase of $13.5 million for the TACSAT–3/JWS–2 demonstration and $2.0 million for Blue MAJIC.

Penetrator study

The committee understands that Hard and Deeply Buried Targets (HDBTs) pose a threat to national security and that currently, the Department of Defense does not have the capability to hold many of these targets at risk. The committee further understands that the Commander, United States Strategic Command has a need to conduct sled tests that would evaluate the feasibility of various options for penetrator weapons that could be used against HDBTs.

The committee authorizes $4.0 million in PE 64327F for a penetrator test that would evaluate the feasibility of various options for different types of penetrators that could hold HDBTs at risk. The committee intends that this study be completed by the end of fiscal year 2006. Should additional funds above the $4.0 million be required for this study, the Secretary of Defense should submit a reprogramming request to the congressional defense committees.

Project Suter

The budget request contained $1.0 million in PE 35206F for the development of Advanced Technology and Sensors.

The committee is supportive of Project Suter, which experiments with concepts, systems, tactics, techniques, and procedures that enable warfighters to access and utilize comprehensive, dynamic information superiority operations against conventional and asymmetric threat targets. The committee notes that the Joint Expeditionary Force Experiment 2004 demonstrated some of Project Suter's capabilities which provided real-time defeat of enemy command and control, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance,

and other weapon capabilities by leveraging existing Department of Defense information technology systems.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 35206F, for the research and development of Project Suter.

Quick-donning oxygen mask

The budget request contained $7.3 million in PE 64706F for development of life support systems, but included no funds for an integrated oxygen mask and goggle system.

The committee notes that current Air Mobility Command (AMC) procedures for smoke in the cockpit require pilots to don both an oxygen mask and a separate anti-smoke goggle to provide respiratory and ocular protection. However, the committee understands that the existing anti-smoke goggles were never designed to integrate with the oxygen mask's suspension assembly and that, in an emergency, the anti-smoke goggles would be donned after donning the oxygen mask resulting in a situation where the pilot would not have ocular protection until the separate anti-smoke goggles were in place. As a result of this situation, the committee understands that development of an integrated oxygen mask and goggle systems is AMC's number one initiative on its life support item development list.

Consequently, the committee recommends $12.3 million in PE 64706F, an increase of $5.0 million, for development on an integrated oxygen mask and goggle system.

Radio frequency identification rapid adoption collaboration initiative

The budget request contained $36.9 million in PE 78011F for manufacturing technology development.

The committee notes the development and application of radio frequency identification (RFID) for monitoring the inventory and shipment of cargo and parts. Similar in principle to the use of optical bar coding, radio frequency identification permits stand-off monitoring of the progress of a coded item through a supply chain. The committee notes proposals for implementing RFID in Department of Defense production and supply chains that could result in significant improvements in inventory management and cost savings in the operation of the enterprise supply chain. One such proposal would develop a methodical adoption process for using RFID technology by small and medium enterprise suppliers within DOD supply chain and develop an electronically coordinated lean manufacturing toolkit for their use.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 78011F for the establishment of a collaborative initiative for a pilot program to demonstrate the potential for rapid adoption of RFID technology in defense enterprise supply chains.

Rocket systems launch program

The budget request contained $13.8 million in PE 68560F for the rocket systems launch program, but contained no funds for the ballistic missile range safety technology system (BMRST).

The committee places a high priority on a responsive launch capability and believes BMRST may play a promising role in fielding that capability.

The committee recommends $18.3 million in PE 68560F, an increase of $4.5 million to explore the application of BMRST in the development of a responsive launch capability.

Satellite threat evaluation environment development

The budget request contained $79.4 million in PE 62202F for human effectiveness applied research, but contained no funds for Satellite Threat Evaluation Environment Development (STEED).

The committee recognizes STEED would determine threats against space-based assets, quantify those threats, determine threat capabilities and locations, and aid decision-makers in preparing adequate defensive counterspace responses to those threats

The committee recommends $80.9 million in PE 62202F, an increase of $1.5 million for STEED.

Single integrated space picture

The budget request contained $85.2 million in PE 35906F for the development of the Single Integrated Space Picture (SISP) program.

The committee notes that SISP seeks to provide situational awareness of space capabilities, threats and operations. The program's objectives are to provide a common operational picture of space to include surveillance, warning, communications, data relay, and navigation between various forces. The committee believes these goals are important to the development of a true common operational picture. However, the committee does not believe SISP should be developed in a vacuum or to serve a service-specific requirement. The committee believes that in order to have a true common operational picture, commanders must be able to see air, ground, space, and maritime assets to make combat decisions.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to refer to the Single Integrated Air Picture report language elsewhere in this report.

Space based infra-red system high

The budget request contained $756.6 million in PE 64441F for the Space Based Infra-Red System High (SBIRS) program.

The committee has expressed repeated concern regarding the continued cost increases, schedule delays, and technical problems associated with the program. The committee maintains strong support of a next generation early warning capability and of the SBIRS program. However, should the program continue to exceed the cost and schedule benchmarks set after the establishment of another new baseline for SBIRS and its associated cost estimates, the committee may be forced to find an alternative to the SBIRS program.

The committee recognizes the Department of the Air Force is currently performing an independent program assessment reviewing the technical and cost baselines of the SBIRS program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review and certify the final results of the assessment and submit a copy of the certified

assessment to the congressional defense committees and congressional intelligence committees within 30 days after its completion.

Space cadre

The committee commends the efforts in coordination and development of a space cadre over the last year by each of the services and the National Security Space Office. The committee recognizes the remarkable progress made; however, the committee continues to see some measure of resistance and a lack of consistent vision for the space cadre.

The committee firmly believes the success of our nation's future activities in space, and the quality of our national security, depends on the professional development and sustainment of a qualified space cadre. This requires changes to training, education, personnel systems, assignment processes, and promotion criteria, for example. The committee believes that this enterprise demands nothing short of a culture change across the Department of Defense and in particular within the Air Force. The committee believes it is important that this cultural change take root in the Air Force in a deeper and more visible manner than the other services. The corporate Air Force leadership must embrace this change.

Given past performance, the committee believes that as the developer and acquisition agent of space systems designed to satisfy the needs of all services, the Air Force must focus more of its space cadre efforts specifically on acquisitions. The importance of the skills required by competent teams to build and acquire space systems cannot be underestimated. These skills must be developed and rewarded at all levels of the Air Force, but most importantly, at senior levels of leadership. Critical acquisition positions must be filled with experienced personnel to satisfy the demands of these important positions. The committee recommends the Department of the Air Force focus portions of its space cadre effort on the acquisition workforce and in the context of the requirements and intent of the Defense Acquisitions Workforce Improvement Act (Public Law 101–510) for the purpose of improving space acquisition performance.

Space radar

The budget request contained $225.8 million in PE 63858F for space radar.

In an attempt to address the technical and affordability concerns of Congress, the Air Force has proposed the development of a quarter-scale space radar demonstration. The committee applauds and encourages the refreshing thinking within the Air Force that conceived of a subscale demonstration option as a part of the space radar acquisition strategy. The application of this type of solution to other space programs in the future may validate the program and prevent many of the problems that plague space systems acquisition.

The intelligence community and warfighters have asked for a radar capability and have little concern about which platform collects the data. The committee believes that the future success and stability of the space radar program rests in the demonstration of a national radar capability in which a space demonstration is a component integrated with air and ground components.

The first step towards producing a successful and stable program is the development of a comprehensive demonstration program that will provide an opportunity to assess the utility versus the cost of a space radar system in the context of a broader radar capability. The committee understands the keys to producing an affordable and effective space radar solution will be the integration of airborne and space radar assets and the development of a robust and highly advanced ground exploitation system. The demonstration program must fully incorporate these components of an integrated radar capability. To date, neither component has received sufficient emphasis or investment. The committee supports the demonstration of a greater capability of these components in the context of space assets using existing classified and unclassified data sources and believes a demonstration of this capability should be conducted prior to investment in a new space system or significant development of the proposed space demonstration.

The committee is convinced that the Air Force is still in the planning process and has not yet fully considered the requirements for the described demonstration program. The committee does not believe the Air Force has sufficiently emphasized affordability as a key objective, and encourages the Air Force to reassess the range of technical options available to provide increased utility to both the intelligence and warfighter communities.

The committee recommends $100.0 million in PE 63858F, a reduction of $125.8 million for the space radar program. The committee directs program funds be invested in the demonstration of the following:

(1) Ground exploitation capability;

(2) Horizontal integration;

(3) Continued radar technology maturation;

(4) New technology breakthroughs that will lower the payload weight and cost.

The committee recommends the Air Force thoroughly plan a demonstration program maximizing the use of ground, airborne, and existing space assets before committing to the new development of a subscale spacecraft. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency and the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office, to develop and submit a report to the congressional defense committees and congressional intelligence committees by February 1, 2006, with a detailed five-year (fiscal years 2006 through 2010) radar demonstration program plan that will incorporate the above direction and focus on risk reduction, modeling and simulation, ground and air demonstrations and tests, and the use of all planned or existing space assets. The program plan should include an option for the launch of a space demonstration no earlier than fiscal year 2009 and should provide annual technical and cost milestones that if met will provide confidence in a technically feasible and affordable development plan for space radar. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to perform a detailed national utility study, develop a joint concept of operations for a future horizontally integrated radar capability, and submit a report to the congressional defense committees and congressional intelligence commit-

tees by February 28, 2006, on the utility study and the concept of operations.

Space situational awareness

The budget request contained $151.1 million in PE 35910F for Spacetrack, but contained no funds to accelerate the space based surveillance system or the upgrade to the Air Force Space Surveillance System.

The committee believes that our space assets remain vulnerable and that the nation has the responsibility to protect and defend these assets from any threat. The foundation of any credible policy regarding protection and defense of U.S. space assets is a comprehensive space situational awareness system. The committee is concerned that the development of a comprehensive space situational awareness system is moving forward too slowly and without a coherent strategy or vision.

The committee recommends $187.1 million in PE 35910F for Spacetrack, an increase of $30.0 million for the acceleration of the space based surveillance system and $6.0 million to accelerate the S-band upgrade to the Air Force Space Surveillance System.

Space technology

The budget request contained $84.5 million in PE 62601F for space technology, but contained no funds for elastic memory composites or for polyimide macro electromechanical systems (PMEMS) for space.

The committee notes space-qualified elastic memory composite materials can significantly improve the reliability of on-orbit spacecraft deployment mechanisms and may enable collapsible, lower-weight composite tank structures.

The committee is concerned by affordability issues of a radar system in space and is interested in pursuing breakthrough technology that may provide low cost, high payoff solutions for the future. The committee sees promise in the ability of PMEMS to reduce power aperture requirements to levels that permit dramatic reductions in the size, weight, cooling and power consumption of a space radar system and therefore total system size and cost.

The committee recommends $93.5 million for PE 62601F, an increase of $4.0 million for elastic memory composites and $5.0 million for PMEMS.

Transformational satellite communications system

The budget request contained $835.8 million in PE 63845F for the transformational satellite communications systems (TSAT).

The committee recognizes the necessity of the capability that TSAT would provide for the warfighter. The development and deployment of this technology would transform military communications and enable additional military capabilities.

The committee understands that before the capability of TSAT or a similar system can be fielded, the space acquisition community must succeed in no less than eight high-risk technical areas.

The committee notes space acquisition has been characterized with repeated cost overruns, schedule delays, and reduction of expected capability. The Government Accountability Office and the Defense Science Board's Young panel have highlighted the systemic

problems leading to multiple acquisition failures and provided recommendations to correct the causes. These problems include reliance on immature technology, overdependence on the contractor for program management, and a lack of government systems engineering and cost analysis expertise.

In an effort to achieve transformation, the Air Force has continued to initiate programs that are technologically revolutionary. The committee commends the Department of the Air Force on its vision for the solutions of the future and its desire to embrace risk, but is not confident the current acquisition system can accommodate the risk associated with leaps to revolutionary technology.

Acquisition and management practices, as well as industry standards and quality control must be vastly improved and, in some cases, rebuilt before the country can endeavor to achieve the transformation planned in the current budget. Today's critical transformation opportunities exist in finding new ways for the acquisition community to do business and address the fundamental need for change. Once the systemic shortfalls are addressed, the Department should once again push the envelope on technology and risk for its military space systems. Until then, and to address those shortfalls, the committee recommends an evolutionary versus revolutionary approach. The committee remains convinced, given the current state of acquisition, that this approach will provide more capability to the warfighter sooner and do so in a more cost effective manner.

The committee believes, given current acquisition schedules, that funding for evolving Wideband Gapfiller System and Advanced Extremely High Frequency capabilities will not be required until fiscal year 2007. As such, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct an independent analysis of alternatives as described in Section 912 of this Act.

The committee recommends $435.8 million in PE 63845F, a reduction of $400.0 million for TSAT. The committee directs the Department to shift the focus of the TSAT program in fiscal year 2006 from award of an acquisition contract to continued development and risk reduction of the critical technologies that will allow the deployment of this capability to the warfighter. These technologies should include development of internet protocol, a router in space, and laser communications. The committee urges the Department of Defense to consider a more prudent balance between technical risk and providing increased capability to the warfighter during the Quadrennial Defense Review and the fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2008 budget submissions.

Warfighter pocket computer development

The budget request contained $29.8 million in PE 63231F, crew systems and personnel protection technology, but included no funds for the warfighter pocket computer development.

The committee notes the potential combat capability the warfighter pocket computer could bring to the Battlefield Air Operations (BAO) kit. The BAO kit is an integrated terminal attack control capability that enables special operations forces battlefield airmen to find, track, target and control friendly aircraft, as well as other weapons assets, and then provide follow-on target damage assessment. The effort to develop a rugged, sub-notebook sized

computer to assist in these combat duties could greatly enhance the development and capability of the BAO kit's battlefield air targeting man-aided knowledge improvement effort.

Therefore, the committee recommends $33.3 million for PE 63231F, an increase of $3.5 million for warfighter pocket computer development.

DEFENSE-WIDE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Overview

The budget request contained $18.8 billion for Defense-wide research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E).

The committee recommends $19.1 billion, an increase of $289.4 million to the budget request.

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DEFENSEWIDE					
		BASIC RESEARCH					
0601101E	1	Defense Research Sciences	130,090				130,090
0601111D8Z	2	Government/Industry Cosponsorship of University Research					
0601114D8Z	3	Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research	9,164				9,164
0601120D8Z	4	National Defense Education Program	10,282				10,282
0601384BP	5	Chemical and Biological Defense Program	72,533	10,000			82,533
0601384BP		Chemical/Biological Defense Basic Research Initiative			10,000		
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**222,069**	**10,000**	**10,000**		**232,069**
		APPLIED RESEARCH					
0602000D8Z	6	Insensitive Munitions-Exploratory Development	5,176				5,176
0602227D8Z	7	Medical Free Electron Laser	9,845	10,000			19,845
062227D8Z		Medical Free Electron Laser			10,000		
0602228D8Z	8	Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) Science	13,887				13,887
0602234D8Z	9	Lincoln Laboratory Research Program	29,914				29,914
0602301E	10	Computing Systems and Communications Technology					
0602302E	11	Embedded Software and Pervasive Computing					
0602303E	12	Information & Communications Technology	198,831				198,831
0602304E	13	Cognitive Computing Systems	200,799				200,799
0602383E	14	Biological Warfare Defense	145,354	4,000			149,354
0602383E		Multivalent Asymmetric Protocols for Biological Defense			4,000		
0602384BP	15	Chemical and Biological Defense Program	187,787	20,000			207,787
0602384BP		Chemical/Biological Defense Applied Research Initiative			20,000		
0602702E	16	Tactical Technology	361,562				361,562
0602712E	17	Materials and Electronics Technology					
0602715E	18	Materials and Biology Technology	294,188				294,188
0602716BR	19	WMD Defeat Technology	206,487				206,487
0602716E	20	Electronics Technology	241,736	1,400			243,136
0602716E		Scalable Active Memory Processing Engines			1,400		
0602717BR	21	WMD Defense Technologies	106,708				106,708

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0602787D8Z	22	Medical Technology					
1160401BB	23	Special Operations Technology Development	13,595	10,000			23,595
1160401BB		ANGLEFIRE for Full Spectrum Close-In Layered Shield			10,000		
1160407BB	24	SOF Medical Technology Development	2,215				2,215
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**2,018,084**	**45,400**	**45,400**		**2,063,484**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT					
0603002D8Z	25	Medical Advanced Technology					
0603121D8Z	26	SO/LIC Advanced Development	34,529				34,529
0603122D8Z	27	Combating Terrorism Technology Support	55,301	32,000			87,301
0603122D8Z		Program Increase			25,000		
0603122D8Z		Portable Armor Wall System			3,000		
0603122D8Z		Large Vehicle Inspection Using Magnetic Quadrupole Resonance			4,000		
0603160BR	28	Counterproliferation Advanced Development Technologies	96,143				96,143
0603175C	29	Ballistic Missile Defense Technology	136,241	(5,000)			131,241
0603175C		Program Reduction				(16,800)	
0603175C		Aluminum Nitride Wide Bandgap Devices			4,000		
0603175C		Conceptual Study Alternative Boost Phase Defense			7,800		
0603225D8Z	30	Joint DoD-DoE Munitions Technology Development	25,102				25,102
0603285E	31	Advanced Aerospace Systems					
0603286E	32	Advanced Aerospace Systems	75,866				75,866
0603287E	33	Space Programs and Technology	223,811				223,811
0603384BP	34	Chemical and Biological Defense Program	164,481	15,000			179,481
0603384BP		Chemical/Biological Defense Development Initiative			15,000		
0603400D8Z	35	J-UCAS					
0603618D8Z	35a	MANPADS Defense Program (Transfer from RDDW 89)		6,000	6,000		6,000
0603648D8Z	36	Joint Capability Technology Demonstrations (L-83)	35,000				35,000
0603704D8Z	37	Special Technical Support					
0603711BR	38	Arms Control Technology					
0603712S	39	Generic Logistics R&D Technology Demonstrations	22,360	2,000			24,360
0603712S		Connectory for Rapid Identification of Advanced Technology			2,000		

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0603712S	39a	Generic Logistics R&D Technology Demonstrations		4,800			4,800
0603712S		Emerging/Critical Interconnection Technology			4,800		
0603713S	40	Distribution Process Owner Technology Development and Implementation	10,000				10,000
0603716D8Z	41	Strategic Environmental Research Program	64,101				64,101
0603727D8Z	42	Joint Warfighting Program	10,205				10,205
0603739E	43	Advanced Electronics Technologies	214,378				214,378
0603750D8Z	44	Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations	163,649	10,000			173,649
0603750D8Z		Event Management Visualization and Data Analysis			1,000		
0603750D8Z		SPIKE Missile Development and Production			9,000		
0603755D8Z	45	High Performance Computing Modernization Program	189,747	7,100			196,847
0603755D8Z		Army Space and Missile Defense Simulation Upgrade			7,100		
0603760E	46	Command, Control and Communications Systems	216,408				216,408
0603762E	47	Sensor and Guidance Technology (DW 48a&b)					
0603763E	48	Marine Technology					
0603764E	49	Land Warfare Technology / FCS	139,100				139,100
0603765E	50	Classified DARPA Programs	162,534				162,534
0603766E	51	Network-Centric Warfare Technology	136,899				136,899
0603767E	52	Sensor Technology	189,452				189,452
0603768E	53	Guidance Technology	103,272				103,272
0603769DSE	54	Distributed Learning Advanced Technology Development	14,689				14,689
0603781D8Z	55	Software Engineering Institute	25,209				25,209
0603805S	56	Dual Use Application Programs					
0603826D8Z	57	Quick Reaction Special Projects/Challenge Program (IFF)	110,717				110,717
0603832D8Z	58	Joint Wargaming Simulation Management Office	34,928				34,928
0603941D8Z	59	Test & Evaluation Science & Technology	28,614				28,614
0603942D8Z	60	Technology Link	3,435				3,435
0605160D8Z	61	Counterproliferation Support					
1160402BB	62	Special Operations Advanced Technology Development	104,315	(16,500)			87,815
1160402BB		Surveillance Augmentation Vehicle-Insertable on Request			3,500		
1160402BB		Advanced Tactical Laser Program				(20,000)	
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**2,790,486**	**55,400**	**92,200**	**(36,800)**	**2,845,886**

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES					
0603228D8Z	63	Physical Security Equipment					
0603527D8Z	64	RETRACT LARCH	6,683				6,683
0603709D8Z	65	Joint Robotics Program	11,755				11,755
0603714D8Z	66	Advanced Sensor Applications Program	18,275				18,275
0603851D8Z	67	Environmental Security Technical Certification Program	30,632				30,632
0603879C	68	Advanced Concepts, Evaluations And Systems					
0603881C	69	Ballistic Missile Defense Terminal Defense Segment	1,143,610	25,000			1,168,610
0603881C		THAAD			25,000		
0603882C	70	Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Defense Segment	3,266,196	170,000			3,436,196
0603882C		Test Resources			50,000		
0603882C		Additional Flight Test			100,000		
0603882C		Program Reduction Block 2008 Interceptors 36-40				(25,000)	
0603882C		Ballistic Missile Defense Signal Processor			25,000		
0603882C		Throttleable Control System			10,000		
0603882C		Two Color Seeker			10,000		
0603883C	71	Ballistic Missile Defense Boost Defense Segment	483,863				483,863
0603884BP	72	Chemical and Biological Defense Program	100,796	25,000			125,796
0603884BP		Chemical/Biological Defense Program Development Initiative			25,000		
0603884C	73	Ballistic Missile Defense Sensors	529,829				529,829
0603886C	74	Ballistic Missile Defense System Interceptor	229,658				229,658
0603888C	75	Ballistic Missile Defense Test & Targets	617,456				617,456
0603889C	76	Ballistic Missile Defense Products	455,152	(50,000)			405,152
0603889C		Program Reduction Block 2008 C2BMC				(30,000)	
0603889C		Program Reduction Hercules Block 2010				(5,000)	
0603889C		Program Reduction Joint Warfighter Support Block 2008				(15,000)	
0603890C	77	Ballistic Missile Defense Systems Core	447,006	(40,000)			407,006
0603890C		Program Reduction				(40,000)	
0603891C	78	Special Programs - MDA	349,522				349,522
0603920D8Z	79	Humanitarian Demining	14,305				14,305

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0603923D8Z	80	Coalition Warfare	5,777				5,777
0604016D8Z	81	Department of Defense Corrosion Program	5,141				5,141
0604400D8Z	82	J-UCAS					
0604648D8Z	83	Joint Capability Technology Demonstrations (L-36)	3,000				3,000
0604722D8Z	84	Joint Service Education and Training Systems Development					
0605017D8Z	85	Reduction Of Total Ownership Cost	24,824				24,824
0303191D8Z	86	Joint Electromagnetic Technology (JET) Program	3,566				3,566
		TOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**7,747,046**	**130,000**	**245,000**	**(115,000)**	**7,877,046**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION					
0604051D8Z	87	Defense Acquisition Challenge Program (DACP)	28,975				28,975
0604384BP	88	Chemical and Biological Defense Program	280,908				280,908
0604618D8Z	89	MANPADS Defense Program	13,349	(13,349)			
0604618D8Z		Program Reduction				(7,349)	
0604618D8Z		Transfer to RDDW 35a				(6,000)	
0604709D8Z	90	Joint Robotics Program	13,745				13,745
0604764K	91	Advanced IT Services Joint Program Office (AITS-JPO)	9,325				9,325
0604771D8Z	92	Joint Tactical Information Distribution System (JTIDS)	11,075				11,075
0605013BL	93	Information Technology Development	19,574	(10,400)			9,174
0605013BL		Program Reduction				(10,400)	
0605015BL	94	Information Technology Development-Standard Procurement System	5,074				5,074
0605016D8Z	95	Financial Management System Improvements	75,987	(39,000)			36,987
0605016D8Z		Program Reduction				(39,000)	
0605018DSE	96	Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System (DIMHRS)	20,322	(10,000)			10,322
0605018DSE		Program Reduction				(10,000)	
0605019D8Z	97	Acquisition Domain	3,600	(1,500)			2,100
0605019D8Z		Program Reduction				(1,500)	
0605140D8Z	98	Trusted Foundry	31,655				31,655
0605648D8Z	99	Defense Acquisition Executive (DAE) Pilot Program	1,000				1,000
0303129K	100	Defense Message System	13,367	(13,367)			
0303129K		Program Reduction				(13,367)	

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0303140K	101	Information Systems Security Program		3,000			3,000
0303140G		Intelligence Analyst Education and Training			3,000		
0303141K	102	Global Combat Support System	17,952				17,952
0303158K	103	Joint Command and Control Program (JC2)	14,580				14,580
0305840K	104	Electronic Commerce	6,698				6,698
0305840S	105	Electronic Commerce					
0901200D8Z	106	BMMP Domain Management and Systems Integration	11,802	(4,500)			7,302
0901200D8Z		Program Reduction				(4,500)	
		TOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**578,988**	**(89,116)**	**3,000**	**(92,116)**	**489,872**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
0603704D8Z	107	Special Technical Support	19,916				19,916
0603757D8Z	108	Training Transformation (T2)					
0603835D8Z	109	Transformation Initiatives Program	10,152				10,152
0603858D8Z	110	Unexploded Ordnance Detection and Clearance					
0604140D8Z	111	Capital Asset Management System-Military Equipment	4,812				4,812
0604774D8Z	112	Defense Readiness Reporting System (DRRS)	13,475				13,475
0604875D8Z	113	Joint Systems Architecture Development	9,254				9,254
0604940D8Z	114	Central Test and Evaluation Investment Development (CTEIP)	128,759				128,759
0604943D8Z	115	Thermal Vicar	7,278				7,278
0605104D8Z	116	Technical Studies, Support and Analysis	31,075	1,000			32,075
0605104D8Z		National Defense University Technology Pilot Program			1,000		
0605110BR	117	Critical Technology Support					
0605110D8Z	118	USD (A&T) –Critical Technology Support	1,999				1,999
0605114D8Z	119	BLACK LIGHT					
0605116D8Z	120	General Support to C3I					
0605117D8Z	121	Foreign Material Acquisition and Exploitation	36,895				36,895
0605123D8Z	122	Interagency Export License Automation					
0605124D8Z	123	Defense Travel System	20,441				20,441
0605126J	124	Joint Theater Air and Missile Defense Organization	81,504				81,504
0605128D8Z	125	Classified Program USD(P)					

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0605130D8Z	126	Foreign Comparative Testing	35,738	575			36,313
0605130D8Z		Weather Scout UAV			575		
0605161D8Z	127	Nuclear Matter	12,442				12,442
0605170D8Z	128	Support to Networks and Information Integration	10,706				10,706
0605200D8Z	129	General Support to USD (Intelligence)	5,282				5,282
0605384BP	130	Chemical and Biological Defense Program	81,425				81,425
0605502BR	131	Small Business Innovation Research					
0605502C	132	Small Business Innovative Research					
0605502D8Z	133	Small Business Innovative Research					
0605502E	134	Small Business Innovative Research					
0605710D8Z	135	Classified Programs - C3I					
0605790D8Z	136	Small Business Innovation Research	1,983				1,983
0605798S	137	Defense Technology Analysis	5,393				5,393
0605799D8Z	138	Force Transformation	19,927	80,000			99,927
0605799D8Z		Full Spectrum Effects Platform, Project Sheriff			10,000		
0605799D8Z		Common Bus Development			20,000		
0605799D8Z		Small Payloads			50,000		
0605801K	139	Defense Technical Information Services (DTIC)					
0605801KA	140	Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC)	49,969	(7,600)			42,369
0605801KA		Program Reduction				(7,600)	
0605803SE	141	R&D in Support of DoD Enlistment, Testing and Evaluation	8,853				8,853
0605804D8Z	142	Development Test and Evaluation	8,873				8,873
0605898E	143	Management Headquarters (Research and Development) DARPA	49,472				49,472
0301555G	144	CLASSIFIED Programs					
0301556G	145	SPECIAL PROGRAM					
0303169D8Z	146	Information Technology Rapid Acquisition	5,580	(5,580)			
0303169D8Z		Program Reduction				(5,580)	
0305193D8Z	147	Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO)	13,940				13,940
0305193G	148	Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO)					
0901585C	149	Pentagon Reservation	17,386				17,386
0901598C	150	Management Headquarters - MDA	99,327				99,327

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0901598D8W	151	IT Software Dev Initiatives	1,694				1,694
XXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	15,245	5,000			20,245
XXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs (MASINT)			5,000		
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**808,795**	**73,395**	**86,575**	**(13,180)**	**882,190**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
0604130V	152	Defense Information Systems for Security (DISS)	16,850				16,850
0605127T	153	Partnership for Peace (PfP) Information Management System	5,660				5,660
0607384BP	154	Chemical and Biological Defense	10,093				10,093
0208043J	155	Classified Programs	1,570				1,570
0208045K	156	C4I Interoperability	65,517				65,517
0208052J	157	Joint Analytical Model Improvement Program					
0301011G	158	Cryptologic Activities					
0301301L	159	General Defense Intelligence Program					
0301318BB	160	HUMINT (Controlled)					
0301398L	161	Management Headquarters GDIP, DIA					
0301555BB	162	Classified Programs					
0301556BB	163	SPECIAL PROGRAM					
0302016K	164	National Military Command System-Wide Support	659				659
0302019K	165	Defense Info Infrastructure Engineering and Integration	5,466				5,466
0303126K	166	Long Haul Communications (DCS)	1,470				1,470
0303131K	167	Minimum Essential Emergency Communications Network (MEECN)	7,438				7,438
0303140D8Z	168	Information Systems Security Program	12,546				12,546
0303140G	169	Information Systems Security Program	462,211	5,000			467,211
0303140G		Pacific Wind			4,000		
0303140G		Computer Science and Internet Security Degree Program			1,000		
0303149J	170	DISA Mission Support Operations	3,426				3,426
0303149J	171	C4I for the Warrior	3,549				3,549
0303149K	172	C4I for the Warrior	6,311				6,311
0303150K	173	Global Command and Control System	52,331				52,331
0303153K	174	Joint Spectrum Center	14,097				14,097

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0303165K	175	Defense Collaboration Tool Suite (DCTS)					
0303170K	176	Net-Centric Enterprise Services (NCES)	79,018				79,018
0303610K	177	Teleport Program	12,180				12,180
0304210BB	178	Special Applications for Contingencies	21,116				21,116
0304345BQ	179	National Imagery and Mapping Program					
0305102BQ	180	Defense Imagery and Mapping Program		19,000			19,000
0305102BQ		GeoSAR			4,000		
0205620N		NGA-NAVAIR Experimental Activity- Tactical Sensors			15,000		
0305125D8Z	181	Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP)	11,363				11,363
0305127BZ	182	Foreign Counterintelligence Activities					
0305146BZ	183	Defense Joint Counterintelligence Program (JMIP)	20,406				20,406
0305146D8Z	184	Defense Joint Counterintelligence Program (JMIP)					
0305183L	185	Defense Human Intelligence (HUMINT) Program (DHIP)					
0305190D8Z	186	C3I Intelligence Programs					
0305191D8Z	187	Technology Development					
0305193L	188	Intelligence Support to Information Operations (IO)					
0305199D8Z	189	Net Centricity	8,387				8,387
0305202G	190	Dragon U-2 (JMIP)					
0305206G	191	Airborne Reconnaissance Systems					
0305207G	192	Manned Reconnaissance Systems					
0305208BQ	193	Distributed Common Ground Systems					
0305208G	194	Distributed Common Ground Systems					
0305208L	195	Distributed Common Ground Systems					
0305883L	196	Hard and Deeply Buried Target (HDBT) Intel Support					
0305884L	197	Intelligence Planning and Review Activities					
0305885G	198	Tactical Cryptologic Activities		14,000			14,000
0305885G		Guardrail Common Sensor			10,000		
0305885G		Project Raincoat			4,000		
0305889G	199	Counterdrug Intelligence Support					
0307141G	200	NASS, IO Technology Integration & Tool Dev					
0307207G	201	Aerial Common Sensor (ACS) (JMIP)					

Title II - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
0708011S	202	Industrial Preparedness	18,219	5,600			23,819
0708011S		Copper-based Casting Technology			5,600		
0708011D8Z	202a	Defense Manufacturing Technology		2,000	2,000		2,000
0708012S	203	Logistics Support Activities	2,900				2,900
0902298J	204	Management Headquarters (JCS)	5,762				5,762
1001018D8Z	205	NATO Joint STARS	25,474				25,474
1160279BB	206	Small Business Innovative Research/Small Bus Tech Transfer Pilot Prog					
1160403BB	207	Special Operations Aviation Systems Advanced Development	104,330				104,330
1160404BB	208	Special Operations Tactical Systems Development	63,513	15,710			79,223
1160404BB		Special Operations Combat Assault Rifle			8,500		
1160404BB		Multi-role, Anti-armor, Anti-personnel Weapons System			6,800		
1160404BB		Ballistic Lightweight Enabled Helmet (ABLE) for Armed Forces			410		
1160405BB	209	Special Operations Intelligence Systems Development	33,167				33,167
1160408BB	210	SOF Operational Enhancements	66,313				66,313
1160421BB	211	Special Operations CV-22 Development	29,954				29,954
116045BB	212	Special Operations Aircraft Defense Systems	38,824				38,824
1160426BB	213	Operations Advanced Seal Delivery System (ASDS) Development	2,040				2,040
XXXXXXX	999	Classified	3,425,788	3,000			3,428,788
XXXXXXX		Program Increase			3,000		
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**4,637,948**	**64,310**	**64,310**		**4,702,258**
		TOTAL, RDT&E, DEFENSE WIDE	**18,803,416**	**289,389**	**546,485**	**(257,096)**	**19,092,805**

Items of Special Interest

Accelerated intelligence analyst education and training

The committee is aware that the defense intelligence community needs a new generation of intelligence analysts due to the emergence of new missions and the retirement of older analysts. The committee further understands that there are very few colleges and universities that provide organized degree programs that can lead to intelligence analyst certification in preparation for subsequent entry into the defense intelligence analyst career field. The lack of such programs is compounded by the lengthy security clearance process, making it more challenging to develop a qualified analyst pool. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 33140G for the National Security Agency to establish a process to identify those college and university curriculums that may lead to intelligence analyst certification. This funding may also be used to identify those security clearance eligible students enrolled in such programs who may also be interested in pursuing a career as an intelligence analyst.

Accelerating transition and fielding of advance technologies for emerging critical operational needs of special operations forces

The committee believes that the U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) would particularly benefit by access to the Director of Defense Research and Engineering's Quick Reaction Special Projects Program. Unique among combatant commands, SOCOM has full acquisition authority for special operations peculiar equipment, material, and supplies. Recent combat experience has demonstrated the urgent need for several new items of special operations peculiar equipment that the Commander, SOCOM has no readily available authority to develop and procure for his troops in combat. Since this sort of quickly emerging requirement is precisely what the Quick Reaction Special Projects Program is intended to support, the committee believes the Commander, SOCOM, should be allowed to avail himself of this authority.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Director, Defense Research and Engineering, to make $10.0 million of the increased funding recommended by the committee elsewhere in the committee report available for the exclusive use of the Commander, SOCOM.

Advanced concept technology demonstrations

The budget request contained $163.6 million in PE 63750D8Z for advanced concept technology demonstrations, but included no funds for shoulder fired smart round (SPIKE) urban warfare system development. The SPIKE missile fills a critical need for a low-cost, light-weight fire and forget missile for ground troops to use against lightly armored and other material targets and has possible maritime application as well.

The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 63750D8Z, for SPIKE missile development.

Advanced tactical laser program

The budget request contained $104.3 million in PE 1160402BB for special operations advanced technology development, including

$61.8 million for the advanced tactical laser advanced concept technology demonstration program (ATL ACTD). The committee expressed concern with the ATL ACTD program in the committee report on H.R. 4200 (H. Rept. 108–491). Despite the committee's doubts about the military feasibility of continuing development of a large chemical tactical laser for deployment aboard a C–130 aircraft, the budget request for fiscal year 2006 for the ATL ACTD is $20.0 million higher than was projected in the fiscal year 2005 budget request. The committee notes that this program comprises 13 percent of the U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) research and development budget and is projected to consume more than $340.0 million in additional SOCOM research and development funds in fiscal year 2007 and beyond. The committee believes that SOCOM has more urgent and useful priorities for research and development funding than the ATL ACTD.

The committee recommends $41.8 million in PE 1160402BB, a reduction of $20.0 million for the ATL ACTD.

Alternative fuels

The committee understands alternative fuels are comprised solely or partially from sources other than fossil fuel and notes the benefit of alternative fuels as a possible means for reducing reliance upon foreign oil reserves.

Bio-diesel and ethanol, fuel products made of soybeans and corn, respectively, meet existing federal guidelines that facilitate increased consumption of alternative fuels. The committee notes that officials in the Department of the Army and the Department of Defense have taken steps towards greater alternative fuel use, including the purchase of alternative fueled vehicles.

The committee urges further research and development in the area of alternative fuels and expects the Department of Defense to continue its efforts to make greater use of such products and to increase the number of alternative fueled vehicles.

Army space and missile defense simulation upgrade

The budget request contained $189.7 million in PE 63755D8Z for the Department of Defense high performance computing modernization program.

The Army Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC) Simulation Center is a mission critical computer facility, which was established to provide supercomputer computational, high performance network, and storage capabilities. The center supports the development, testing, and integration of strategic defense technologies and simulations, including computational physics and chemistry, weapons design, and force modeling for SMDC, the Missile Defense Agency, the Navy, and the Army.

The committee notes increased requirements for end-to-end simulation, testing, and evaluation of advanced interceptors and sensors. These requirements include extrapolating data beyond the capabilities of existing wind tunnels to determine interceptor performance for programs such as the kinetic energy interceptor, lightweight endoatmospheric projectile, and Standard Missile 3. As sensors are upgraded to meet new threats, support boost phase discrimination, target signature discrimination, and cruise missile defense, improved seeker image analysis is required. In conjunction

with planned increases in network bandwidth and improved architectures, the proposed upgrades will triple the center's classified computational capability.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.1 million in PE 63755D8Z for the SMDC simulation center upgrade program.

Asymmetric protocols for biological defense

The budget request contained $145.4 million in PE 62383E for biological warfare defense applied research.

A military or terrorist scenario in which aerosolized biological agents such as anthrax spores or smallpox virus are used would almost certainly result in mass casualties. Weaponized forms of the agents offer significant challenges to medical treatments that are not found in naturally occurring forms. While antibiotics are the only approved method for treating anthrax, the 2003 bioterrorist anthrax attack in Washington, D.C., showed that antibiotics are unfortunately not adequate to provide full treatment against inhalation anthrax. The committee also notes that there are a number of biological agents that could, with appropriate development and weaponization, be used in biological warfare or in a terrorist attack. Developing specific protections against all possible biological agents presents a significant challenge. As a result, the committee believes there is a need for therapeutics that would provide broad spectrum protection against a range of possible biological agents and also work in concert with other methods of treatment.

The committee notes research in therapeutics, sponsored by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, shows good results from laboratory testing in mice against pox virus and against anthrax and appears to have the potential for providing broad spectrum protection. Other tests have involved therapeutics that may reinforce the innate immunity of the host. A detailed review of the research in November 2004 indicates that the results of the research to date are promising and the program is ready to move into trials with larger animals.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62383E for applied research in multivalent asymmetric protocols that would provide broad spectrum protection for biological defense.

Ballistic missile defense

The budget request contained $7.8 billion for ballistic missile defense.

The committee notes that the budget request represents a $1.0 billion decrease from the fiscal year 2006 projections contained in the fiscal year 2005 request. Given that the Department of Defense had to make difficult programmatic decisions, the committee approves of the overall strategy employed in revising the fiscal year 2006 request for ballistic missile defense. While the committee understands that the spiral development strategy employed by the Department for ballistic missile defense is appropriate to the research and development nature of the ballistic missile defense program elements, the committee also notes that rigorous testing that leads to fielding of operational systems takes priority over future block research and development efforts. Thus, the committee recommends a reallocation of the request to focus on testing and field-

ing of near term capability ballistic missile defense elements. The committee also encourages the Department to continually reevaluate future block efforts in light of the results from operationally realistic testing to ensure that future year research and development efforts in one program do not get too far ahead of the actual performance results of the baseline system being tested, such as with Ground-based Midcourse Defense and the Airborne Laser program.

The committee recommends $7.9 billion, an increase of $100.0 million.

Boost defense segment

The budget request contained $483.9 million in PE 63883C for boost phase defense. The committee notes that the Airborne Laser (ABL) program met two major milestones in late 2004 and that the program has been structured so as to require achievement of incremental knowledge points prior to the scheduled lethal demonstration in 2008. The committee approves of this program restructuring that facilitates objective evaluations of program performance by the Department of Defense at specified knowledge points.

The committee notes that to make progress towards the 2008 lethal demonstration, the System Integration Laboratory Laser Long Run Performance Test, scheduled in fiscal year 2005, is a critical milestone. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit with the fiscal year 2007 budget request a specific evaluation of the System Integration Laboratory Laser Long Run Performance Test. Included in this specific evaluation shall be an assessment of how the test fared against duration goals set prior to the test, the ability to duplicate this duration at expected ABL aircraft operating altitudes, and the ballistic missile threats that can be defeated with confidence by laser firings of the duration tested.

While the committee supports the knowledge point approach taken by the Department towards the Airborne Laser program, it also recognizes that decisions on future funding support must take into account the operational capabilities and costs of a deployed boost phase defense system. The committee notes that while the Department has stated in the budget request that the ABL program is the primary boost phase defense program, funds are also requested for the Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI) or System Interceptor Program. Accordingly, the committee includes a provision (sec. 231) that would require the Secretary to submit a report on a capability and cost estimate comparison between the ABL, KEI and any other boost phase defense system under consideration by the Department.

For purposes of comparison, the report shall assume the planned ABL and KEI Block 2010 capabilities as submitted in the fiscal year 2006 budget request. The report should include the following elements in its comparison of the Airborne Laser and Kinetic Energy Interceptor programs:

(1) An assessment of the operational capabilities of the two systems against ballistic missiles launched from North Korea or a location in the Middle East against the continental United States, Alaska, or Hawaii;

(2) An assessment of the quantity of operational assets required for deployment periods of seven days, thirty days, ninety days, and one year;

(3) Basing options, including forward-deployed options for Airborne Laser and for both land and sea-based options for the Kinetic Energy Interceptor; and

(4) An assessment of life-cycle costs to include research and development efforts, procurement, deployment, operating and infrastructure costs.

Core

The budget request contained $447.0 million in PE 63890C for ballistic missile defense (BMD) systems core.

Within the program, the request reflected an increase of $63.9 million for BMD information management systems. While the committee notes that additional funds are required to support the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) Center, Von Braun Complex, the MDA Campus, and enterprise applications compliance requirements, it does not support the full amount of the requested increase.

The committee recommends $407.0 million in PE 63890C, a decrease of $40.0 million for BMD information management systems.

Midcourse defense segment

The budget request contained $3.3 billion in PE 63882C for ballistic missile defense (BMD) midcourse defense segment.

The committee is concerned that the test program for Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) may not be adequately resourced in the budget request based on recent reports from an independent review team chartered by the Director, Missile Defense Agency to review the GMD test program following recent GMD flight test failures. The independent review team recommended additional ground test and expanded qualification test resources for the GMD program. The committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million for additional ground test units and expanded qualification testing to support the GMD test program. The committee further recommends an increase of $100.0 million for an additional flight-intercept test from an operational silo to be conducted as soon as practicable.

The committee notes that the budget request includes $50.0 million for long lead procurement of Block 2008 ground based interceptors 31–40. The committee believes that testing of the Block 2004 and Block 2006 capabilities takes priority over long lead procurement for Block 2008 interceptors. The committee recommends reallocating resources from Block 2008 ground based interceptors 36–40 to fund the higher priority effort of ensuring the ground test program is robust and fully resourced. Accordingly, the committee recommends funding only the first 5 (31–35) of the additional 10 Block 2008 interceptors, a reduction of $25.0 million.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has announced plans to cancel the dual booster strategy and instead will rely upon the Orbital Sciences (OBV) booster in the future. The committee also understands that the Department has yet to make a final decision on what option to pursue for termination of the Lockheed Martin (BV+) booster procurement. While the committee takes no action with respect to any savings that may be realized in shifting to the single booster approach, the committee does encourage the Department to consider applying any future savings to flight test ground based interceptors.

The budget request contained $836.0 million for Aegis BMD, including $24.8 million for the Japanese Cooperative Program. The committee is encouraged by the recent successful intercept of an Standard Missile-3 (SM–3) Block I Missile. The committee fully supports the Aegis BMD program and provides $881.0 million for AEGIS BMD, an increase of $45.0 million as follows: $25.0 million to support development of the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense signal processor; $10.0 million to accelerate the throttleable divert and axial control system as a risk reduction alternative to the existing solid divert and attitude control system design; and $10.0 million to accelerate integration of the two-color seeker into the SM–3 Block IB Kinetic Warhead.

The committee recommends $3.4 billion in PE 63882C, an increase of $170.0 million for the midcourse defense segment.

Missile defense advanced technology

The committee notes that the Director, Missile Defense Agency and the Commander, U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC) signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) in March 2005 that covers research, development, testing, and transition of advanced technology for the Ballistic Missile Defense System. This MOA retains overall program planning and direction for advanced technology programs at the Missile Defense Agency. Further, the MOA establishes a Kill Vehicle Center of Excellence at SMDC and assigns other advanced technology projects to the SMDC Technical Center.

The committee understands the critical role of the SMDC Technical Center in advanced technology development for missile defense. The committee encourages the Missile Defense Agency to incorporate in its Future Year Defense Plan budget process an investment strategy to support technology innovation for future missile defense advanced technology programs.

Procurement funding and transition of ballistic missile defense systems to services

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not yet clearly established a mechanism or specified the criteria under which the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) transfers responsibility for continued development and procurement of missile defense systems to the services. The committee urges the Department to reach an agreement on how to properly allocate sufficient budgetary resources to ensure the seamless transition of ballistic missile defense elements to the services prior to submission of the fiscal year 2007 budget request.

The committee is concerned with the Future Year Defense Plan (FYDP) strategy for procuring Aegis ballistic missile defense (BMD) and Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) systems, assuming that both programs are successful in their planned developmental intercept flight tests. The Aegis BMD program is delaying important upgrades, particularly for a two-color infrared seeker and a throttleable divert attitude and control system, and assumes an inefficient production rate due solely to fiscal constraints. Similarly, THAAD's outyear funding is also inadequate. The MDA has already identified a sizeable shortfall for THAAD in fiscal year

2006 and the FYDP assumes only one THAAD firing unit will be procured.

The committee urges the Department to reevaluate its acquisition strategy in the next budget cycle and ensure that systems such as Aegis BMD and THAAD have a coherent strategy that is adequately funded to transition fielded elements to the services.

Products

The budget request contained $455.2 million in PE 63889C for ballistic missile defense (BMD) products, an increase of $71.4 million from the fiscal year 2005 appropriation.

The committee notes that the budget request contained an increase of $118.1 million for command and control, battle management and communications (C2BMC) Block 2006 and an increase of $65.1 million for C2BMC Block 2008. While the committee understands the importance of C2BMC to the BMD System, it does not support such a significant increase in spending on C2BMC Block 2008 until C2BMC Block 2006 has completed operationally realistic testing involving actual intercept tests. The committee authorizes $45.9 million for C2BMC Block 2008, a decrease of $30.0 million. The committee notes that even with this funding decrease in C2BMC Block 2008, the authorization represents an increase of $22.0 million for all block C2BMC spending compared to the fiscal year 2005 appropriation. The committee also directs the Department to focus its efforts on C2BMC performance in support of near term Block 2006 requirements.

The committee notes that the request contains $11.0 million for Hercules Block 2010. While the committee supports the overall goal of the Hercules program, consistent with other recommendations in this report, it does not support funding for future year block efforts prior to successful operational testing of more near term projects. The committee recommends $6.0 million for Hercules Block 2010, a decrease of $5.0 million.

The committee notes that the budget request contained $56.5 million for Joint Warfighter Support, more than double the fiscal year 2005 appropriation. The committee does not believe such a significant increase is warranted and notes that a portion of the increase is to expand BMD system Exercise and War Gaming to include fielding of new capabilities. While the committee understands the need to look to the future as part of spiral development, the committee also notes that efforts looking at new capabilities are somewhat premature until the nearer term capabilities are successfully tested. The committee recommends $41.5 million, a decrease of $15.0 million, for Joint Warfighter Support Block 2008.

System interceptor

The budget request contained $229.7 million in PE 63886C for System Interceptor. As noted previously, the committee supports the Department of Defense's (DOD) restructuring of the Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI), or System Interceptor, program with the fiscal year 2006 budget. This restructuring appropriately emphasizes the development of a quick acceleration booster as the critical knowledge point for the KEI program. The program office plans for a KEI booster demonstration in fiscal year 2008.

While the focus on KEI booster development is appropriate, the committee also understands that the need to identify and intercept a target in the boost phase presents technological and operational challenges to either a directed energy or kinetic energy weapon. In the KEI operational scenario, the command and control, battle management and communications (C2BMC) system faces a challenging timeline to facilitate intercept while the ballistic missile is still in the boost phase. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department to demonstrate the C2BMC timeline and fire control performance as a critical knowledge point prior to the end of fiscal year 2006.

The committee notes that the Future Year Defense Plan profile for the KEI program reflects substantial increases in program funding requirements beginning in fiscal year 2007. While the committee supports the DOD's approach to boost phase defense, the committee observes that the Department must carefully evaluate the affordability of future year spending requirements for boost phase defense programs and must reevaluate future plans based on demonstrated performance of both the Airborne Laser (ABL) and KEI programs. Should the ABL program fail to meet its specified requirements at the designated program knowledge points, the committee fully expects the Department to quickly reevaluate the primary and secondary boost-phase options and to adjust future budget requests accordingly.

The committee recommends $229.7 million, the amount of the budget request for the System Interceptor program.

Technology

The budget request contained $136.2 million in PE 63175C for ballistic missile defense technology.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense has determined that the High Altitude Airship (HAA) Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration (ACTD) has experienced weight problems and that the projected time to resolve certain performance problems exceeds the criteria for continuation as an ACTD program. The committee also notes that other organizations within the Department are pursuing HAA programs for homeland defense. The committee recommends no funding for the HAA program, a decrease of $16.8 million.

The committee is aware of the potential enhancements that improved wide bandgap devices offer for high power, high frequency radars that have applications for missile defense. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million to enable the development of and insertion opportunities for Aluminum Nitride Substrates for wide bandgap devices in missile defense system radars.

Given the importance of intercepting ballistic missiles in the boost phase, the committee believes that the Department should be open to considering additional and potentially less expensive options for boost phase defense. The committee observes that the Air Force has conducted some preliminary studies into the feasibility of using the advanced medium range air-to-air missile (AMRAAM) launched from tactical aircraft to intercept ballistic missiles in boost phase ascent. The committee believes that tactical aircraft or unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) may potentially offer an alter-

nate launch platform for air intercept missiles for boost phase defense.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.8 million in PE 63175C for architectural studies to determine the technical feasibility of the concept of using tactical systems in the AMRAAM family launched from tactical aircraft or UAVs as platforms from which to interdict threat ballistic missiles in their boost phase using "hit-to-kill" technologies. This study shall include an evaluation of the modifications required to the seeker of the selected interceptor missile to perform boost phase intercept missions.

Terminal defense segment

The budget request contained $1.1 billion in PE 63881C for ballistic missile defense terminal defense segment.

The committee is encouraged by the aggressive flight test schedule for the Terminal High Altitude Air Defense (THAAD) program, with 10 flight tests scheduled for fiscal years 2005 through 2007. The committee also understands that the program is still trying to recover from both a plant explosion at the boost motor/thrust vector actuation supplier in 2003 and a funding reduction in fiscal year 2005. Observing that the THAAD program represents a potentially near term fielding capability, the committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million for THAAD risk reduction.

The committee further notes that the first THAAD fire unit is scheduled to be fielded in fiscal year 2009. While the committee fully supports the THAAD program, it also has concerns on the exact plans for transitioning THAAD to the Department of the Army and for future year funding once transitioned to an operational status. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit by March 1, 2006, a report to the congressional defense committees that specifies the testing milestones that must be met by the Missile Defense Agency prior to transitioning THAAD fire units to the Army as well as the Department of the Army's Future Year Defense Plan funding for fiscal years 2008 through 2012 to support transitioning and fielding of the THAAD system.

Testing

The committee notes that the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system experienced several test setbacks last year. The committee notes that the root cause of testing failures must be clearly identified. The committee directs the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation to include an independent assessment of the root cause of all testing failures encountered during the previous year in each annual assessment of ballistic missile defense testing submitted in accordance with section 232(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107).

In addition, the committee notes that in the most recent annual report, the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation identified multiple concerns about the Missile Defense Agency's ability to characterize the operational capability of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system's limited defensive operations against long-range ballistic missiles. The committee directs the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation to submit an evaluation of the Missile Defense Agency's efforts to address these concerns in the next annual assessment report.

Business management and modernization program

The budget request contained $172.1 million in research and development for the development of the business management modernization program (BMMP). This program is the Department of Defense's (DOD) plan to transform and modernize its business and financial processes and systems. BMMP seeks to tie together and to ensure interoperability between financial, accounting, human resources, logistics, acquisition, information technology infrastructure, and strategic planning and budgeting systems.

The committee is supportive of the new Defense Business Systems Management Committee (DBSMC) that was established as a result of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) and the leadership that has recently occurred. The committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense and the DBSMC to review and implement section 332 of Public Law 108–375 as it lays the foundation for defense business systems architecture, modernization, and accountability.

In addition, the committee notes that the BMMP program office has not finalized a strategy to expend the remainder of its fiscal year 2005 appropriated dollars, and has not provided a plan detailing program specific goals for the fiscal year 2006 budget request. The committee does not support funding for an information technology program that does not have firmly established requirements or a schedule to deliver capabilities that are unclear at this time.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $55.4 million for the development of BMMP.

Chemical/biological defense research, development, test and evaluation program

The budget request contained a total of $898.0 million for chemical and biological defense research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E), including $72.5 million in PE 61384BP for basic research, $187.8 million in PE 62384BP for applied research, $164.5 million in PE 63384BP for advanced technology development, $100.8 million in PE 63884BP for advanced component development and prototypes, $280.9 million for system development and demonstration, $81.5 million in PE 65384BP for RDT&E management support, and $10.1 million for operational systems development. The budget request also contained $145.4 million in PE 62383E for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) biological defense research program.

The committee notes that the changing chemical and biological threat, both to U.S. armed forces on the world's battlefields and to U.S. homeland security, places more emphasis on the need for responsive technology options that could address the threat; the ability to quickly assess, develop, and demonstrate the technology; and then, the ability to rapidly insert or deploy the technology in fielded systems. The committee also continues to note the wealth of new concepts and technologies of varying levels of maturity that emerge annually from the nation's science and technology base.

The committee recommends continuation of the chemical and biological defense research and development initiatives established in the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), one in the basic research category, one in applied research category and one in the advanced

technology development category, and adds an additional initiative in advanced component development and prototyping. These initiatives will provide the opportunity for emerging technologies and concepts to compete for funding on the basis of technical merit and on the contribution that the technology could make to the chemical and biological defense capabilities of the armed forces and to homeland defense. The new advanced component development and prototyping initiative will provide a means to enhance transition of the most promising mature technologies from the science and technology base to acquisition programs. The committee encourages the use of the broad agent announcement in soliciting proposals for candidate projects under each of the initiatives.

Chemical/biological defense basic research initiative

The committee recommends that the technologies to be considered for funding under the basic research initiative include, but are not limited to the following:

(1) Engineered pathogen identification and countermeasures ("Bug to Drug");

(2) Fluorescence Activated Sensing Technology; and

(3) Multipurpose biodefense immunoarrays

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 61384BP for the chemical/biological defense basic research initiative.

Chemical/biological defense applied research and advanced technology development initiatives

The committee recommends that technologies to be considered for funding under the applied research and advanced technology development initiatives include, but are not limited to the following:

(1) Improved prophylaxis against neurotoxin effects;

(2) Novel vaccine platform development;

(3) Novel vaccine/therapeutic delivery means;

(4) Advanced concepts in regenerative air filtration;

(5) Wide-area detection and warning systems;

(6) Broad specificity enzyme-based destruction of agents;

(7) Sensor placement/optimization for next generation battle space management; and

(8) Rapid antibody-based biological countermeasures.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 62384BP to continue the chemical/biological defense applied research initiative, an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63384BP to continue the chemical/biological defense advanced technology development initiative.

Chemical/biological defense advanced component development and prototyping initiative

During its review of the fiscal year 2006 budget request the committee noted that the budget request for the total chemical and biological defense research and development program increased $183.1 million compared to the amount provided in fiscal year 2005, but also noted that the amount requested for advanced component development and prototypes decreased by $24.9 million. The committee notes that activities supported by this budget category are

critical to the transition of promising technologies from the science and technology base into development and that additional funding is required to meet the validated objectives of the chemical biological defense program in the areas of:

(1) Medical surveillance concepts and prototypes;
(2) Wide-area surveillance, cueing, detection and warning;
(3) Broad-spectrum therapeutics; and
(4) Broad spectrum detection capabilities.

Consequently, the committee recommends $125.8 million in PE 63884BP, an increase of $25.0 million for the advanced component development and prototyping initiative.

Combating terrorism technology support

The budget request contained $55.3 million in PE 63122D8Z for combating terrorism technology support advanced technology development.

The combating terrorism technology support program develops technology and prototype equipment that addresses needs and requirements with direct operational application in the national effort to combat terrorism. The program addresses defense, interagency, and international requirements for combating terrorism technology. Projects support anti-terrorism, counter-terrorism, intelligence and terrorism consequence management activities to: conduct tactical operations; protect military forces, civilian personnel, installations, infrastructure elements and the general population from terrorist attack; detect, neutralize, and mitigate the effect of conventional and unconventional devices; conduct surveillance and tracking of terrorists; conduct threat and incident assessments; and process and disseminate information. As a part of the program, international allies have worked jointly with the United States to fund a variety of key technologies that provide the U.S. armed forces, law enforcement agencies, and first responders with key enabling tools to counter terrorism.

The committee notes and highly commends the contributions made by the Technical Support Working Group in the development, demonstration, and fielding of advanced technologies for the fight against terrorism.

The committee recommends $80.3 million in PE 63122D8Z, an increase of $25.0 million for the combating terrorism technology support program to develop and field critical operational capabilities to counter and protect against terrorist chemical, biological, and explosive threats against military and civilian targets.

Connectory for rapid identification of advanced technology

The budget request contained $22.4 million in PE 63712S for generic logistics research and development technology demonstrations, but included no funding for continuation of the connectory project.

The objective of the connectory project is to develop a capability for the rapid identification of technology sources for the Department of Defense (DOD) that would provide the Department with instant access to the industrial base, and permit the rapid identification of promising sources of new, creative technical solutions for current combat and anti-terrorism programs. The committee notes the progress in the program and plans for developing methods for

screening manufacturers and their products and linking these sources to DOD buyers and prime contractors, forming business networks to potentially lower the cost of procurement, and analyzing industries in a region to identify the location of emerging technology clusters.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63712S for continuation of the connectory project for rapid identification of technology resources.

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency

The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has been a leader and innovator in basic scientific research and defense science and technology for decades. Originally chartered to prevent technological surprise, DARPA promotes revolutionary technology innovations by focusing on high-risk, high-payoff technologies that offer new military capabilities and complement the military departments' nearer-term science and technology programs. The committee has supported ever increasing funding for DARPA as the only agency not tied to a military service mission and the demands of a service budget to produce quick results. Recognizing that some of DARPA's high-risk programs may not be successful, the committee encourages DARPA to continue its focus on the development, demonstration, and transition of high-risk, high-payoff technology to the military departments and to U.S. industry.

At the same time, the committee recognizes that the pursuit of the more futuristic technologies must be tempered by the hard fact that we are a nation at war and our armed forces have immediate needs for innovative technical solutions across a variety of disciplines. The committee commends DARPA on its quick reaction support and fielding of advanced innovative technologies to meet emerging critical operational needs of our forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom and elsewhere in support of the global war on terrorism.

The committee believes DARPA should continue to redirect some of its more futuristic efforts to the solution of today's combat problems. Those immediate needs involving detection, sensing, protection, surveillance, and a host of other issues that may well be "DARPA hard" problems that the Agency should be examining, rather than some of the more futuristic efforts in the DARPA program. Therefore, although the committee is pleased with the overall progress in the defense science and technology program, the committee believes that increased priority must continue to be given to the nearer-term requirements of the combatant commanders and U.S. armed forces in the field.

Defense integrated military human resources system

The budget request contained $20.3 million in PE 65018SE for research, testing, development, and evaluation of the defense integrated military human resources system (DIMHRS). The committee notes this is an ambitious program that entails the development and implementation of a single personnel and pay system that will support all military personnel, active, guard, reserve, and retired. This program seeks to transform the military personnel and pay processes.

While the committee supports the concept of a single integrated pay and personnel system, the committee remains highly concerned

that this program will not deliver such promised capabilities. The Department of the Air Force testified that DIMHRS will only be a 60 percent solution for its pay and personnel requirements; and the United States Marine Corps testified that DIMHRS is a degraded capability from its current pay and personnel system. The Department of the Army, which will be first to receive DIMHRS, has not clearly inventoried its legacy pay and personnel systems to determine which ones will be terminated or will migrate to DIMHRS.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 15, 2006, a strategy to address the four military services' concerns that DIMHRS will not be a 100 percent solution for its service-specific requirements. This plan will address how DIMHRS will accommodate these deficiencies, for example, interface standards for legacy systems and or plans to augment DIHMRS capabilities to satisfy these service specific requirements.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $10.3 million for PE 65018SE, a decrease of $10.0 million for the research, testing, development, and evaluation of DIMHRS.

Defense manufacturing technology

The budget request included no funds in PE 78011D8Z for the defense manufacturing technology program.

The committee notes that the manufacturing technology (ManTech) program in the Department of Defense (DOD) is a critical funding vehicle for advancing and enabling the fielding of new technologies to the warfighter. The ManTech program supports the development of key manufacturing processes that target throughput rates, affordability, process-driven product performance, and the ability to sustain a hardware item in some form of rate production over its lifecycle.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 78011D8Z for the defense manufacturing technology program.

Defense message system

The budget request contained $13.4 million for PE 33129K for research, development, testing and evaluation for the defense message system (DMS). This program is one of the warfighters' message systems, by providing secure and accountable messaging services.

The committee notes that DMS was initially created to satisfy a Department of Defense (DOD) requirement for a secure message system to replace the aging and archaic Automated Defense Information (AUTODIN) system. At the inception of this program, email use was widespread, and the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) proposed satisfying this requirement with an email system encrypted with a public key infrastructure (PKI) system, as is done by commercial industry and other government agencies. However, the intelligence community rejected the DISA proposal citing security issues. To address these concerns, DISA generated an elaborate, expensive proposal to modify an existing email system, to include the procurement of other hardware and software to support it. The committee notes that Department has spent more than $9.0 billion to implement DMS and to keep AUTODIN operational.

However, the intelligence community, continues to cite security issues and does not use DMS.

Additionally, the committee questions the continued development of this program when the Department is providing duplicative capabilities with Internet Protocol version 6, standard Microsoft Outlook, and PKI systems to its users.

Therefore, the committee recommends no funds in PE 33129K, a decrease of $13.4 million for research, development, testing, and evaluation of DMS.

Defense science and technology funding

The budget request contained $10.5 billion for the Department of Defense science and technology program, including all defense-wide and military service funding for basic research, applied research, and advanced technology development. The request included $1.7 billion for the Army, $1.8 billion for the Navy, $1.9 billion for the Air Force, and $5.0 billion for Defense-Wide science and technology (including $3.1 billion for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)). The committee recommends $11.4 billion for the Department of Defense science and technology program, an increase of $901.6 million to the budget request. The committee's recommendation includes $2.2 billion for the Army (an increase of $477.3 million), $2.0 billion for the Navy (an increase of $189.4 million), $2.1 billion for the Air Force (an increase of $118.5 million), and $5.1 billion for Defense Agency science and technology, an increase of $116.4 million (including $3.1 billion for DARPA, an increase of $11.4 million).

The committee regards defense science and technology investments as critical to maintaining U.S. military technological superiority in the face of growing and changing threats to U.S. national security interests around the world. The budget request is $2.2 billion (or 24 percent) less than the $13.1 billion provided for fiscal year 2005 and is approximately $28.0 million less than the fiscal year 2005 request ($240.0 million less when adjusted for inflation). The committee notes that the budget request is 2.5 percent of the total defense budget request (compared to 2.6 percent of the request in fiscal year 2005) and does not meet the goal of 3 percent established by the 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review.

The past year has provided numerous examples of successful technology development and deployment. The men and women of the U.S. armed forces are better equipped, trained, and protected because of revolutionary breakthroughs emerging from the technology base. The committee commends the Department for the response of the defense science and technology base to the emerging critical operational needs in support of the global war on terrorism and Operation Iraqi Freedom. Elsewhere in this report the committee has recommended increased funding to further accelerate the transition of advanced technologies.

The committee notes that earlier this year the National Research Council of the National Academies of Science and Engineering released its congressionally directed report "Assessment of Department of Defense Basic Research." The report concluded that the Department is managing its basic research program effectively, but made a number of recommendations regarding the program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Con-

gress with the Fiscal Year 2007 budget request the actions being taken or recommended by the Department to implement the recommendations contained in the report.

The committee is deeply concerned about sustaining and maintaining DOD science and technology infrastructure, about the projected loss to the defense science and engineering work force over the next ten years of an estimated 13,000 scientists, mathematicians, engineers, and technicians, and about the actions necessary to enable the Department to recruit and maintain a skilled and trained defense science and engineering work force. In the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), Congress established a pilot program "Science, Mathematics and Research for Transformation (SMART)" within the Department to provide targeted education assistance to individual seeking a baccalaureate or an advanced degree in science and engineering disciplines that are critical to national security. Elsewhere in this report, the committee has recommended a provision which will build on the SMART program and improve DOD's ability to recruit, develop, and retain individuals critical to fulfilling the Department's national security mission.

Despite the positive aspects of DOD's science and technology program, the committee is concerned about long-term projections for reductions in DOD science and technology as a percentage of total obligation authority, and in short-term trends in the science and technology accounts of some of the military departments and defense agencies. The committee cannot emphasize too strongly the need for the Department to maintain a strong and robustly funded science and technology program that will provide the advanced technologies needed to assure technical dominance of our armed forces on any current or future battlefield.

Defense technical information center

The budget request contained $50.0 million in PE 65801KA for the Defense technical information center (DTIC).

The center's mission is to provide a timely and effective exchange of scientific and technical information (STI) and research and engineering information, to improve the quality and resource effectiveness of the Department of Defense's (DOD) research. The committee notes that DTIC provides centralized acquisition, processing, storage, retrieval, and dissemination of STI, including information that is restricted, controlled and classified. In addition, DTIC's knowledge management and leading edge information technology applications seek to improve information services and STI transfer to benefit DOD's warfighters, scientists, engineers, and managers. While the committee understands that DTIC processes and disseminates STI and performs studies and analysis, the committee is concerned that DTIC's request increased almost 20 percent from fiscal year 2005 without clearly identifying what the requirements are for the increased funding request, even after several attempts by the committee to ascertain the rationale.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $42.4 million in PE 65801KA, a decrease of $7.6 million for DTIC research and development.

Emerging/critical interconnection technology

The budget request contained $22.4 million in PE 63712S for generic logistics research and development technology demonstrations.

The committee notes that printed circuit boards are fundamental components of military navigation, guidance and control, electronic warfare, missile, and surveillance and communications equipment. The committee notes that printed circuit boards for military systems have unique design requirements for high performance, high reliability, and the ability to operate under extreme environmental conditions that require the use of high density, highly rugged, and highly reliable interconnection technology. The committee also notes that the commercial printed circuit board industry focuses on the design and high-volume production of low-cost boards and the United States has lost much of its printed circuit board manufacturing capability to overseas sources. The committee recognizes the need to enhance the U.S. capability for development and production of high density, highly reliable printed circuit boards for use in U.S. military systems.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.8 million in PE 63712S to continue the program for development of emerging and critical printed circuit interconnection technology.

Event management visualization and data analysis

The budget request contained $163.6 million in PE 63750D8Z for advanced concept technology demonstrations. The committee understands that combatant commanders need automated tools that streamline and de-conflict data input from multiple sources. In addition, the commanders also have a requirement to consolidate information into an efficient and effective display of situational awareness, in support of adaptive planning and incident management.

The Event Management Framework (EMF) improves the process of data correlation from multiple sources to build a consolidated view that provides actionable information in a fast, cost effective and accurate manner. EMF correlates multiple factors for event reasoning purposes, provides customized displays to multiple end users, and enhances the decision making process. This program incorporates techniques to use a rules-based methodology to improve communication and coordination among agencies, commands, and coalition forces by relaying information while protecting sensitive data.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 63750D8Z for the development of EMF.

Force transformation

The budget request contained $19.9 million in PE 65799D8Z for force transformation, but contained no funds for the Full Spectrum Effects Platform, Project Sheriff.

Project Sheriff is an Office of Force Transformation initiative to rapidly field for operational experimentation transformational concepts such as target discrimination, speed of light weapons, fused sensors, and cognitive computing working in concert with active protection to produce weapons effects capabilities scalable from non-lethal to lethal. The committee believes Project Sheriff will sig-

nificantly expand a tactical commander's options and should be rapidly developed for fielding.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for PE 65799D8Z for force transformation, Project Sheriff.

GeoSAR mission enhancements

The committee understands that GeoSAR is a revolutionary mapping system that directly supports the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency's need for sophisticated mapping products. The committee also understands that GeoSAR products can meet combatant commander needs for geospatial mapping.

The committee provides $4.0 million for GeoSAR mission enhancements as follows: $2.1 million for field-deployable processing for rapid response and $1.9 million for radar system upgrades to support both mapping and intelligence requirements.

Guardrail Common Sensor

The budget request contained no funding in PE 35885G for Guardrail Common Sensor (GRCS) support for on-board sensors equipment.

The committee is very concerned with the degraded operational status of the GRCS program. The program contains no specific defense cryptologic funds for the continual upgrade and modification of sensors to exploit evolving signals intelligence (SIGINT) requirements. The global war on terrorism has proven that the SIGINT threat has evolved beyond most of the GRCS collection and exploitation capabilities. The fiscal year 2005 supplemental addressed some of this problem by providing additional funding for the rapid insertion of quick reaction capabilities but only as clip-in suites, and not part for the baseline funding profile for all GRCS operational systems. The committee believes that it is imperative that all four GRCS systems be upgraded to a common software-reprogramable baseline to allow the GRCS systems to meet the current threats, immediately and dynamically.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 35885G for the SIGINT common configuration baseline for the GRCS.

Information assurance

The committee believes the Department of Defense (DOD) should do more to implement effective tamper resistant software capabilities on critical components and technologies. The committee continues to believe the Department must ensure a comprehensive anti-tamper policy to employ defenses against a variety of sophisticated threats. Such threats could potentially threaten our nation's strategic advantage and weaken the industrial base's technological competitiveness in the international marketplace.

The committee notes that the conference report (H. Rept. 108–354) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) directed the Secretary of Defense to assess the utility of tamper-resistant security software and other innovative software security tools in protecting critical DOD command, control, communications and intelligence software and incorporate such protections, as appropriate, into the Department's information assurance programs. Accordingly, the committee di-

rects the Secretary to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2005, the results of that assessment and the protective measures implemented into the Department's information assurance programs as a consequence of that review.

Information Systems Security Program

The budget request contained $462.2 million in PE 33140G for the Information Systems Security Program.

The committee understands the importance of video intelligence in providing critical situational awareness to the warfighter on the battlefield. The committee understands the value of the digital video products provided by the Pacific Wind video system.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 33140G for Pacific Wind as follows: $1.5 million to upgrade the video compression standard to enable high-definition images and $2.5 million to make the system two-way (full-duplex) capable.

Intelligence analyst education and training

The committee is aware that the defense intelligence community needs a new generation of intelligence analysts due to the emergence of new missions and the retirement of older analysts. The committee further understands that there are very few colleges and universities that provide organized degree programs that can lead to intelligence analyst certification in preparation for subsequent entry into the defense intelligence analyst career field. The lack of such programs is compounded by the lengthy security clearance process, making it more challenging to develop a qualified analyst pool.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 33140G for the National Security Agency to establish a process to identify those college and university curriculums that may lead to intelligence analyst certification. This funding may also be used to identify those security clearance eligible students enrolled in such programs who may also be interested in pursuing a career as an intelligence analyst.

Large vehicle inspection using magnetic quadrupole resonance

The budget request contained $55.3 million in PE 63122D8Z for Combating Terrorism Technology Support.

The committee notes the development, demonstration, and employment of scanning explosives detection systems that use nuclear magnetic quadrupole resonance technology to detect the presence of explosives with a greatly enhanced detection probability and reduced false alarm rate.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63122D8Z to accelerate the development and evaluation of magnetic quadrupole resonance technology for the screening of cargo and large vehicles for the presence of explosives. The committee understands that this funding will support the completion of the final phase of the program.

M–291 skin decontamination kits

The committee is concerned about the availability of M–219 skin decontamination kits for the Department of Defense. The M–291 is

the only Food and Drug Administration approved, standard individual issue skin decontamination kit fielded by the U.S. armed forces. The kit protects and decontaminates skin from all known nerve and blister agents without harm to the skin.

Currently, the U.S. Army maintains a limited production capability to manufacture M–291 kits for the Department. The committee understands that infrequent and low volume requirements have resulted in long lead times and inefficient production costs. The committee also understands that the M–291 kit is in demand by city and state governments, first responders, emergency personnel, and the Department of Homeland Security.

The committee encourages the U.S. Army to increase the M–291 kit production rate to a more cost-effective level. The increased manufacturing rate would also allow an increase in the number of M–291 kits that could be made available for purchase by the various Homeland Security activities.

Man portable air defense system defense program

The budget request included $13.3 million in PE 64618D8Z for systems development and demonstration (SDD) to develop and demonstrate low cost, rapidly fieldable infra-red countermeasures (IRCM) options and $10.4 million in procurement to "examine new techniques" to reduce the cost and lead time required to protect aircraft against the man portable air defense system (MANPADS) threat at "expeditionary airfields and urban areas."

The following points need to be considered:

(1) SDD programs require validated requirements and mature technologies that have been demonstrated in at least a laboratory or test range environment. There are no validated requirements for this program, nor have any technologies been demonstrated;

(2) The concept for this program was considered by the Department of Homeland Security for its on-going program to protect civilian aircraft from the MANPADS threat and was rejected. Consequently, this program would be unique to the military services;

(3) Entry into SDD requires an independent program cost estimate. No such cost estimate exists; and

(4) The committee believes the Secretary of Defense should not be managing programs that are inherently within the purview of the military services.

In addition to the fact this is a science and technology program in content and scope of work and not an SDD program, the committee remains concerned that the concept for this program remains seriously flawed. At this point it has not been determined whether the concept requires surface to air missiles to be detected and engaged in very short time-lines from the ground or whether the deployed system would alert the presumed target aircraft to a MANPADS firing, requiring the target aircraft to dispense onboard countermeasures. Given the detection, decision, engagement times involved, engagement geometry, and having to fire surface to air missiles or high powered lasers at a threat missile is problematical, perhaps fratricidal. Further, a similar, but far less complex problem of detecting and engaging rockets, artillery, and mortars has been examined and the per system cost is well over $200.0 mil-

lion—20 times what is being discussed by program officials as an estimated cost.

Finally, the Secretary of Defense needs to examine the policy and budget implications of deploying systems to expeditionary airfields to protect against the MANPADS threat while leaving U.S. airfields totally unprotected.

Accordingly, the committee authorizes $6.0 million in PE 63618D8Z, a new science and technology program element, and directs within the funds authorized that an independent evaluation be completed of the concept of operations and on the cost of the proposed system solution. Further, the committee authorizes no funds for procurement due to the lack of supporting justification.

Medical free electron laser

The budget request contained $9.8 million in PE 62234D8Z for medical free electron laser applied research.

The committee notes that the medical free electron laser program seeks to develop advanced, laser-based applications for military medicine and related materials research. Because free electron lasers provide unique pulse features and tunable wavelength characteristics that are unavailable in other laser devices, their use broadens the experimental options for the development of new laser-based medical technologies. The program is a merit-based, peer-reviewed, competitively awarded research program, the majority of which is focused on developing advanced procedures for rapid diagnosis and treatment of battlefield related medical problems.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62234D8Z, to continue the merit-based, peer-reviewed, competitively awarded program in medical free electron laser applied research.

National Defense University technology pilot program

The budget request contained $31.1 million in PE 65104D8Z for the Office of Secretary of Defense technical studies, support, and analysis.

In fiscal year 2002 at the request of the President, National Defense University (NDU), Congress added funds to enable the university to establish a pilot research and analysis program that would focus on defense policy issues that have significant technology elements. The objective of the program is to determine how the United States can maintain its competitive edge against other military adversaries at a time when commercial information technology (IT) is readily available on the global market. The committee requests that the NDU President and the Director, Defense Research and Engineering report the results of the program and plans for future efforts with the submission of the fiscal year 2007 budget request to Congress.

The committee recommends $32.1 million in PE 65104D8Z, an increase of $1.0 million to continue the NDU technology pilot program.

Operationally responsive space

The budget request contained $19.9 million in PE 65799D8Z for operationally responsive space, but included no funds for development of the common bus.

The committee believes the nation must develop a responsive space capability and envisions that this capability may transform the battlefield and the space community far more than any other initiative. The committee believes a responsive space capability must include a set of common launch vehicles, common satellite standards, and flexible payloads that are engineered for common interfaces. The committee recognizes that the development of a common bus is the first critical step towards a responsive space system; however, the committee is concerned by the lack of coordination and focus on the development of payloads for small satellites.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for common bus development and an increase $50.0 million for small satellite payload development in PE 65799D8Z. The committee authorizes the funds for small satellite payload development to be used as required by section 913 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

Project M shock mitigation technology

The committee notes the progress in the Office of Naval Research's application of shock mitigation technology, initially developed under the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency's (DARPA) Project M program, to mitigation of the shock experienced by high-speed boats operating in littoral waters. The focus of the program has been to develop semi-active and fully-active shock mitigating seats to reduce the high shock and vibration experienced by the Navy SEALS Mark V patrol craft crew and passengers in high-speed special operations. The program has also been exploring the use of a Look-Ahead Detection System which observes the approaching ocean surface and sends warnings to the seat to enable shock-compensating motion before the shock impacts the hull. The results of at-sea tests show significant promise for mitigating the shock experienced in the Mark V–B special operations craft in sea conditions ranging from mid-Sea State 3 to low-Sea State 4 at speeds of 30 to 48 knots.

The committee encourages the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command to review the results of the testing on the shock-mitigating seats for possible application to the Mark V patrol craft and consideration by the Director, DARPA, of the application of the Project M technology to DARPA's new program for development of a high-speed assault craft.

Raincoat

The budget request contained $22.0 million in PE 35885G for tactical signal intelligence technology, but contained no funding for Project Raincoat at the National Security Agency (NSA).

The NSA's Project Raincoat provides new surveillance tracking and reasoning assessment technology that will assist in the detection, identification, and monitoring of signals intelligence. The project uses a behavioral science approach, and link analysis founded on analytic operator experience to cue sensors automatically to pre-identified signals activity. The result alerts operators when a correlation is established, and effectively increases operator efficiency through a targeted search strategy in the platform's receivers.

Therefore, the committee recommends $26.0 million in PE 35885G, an increase of $4.0 million for Project Raincoat.

Rapid acquisition incentives

The budget request contained $5.6 million in PE 33169D8Z for the information technology (IT) Rapid Acquisition Incentives (RAI) program.

This program is intended to provide funding for pilot initiatives that will support the Department of Defense's efforts to transition to a network-centric environment. The committee notes that while this program's goal to deliver practical business case-based operational solutions is admirable, the committee is not supportive of authorizing funding for IT programs which have not been specifically targeted. The committee is concerned that RAI does not outline which activities or projects will be financed, establish the requirements, or what capabilities are promised, and how such capabilities will be fielded.

Accordingly, the committee recommends no funding in PE 33169D8Z, a decrease of $5.6 million for the development of the RAI program.

Scalable active memory processing engines

The budget request contained $242.7 million in PE 62716E for applied research in electronics technology.

The committee notes that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency's polymorphous computing architectures program is developing a revolutionary approach to the implementation of embedded computing systems to support reactive multi-mission, multi-sensor, and in-flight retargetable missions. This revolutionary approach will also significantly reduce the payload adaptation, optimization, and verification process.

The committee notes that massively parallel processing technologies being developed under the Scalable Active Memory Processing Engines program will provide significantly enhanced on-board sensor processing capabilities in an accelerated timeframe and significantly improve front-end processing for ballistic missile defense radars, as well as on-board missile discrimination processing.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.4 million in PE 62716E to accelerate the development of scalable, low-power, ultra-high performance processors for ballistic missile defense and other applications.

Special operations advanced technology development

The budget request contained $104.3 million in PE 116402BB for special operations advanced technology development, but contained no funds for the surveillance augmentation vehicle-insertable on request (SAVIOR) system.

The SAVIOR system promises to increase force protection for troops operating in cluttered, urban environments. SAVIOR is a mobile, intelligent sensor suite that can alert ground forces to the presence of a threat with its intensive surveillance network.

The committee recommends $107.8 million for PE 116402BB, special operations advanced technology development, an increase of $3.5 million for development of the SAVIOR system.

Special Operations Command small weapons acquisition

The committee believes that the unique acquisition authority possessed by the U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) is a key element of the command's ability to respond effectively to common special operating forces operator needs and to address rapidly emerging requirements. Even so, major acquisition programs must be managed with a due regard to competition, unless the need for a quick solution is paramount. In that regard, the SOCOM program to acquire a combat assault rifle to replace six different weapons is on track to be a success. The committee expects that the same success will be demonstrated by the ongoing combat pistol acquisition program. The committee believes that operator needs should drive the requirements process, but also believes that the combination of the weapon requirements and product delivery schedule must not be so narrow as to restrict the command to a single source solution except under extraordinary circumstances.

The committee is also aware of another emerging requirement that should be explored. The committee understands that high technology, extreme long-range sniper systems are being commercially developed that could provide special forces operators with a quantum leap in sniper capability over today's fielded systems. The committee understands that special forces snipers have tested these systems and believe they may be superior to the weapons they now employ. The committee urges the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command to review these U.S. developed technologies and consider acquiring these systems for special forces operators.

Special Operations Command tactical tanker fleet

The committee is concerned about the long-term viability of the U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) C–130 tactical tanker fleet, given persistent center wing box problems and the proposed cancellation of the C–130J modernization program. The small size of the SOCOM fleet, combined with heavy, on-going operational demands, make taking aircraft out of service for extensive center wing box and avionics upgrades problematic. The committee supports the command's ongoing C–130 fleet modernization program but is concerned that these upgrades are relatively short-term fixes that do not address the long-term need for newer, modern aircraft. The committee believes that SOCOM tactical tanker requirements should be considered as part of the overall C–130J program assessment conducted by direction of the committee elsewhere in this report as part of the Mobility Capability Study and Quadrennial Defense Review. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to consider SOCOM tactical tanker requirements in the final decision on the C–130J procurement and to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services with the Department of Defense's plan for the modernization of the SOCOM C–130 tanker fleet through 2022 by February 15, 2006.

Special operations tactical systems development

The budget request contained $63.5 million in PE 116404BB for special operations tactical systems development, but contained no funds for further development of the special operating forces com-

bat assault rifle (SCAR) and no funds for the multi-role, anti-armor, anti-personnel weapons system (MAAWS) multi-target warhead.

The committee believes that the SCAR is an urgently needed replacement for the existing M–4 system that should be field tested and refined as quickly as possible for special forces operator employment.

The MAAWS multi-target warhead is a unique 84 millimeter round with 2 warheads that will fire from existing weapons designed to defeat threat forces protected by hardened barriers. The committee notes that this item is on the unfunded priority list of the Commander, Special Operations Command.

The committee recommends $78.8 million for PE 116404BB special operations tactical systems development, an increase of $8.5 million to further develop the SCAR and an increase of $6.8 million for the MAAWS multi-target warhead.

Special operations technology development

The budget request contained $13.6 million in PE 116401BB for special operations technology development, but contained no funds for the Angel Fire for Full Spectrum Close-In Layered Shield (FCLAS) system.

The Angel Fire for FCLAS active protection system is a promising integrated sensor and counter-measure package with the potential to provide increased protection to lightly protected military aircraft and vehicles in hostile environments. Such systems are urgently needed in today's increasingly lethal operating environments.

The committee recommends $23.6 million for PE 116401BB special operations technology development, an increase of $10.0 million for the Angel Fire for FCLAS system.

Tactical exploitation of innovative sensors

The committee strongly supports the joint experimental aviation activity established between Naval Air Systems (NAVAIR) and the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency (NGA) for the tactical exploitation of innovative sensors. The committee understands the partnership promises to improve and accelerate the development and fielding of transformational capabilities to both NGA and the Department of the Navy by leveraging and integrating manned aircraft, unmanned aircraft, lighter than air vehicles, and ground systems. The committee strongly supports the emphasis to improve tasking, collection, processing, exploitation, and dissemination activities within the broad framework of the national intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance community. The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 35102BQ for sensor development and flight operations in support of the NGA–NAVAIR Experimental Aviation Activity.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

Overview

The budget request contained $168.5 million for Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense.

The committee recommends $168.5 million, no change to the budget request.

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

Account	Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE					
0603941D8Z	1	Test & Evaluation Science & Technology					
0604940D8Z	2	Central Test and Evaluation Investment Development (CTEIP)					
0605118D8Z	3	Operational Test and Evaluation	43,928				43,928
0605131D8Z	4	Live Fire Testing	10,340				10,340
0605804D8Z	5	Development Test and Evaluation	114,190				114,190
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE	**168,458**				**168,458**

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would establish the amounts authorized to be appropriated for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2006.

Section 202—Amount for Defense Science and Technology

This section would establish basic research, applied research, and advanced technology development funding levels for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2006.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 211—Annual Comptroller General Report on Future Combat Systems Program

This section would establish an annual review of the Future Combat Systems program by the Comptroller General to be submitted to Congress by March 15, of each year. The report would include the extent to which such systems development and demonstration (SDD) program is meeting established performance, cost, and schedule goals; the plan for such SDD for the next fiscal year; and a conclusion whether such SDD program is likely to be completed at a cost not in excess of the most recent Selected Acquisition Report. The final report required by this section would be submitted at the completion of the systems development and demonstration milestone.

Section 212—Objective Requirements for Non-line-of-sight Cannon System not to be Diminished to Meet Weight Requirements

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the objective requirements established for the Non-Light-of-Sight Cannon not be diminished in order to achieve the weight requirements in existence as of April 14, 2003.

Section 213—Independent Analysis of Future Combat Systems Manned Ground Vehicle Transportability Requirement

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to complete an independent analysis and submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2006 on the Future Combat Systems key performance parameter transportability requirement for the manned ground vehicles (MGV). The analysis would seek to determine whether:

(1) Such a requirement can be supported by the projected extended planning period, inter- and intra-theater airlift force structure and is justified by any likely deployment scenario envisioned by current operational plans;

(2) Mature technologies have been demonstrated that allow this requirement to be met while demonstrating at least equal

lethality and survivability of the current manned vehicles or their equivalent, intended to be replaced; and

(3) The projected unit procurement cost warrants the investment required to deploy these vehicles.

The committee is concerned that the transportability performance requirement is inconsistent with the maturity of relevant technologies and projected airlift mobility capabilities, compromises lethality and survivability, and unnecessarily costly for the projected benefit. The current MGV weight exceeds by over 25 percent of that required to meet the MGV objective.

Section 214—Amounts for Armored Systems Modernization Program

This section would prescribe the fiscal year 2006 authorization and budget activity for the specific projects requested in the Armored Systems Modernization Program.

Section 215—Limitation on Systems Development and Demonstration of Manned Ground Vehicles Under Armored Systems Modernization Program

This section would prohibit the use of funds authorized for appropriation to be obligated for systems development and demonstration of manned ground vehicles for the armored systems modernization program until mature technologies have been demonstrated in a relevant environment to provide at least equaled lethality and survivability compared with the manned ground vehicles intended to be replaced by such ground vehicles.

Section 216—Testing of Internet Protocol Version 6 by the Naval Research Laboratory

This section would amend section 331 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) to require the Secretary of Defense to conduct the testing and evaluation of internet protocol version six required by that section through the Naval Research Laboratory. This section would also require that the Secretary submit an annual report on the testing and evaluation to the congressional defense committees for fiscal years 2006 through 2008.

Section 217—Program to Design and Develop Next-Generation Nuclear Submarine

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to carry out a program to design and develop a class of nuclear submarines that will serve as a successor to the Virginia class of nuclear submarines. This section would require the Secretary to commence design of the next generation nuclear submarine to follow the Virginia class, beginning construction in about fiscal year 2014.

The committee is aware that for the first time in 50 years, the Navy does not have a program to develop a nuclear submarine. Nuclear submarines, beginning with the Nautilus, have provided unmatched, important capabilities for this nation, and were instrumental in winning the Cold War.

In the last five decades the United States has developed an unequaled capability to design, develop and manufacture the world's top nuclear submarines. However, the committee is aware that this unique capability to design nuclear submarines is perishable. The recent example of the United Kingdom's problems with its new Astute class nuclear submarine is a clear indication of what happens when the submarine design capability is not maintained.

The committee understands that the only means by which the United States can expect to maintain its design capability is to continue to employ those designers to develop new submarine designs.

The committee is aware that existing submarine designs have emphasized open ocean capabilities. While the Virginia, Seawolf, and Los Angeles classes all operate effectively in the littoral, they were optimized for the open ocean. The committee believes that for the foreseeable future, the littoral rather than open ocean is the area of greatest importance. The committee sees an opportunity to maintain nuclear submarine design expertise developing a new class of nuclear submarine optimized for the littoral. This design shall make maximum use of emerging technologies, including those spawned by the joint Navy-Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) Tango Bravo project to develop a design optimized for littoral operations that dramatically reduces submarine cost while providing applicable warfighting capability equal to or greater than the Virginia class.

Section 218—Extension of Requirements Relating to Management Responsibility for Naval Mine Countermeasures Program

This section would extend to 2011 the requirement established in section 216 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102–190), as most recently amended by section 212 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 104–314), that the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff annually certify the adequacy of the Navy's mine countermeasures program.

The section would require that the Secretary, in certifying that the budget submitted to Congress and the Future Years Defense Plan propose sufficient resources for executing the updated mine countermeasures master plan, ensure that the budget meets the requirements of section 2437 of title 10, United States Code. Section 2437 provides that whenever a new major defense acquisition program begins development a sustainment plan shall be developed for the existing system that would be replaced by the system under development and that an appropriate level of budgeting be provided to sustain the existing system until the replacement system is fielded and assumes the major responsibility for the mission of the existing program. The committee notes that in the U.S. Naval Mine Countermeasures Plan for fiscal year 2006, the Navy plans to begin decommissioning the MHC–51 class mine hunting ships, based in part on assumptions regarding the fielding schedule for the Littoral Combat Ship. The committee believes that the Navy's assumption regarding the fielding schedule for Littoral Combat Ship is premature.

The section would amend the requirement to notify Congress prior to any reprogramming action relative to the Navy's mine

countermeasures program as long as the reprogramming action does not affect certification of the program provided to Congress by the Secretary of Defense.

The section would also require that the Secretary forward to the congressional defense committees with the Secretary's annual certification of the adequacy of the Navy's mine countermeasures program a copy of the Navy's Mine Countermeasures Plan which supports that certification.

Section 219—Single Joint Requirement for Heavy Lift Rotorcraft

The committee is aware that the Army and the Marine Corps both need a future transport helicopter to replace existing heavy lift rotorcraft. The committee also notes that costs for Defense Department weapons systems, including rotorcraft, continue to escalate making it imperative that the Department take advantage of any and all means including reducing the number of system development programs where it make sense to contain costs. Additionally, the Department must take advantage of economies of scale in production.

Present world-wide operations have demonstrated that the future for ground forces is joint operations with the Army and the Marine Corps. A key ingredient in these operations is systems interoperability. One way to not only contain costs but also facilitate interoperability is to, where possible; develop joint systems for the Army and the Marine Corps. While in the past there may have been a desire on the part of both services to differentiate by using different equipment, this is no longer a valid fundamental consideration. The committee is aware that present timelines for heavy lift rotorcraft replacement are not the same for the Army and the Marine Corps. Recognizing this, the committee believes that it is possible to establish a competitive program based on a single joint requirement that phases rotorcraft delivery in a manner to meet both service schedules.

Currently, the Joint Heavy Lift Rotorcraft (JHL) program is "joint" in name only and is only intended to be the Department of the Army's next-generation heavy lift rotorcraft to replace the Army's CH–47 "Chinook." The Marine Corps has its own program, the Heavy Lift Replacement (HLR), intended to replace the CH–53 "Super Stallion." The budget request includes $272.0 million in PE 65212N for systems development and demonstration for this program. The committee strongly believes that the foundation on which the JHL must proceed to development and production is a single, joint requirement, validated and approved by the Secretary of Defense. While it may not be possible for each service to include precisely the capability it desires, it must be possible to agree on the essential capabilities to be included in JHL and at the same time draft a requirement that does not in and of itself force a particular technology solution.

In the past issues such as corrosion control requirements, range, lift capability and ship basing have been used to justify separate programs. However, it is clear that in the future both the Army and the Marine Corps will operate from and be transported by ship and therefore, require the same level of corrosion control, be subject to other considerations mandated by ship based operations, and need be capable of similar long ranges.

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Army to develop a single, common JHL requirement for approval by the Joint Requirement Oversight Council and the Secretary of Defense. This section would further direct that the Secretary of Defense not authorize the JHL program to begin until a validated and approved joint requirement exists. It is imperative that a common set of requirements be established in the immediate future to preclude unnecessary delays in upgrading the military services heavy lift capability.

Section 220—Requirements for Development of Tactical Radio Communications Systems

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to provide a comprehensive report that would:

(1) Assess the Department of Defense's (DOD) immediate requirements for tactical radio communications, and whether these requirements may be satisfied with the purchase of legacy radios;

(2) Ensure that DOD users may rapidly acquire tactical radio communications utilizing existing technologies or mature systems readily available in the commercial marketplace; and

(3) Apply DOD Instruction 5000.2 to JTRS in a manner that does not permit the Milestone B entrance requirements to be waived.

This section would also give the Joint Program Executive Officer (JPEO) for the Joint Tactical Radio System program the authority and control of execution year research and development funding for all the clusters and the waveform developments for JTRS. The committee believes the JPEO must have these authorities to successfully manage a program of this size and cost. This section would also allow the JPEO to transition technologies through Systems Development and Demonstration and Production and Deployment (SDD) more quickly. The committee strongly believes that interim radio communication capabilities should be evolutionary and be able to transition to the long-term system solution with maximum hardware and software reuse.

The Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) program is a family of interoperable, advanced software-defined radios. The committee has serious concerns that Cluster 1 program, the first and largest of several clusters has encountered significant cost overruns, severe schedule delays, and performance problems. The committee expects that the Department's compliance with subsection (a)(2) of this section will result in the elimination of the current JTRS waiver process. This would allow the services to purchase tactical radio communications to fulfill their immediate requirements. The committee believes that given recent developments that include the stop-work order and the show cause letter to the contractor, the Secretary should thoroughly reevaluate and assess the Department's requirements for tactical radio communications, the JTRS program and its promised capabilities.

Section 221—Limitation on Systems Development and Demonstration of Personnel Recovery Vehicle

The Air Force budget request included $113.8 million in PE 27224F, within the operational systems development budget activity, for Combat Rescue and Recovery, all of which is for systems development and demonstration of the Personnel Recovery Vehicle (PRV).

This section would limit any obligation of funding for the Personnel Recovery Vehicle until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense:

(1) Certifies that the requirements and schedule for the PRV have been validated and are reasonable and necessary;

(2) Certifies that all technologies required to meet the requirements are mature;

(3) Certifies that no other aircraft, and no other modification of an aircraft in the Department of Defense inventory can meet the PRV requirement; and

(4) Provides an independent cost and manpower estimate for the PRV.

The committee also deletes all funding for operational systems development in PE 27224F and places the requested $113.8 million in systems development and demonstration, PE 64261F, Personnel Recovery Vehicle.

Section 222—Separate Program Element Required for Each Significant Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Project

In its annual budget requests for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E), the Department of Defense continues to aggregate more and more projects within individual program elements. In addition, the Department continues to incorrectly apply its own directives in the classification of its programs and projects by budget activity, for example, Personnel Recovery Vehicle and Man Portable Air Defense System Defense.

This section would require that any RDT&E project, whose estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations for that project exceed $100.0 million, is assigned its own program element.

Further, the committee continues to encourage the Department to follow its own directives in the proper budget activity classification of RDT&E programs.

Section 223—Small Business Innovation Research Phase III Acceleration Pilot Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to designate the secretary of a military department to establish a pilot program to transition at least 10 Phase II Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) projects into Phase III annually. The pilot would run for three years. Small businesses are our nation's engine of technology innovation. The federal government and the Department of Defense (DOD) spend significant sums annually on Phase I and Phase II Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) technology development that has yet to be fully transitioned into production (Phase III). While the primary focus of the program is to fund Phase III in the commercial marketplace, the committee recognizes that Department has managed the SBIR program with the military

customer as the focus. The committee believes that too many innovative technologies developed with DOD support and funding are subsequently neglected because many DOD acquisition programs are managed by large prime contractors with no visibility into the SBIR program and the promising technologies under development. While the committee is reluctant to direct consideration of SBIR Phase II projects as Phase III projects in subcontractual arrangements, the committee believes that a more focused effort to transition promising technologies will benefit both the warfighter and the taxpayer. The committee urges the Secretary to designate the military department that has demonstrated the greatest success in transitioning these technologies, and to consider implementing a process to provide incentives to defense contractors to subcontract to DOD SBIR firms, in a manner similar to procedures used for minority, women-owned, and veteran owned small businesses.

Section 224—Revised Requirements Relating to Submission of Joint Warfighting Science and Technology Plan

This section would amend section 270 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) to require submission of the Joint Warfighting Science and Technology Plan required by that section biennially, rather than annually. This section would also repeal the requirement for the plan to contain review and assessment summaries.

Section 225—Shipbuilding Industrial Base Improvement Program for Development of Innovative Shipbuilding Technologies, Processes, and Facilities

This section would establish a Shipbuilding Industrial Base Program for the U.S. shipbuilding industry to improve the efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and quality of U.S. ship construction, and promote the international competitiveness of U.S. shipyards. Under this program, the Secretary of the Navy may provide funds for the development of modernized shipbuilding infrastructure and innovative design and production technologies and processes for naval vessels. The Secretary may also provide funds from this program to shipyards for the acquisition of such infrastructure, technologies, and processes. Participants of the program should have the ability to develop infrastructure, technologies, and processes that are beneficial to or needed by the shipbuilding industry based on inefficiencies discovered in a periodic assessment of program design, engineering, and production engineering; organization and operating systems; steelwork production; and ship construction and outfitting.

The committee is aware that a 2005 shipbuilding industrial base study conducted by the Department of Defense identified weaknesses in the naval ship construction program and recommended a specific set of targeted investments to increase efficiency and modernize the U.S. shipbuilding infrastructure, including physical facilities, critical processes, specialized labor pool, unique tools, and the associated systems and processes. The committee is encouraged that the United States Shipbuilders have embraced the National Shipbuilding Research Program as an effective and efficient means to collaborate on innovation in shipbuilding and ship repair. The

committee believes that the Department can take advantage of this existing collaboration as an effective vehicle to address shipyard productivity issues related primarily to naval ship design practices.

The committee believes the Shipbuilding Industrial Base Improvement Program established under this section would enable infrastructure modernization of the U.S. shipbuilding industry to include collaborative work by the nation's shipyards in several key areas: design-for-production, ship design/engineering processes, production engineering methodology, enhanced supply chain integration, and organization and operating system optimization associated with naval ship construction programs.

The committee recommends an increase of $100.0 million in PE 78730N only for the Shipbuilding Industrial Base Improvement Program. A key aspect of the fiscal year 2006 recommended authorization would be design optimization projects of several ship classes—a mix of those classes in production as well as new design classes—including a coordinated effort to collect lessons learned across ship platforms and share productive methods among the programs.

Section 226—Renewal of University National Oceanographic Laboratory System Fleet

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to develop a plan for a program to construct ships for the University National Oceanographic Laboratory System (UNOLS) Fleet and would require that the Secretary include in the plan provisions for the construction of up to four Ocean class ships. The section would also authorize $4.0 million in PE 63564N, Ship Preliminary Design and Feasibility Studies, to conduct feasibility assessments and initiate design of the first ship of the class.

Section 227—Limitation on VXX Helicopter Program

This section would limit the obligation of research, development, test and evaluation funds, or procurement funds, for acquisition of pilot production helicopters for the VXX helicopter program until the Secretary of the Navy certifies to the congressional defense committees that the results of the tests conducted by the fleet of test article helicopters for the VXX program demonstrate that VXX helicopters in the VXX mission configuration can be produced without significant further design modification.

The budget request contained $935.9 million in PE 64273N for the VXX executive helicopter development program, including funds for the first of three payments for five pilot production helicopters. The VXX executive helicopter program is developing a replacement for the VH–3D helicopter.

The committee notes that the VXX program schedule plans for the concurrent development and production of both three test articles and pilot production helicopters. While the committee understands the need to develop and produce the VXX as rapidly as possible, it further notes that the Department of Defense, Director of Operational Test and Evaluation's Fiscal Year 2004 Annual Report includes remarks that the program's acquisition strategy violates the "fly before buy" concept, and that risk reduction and robust execution of a test-fix-fly program could require additional schedule

margin to ensure that an appropriate amount of testing be accomplished before pilot production vehicles are procured.

SUBTITLE C—MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Section 231—Report on Capability and Costs for Operational Boost/Ascent-Phase Missile Defense Systems

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the missile defense programs, particularly the Airborne Laser and Kinetic Energy Interceptor, which are designed to protect against boost/ascent-phase ballistic missile attacks. This section would also require a capability and cost assessment of each boost/ascent-phase system.

The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2006, on the results of this assessment.

Section 232—Required Flight-Intercept Test of Ballistic Missile Defense Ground-based Midcourse System

The section would authorize $100.0 million above the budget request for the midcourse defense segment, for one additional flight-intercept test of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system. This is in addition to the regularly planned flight tests of the GMD system conducted by the Missile Defense Agency, and the test shall be conducted as soon as practicable.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained approximately $108.0 billion in operation and maintenance funds to ensure the U.S. military can fight and meet the demands of each combatant commander. These funds will be used to train U.S. forces, purchase equipment and spare parts, repair older equipment, and transport equipment and personnel around the world. These funds, however, will not be used to fund the global war on terrorism (GWOT). The committee understands the administration will request emergency supplemental funds for fiscal year 2006 to meet that requirement. Nevertheless, the committee believes that costs directly associated with the GWOT are embedded in the fiscal year 2006 budget request. The committee has appropriately transferred these funds out of the committee's recommended funding for fiscal year 2006 to the "bridge" supplemental fund found in title XV of this bill, where the funds are authorized to be obligated for the GWOT expenses.

For the last two years, the committee has closely examined the ability of the secretaries of the military departments to reset and reconstitute military equipment that has returned from deployment. What is surprising to the committee is not the level of operation and maintenance funds needed, but rather the need for significantly higher procurement funds. Because equipment used in Iraq and Afghanistan is not being returned for maintenance and it is undergoing significant operational tempo under harsh conditions, the services will not repair the equipment, but replace it.

The necessity to leave equipment in theatre results in troops at home station having limited equipment to train, maintain, or attain necessary skills. The committee notes the mission capability rates of equipment at home station is often significantly lower than deployed equipment. This is of concern to the committee. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense and the service secretaries to identify any such shortfalls and to request funding where needed.

Finally, the committee praises the performance and role of the public depots and arsenals. The GWOT requirement on these industrial facilities reminds the committee of their unique and significant role in national security.

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
	APPROPRIATION SUMMARY					
	Department of the Army					
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	25,316,595	(932,722)	104,000	(1,036,722)	24,383,873
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	1,987,382	10,900	10,900		1,998,282
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	4,509,719	11,400	11,400		4,521,119
	Total Department of the Army	31,813,696	(910,422)	126,300	(1,036,722)	30,903,274
	Department of the Navy					
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	30,759,889	(447,153)	182,300	(629,453)	30,312,736
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	3,804,926	(173,649)	11,500	(185,149)	3,631,277
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	1,245,695				1,245,695
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	199,934	7,500	7,500		207,434
	Total Department of the Navy	36,010,444	(613,302)	201,300	(814,602)	35,397,142
	Department of the Air Force					
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	31,521,136	(962,001)	5,200	(967,201)	30,559,135
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	2,501,686				2,501,686
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	4,724,091	3,000	3,000		4,727,091
	Total Department of the Air Force	38,746,913	(959,001)	8,200	(967,201)	37,787,912
	Defense-Wide					
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	18,453,469	(77,688)	132,200	(209,888)	18,375,781
	Total Defense-Wide	18,453,469	(77,688)	132,200	(209,888)	18,375,781
	Transfer Accounts, Miscellaneous, and Other					
	TRANSFER ACCOUNTS	1,369,689				1,369,689
	MISCELLANEOUS	508,331				508,331
	Total Miscellaneous	1,878,020				1,878,020
	TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:	**126,902,542**	**(2,560,413)**	**468,000**	**(3,028,413)**	**124,342,129**

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
	Operation and Maintenance, Army					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	LAND FORCES	3,860,812	(149,200)	8,500	(157,700)	3,711,612
010	DIVISIONS	866,129	(35,900)			830,229
	Bio/Chem Resistant Canteens			1,000		
	Advanced Technology Batteries			2,500		
	Fleece Insulated Liners for ECWCS			2,000		
	Repair Parts - Transfer to Title XV				(42,400)	
	Tank Sonic Dry Clean Filter System			1,000		
020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	430,353	(12,500)			417,853
	Repair Parts - Transfer to Title XV				(12,500)	
030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	351,673	2,000			353,673
	M Gators			2,000		
040	ECHELON ABOVE CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	951,681	(102,800)			848,881
	Rapid Fielding Initiative - Transfer to Title XV				(102,800)	
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,260,976				1,260,976
	LAND FORCES READINESS	3,715,371	(297,000)	10,000	(307,000)	3,418,371
060	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,870,382				1,870,382
070	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	615,063	(37,200)			577,863
	Unit of Action Experimentation - Transfer to Title XV				(37,200)	
080	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,229,926	(259,800)			970,126
	Arsenal/Depot Ait Initiative			10,000		
	Depot Maintenance - Transfer to Title XV				(269,800)	
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	7,726,177	(15,000)		(15,000)	7,711,177
090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	5,347,826	(15,000)			5,332,826
	Utilities Privatization				(15,000)	
100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,825,518				1,825,518
110	MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	220,288				220,288

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
120	UNIFIED COMMANDS	102,343				102,343
130	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	230,202				230,202
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**15,302,360**	**(576,900)**	**18,500**	**(595,400)**	**14,725,460**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION					
	MOBILITY OPERATIONS	**356,991**				**356,991**
140	STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION	248,241				248,241
150	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	99,917				99,917
160	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	8,833				8,833
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 02:	**356,991**				**356,991**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING					
	ACCESSION TRAINING	**442,736**				**442,736**
170	OFFICER ACQUISITION	103,722				103,722
180	RECRUIT TRAINING	32,125				32,125
190	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	36,538				36,538
200	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS	270,351				270,351
	BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING	**1,929,466**	**12,000**	**12,000**		**1,941,466**
210	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	510,526	11,000			521,526
	SCOLA			6,000		
	Defense Language Institute			5,000		
220	FLIGHT TRAINING	635,105				635,105
230	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	114,854	1,000			115,854
	Leadership for Leaders Program			1,000		
240	TRAINING SUPPORT	668,981				668,981
	Live Training Instrumentation for Air & Missile Defense Units		5,000	5,000		5,000

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
	RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING	1,161,863	(32,000)		(32,000)	1,129,863
250	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	481,868				481,868
260	EXAMINING	121,937				121,937
270	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	262,410				262,410
280	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	154,232	(32,000)			122,232
	Civilian Intern Program				(32,000)	
290	JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS	141,416				141,416
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 03:	3,534,065				3,519,065
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	SECURITY PROGRAMS	919,796				919,796
300	SECURITY PROGRAMS	919,796				919,796
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,895,096	(51,000)	65,000	(116,000)	1,844,096
310	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	581,060	65,000			646,060
	AAFES-Second Destination Transportation			65,000		
320	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	570,178	(116,000)			454,178
	Sustainment System Technical Support - Transfer to Title XV				(116,000)	
330	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	389,696				389,696
340	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	354,162				354,162
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	2,977,576	(21,400)	3,500	(24,900)	2,956,176
350	ADMINISTRATION	606,588				606,588
360	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	850,053	(21,400)			828,653
	GFEBS				(24,900)	
	Army Knowledge Online Disaster Recovery System			3,500		
370	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	238,344				238,344
380	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	189,720				189,720
390	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	850,059				850,059
400	ARMY CLAIMS	197,361				197,361

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
410	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	45,451				45,451
	SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	330,711	(11,800)		(11,800)	318,911
420	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS	289,447	(11,800)			277,647
	NATO Support - Transfer to Title XV				(11,800)	
430	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	41,264				41,264
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**6,123,179**				**6,038,979**
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
	Civilian Personnel Under Execution		(17,000)		(17,000)	(17,000)
	Unobligated Balances		(239,622)		(239,622)	(239,622)
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Army	**25,316,595**	**(932,722)**	**104,000**	**(1,036,722)**	**24,383,873**
	Operation and Maintenance, Navy					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	AIR OPERATIONS	6,165,007				6,165,007
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	3,574,529				3,574,529
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	857,918				857,918
030	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	58,661				58,661
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	114,331				114,331
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	473,514				473,514
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	961,921				961,921
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	124,133				124,133
	SHIP OPERATIONS	8,389,040	70,000	70,000		8,459,040
080	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	2,999,986	60,000			3,059,986
	USS Kennedy			60,000		
090	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	588,395	4,000			592,395

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
	Man Overboard ID System			4,000		
	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE					
100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	3,967,408	6,000			3,973,408
	Stainless Steel Sanitary Spaces			4,000		
	NULKA			2,000		
110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	833,251				833,251
	COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT	**2,599,587**	**(12,900)**		**(12,900)**	**2,586,687**
120	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	298,100				298,100
130	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	18,422				18,422
140	SPACE SYSTEMS & SURVEILLANCE	156,814				156,814
150	WARFARE TACTICS	367,830				367,830
160	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY & OCEANOGRAPHY	259,807				259,807
170	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,321,953	(12,900)			1,309,053
	JFCOM Joint Training				(12,900)	
180	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	172,958				172,958
190	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,703				3,703
	WEAPONS SUPPORT	**1,554,694**				**1,554,694**
200	CRUISE MISSILE	181,294				181,294
210	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	830,094				830,094
220	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	69,722				69,722
230	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	473,584				473,584
	BASE SUPPORT	**4,762,215**	**(57,000)**		**(57,000)**	**4,705,215**
250	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,344,971				1,344,971
260	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,417,244	(57,000)			3,360,244
	Utilities Privatization				(57,000)	
	Operating Tempo - Transfer to Title XV		(180,000)		(180,000)	(180,000)
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**23,470,543**	**(179,900)**	**70,000**	**(249,900)**	**23,290,643**

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION					
	READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES	**533,527**				**533,527**
270	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	533,527				533,527
	ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	**128,787**	**8,000**	**8,000**		**136,787**
280	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	3,158				3,158
290	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	125,629	8,000			133,629
	Navy ship disposal			8,000		
	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	**49,777**				**49,777**
300	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	28,245				28,245
310	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	1,653				1,653
320	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	19,879				19,879
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 02:	**712,091**	**8,000**	**8,000**		**720,091**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING					
	ACCESSION TRAINING	**237,667**				**237,667**
330	OFFICER ACQUISITION	123,975				123,975
340	RECRUIT TRAINING	10,153				10,153
350	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	103,539				103,539
	BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	**1,237,418**				**1,237,418**
360	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	494,195				494,195
370	FLIGHT TRAINING	364,692				364,692
380	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	134,935				134,935
390	TRAINING SUPPORT	243,596				243,596
	RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION	**551,797**	**300**	**300**		**552,097**

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
400	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	282,293	300			282,593
	Naval Sea Cadet Corps			300		
410	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	155,646				155,646
420	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	70,983				70,983
430	JUNIOR ROTC	42,875				42,875
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 03:	**2,026,882**	**300**	**300**		**2,027,182**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	**2,080,141**	**(16,000)**		**(16,000)**	**2,064,141**
440	ADMINISTRATION	739,521	(16,000)			723,521
440	Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan				(16,000)	
450	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	3,517				3,517
460	CIVILIAN MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT	100,751				100,751
470	MILITARY MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT	212,813				212,813
480	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	250,278				250,278
490	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	773,261				773,261
500	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES					
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT	**1,504,721**	**1,000**	**1,000**		**1,505,721**
510	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	188,257				188,257
520	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS		1,000			1,000
	Ford Island Environmental Clean Up			1,000		
530	PLANNING, ENGINEERING & DESIGN	306,919				306,919
540	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	841,706				841,706
550	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT					
560	HULL, MECHANICAL & ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	46,373				46,373
570	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	46,334				46,334
580	SPACE & ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	75,132				75,132

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
	SECURITY PROGRAMS	374,329				374,329
590	NAVAL CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	374,329				374,329
	SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	10,663				10,663
640	INTERNATIONAL HDQTRS & AGENCIES	10,663				10,663
	CANCELLED ACCOUNTS	580,519				580,519
9990	OTHER PROGRAMS	580,519				580,519
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**4,550,373**	**(15,000)**	**1,000**	**(16,000)**	**4,535,373**
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
	Civilian Personnel Under Execution		(172,000)		(172,000)	(172,000)
	Lease Buy Outs		103,000	103,000		103,000
	Unobligated Balances		(191,553)		(191,553)	(191,553)
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy	**30,759,889**	**(447,153)**	**182,300**	**(629,453)**	**30,312,736**
	Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	EXPEDITIONARY FORCES	1,009,774	(40,300)	11,500	(51,800)	969,474
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	479,482	11,500			490,982
	Hyper-realistic MOUT Training			2,000		
	Bio/Chem Resistant Canteens			1,000		
	Mtn Cold Weather Clothing and Equipment			6,000		
	Advanced Technology Batteries			2,500		
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	416,501				416,501
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	113,791	(51,800)			61,991
	Depot Maintenance- Transfer to Title XV				(51,800)	

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
	USMC PREPOSITIONING	74,424				74,424
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	69,343				69,343
050	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	5,081				5,081
	BASE SUPPORT	1,827,118				1,827,118
060	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	483,005				483,005
070	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	1,344,113				1,344,113
	Operating Tempo - Transfer to Title XV		(95,900)		(95,900)	(95,900)
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**2,911,316**	**(136,200)**	**11,500**	**(147,700)**	**2,775,116**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING					
	ACCESSION TRAINING	11,259				11,259
080	RECRUIT TRAINING	10,885				10,885
090	OFFICER ACQUISITION	374				374
	BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	185,172				185,172
100	SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING	40,259				40,259
110	FLIGHT TRAINING	178				178
120	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	10,687				10,687
130	TRAINING SUPPORT	134,048				134,048
	RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION	183,624				183,624
140	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	115,498				115,498
150	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	51,221				51,221
160	JUNIOR ROTC	16,905				16,905
	BASE SUPPORT	188,173				188,173
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	67,804				67,804
180	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	120,369				120,369

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 03:	**568,228**				**568,228**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	**309,284**				**309,284**
190	SPECIAL SUPPORT	243,195				243,195
200	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	38,352				38,352
210	ADMINISTRATION	27,737				27,737
	CANCELLED ACCOUNT					
230	CANCELLED ACCOUNT					
	BASE SUPPORT	**16,098**				**16,098**
240	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	3,151				3,151
250	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	12,947				12,947
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**325,382**				**325,382**
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
	Unobligated Balances		(37,449)		(37,449)	(37,449)
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	**3,804,926**	**(173,649)**	**11,500**	**(185,149)**	**3,631,277**
	Operation and Maintenance, Air Force					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	AIR OPERATIONS	**13,189,616**	**(119,200)**	**4,600**	**(41,200)**	**13,070,416**
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	4,043,366	2,000			4,045,366
	Oxygen Mask and Visor			2,000		
020	PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	287,173				287,173

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
030	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	607,049				607,049
040	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING	1,401,092	(41,200)			1,359,892
	Distributed Missions Operations				(41,200)	
050	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	1,479,650	2,600			1,482,250
	Eagle Vision			2,600		
060	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,057,399				2,057,399
070	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,027,414				1,027,414
080	BASE SUPPORT	2,286,473	(82,600)			2,203,873
	Base Services-Gymnasiums				(65,000)	
	Utilities Privatization				(17,600)	
	COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS	**2,771,222**				**2,771,222**
090	GLOBAL C3I & EARLY WARNING	1,201,149				1,201,149
100	NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	242,433				242,433
110	OTHER COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT PROGRAMS	701,889				701,889
120	JCS EXERCISES	29,130				29,130
130	MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	255,866				255,866
140	TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE AND SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	340,755				340,755
	SPACE OPERATIONS	**1,783,963**				**1,783,963**
150	LAUNCH FACILITIES	349,313				349,313
160	LAUNCH VEHICLES	94,113				94,113
170	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	253,670				253,670
180	SATELLITE SYSTEMS	73,610				73,610
190	OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	277,926				277,926
210	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	180,604				180,604
200	BASE SUPPORT	554,727				554,727
	Operating Tempo - Transfer to Title XV		(476,000)		(476,000)	(476,000)
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**17,744,801**	**(595,200)**	**4,600**	**(599,800)**	**17,149,601**

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION					
	MOBILITY OPERATIONS	**3,962,406**				**3,962,406**
220	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,660,080				2,660,080
230	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	51,326				51,326
240	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	176,764				176,764
250	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	393,248				393,248
260	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	154,650				154,650
270	BASE SUPPORT	526,338				526,338
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 02:	**3,962,406**				**3,962,406**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING					
	ACCESSION TRAINING	**294,725**				**294,725**
280	OFFICER ACQUISITION	79,026				79,026
290	RECRUIT TRAINING	6,411				6,411
300	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	99,856				99,856
310	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION (ACADEMIES ONLY)	34,304				34,304
320	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY)	75,128				75,128
	BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	**2,220,968**				**2,220,968**
330	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	360,192				360,192
340	FLIGHT TRAINING	809,154				809,154
350	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	178,515				178,515
360	TRAINING SUPPORT	112,980				112,980
370	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	14,095				14,095
380	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, AND MODERNIZATION	157,248				157,248
390	BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	588,784				588,784
	RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION	**533,788**				**533,788**
400	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	136,567				136,567
410	EXAMINING	3,435				3,435

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
420	OFF DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	187,656				187,656
430	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	148,557				148,557
440	JUNIOR ROTC	57,573				57,573
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 03:	**3,049,481**				**3,049,481**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	**3,101,910**				**3,101,910**
450	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	881,829				881,829
460	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	651,796				651,796
470	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	192,354				192,354
480	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	48,627				48,627
490	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	248,043				248,043
500	BASE SUPPORT	1,079,261				1,079,261
	SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**2,276,360**	**(134,400)**	**600**	**(135,000)**	**2,141,960**
510	ADMINISTRATION	348,301				348,301
520	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	533,574	(134,400)			399,174
	Base Level Communications Structure				(103,000)	
	Medical Qualification Tracking Visualization and Data Analysis Project			600		
	Combat Information Transport System				(32,000)	
530	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	244,970				244,970
540	RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES					
550	ARMS CONTROL	48,071				48,071
560	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	709,368				709,368
570	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	42,852				42,852
580	CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION	24,288				24,288
590	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	13,438				13,438
600	BASE SUPPORT	311,498				311,498
	SECURITY PROGRAMS	**1,365,179**				**1,365,179**

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
610	SECURITY PROGRAMS	1,365,179				1,365,179
	SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS	20,999				20,999
6200	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	20,999				20,999
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**6,764,448**	**(134,400)**	**600**	**(135,000)**	**6,630,048**
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
	Unobligated Balances		(195,401)		(195,401)	(195,401)
	Mil to Civ Conversion		(37,000)		(37,000)	(37,000)
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	**31,521,136**	**(962,001)**	**5,200**	**(967,201)**	**30,559,135**
	Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	580,883	(8,900)			571,983
	Management Headquarters Training Transformation				(8,900)	
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	2,205,693	1,000			2,206,693
	Bio/Chem Resistant Canteens			1,000		
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**2,786,576**	**(7,900)**	**1,000**	**(8,900)**	**2,778,676**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING					
030	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	105,601				105,601
040	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	67,158	2,400			69,558
	Joint Forces Staff College			2,400		
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 03:	**172,759**	**2,400**			**175,159**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
050	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	147,992	(10,000)			137,992
	Excessive Growth				(10,000)	
060	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	100,468				100,468

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	379,947				379,947
100	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	5,481				5,481
120	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	38,412				38,412
130	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	305,835	18,000			323,835
	CTMA			15,000		
	Beryllium Industrial Base			3,000		
140	DEFENSE POW / MISSING PERSONS OFFICE	16,105				16,105
150	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	21,697				21,697
160	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	320,099	1,300			321,399
	Export Control Database			1,300		
170	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY	1,769,628	69,500			1,839,128
	Family Wounded and injured support programs			8,500		
	Internet Safety Education Programs			1,000		
	Supplementary DOD Impact Aid			60,000		
180	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	402,798	(12,100)			390,698
	DLAMP				(7,300)	
	Fellows				(4,800)	
190	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,044,322				1,044,322
200	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,045,125				1,045,125
210	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	143,966				143,966
220	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	282,468				282,468
240	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	30,463				30,463
250	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	778,858	(31,300)			747,558
	Capitol Cost Sharing				(61,300)	
	Fort Carson compatible use buffers			10,000		
	Readiness Environment Preservation			20,000		
260	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	473,483				473,483
9990	OTHER PROGRAMS	8,186,987				8,186,987
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**15,494,134**	**35,400**	**118,800**	**(83,400)**	**15,529,534**
	UNDISTRIBUTED					

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
	OSD Defense Business Modernization Program (BMPP) and Domains		(12,600)		(12,600)	(12,600)
	DLA BMMP Logistics Modernization		(1,800)		(1,800)	(1,800)
	Joint Advertising and Market Research		10,000	10,000		10,000
	Unobligated Balances		(103,188)		(103,188)	(103,188)
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	**18,453,469**	**(77,688)**	**132,200**	**(209,888)**	**18,375,781**
	Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	LAND FORCES	**794,940**	**7,000**	**7,000**		**801,940**
010	DIVISION FORCES	25,875	7,000			32,875
	Extended Cold Weather Clothing System			7,000		
020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	19,133				19,133
030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	248,116				248,116
040	ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	129,191				129,191
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	372,625				372,625
	LAND FORCES READINESS	**355,992**				**355,992**
060	FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	177,121				177,121
070	LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	81,562				81,562
080	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	97,309				97,309
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	**672,849**				**672,849**
090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	462,716				462,716
100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	204,370				204,370
110	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	5,763				5,763
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**1,823,781**	**7,000**	**7,000**		**1,830,781**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	163,601	900	900		164,501
120	ADMINISTRATION	58,298				58,298
130	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	9,293				9,293
140	PERSONNEL/FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION	7,577				7,577
150	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	88,433	900			89,333
	Citizen Soldier Support			900		
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**163,601**	**900**			**164,501**
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
	Authority to present recognition items to returning soldiers		3,000	3,000		3,000
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	**1,987,382**	**10,900**	**10,900**		**1,998,282**
	Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS	679,672				679,672
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	518,962				518,962
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	16,250				16,250
030	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	2,179				2,179
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	141,907				141,907
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	374				374
	RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS	134,774				134,774
060	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	61,711				61,711
070	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	537				537
080	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	71,895				71,895
090	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	631				631

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
	RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	224,868				217,255
100	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	7,613				7,613
110	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	217,255				217,255
	RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT	5,070				5,070
120	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,070				5,070
	BASE SUPPORT	172,666				172,666
130	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	62,788				62,788
140	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	109,878				109,878
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**1,217,050**				**1,217,050**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	28,645				28,645
150	ADMINISTRATION	4,871				4,871
160	CIVILIAN MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT					
170	MILITARY MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT	9,037				9,037
180	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	3,907				3,907
190	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	5,385				5,385
200	OTHER SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	5,445				5,445
	CANCELLED ACCOUNTS					
210	CANCELLED ACCOUNTS					
9990	OTHER PROGRAMS					
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**28,645**				**28,645**
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	**1,245,695**				**1,245,695**
	Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve					

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	MISSION FORCES	**166,689**	**7,500**	**7,500**		**174,189**
010	OPERATING FORCES	45,812	7,500			53,312
	All Purpose Environmental Clothing System			7,500		
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	13,964				13,964
030	TRAINING SUPPORT	26,079				26,079
	BASE SUPPORT	**80,834**				**80,834**
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	10,105				10,105
050	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	70,729				70,729
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**166,689**	**7,500**	**7,500**		**174,189**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**33,245**				**33,245**
060	SPECIAL SUPPORT	11,975				11,975
070	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	815				815
080	ADMINISTRATION	7,898				7,898
090	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,066				8,066
	BASE SUPPORT	**4,491**				**4,491**
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	4,491				4,491
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**33,245**				**33,245**
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	**199,934**	**7,500**	**7,500**		**207,434**
	Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve					

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	AIR OPERATIONS	**2,393,017**				**2,393,017**
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,585,504				1,585,504
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	85,545				85,545
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	377,817				377,817
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	55,764				55,764
050	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	288,387				288,387
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**2,393,017**				**2,393,017**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**108,669**				**108,669**
060	ADMINISTRATION	64,017				64,017
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	15,854				15,854
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	21,095				21,095
090	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	7,052				7,052
100	AUDIOVISUAL	651				651
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**108,669**				**108,669**
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	**2,501,686**				**2,501,686**
	Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard					
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	LAND FORCES	**2,086,646**	**10,500**	**10,500**		**2,097,146**
010	DIVISIONS	600,818	10,500			611,318
	Extended Cold Weather Clothing System			7,000		
	Advanced Solar Covers			3,500		

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	530,869				530,869
030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	322,856				322,856
040	ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	606,026				606,026
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	26,077				26,077
	LAND FORCES READINESS	609,533				609,533
060	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	227,670				227,670
070	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	126,496				126,496
080	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	255,367				255,367
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	1,473,920				1,473,920
090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	610,219				610,219
100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	391,544				391,544
110	MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	406,794				406,794
120	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	65,363				65,363
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**4,170,099**	**10,500**	**10,500**		**4,180,599**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	339,620	900			340,520
130	ADMINISTRATION	111,552				111,552
140	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	52,814				52,814
150	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	50,653				50,653
160	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	124,601	900			125,501
	Citizen Soldier Support			900		
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**339,620**	**900**	**900**		**340,520**
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	**4,509,719**	**11,400**	**11,400**		**4,521,119**
	Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard					

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES					
	AIR OPERATIONS	**4,685,689**	**3,000**	**3,000**		**4,688,689**
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	2,938,127				2,938,127
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	497,447	3,000			500,447
	Senior Scouts			3,000		
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	612,807				612,807
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	169,791				169,791
050	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	467,517				467,517
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 01:	**4,685,689**	**3,000**	**3,000**		**4,688,689**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
	SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**38,402**				**38,402**
060	ADMINISTRATION	28,949				28,949
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	9,453				9,453
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 04:	**38,402**				**38,402**
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	**4,724,091**	**3,000**	**3,000**		**4,727,091**
	TRANSFER ACCOUNTS					
010	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	407,865				407,865
020	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	305,275				305,275
030	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	406,461				406,461
040	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	28,167				28,167
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES	221,921				221,921
	TOTAL, O&M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS	**1,369,689**				**1,369,689**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS					

Title III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
060	U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	11,236				11,236
070	SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS					
080	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	20,000				20,000
090	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE					
100	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE					
110	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE					
120	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE					
130	IRAQ FREEDOM FUND, DEF					
140	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AFFAIRS	61,546				61,546
150	PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND					
160	FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION	415,549				415,549
	TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS	**508,331**				**508,331**
	TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:	126,902,542	(2,560,413)	468,000	(3,028,413)	124,342,129

Title III - REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUND					
Army	107,340				107,340
Navy	83,475				83,475
Air Force	41,525				41,525
Defense-wide	84,000				84,000
Defense Commissary Agency	1,155,000				1,155,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUND	**1,471,340**				**1,471,340**
MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
National Defense Sealift Fund	1,648,504	48,519	384,419	(335,900)	1,697,023
Armed Forces Retirement Fund	58,281				58,281
TOTAL, MANAGEMENT FUNDS	**1,706,785**	**48,519**	**384,419**	**(335,900)**	**1,755,304**
TOTAL, REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS	**3,178,125**	**48,519**	**384,419**	**(335,900)**	**3,226,644**

Title III - OTHER PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM					
Operations and Maintnenance	19,247,137	(42,918)			19,204,219
GAO estimate annual DHP Unobligated Funds				(99,900)	
Perinatal Information Center			982		
Madigan Army Medical Center Trauma Program			2,000		
TRICARE Prime Remote Exceptional Eligibility			4,000		
Modifications to TRICARE Reserve Select			50,000		
Procurement	375,319				375,319
Research and Development	169,156	7,500			176,656
Ex-Rad Radiation Protection Program			7,500		
TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**19,791,612**	**(35,418)**	**56,982**	**(99,900)**	**19,756,194**
CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITONS PROGRAM					
Operations and Maintnenance		1,241,514	1,241,514		1,241,514
Procurement		47,786	47,786		47,786
Research and Development		116,527	116,527		116,527
TOTAL, CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION		**1,405,827**	**1,405,827**		**1,405,827**
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG PROGRAM					
Operations and Maintnenance	895,741				895,741
TOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG PROGRAM	**895,741**				**895,741**
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL					
Operations and Maintnenance	208,687	(35,200)			173,487
Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan				(35,200)	
Procurement	1,000				1,000
Research and Development					
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**209,687**	**(35,200)**		**(35,200)**	**174,487**
TOTAL, OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS	**20,897,040**	**1,335,209**	**1,470,309**	**(135,100)**	**22,232,249**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

BUDGET REQUEST ADJUSTMENTS—READINESS

The committee recommends the following adjustments to the fiscal year 2006 amended budget request:

[In millions of dollars]

Department of the Army Adjustments:	
BA 1 Advanced Technology Batteries	+2.5
BA 1 Arsenal/Depot AIT Initiative	+10.0
BA 1 Bio/Chem Resistant Canteens	+1.0
BA 1 Utilities Privatization	(15.0)
BA 1 M Gators	+2.0
BA 1 Fleece Insulation-Extended Cold Weather Clothing	+2.0
BA 1 Tank Sonic Dry Clean Filter System	+1.0
BA 3 Civilian Intern Program	(32.0)
Under Execution Civilian Personnel	(17.0)
Unobligated Balances	(239.6)
BA 1 National Guard Extended Cold Weather Clothing System	+7.0
BA 1 National Guard Advanced Solar Covers	+3.5
BA 4 National Guard Citizen Soldier Support	+0.9
BA 4 Reserve Citizen Soldier Support Program	+0.9
BA 1 Reserve Extended Cold Weather Clothing System	+7.0
Department of the Navy Adjustments:	
BA 1 Stainless Steel Sanitary Spaces	+4.0
BA 1 Man Overboard ID System	+4.0
BA 1 JFCOM Joint Training	(12.9)
BA 1 Utilities Privatization	(57.0)
BA 1 NULKA	+2.0
BA 2 Ship Disposal	+8.0
BA 4 Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan	(16.0)
BA 4 Ford Island Environmental Clean-Up	+1.0
Under Execution Civilian Personnel	(172.0)
Unobligated Balances	(191.6)
United States Marine Corps Adjustments:	
BA 1 Hyper-Realistic MOUT Training	+2.0
BA 1 Bio/Chem Resistant Canteens	+1.0
BA 1 Mtn. Cold Weather Clothing and Equipment	+6.0
BA 1 Advanced Technology Batteries	+2.5
BA 1 Reserve All Purpose Environmental Clothing System	+7.5
Unobligated Balances	(37.4)
Department of the Air Force Adjustments:	
BA 1 Distributed Mission Operations	(41.2)
BA 1 Base Services (gymnasiums)	(65.0)
BA 1 Oxygen Mask and Visor	+2.0
BA 1 Utilities Privatization	(17.6)
Military to Civilian Conversion	(37.0)
Unobligated Balances	(195.4)
Defense-Wide Activities Adjustments:	
BA 1 The Joint Staff-Management Headquarters Training Transformation	(8.9)
BA 1 Office of the Inspector General Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan	(35.2)
BA 1 SOCOM-Bio/Chem Resistant Canteens	+1.0
BA 3 National Defense University, Joint Forces Staff College	+2.4
BA 4 Defense Human Resources Activity DLAMP	(7.3)
BA 4 Defense Human Resources Activity Fellows	(4.8)
BA 4 Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) CTMA	+15.0
BA 4 DLA Beryllium Supply Industrial Base	+3.0
BA 4 Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) Ft. Carson Compatible Use Buffers	+10.0
BA 4 OSD Capitol Cost Sharing	(61.3)
BA 4 OSD Readiness Environmental Preservation	+20.0
BA 4 American Forces Information Service	(10.0)
Unobligated Balances	(103.2)
Transfers to Title XV:	
BA 1 Army Rapid Fielding Initiative	(102.8)

[In millions of dollars]—Continued

BA 1	Army Operating Tempo	(115.7)
BA 1	Army Depot Maintenance	(269.8)
BA 1	Army Repair Parts	(56.9)
BA 1	Army Unit of Action Experimentation	(37.2)
BA 4	Army Sustainment System Technical Support	(116.0)
BA 4	Army NATO Support	(11.8)
BA 1	Navy Operating Tempo	(180.0)
BA 1	USMC Depot Maintenance	(51.8)
BA 1	USMC Operating Tempo	(95.9)
BA 1	Air Force Operating Tempo	(476.0)

Base Services Related Supplies

The budget request contained $123.7 million for Base Services Related Supplies and Materials, representing an increase of $83.7 million from the amount authorized for fiscal year 2005. The committee understands that the need for force enables such services as mess attendants, gymnasiums, and libraries and is aware of the impact these services have on quality of life. However, the committee feels that tripling the program funding is unjustified.

The committee recommends $58.7 million for Base Services Related Supplies, a decrease of $65 million.

Capital Security Cost Share

The budget request contained $61.3 million for the Department of Defense's (DOD) Capitol Security Cost Share. Section 629 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447) requires all agencies with an overseas presence to fund a portion or share of the Department of State's costs for the construction of U.S. diplomatic facilities. Each agency's share is based on the number of personnel based in overseas diplomatic facilities. DOD's estimated share of the fiscal year 2006 assessment is $61.3 million. This fee is expected to increase to $125.6 million by fiscal year 2009, despite forecasted stability in DOD overseas staffing levels. In accordance with section 629(e)(1) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447), the program encourages right-sizing of each agency's overseas presence. While the committee notes that the Department plays a critical role in the Department of State's ability to accomplish its worldwide mission, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to scrutinize the number of overseas positions and take steps to ensure that only staff essential to DOD's mission are based in overseas diplomatic facilities. Furthermore, the committee believes that the Department of Defense provides non-reimbursed goods and services to the Department of State at a level that exceeds the assessed amount.

The committee recommends a decrease of $61.3 million for the Capital Security Cost Share.

Civilian Intern Program

The budget request contained $51.7 million in program growth for the Department of the Army's Civilian Intern Program. While the committee agrees a career program to train new hires is appropriate, the committee believes the requested program growth is excessive. The committee notes that the program will have only 22 new interns in fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommends a decrease of $32.0 million.

Distributed Mission Operations

The budget request contained $181.9 million for sustainment and expansion of the Distributed Mission Operations (DMO) program, an increase of $60.3 million. The committee supports DMO as an effective and vital means of maintaining war fighting capability and readiness, but is concerned that expansion of the program at the rate requested is excessive. The committee supports sustainment of the current program and the expansion of one F–15E and two F–16 Mission Training Centers (MTC). With the addition of these new MTCs, the Air Force will have a worldwide total of four F–15C sites, one F–15E site, six F–16 sites, and two E–3B Airborne Warning and Control System sites.

The committee recommends funding DMO at $140.0 million, a decrease of $41.9 million.

Eagle Vision

The budget request contained no funds for operating and maintaining the Eagle Vision. The committee believes that the ability to receive, process, and exploit commercial imagery products through Eagle Vision is of high value.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.6 million for operating Eagle Vision.

Expansion of Export Control Database

The budget request contained $320.1 million for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency including funds to strengthen and expand the existing federal effort to help foreign governments improve their export control performance. The committee notes that the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control operates an export control database that is currently used by some 16 countries in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

The committee recommends an additional $1.3 million to sustain and expand the worldwide subscriptions to this database, provide education and training for its use, expand the database coverage of weapons of mass destruction with specific focus on terrorism threats, produce a secure intranet version of the database, and continue related research and public education initiatives on export control policy.

Joint Initiatives

The budget request contained funds for over 120 different joint programs, studies, and management initiatives. Of specific concern is the lack of oversight of joint training. The committee strongly believes that joint initiatives are critical to the success of the U.S. military in response to the threats challenging our nation in the new millennium. The committee, however, is concerned that the Secretary of Defense lacks oversight of the vast number and broad scope of joint initiatives that have proliferated across the Department of Defense (DOD). The committee has not seen evidence that the Joint Forces Command, the Joint Staff, and military services coordinate funding requirements for joint training programs to include the Joint Chiefs of Staff Exercise Program, the Joint National Training Capability, service-sponsored exercises, and sustainment

and modernization of DOD training ranges. The committee is concerned there are duplicate and unnecessary funding requests.

The committee recommends a decrease of $12.9 million in funding for the Department of the Navy's Joint Forces Command and a decrease of $8.9 million in funding for The Joint Staff's Management Headquarters for Training Transformation.

Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan

The budget request contained $485 million to implement the mid-range financial improvement plan. Late in fiscal year 2004, the Secretary of Defense initiated a mid-range financial improvement plan to obtain financially auditable statements by fiscal year 2007. The committee determined this plan was poorly defined, had uncertain implementation plans and was not properly articulated to the defense agencies or military services. In accordance with section 352 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), the Secretary was prohibited from obligating operation and maintenance funds to implement this plan until a report better describing the program was delivered to Congress. The report has not yet been delivered. Nevertheless, the Department of Defense, Inspector General, awarded a task and delivery order contract to an audit firm to proceed with the audits. The committee believes the plan continues to lack an appropriate structure or implementation plan.

The committee recommends a decrease of $32.5 million to the Department of Defense, Inspector General and a decrease of $16.0 million to the Department of the Navy. The committee understands that no other defense agencies or military services budgeted funds in fiscal year 2006 for the mid-range financial improvement plan.

Military-to-Civilian Conversion Program

The budget request contained $89.3 million in the civilian personnel account for 1,395 Air Force military-to-civilian conversions. While the committee concurs that this program is essential to free up military end strength for operational functions, the committee is concerned that plan is not executable due to the hiring time required for civilian personnel.

The committee recommends funding military-to-civilian conversions at $52.3 million, a decrease of $37.0 million.

Navy Ship Disposal

The budget request contained $11.9 million for ship disposal within the operation and maintenance, Navy. The committee notes that the Secretary of the Navy has developed an efficient ship disposal program with a sound record of protecting health, safety, and the environment. The committee expects that these additional funds will be used to accelerate planned disposals, including reefing and deepwater sinking (SINKEX). In section 3505 of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation is required to transfer, through use of the Economy Act (31 U.S.C. 1535) no fewer than four obsolete combatant vessels from Maritime Administration's (MARAD) inventory to the Navy for disposal using Navy disposal contracts. The committee understands that the cost of disposal under the Navy program is sometimes more expensive than

through MARAD disposal contractors. While the transfer under the Economy Act requires an accompanying transfer of funds from MARAD, the Navy is encouraged to utilize part of the increase recommended in this section to ensure that the transfers recommended in section 3505 are implemented in a timely but cost effective manner. While acknowledging differences in program administration, the committee also encourages the Secretary of the Navy to assist the Maritime Administration in developing best management disposal practices similar to those the Navy currently has in place.

The committee recommends $19.9 million, an increase of $8.0 million.

Operation Tempo Alignment to Account for the Global War on Terrorism

Over the past three fiscal years, the administration has relied upon emergency supplemental funds to support the global war on terrorism (GWOT). Costs directly associated with the GWOT are not included in the annual Department of Defense budget request. Despite this policy, the committee believes such costs are embedded in the fiscal year 2006 budget request. The committee has accordingly transferred $1,511.9 million out of the budget request into the "bridge" supplemental fund found in title XV of this bill:

[In millions of dollars]

Army	+708.2
Navy	+180.0
Marine Corps	+147.7
Air Force	+476.0

Tank Sonic Dry Clean Filter Systems

The committee believes the secretaries of the military departments should continue to adapt maintenance requirements for equipment in Iraq and Afghanistan in order to extend their useful life. One action the committee believes should be taken is the cleaning and reuse of filters needed in Army tanks. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to purchase and utilize the tank sonic dry clean filter systems for appropriate tank engines in theatre.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million for the Secretary to purchase, deploy, and train personnel on the proper use of these systems.

Utilities Privatization Implementation

As noted in items of special interest in title 28 of division B of this Act, a recent report by the Government Accountability Office raises significant concerns about the efficacy of the Department of Defense's utilities privatization program. As such, section 2812 provides for the temporary suspension of utilities privatization authorities.

In accordance with this provision, the committee recommends the following reductions to reflect savings related to utilities privatization implementation efforts that will not occur during fiscal year 2006:

[In millions of dollars]

Army	(15.0)
Navy	(57.0)
Air Force	(17.6)

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ISSUES

Overview

The committee is well aware of the critical importance of information technology (IT) to the conduct of combat operations as well as the efficient management of Department of Defense (DOD) business operations. IT systems provide the real-time intelligence that enables U.S. soldiers to detect and avoid danger; help find and defeat the enemy; and enable battlefield, theatre, and domestic medical technologies to save the lives of battle-wounded troops. IT systems will also someday provide the means by which the Department can accurately manage its people, funds, and equipment—a daunting challenge for a worldwide, dynamic, half-a-trillion-dollar enterprise facing a determined and elusive enemy.

The committee recognizes the importance of IT and has taken a particular interest in DOD's management of IT programs in recent years. The committee has and continues to stress the importance of a DOD-wide enterprise architecture to lay the foundation, set the standards, guide the development, and ensure interoperability of new systems.

Adjustments to Information Technology

Overall, the committee is pleased that the Department has progressed in several areas: more focused management of programs, more emphasis on joint programs, and most importantly, an emphasis on warfighting systems that protect American lives, inform battlefield commanders, and more precisely guide U.S. munitions.

Despite commendable progress, the committee believes that several programs recommended for funding in the budget request are redundant or premature. For example, the base level communications infrastructure program proposed by the Air Force should be delayed until the impacts of the overseas base restructuring, the base realignment and closure process, and the Quadrennial Defense Review are better known. Other programs have suffered delays or do not yet have firm requirements which the committee believes will preclude the prudent expenditure of funding in the budget request.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the following adjustments:

[In millions of dollars]

Department of the Army Adjustments:	
Live Instrumentation Air and Missile Defense Units	+5.0
Army Knowledge Online Disaster Recovery System	+3.5
GFEBS	(24.9)
Department of the Air Force Adjustments:	
Base Level Communications Structure	(103.0)
Combat Information Transportation System	(32.0)
Medical Qualification Tracking Visualization Data Analysis	+0.6

[In millions of dollars]—Continued

Defense-wide Adjustments:	
Office of the Secretary of Defense Business Modernization Program (BMMP) and Domains	(12.6)
Defense Logistics Agency BMMP Logistics Systems Modernization	(1.8)

Army Knowledge Online Disaster Recovery

The budget request contained $79.0 million for the Army Knowledge Online (AKO) effort.

AKO is a critical key technology component of the AKO strategy. The AKO portal is the single, secure access point for 1.7 million Army personnel and other users supporting the Army into the Army Intranet, and provides deployed soldiers' access to various Army and Department of Defense systems. AKO provides core enterprise-wide directory, security, collaboration, and other functionalities.

The committee notes the increased utilization of AKO, combined with dramatic data growth has resulted in the need for improvements to the Army's disaster recovery services. Additionally, the Army plans to host other Army mission critical applications at the disaster recovery facilities as part of their plan for server consolidation and AKO integration. The committee believes additional efforts are necessary to ensure continuity of operations and critical functions for AKO.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $82.5 million for AKO, an increase of $3.5 million for disaster recovery services.

Enterprise License Agreement

The Department of Defense's (DOD) continuing transition from legacy to state-of-the-art information technology systems is burdened with rising modernization costs. The committee supports DOD's efforts to mitigate such cost pressures and encourages the Department to embrace more innovative contract arrangements to realize cost savings.

The committee believes that savings will be achieved and security enhanced in the procurement of commercial software applications by including provisions in the original procurement agreement that the delivered software meet DOD configuration standards. Additional stipulations that the vendor will update the software to meet any necessary DOD-driven configuration changes will yield further savings. The committee notes that the Air Force entered into such an innovative agreement in June 2004, that has accomplished these results.

The committee believes the Department should explore the successful Air Force model for possible emulation throughout the Department. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to review the Air Force enterprise license agreement, consider applying a similar approach for the Department, and submit a report on this assessment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2006.

High Performance Computing Systems—"Supercomputers"

The committee is concerned that despite the availability of cost effective, commodity, multi-processor computer systems, more attention must be directed toward improving software to improve "time-to-solution" for scientific discovery and national security workloads. When procuring High Performance Computing (HPC) systems, the committee is concerned that the U.S. HPC community is advertising the theoretical peak performance of HPC systems while down-playing the more important actual sustained performance delivered by such systems on an HPC center's actual workload.

Since the traditional U.S. leadership in HPC systems is critical to U.S. competitiveness and many technologies critical to the Department of Defense (DOD), the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2006, on the following: (1) a five year plan for advanced software at all levels from applications to system tools that improve HPC time-to-solution, to include complementary multi-agency activities; and (2) a two year plan for advanced software development producing measurable goals and milestones that result in time-to-solution benchmarks more predictive of HPC performance for various actual systems and workloads than the synthetic workloads sometimes currently used for performance prediction. Both of these reports must outline the steps the Department will take to improve HPC software resulting in significant improvements in time-to-solution and performance prediction for today's DOD HPC applications and emerging 2010 petascale applications. The committee encourages the Department to share any improvements resulting from execution of these plans to be made available to the entire U.S. HPC community to promote continued U.S. leadership in HPC.

Live Instrumentation for Air and Missile Defense Units

The budget request contained no funding for live instrumentation for Air and Missile Defense (AMD) units.

Recent operations in Iraq highlight the critical need for AMD units to have opportunities to "train like we fight" and to do so with both manned and unmanned air assets. The committee believes that instrumentation and digital links to the National Training Center at Fort Irwin, California, will address the immediate need to integrate AMD forces with the Army maneuver combat training to allow for a truly joint training environment. The committee believes live training instrumentation will allow real-time data collection and analysis, as well as mitigate current training and readiness issues. AMD units play an increasingly important role in the U.S. national security strategy and they should be included in joint training and exercises.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $5.0 million for the continuing development of training instrumentation for AMD units

Medical Qualification Tracking Visualization and Data Analysis Project

The Department of Defense Medical Examination Review Board (the Board) is responsible for the determination of medical accept-

ability of applications to all the U.S. service academies and the Reserve Officer Training Corps Scholarship program. The Board processes 27,000 applications annually, not including the thousands of transactions it processes in response to congressional and service academy inquiries. The committee understands that the Board requires a visual mechanism for extracting information from its database. The committee believes this requirement may be satisfied by the Medical Qualification Tracking Visualization and Data Analysis (MQTVDA) Project which is an application that data mines the Board's database. The committee believes the MQTVDA will provide greater transparency to this process and improve the Board's efficiency.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $600,000 for the research and development of MQTVDA.

Medical Information Systems Architecture

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) is considering conversion of its Composite Health Care System (CHCS) to an alternative database and application platform. CHCS provides essential, automated information support to military health system providers at hospitals and clinics worldwide. The existing CHCS application runs on a legacy database system that is supported by an aging operating system, and is limited to a single hardware platform. Converting CHCS to an open architecture would provide significant improvements and expand hardware options. The committee supports DOD's efforts to exploit previous technological investments, and to utilize new technologies as necessary to transform clinical support systems in a cost and operationally efficient manner. However, the committee notes that this transformation should not result in a stove-piped system. The committee strongly encourages the Department to apply lessons learned in recent pilot demonstrations, in conjunction with DOD's existing enterprise architecture, to guide its CHCS conversion efforts, and to maximize return on investment.

Network Device Authentication

The committee recognizes the importance of computer network security to protect sensitive information. The committee is aware that in addition to authenticating network users, it is now possible to authenticate devices that access computer networks, which add an extra layer of security. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to examine device authentication alternatives for security and cost-effectiveness and to consider incorporating device authentication for the Department of Defense's computer networks.

Radio Frequency Identification in the Medical Supply Chain

The committee notes the progress made by the Military Health Care System (MHS) pharmacy program to implement bar code technology to manage pharmaceutical logistics and improve patient safety. The committee is aware that the Secretary of Defense has mandated that all Department of Defense (DOD) components shall immediately resource and implement the use of high data capacity active radio frequency identification (RFID) in DOD operational environment. When fully implemented, RFID technology will improve

the asset tracking and lifecycle management of the medical supply chain, medical logistics management, facility security, patient safety and medical equipment maintenance. The committee urges the Secretary to begin implementing RFID in the medical supply chain consistent with DOD's RFID policies and architecture to prevent the MHCS from becoming stove-piped or unable to operate with other DOD systems.

Servicewide Communication—General Fund Enterprise Business Systems

The budget request contained $31.8 million in operation and maintenance funds for the General Fund Enterprise Business System (GFEBS). The $31.8 million was transferred from base operations support to servicewide communications in fiscal year 2005. The committee understands that the Secretary of the Army only requires $6.9 million for GFEBS in fiscal year 2006.

The committee recommends $6.9 million for GFEBS, a decrease of $24.9 million.

OTHER MATTERS

Arsenal Support Program Initiative

The committee is aware that the Rock Island Arsenal has been administratively split into two separate commands, a garrison command and a manufacturing command. While the committee supports this restructuring effort, there is concern that this action may preclude the entire Rock Island Arsenal from being considered eligible for the Arsenal Support Program Initiative. The committee encourages the Department of the Army to consider the Rock Island Arsenal, in its entirety, as an "eligible facility" as defined by in section 4551 of title 10, United States Code.

Base Operating Support Budget Shortfalls

The committee is concerned by widespread reports of shortfalls in base operating support (BOS) budgets at U.S. military installations. According to these reports, BOS shortfalls have caused the services to consider or implement reductions to basic base services such as child care, dining hall operations, and facilities management activities, dramatically affecting both military quality of life and readiness. The committee is aware that the Department has a long history of utilizing infrastructure budgets, including BOS and sustainment, restoration, and modernization budgets, as "billpayers" for operational requirements, and most recently, to support costs associated with the global war on terrorism. The committee is troubled by this practice, and urges the Department to fully fund and execute BOS, sustainment, and facilities recapitalization budgets.

In addition, the committee directs each service secretary to report to the House Committee on Armed Services by June 15, 2005, the amount of funding each service anticipates expending for BOS and sustainment activities during fiscal year 2005. Each secretary should provide an estimate of funding levels necessary to fully meet "must pay" BOS requirements as well as DOD's goal of funding 95 percent of sustainment requirements. The reports should

also include a listing of anticipated reductions to BOS-funded services if anticipated execution levels are below the "must pay" level. Finally, each report should include an assessment of whether the amount of BOS funding included in the fiscal year 2006 budget request is sufficient to meet "must pay" requirements, and a list of likely sources of funding or base activity cuts that would be necessary to meet budgeted levels during the coming fiscal year.

Budget Justification Documents for Operation and Maintenance

In the committee report (H. Rept. 108–106) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), the committee noted the continued growth in the "other costs" and "other contracts" line items in the service's summary of price and program growth exhibits contained in the budget justification material. In response to section 1003 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), the Secretary of Defense submitted a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services identifying the elements of "other costs" and "other contracts" used in the justification materials of the budget request. The report identified categories of information that the committee believes should be specifically identified under the "other purchases" category in the summary of price and program growth exhibit for fiscal year 2008. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary to identify in budget justification material submitted for fiscal year 2008, and thereafter, the costs for outsourcing and privatization, information technology contracts, other base support contractual services, other training contractual support, and military personnel contract support.

Evaluation of Department of Defense Policy Prohibiting the Purchase of Technical Data to Accompany Acquired Systems

The committee is concerned that Department of Defense (DOD) policies may limit the services from purchasing technical data when acquiring systems, and thereby substantially increase the sustainment portion of the system's total life cycle costs and delay repair of mission essential items. The committee directs the Comptroller General to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2006, containing a comprehensive analysis of the impact of these policies. The comprehensive analysis shall include the following: (1) the status of DOD's plan to revise acquisition policy and regulations in response to recommendations in the Government Accountability Office Report (GAO–04–715) dated August, 2004; (2) the costs associated with the fees assessed for access to view, modify, or distribute technical data relating to the sustainment of procured systems; (3) the assessment of time required to reach back to the system manufacturer for technical data and what impact, if any, this delay has on repairing or modifying fielded systems; and (4) recommendations for more effectively managing the costs associated with technical data access requirements associated with future procurement contracts.

Food Supplies

The committee is aware of the Subsistence Prime Vendor program in the Department of Defense, under which a single vendor manages and supplies food in a particular region. The committee understands that other initiatives or programs to improve the efficiencies of food distribution are being examined within the Department. The committee is interested in these alternative programs and directs the Secretary to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2005, detailing the alternative programs currently being evaluated.

Naval Oceanographic Command

The committee understands that the Secretary of the Navy is in the preliminary process phase of evaluating whether to conduct a study under Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 for administrative support and budget/finance functions performed by government personnel at the Naval Oceanographic Command. During this phase, the committee believes the Secretary should take into consideration the various independent reviews that have previously examined this question, including those done by the Logistics Management Institute and Booz Allen Hamilton.

Pine Bluff Arsenal

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense has invested millions of dollars in the Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, for specialized infrastructure and environmental regulatory permit capacity to provide needed capability to manufacture, repair, assemble and store specialized chemical and biological defense equipment. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to fully examine operations at the Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, in order to determine if depot-level activities are being performed at the facility and if these activities qualify the arsenal for designation as a Center for Industrial and Technical Excellence for Chemical and Biological Defense Equipment.

Predator Unmanned Aerial Vehicle

The budget request contained $218.2 million in operation and maintenance for the Predator unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) program. The committee is concerned about the manning of the Predator UAV. Specifically, the committee has informally inquired about the morale and motivation of rated Air Force officer pilots flying the Predator. The committee has also questioned the costs of flight qualifying pilots in a high performance jet aircraft, only to send them to fly the UAV. The committee has questioned whether enlisted personnel could be flight/operator qualified certified, licensed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and given a specialty code of Predator pilot. The committee notes the other military services' UAV programs utilize enlisted pilot/operators almost exclusively. The committee firmly believes the cost associated with such training is dramatically lower than that of rated pilot officers.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a study of the efficacy of creating an enlisted pilot/operator specialty code for the Predator UAV. The study should review

the feasibility of training, employing, and maintaining enlisted pilots. It should compare the costs of training, the career salary costs, and the retirement cost projections of enlisted pilot/operators versus rated pilots. Finally, the study should carefully explore the morale and motivational career issues. The committee expects the report to be submitted to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees by June 30, 2006.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding

This section would authorize $124.3 billion in operation and maintenance funding for the military departments and defense-wide activities.

Section 302—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize $3.2 billion for working capital funds of the Department of Defense and the National Defense Sealift Fund.

Section 303—Other Department of Defense Programs

This section would authorize $22.3 billion for other Department of Defense Programs for (1) the Defense Health Program; (2) Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction; (3) Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide; and (4) the Defense Inspector General.

SUBTITLE B—ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

Section 311—Revision of Required Content of Environmental Quality Annual Report

This section would amend section 2706(b) of title 10, United States Code, to revise existing reporting requirements on environmental quality programs and other environmental activities. This section would repeal the requirement of the Secretary of Defense to report annually to Congress a list of planned or ongoing projects necessary to support environmental quality programs that exceed $1.5 million during the reporting period and a statement of fines and penalties imposed against the Department of Defense and the military departments under applicable environmental laws during the fiscal year. This section would also eliminate the reporting requirement for the following expenditures on overseas environmental activities: environmental technology, conferences, meetings, studies for pilot programs, and overseas travel. The committee notes this section will reduce costs to the Department.

Section 312—Pilot Project on Compatible Use Buffers on Real Property Bordering Fort Carson, Colorado

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot project at Fort Carson, Colorado, for purposes of evaluating the feasibility and effectiveness of utilizing conservation easements and leases to limit development and preserve habitat on real prop-

erty in the vicinity of military installations in the United States. The pilot program would be conducted in four phases as described in the Fort Carson Army Compatible User Buffer Project, which is a plan to use conservation easements and leases on property in the vicinity of Fort Carson, Colorado. The pilot program shall expire in five years or on the date of completion of the fourth phase of the Fort Carson Army Compatible User Buffer Project, whichever is earlier.

Section 313—Repeal of Air Force Report on Military Installation Encroachment Issues

This section would repeal a reporting requirement in section 315 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375).

Section 314—Payment of Certain Private Cleanup Costs in Connection with Defense Environmental Restoration Program

This section would amend section 2701 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse a private land owner for costs incurred assisting the Department of Defense (DOD) in meeting its covenant responsibilities, pursuant to section 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERLCA) of 1980 (Public Law 95–510), to conduct clean up on property once under the control and contaminated by DOD. This section does not affect, alter or diminish the Secretary's obligation and responsibility to conduct clean up under section 120 of the CERCLA.

SUBTITLE C—WORKPLACE AND DEPOT ISSUES

Section 321—Proceeds from Cooperative Activities with Non-Army Entities

This section would amend section 4544 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize Army industrial facilities to retain the working capital funds received from the sale of unique goods or services. Section 4544 identifies the limited circumstances under which goods and services can be sold.

Section 322—Public-Private Competition

This section would amend section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a "formal" competition when conducting the analysis required under section 2461. This would impact the Secretary's ability to conduct a streamlined competition authorized in the Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76. This section would also prohibit reorganizing or remodeling a function performed by government employees for the purpose of avoiding the competition requirements of section 2461.

Section 323—Public-Private Competition Pilot Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program using the process defined in Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 on four public-private competitions for

work currently performed by a contractor. The pilot program shall be completed in three years. The Secretary shall submit a report to Congress with the study results.

Section 324—Sense of Congress on Equitable Legal Standing for Civilian Employees

This section would state that it is the sense of Congress that Department of Defense civilian employees should receive comparable treatment as contractors throughout the process of a public-private competition, and in particular, with respect to legal standing to challenge the competition.

SUBTITLE D—EXTENSION OF PROGRAM AUTHORITIES

Section 331—Extension of Authority to Provide Logistics Support and Services for Weapons Systems Contractors

This section would amend section 365 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) by striking "2007" and inserting "2010". This would extend, for an additional three years, a program under which the Secretary of Defense may make available logistics support and services to a contractor for the construction, modification, or maintenance of a weapon system. The regulations required to be published prior to implementation have not yet been published. They are expected to be published in the current fiscal year. The extension, therefore, would allow the Secretary five years to conduct the pilot program.

Section 332—Extension and Revision of Temporary Authority for Contractor Performance of Security Guard Functions

This section would prohibit contractor performance of security guard functions, awarded under authority of section 332 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–31), to be in effect after September 30, 2006. To fill a requirement for security guard functions, as authorized under section 332, the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments must conduct new full and open competitions pursuant to section 2304 of title 10, United States Code. In conducting these new competitions the authority in section 602 of the Business Opportunity Development Reform Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–656) would not apply. New contracts could be in effect until the end of fiscal year 2008.

SUBTITLE E—UTAH TEST AND TRAINING RANGE

Section 341—Definitions

This section would define the terms "covered wilderness", "Tribe", "Utah Test and Training Range," and "Wilderness Act."

Section 342—Military Operations and Overflights, Utah Test and Training Range

This section would first explain the importance of the Utah Test and Training Range through the use of congressional findings. This section would also further define the intent of both the Utah Test

and Training Range Protection Act and the Wilderness Act (Public Law 88–577).

Section 343—Planning Process for Federal Lands in the Utah Test and Training Range

This section would first require the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to develop land use plans for federal lands in the Utah Test and Training Range. This section would also prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from granting or issuing any authorizations for rights-of-way under the Federal Land Policy and Manage Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761) upon certain federal lands identified as inventory units.

Section 344—Designation and Management of Cedar Mountain Wilderness, Utah

This section would designate certain federal lands in Tooele County, Utah, as wilderness and therefore as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Section 345—Identification of Additional Bureau of Land Management Land in Utah as Trust Land for Skull Valley Band of Goshutes

This section would identify approximately 640 acres of Bureau of Land Management land in the State of Utah to be administered in trust for the benefit of the Skull Valley Band of Goshutes.

Section 346—Relation to Other Lands and Laws

This section would make clarifying and technical corrections.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 351—Codification and Revision of Limitation on Modification of Major Items of Equipment Scheduled for Retirement or Disposal

This section would codify and revise existing reporting requirements in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108-287) on modifications to aircraft, weapons, vessels, and other items of equipment scheduled to be retired or disposed of within five years. This section would deviate from the previous reporting requirement by limiting the notice to Congress to only those instances where the modification costs exceed $1 million. Historically, 98 percent of waiver requests have been for modifications that had a total installed value below this mark and involved equipment that would be removed and reused when the host system was retired. This exception would balance the need to minimize administrative delays in mission-essential modernization with the appropriate degree of oversight.

Section 352—Limitation on Purchase of Investment Items With Operation and Maintenance Funds

This section would codify and revise a limitation in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–287). This section would prohibit the use of operation and maintenance

funds for the purchase or replacement, of an investment item which costs more than $250,000. It has come to the committee's attention that the Secretary of the Army has expended operation and maintenance funds for the purchase of Shadow unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs). The Secretary's rationale is that under the contractor logistics support contract, the contractor was required to maintain a wartime readiness rate of 85 percent. In at least nine instances this required the contractor to replace a UAV beyond economic repair. This provision would make clear that replacing an item that is beyond economic repair is equivalent to purchasing an item. The committee notes it's concerned with the Department of the Army's inability to gather the relevant facts.

Section 353—Provision of Department of Defense Support for Certain Paralympic Sporting Events

This section would create a new exception for the Secretary of Defense to authorize support for sporting events sanctioned by the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) Paralympic Military Program. The USOC Paralympic Military Program provides support for veterans with service-connected physical disabilities to participate in Paralympic sports as a regular and ongoing part of their rehabilitation and daily lives. Additionally, the section would enable the Secretary to authorize up to $1.0 million per fiscal year in support for USOC sanctioned national or international Paralympic sporting events in which participation exceeds 500 athletes.

Section 354—Development and Explanation of Budget Models for Base Operations Support, Sustainment, and Facilities Recapitalization

This section would require a report during each of the next five fiscal years from the Secretary of Defense on the Department of Defense's (DOD) models for base operations support (BOS), sustainment, and facilities recapitalization budgets. The report should include an explanation of the methodology used to build each model; a description of items contained in each model; whether the models are being applied to each service under common definitions of BOS, sustainment, and facilities recapitalization; the goals for appropriate funding levels in the coming fiscal years for each area of funding; justification for those goals; and changes made to the models and/or goals since the last report.

As noted previously, the committee is troubled by DOD's practice of utilizing BOS, sustainment, and facilities recapitalization budgets as "billpayers" for operational requirements and costs related to the global war on terrorism. While the Department's efforts to establish "models" to determine appropriate funding levels for BOS, sustainment, and facilities recapitalization are noteworthy, the committee recognizes that such models have little value if they do not include Department-wide definitions, are executed at levels inconsistent with model findings, are manipulated to justify substandard budget requests, or do not accurately determine requirements. The committee expects that this annual reporting requirement will provide a useful tool for oversight of DOD's installation budgets.

Section 355—Report on Department of the Army Programs for Prepositioning of Equipment and Other Materiel

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to conduct an assessment of Department of the Army programs for prepositioned equipment and materiel. Since Operation Iraqi Freedom, the Army has continued to rely heavily on prepositioned stocks. The committee is concerned about the inventory levels and maintenance condition of the stocks. The assessment would include a review of all equipment, stocks and sustainment programs as well as how the program is currently configured to support the evolving goals of the Department of the Army. The Secretary shall submit the assessment by January 1, 2006, to the House Committee on Armed Services. This section would also require the Government Accountability Office to provide a report to Congress on the Secretary of the Army's assessment within 120 days of receipt of the report.

Section 356—Report Regarding Effect on Military Readiness of Undocumented Immigrants Trespassing Upon Operational Ranges

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report to Congress by March 15, 2006, on a joint plan to eliminate incursions of undocumented immigrants into military training areas near international borders. The report would also include an assessment of the scope, nature, and impact on military readiness caused by such incursions. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress semi-annual reports on mitigating measures implemented since the last report received.

According to the Marine Corps, undocumented immigrants who entered the Barry M. Goldwater Range, Arizona in 2004, caused the loss of more than 1,250 training hours—or more than 50 training days. The committee is concerned by the impact that such reductions in training time have on military readiness levels. As such, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to pursue mitigating measures resulting from the joint plan required by this section and, where appropriate, seek reprogramming authority during fiscal year 2006 to begin implementation of such measures.

Section 357—Congressional Notification Requirements Regarding Placement of Liquefied Natural Gas Facilities, Pipelines, and Related Structures on Defense Lands

This section would require the Secretary of Defense or the secretaries of the military departments to notify Congress thirty days prior to issuing a final approval, disapproval, or formal opinion regarding the placement of any liquefied natural gas facility, pipelines, or related structure in the vicinity of a military installation.

Section 358—Report Regarding Army and Air Force Exchange System Management of Army Lodging

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress on the results of a study evaluating the merits of allowing the Army and Air Force Exchange System to manage Army lodging. The section would prevent the Department of the

Army from soliciting or considering any request for qualifications for privatization of Army lodging beyond that already identified for inclusion in Group A of the Privatization of Army Lodging Initiative.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Increases in Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized to be on Active Duty for Operational Support

The committee notes a significant increase from fiscal year 2005 to fiscal year 2006 in the maximum number of reserve component personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support. Although the committee, in section 415, recommends the levels requested in the budget, the committee desires to understand more fully the reasons behind the significant increases. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General to assess the factors that led to the fiscal year 2006 increases, as well as the factors being used to develop the fiscal year 2007 budget request, and submit a report of the results of that assessment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2006.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACTIVE FORCES

Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces

This section would authorize the following end strengths for active duty personnel of the armed forces as of September 30, 2006.

Service	FY 2005 authorized and floor	FY 2006		Change from	
		Request	Committee recommendation	FY 2006 request	FY 2005 authorized
Army	502,400	482,400	482,400	0	−20,000
Navy	365,900	352,700	352,700	0	−13,200
USMC	178,000	175,000	175,000	0	−3,000
Air Force	359,700	357,400	357,400	0	−2,300
DOD	1,406,000	1,367,500	1,367,500	0	−38,500

The authorizations contained in this section are the end strengths requested in the budget. The committee does not believe that the budget request provided adequate manning levels for the Army and Marine Corps. Therefore, the committee, in section 1521, recommends fiscal year 2006 increases of 30,000 for the Army and 4,000 for the Marine Corps above the authorizations in this section.

Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels

This section would establish new minimum active duty end strengths for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force as of

September 30, 2006. These changes in minimum strengths reflect the committee recommendations shown in section 401.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES

Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve

This section would authorize the following end strengths for selected reserve personnel, including the end strength for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves, as of September 30, 2006:

Service	FY 2005 authorized	FY 2006		Change from	
		Request	Committee recommendation	FY 2006 request	FY 2005 authorized
Army National Guard	350,000	350,000	350,000	0	0
Army Reserve	205,000	205,000	205,000	0	0
Navy Reserve	83,400	73,100	73,100	0	−10,300
Marine Corps Reserve	39,600	39,600	39,600	0	0
Air National Guard	106,800	106,800	106,800	0	0
Air Force Reserve	76,100	74,000	74,000	0	−2,100
DOD Total	860,900	848,500	848,500	0	−12,400
Coast Guard Reserve	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	0

Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves

This section would authorize the following end strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves as of September 30, 2006:

Service	FY 2005 authorized	FY 2006		Change from	
		Request	Committee recommendation	FY 2006 request	FY 2005 authorized
Army National Guard	26,602	27,345	27,345	0	743
Army Reserve	14,970	15,270	15,270	0	300
Naval Reserve	14,152	13,392	13,392	0	−760
Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	2,261	0	0
Air National Guard	12,253	13,089	13,089	0	836
Air Force Reserve	1,900	2,290	2,290	0	390
DOD Total	72,138	73,647	73,647	0	1,509

The committee's recommendation would provide for a 2.0 percent growth in the strength of these full-time reservists above the levels authorized in fiscal year 2005.

Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status)

This section would authorize the following end strengths for military technicians (dual status) as of September 30, 2006:

Service	FY 2005 authorized (floor)	FY 2006		Change from	
		Request	Committee recommendation (floor)	FY 2006 request	FY 2005 authorized
Army National Guard	25,076	25,563	25,563	0	487
Army Reserve	7,299	7,649	7,649	0	350
Air National Guard	22,956	22,971	22,971	0	15
Air Force Reserve	9,954	9,853	9,853	0	−101

Service	FY 2005 authorized (floor)	FY 2006		Change from	
		Request	Committee recommendation (floor)	FY 2006 request	FY 2005 authorized
DOD Total	65,285	66,036	66,036	0	751

The committee's recommendation would provide for a 1.2 percent growth in the strength of military technicians above the levels authorized in fiscal year 2005.

Section 414—Fiscal Year 2006 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians

This section would establish the maximum end strengths for the reserve components of the Army and Air Force for non-dual status technicians as of September 30, 2006:

Service	FY 2005 authorized	FY 2006		Change from	
		Request	Committee recommendation	FY 2006 request	FY 2005 authorized
Army National Guard	1,600	1,600	1,600	0	
Army Reserve	795	695	695	0	−100
Air National Guard	350	350	350	0	
Air Force Reserve	90	90	90	0	
DOD Total	2,835	2,735	2,735	0	−100

Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized to be on Active Duty for Operational Support

This section would authorize, as required by section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, the maximum number of reserve component personnel who may be on active duty or full-time national guard duty during fiscal year 2006 to provide operational support. The personnel authorized here do not count against the end strengths authorized by sections 401 or 412.

Service	FY 2005 authorized	FY 2006		Change from	
		Request	Committee recommendation	FY 2006 request	FY 2005 authorized
Army National Guard	10,300	17,000	17,000	0	6,700
Army Reserve	5,000	13,000	13,000	0	8,000
Naval Reserve	6,200	6,200	6,200	0	0
Marine Corps Reserve	2,500	3,000	3,000	0	500
Air National Guard	10,100	16,000	16,000	0	5,900
Air Force Reserve	3,600	14,000	14,000	0	10,400
DOD Total	37,700	69,200	69,200	0	31,500

The significant increase in the authorizations made in the budget request compared to the fiscal year 2005 authorizations is due to several factors, including the requirement of section 115(b), United States Code, that the authorizations reflect the peak number in each of the reserve components during fiscal year 2006. Furthermore, according to Department of Defense officials, there was better oversight of data of the military services with regard to the numbers of reserve component members on active duty and increased reliance on voluntary active duty service instead of involuntary mobilizations to meet operational requirements.

SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 421—Military Personnel

This section would authorize $1,088.2 million to be appropriated for military personnel. This authorization of appropriations reflects both reductions and increases to the budget request for military personnel that are itemized below:

Military Personnel

	Amount (in thousands of dollars)
603: Pay reservists at academy prep schools based on military grade	1,000
606: Full basic allowance for housing for mobilized reservists	26,000
607: Increase flexibility to pay overseas cost-of-living allowances	1,000
608: Reserve income replacement	60,000
615: Additional special pay for dentists in residence	2,000
619: Increase flexibility to pay Selected Reserve reenlistment bonuses	1,000
620: Increase cap on Selected Reserve enlistment bonus to $15K	16,000
621: Increase flexibility to pay prior service enlistment bonuses	1,000
622: Increase cap on active duty enlistment bonus to $30K	36,000
641: Increase flexibility to pay expenses during temporary duty	1,000
644: Increased household goods limit for senior NCOs	4,000
672: Pays considered as saved pay upon appointment as officer	2,000
675: Army recruit referral bonus pilot program	1,000
Army: Expanded early commissioning program financial assistance	2,400
GWOT funding Hardship Duty Pay	−36,000
GWOT funding Family Separation Allowance	−100,000
GWOT funding Hostile Fire/Imminent Danger Pay	−85,854
GAO Reserve Component Underexecution Army Guard	−30,000
GAO Reserve Component Underexecution Army Reserve	−10,000
GAO Reserve Component Underexecution Navy Reserve	−10,000
GAO Reserve Component Underexecution Marine Corps Reserve	−1,000

Section 422—Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize $58.3 million to be appropriated for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home during fiscal year 2006.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

OVERVIEW

The committee's recommendations pay particular attention to what the men and women of the armed forces have told the committee in testimony, in discussions and meetings in the field, at their home bases and installations, and in the theaters of war. They and their families are a dedicated, remarkable group of Americans who speak with candor and credibility with regards to what, in this the fourth year of the global war on terrorism, is working and what is not. In that context, the committee recommends changes to the programs that provide for the surviving family members of those who have died or have been seriously injured in service. Specifically, the secretaries of the military departments would be required to appoint, train, and to manage casualty assistance officers to improve that effort. Furthermore, provisions in this title would require the appointment of officers to assist service members who are seriously injured to ensure that they and their families get only the best care and guidance during their time of greatest need. Surviving family members would also be given three

years to select their final home for the transportation of their possessions. The committee also recommends that the Secretary of Defense manage the fairness and equity between the services in the operation of their disability systems and their treatment of disabled members who remain on active duty.

The committee recommends provisions to enhance the ability of the Department of Defense to prosecute offenses relating to sexual assault. For example, recommended changes to the Uniform Code of Military Justice would eliminate the statute of limitations for prosecution of murder, rape and rape of a child; establish the offense of stalking in the Uniformed Code of Military Justice; and clearly define the offense of rape, sexual assault and other sexual misconduct in title 10, United States Code, and pattern the elements of the offenses after the federal statute.

The committee recommendations include provisions critical to protecting the commissary and exchange benefits. One section would provide the Defense Commissary Agency an assured opportunity to complete its own internal efforts to achieve greater efficiencies and savings before being subjected to mandated cost comparison studies. Another recommendation would require that appropriated funds be used to support the costs of shipping goods of the military exchange services that are destined for overseas stores. In addition, as part of title III of this act, the committee recommends that $65.0 million be added to the fiscal year 2006 Army second destination transportation accounts to restore the reduction in the Army and Air Force Exchange System accounts proposed by the budget request.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Advanced Civil School Opportunities for Officers of the Armed Forces

The committee notes that the military services are being challenged to retain sufficient numbers of qualified junior and midgrade officers. The Army, in particular, is below required inventory for majors and senior captains.

The committee is aware of studies that suggest retention of officers with high potential could be improved by providing those officers with an option to attend graduate school, on or after their seventh year of commissioned service, coupled with an agreement to extend their obligated service.

The committee understands that in previous years such fully funded graduate programs contributed to the professional development of and helped to prepare current senior military officers, such as the commanders of the United Stated Central Command and the Multinational Security Transition Command. However, the committee also understands that similar graduate level educational opportunities are no longer available for today's officers, except those designated to become professors at the military service academies or those assigned to technical fields.

The committee believes that resumption of such fully funded graduate degree programs could be beneficial. Therefore, the committee directs the secretaries of the military departments to examine the potential value and effectiveness of a program designed to offer advanced civil schooling opportunities to officers, both as a

tool for retention and as a means to increase the population of officers with a graduate education in disciplines relevant to service needs. The secretaries of the military departments shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives the reports of their assessments not later than April 1, 2006

Comptroller General Review of Financial Management Programs

The committee report (H. Rept. 107–194) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 required a comprehensive examination of the personal financial management programs operated within the military departments and directed the Secretary of Defense to identify best practices among the services to improve and standardize the programs available to service members. While the committee understands that the Department of Defense recognizes financial literacy as an integral part of mission readiness and quality of life, the committee is aware that financial problems continue to challenge active duty personnel and their families. Initial evidence also suggests that financial problems confront reserve component personnel and their families. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General to review the personal financial management programs offered by the services to determine their effectiveness in meeting the needs of active and reserve component service members. The review should examine whether service members have adequate access to the services' financial programs; whether the Department has effectively carried out the fiscal year 2002 mandate; and whether the financial management programs of the military services meet the quality criteria established by the Department. The Comptroller General should also assess the impact of the Department's financial readiness campaign on financial management awareness among service members; review the effectiveness and appropriateness of the partnerships established by the Department with non-governmental and governmental agencies; and assess the Department's efforts to determine the primary causes of bankruptcy among service members and their families. The Comptroller General shall submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2006.

Confidentiality Definition for Domestic Violence

The committee applauds the Department of Defense for issuing a confidentiality policy that protects the privacy and dignity of victims of sexual assault. However, the Department of Defense has yet to issue a comprehensive policy on confidentiality for victims of domestic violence, despite the fact that in 2001 the Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence recommended that the Department "[E]xplore all options for creating a system of confidential services, privileged communications and/or exemptions to mandatory reporting with the goal of creating access to a credible avenue for victims of domestic violence to receive support, information, options and resources to address the violence in their lives." The committee strongly urges the Department to issue a comprehensive confidentiality policy on domestic violence to ensure the ability of victims of domestic violence to obtain support, advocacy and care.

Coordinating the Activities of the Department of Defense, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Veterans' Affairs Intended to Assist Wounded and Injured Service Members and Surviving Family Members of Military Deaths

The committee has observed that there is no existing forum where the activities of the Department of Defense, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Veterans' Affairs can be coordinated in support of injured and wounded service members and their families, and surviving family members of military deaths. The committee believes it is vital that the three departments meet on a regularly scheduled basis to exchange information and coordinate programs for these service members and families during their active duty service and after separation from active duty or death of the member. The committee believes that the effectiveness of the programs operated by these departments can only be maximized when each element of their respective programs is fully coordinated and made available to the service members, veterans, and family members who need assistance.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to examine the options for including the Department of Labor and the Department of Veterans' Affairs in an existing meeting or establishing a new committee structure where the interests of wounded and injured service members and surviving family members can be discussed by the three departments. The Secretary of Defense should coordinate with the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs and should begin addressing these issues in a joint committee structure within 180 days after the date of enactment of this act.

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center

The committee commends the Department of Defense for initiating the Defense Language Transformation Roadmap. The committee recognizes the significant role of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center in achieving the Department's language transformation objectives. However, the committee is concerned that the position of Chancellor has been vacant since January. Believing that the Commandant, together with the Chancellor, will play key roles in promoting the outcomes set forth in the roadmap, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to undertake an aggressive hiring process to fill the Chancellor's position.

Department of Defense Disability Evaluation System

The committee staff visited a number of locations during 2004 where military personnel are assigned in medical hold status. The purpose of the visits was to evaluate the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the medical hold program and examine the related medical and administrative policies, processes, and procedures. During these visits, the committee received complaints from reserve component members that they were disadvantaged under the Disability Evaluation Systems (DESs) operated by the military departments when compared to the treatment received by active duty members. The reserve component members contended that the disability ratings granted to active duty members were consistently higher than those granted to reservists for similar injuries and ill-

nesses. This complaint was particularly prevalent at medical hold locations operated by the Army. The committee believes that the DESs operated by the military departments must provide fair and equitable treatment to all service members. Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the results of the DESs operated by the military departments and determine if they are operating in a fair and equitable manner. The Comptroller General examination should include surveys of the DES results at medical hold locations and other community based sites where reserve component members are being evaluated for disability ratings. The committee directs the Comptroller General to submit a report of his findings by March 31, 2006, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Family Support, Employment and Transition Assistance Programs for Service Members and Their Families

The committee is aware of multiple initiatives designed to address the needs of families of deployed active and reserve component personnel, and to provide transition and employment assistance for returning service members and for those who have been seriously injured. To facilitate a coordinated funding approach, the committee recommends an increase of $8.5 million to the Department of Defense Dependent's Education Agency funding. The committee believes this agency, which already coordinates the funding for the Family Advocacy Program, the family assistance program, and the transition assistance and relocation assistance programs, would be able to use its experience in these programs to coordinate and direct the additional funding that would:

(1) Assist the Department's jobs and employment for military spouses' pilot programs;

(2) Support the National Guard Bureau initiatives to improve the transition of catastrophically injured active and reserve component service members, to assist their families and increase employer support; and

(3) Encourage the implementation of pilot programs, such as Operation Family Safe at Home, which seeks to address the needs of military family not located near military bases.

Foreign Area Officers

The committee recognizes the significant contribution of Foreign Area Officers (FAOs) to our national security. Current operations around the world have highlighted the importance of and increased requirements for highly trained FAOs. As the demand for these uniquely qualified individuals has grown, it has become increasingly difficult to retain these skilled officers. For example, the Army has experienced difficulty retaining FAOs because the specialty lacks career advancement opportunities and the demand for their expertise is growing among other governmental agencies and within the private sector. The committee understands that the Department of Defense is revising its directive for developing and managing FAOs within the services. However, the committee is concerned that the new directive will fail to address the issues of greatest concern and that these highly trained professionals will

not receive the benefit of a strategy to restructure the FAO career path. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the feasibility of establishing a separate military career field for FAOs and developing a career path that would provide career progression opportunities for FAOs from initial commissioning through promotion to senior officer ranks. The study should at a minimum include:

(1) An examination of the current Service procedures to ensure that only the most qualified individuals are chosen to participate in the program;

(2) A review of the projected requirements for FAOs and the status of the actions by the services necessary to meet those requirements; and

(3) An examination of the services commitment to providing the resources necessary to support the development, training, and advancement of FAOs.

The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report of his findings and recommendations by March 31, 2006, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has historically used geographic criteria to objectively determine eligibility for campaign and expeditionary awards. However, the geographic criteria used to establish the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) Expeditionary Medal excludes service members who are serving at Guatanamo Bay Naval Station, Cuba because they are located within 200 nautical miles from America's shores. The committee believes that the service members guarding the terrorists at Guatanamo Bay Naval Station should be awarded the GWOT Expeditionary Medal. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to review the criteria used to determine eligibility for the GWOT Expeditionary Medal and to consider awarding the medal to individuals directly engaged in GWOT operations who are serving outside the United States, but within 200 nautical miles of its shores. The Secretary shall submit a report of his findings and recommendations by March 31, 2006, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Job Corps Recruits

The committee recognizes that all the services are experiencing greater difficulty recruiting the quality men and women necessary to meet force requirements. The committee believes that the Job Corps is an important partner in the effort to identify and motivate the recruit candidates that are needed. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has had a close relationship with the Job Corps since its inception in 1965, but the committee believes that the Job Corps can play a larger role in the recruiting process. Using methods that mirror military training processes and objectives, the residential component of Job Corps instills discipline, responsibility, and unit cohesion into participants and paves the way for an easy transition to military service. The com-

mittee is confident that the Job Corps can enhance its contribution to the services' recruiting efforts and build upon a 40-year successful residential education and training program for disadvantaged youth. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Secretary of Labor, to study additional initiatives to expand the relationship between the Department of Defense and the Job Corps. At a minimum, the study should assess the utility of a DOD investment to develop a military oriented curriculum designed to increase the value of Job Corps graduates to the military services. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report of his findings and recommendations by August 31, 2006, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Joint Advertising and Market Research

The committee believes that the Department of Defense (DOD) has an important corporate-level role to play in complementing the recruiting and advertising programs of the individual services. In that light, the committee believes that the DOD's joint advertising and market research reinvention effort can have a direct, positive long-term impact on the ability of the Department and the military services to recruit quality personnel. The committee believes that such a capability is especially critical at a time when the recruiting efforts of the military services are being challenged by a range of factors. For that reason, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to the budget request for the DOD's joint advertising and market research effort.

List of Organizations and Agencies Available to Assist Wounded and Injured Service Members and Surviving Family Members of Military Deaths

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense, organizations within the military departments, and other governmental agencies responsible for providing assistance to wounded and injured service members and their families and surviving family members of military deaths are not fully aware of all the agencies and organizations capable of providing assistance. As a result, the committee believes that many service members in need are denied support because they are not aware of all the services that are available and there is no coordinated effort to bring the agencies and organizations to the attention of the service members and families.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to inventory the governmental agencies and private sector organizations that are capable of providing assistance to wounded and injured service members and their families and surviving family members of military deaths. The Secretary should organize and disseminate that list to all government agencies responsible for counseling the service members and families and develop guidelines for effective use of the list. The Secretary should implement the system for delivering the information about the agencies and organizations on the list to service members and families within 180 days after the date of enactment of this act.

Military Spouse Education and Employment

The committee recognizes that the decision by service members and their families to remain in the military for a career is heavily influenced by the ability of military spouses to attain educational objectives and achieve career aspirations. The committee is aware that many military families place a high value on the second income earned by spouses and are frustrated by the inability of the spouse to achieve their full potential in the job market because of a lack of education or the disruptive nature of permanent changes in station that are inherent in military life. The committee appreciates that the Department of Defense has a number of initiatives designed to improve military spouse access to education programs and job opportunities. The committee is particularly interested in exploring new cost effective avenues for spouses to pursue their educational objectives because the committee believes that improved education is an important key to resolving the concerns about inadequate career opportunities. The committee also believes that the Department of Defense should seek to ensure that the programs are tailored to meet the unique challenges military spouses face in seeking employment and educational opportunities, and determine the level of awareness among spouses of the opportunities that are available and the steps that could be taken to improve their level of education and employment prospects. The review should also assess the effectiveness of spouse employment programs for spouses with different levels of educational attainment and past job experience. The committee also urges the Secretary to further consider options for requiring defense contractors to hire military spouses, particularly overseas and in remote domestic locations that are isolated from civilian job markets. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report on the general status of military spouse education and employment programs and the matters listed above, to include specific comment on the results of research regarding available educational programs that are suitable for military spouses by March 31, 2006, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Professional Development and Certification of Military Security Personnel

The committee is aware that military security management professionals face many of the same challenges as their civilian counterparts in developing new methods and best practices for managing complex security issues and threats to organizations, people and key assets. Recognizing that certification and training programs available to civilian security specialists could have benefit, the U.S. Air Force Security Forces Directorate has offered Air Force personnel and leaders professional development opportunities through a commercial provider of security personnel training and certification since 2004. The committee recognizes such initiatives may have application in a wider Department of Defense context. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to assess the Air Force initiative to determine if it has applicability beyond the Air Force.

Reserve Component Family Support Programs

The committee is aware of anecdotal information that suggests the support provided to the families of mobilized reserve members was not consistently adequate. The committee heard testimony and received information from other sources that suggests more must be done to prepare the family for the sponsor's mobilization and to verify the welfare of the family during the absence of the service member. The committee is aware of a number of initiatives that do not involve high cost, but do require planning, diligent preparation, and competent execution. The committee believes that much of the capability needed to achieve positive results resides in the reserve units and among the families themselves. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the performance of each of the reserve components in supporting families during periods of mobilization, record the best practices used by units that provided effective support to families, and develop the guidelines and standards for reserve units to employ prior to and during periods of mobilization. The Secretary is directed to submit a report of his findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by October 31, 2006.

Review of Department Defense and Military Service Policies with Regard to the Assignment of Women

In January 1994 the Secretary of Defense published policies that prohibited the assignment of females of the Armed Forces to direct ground combat units and established other criteria by which females could be excluded from assignment to units and positions. One of those criteria was that women could be excluded from assignment to units and positions that are doctrinally required to physically collocate and remain with direct ground combat units. Based on the application of the collocation policy in 1994, the Army chose to keep 123,000 positions closed to the assignment of women.

The committee recently began to examine how the Army was applying this so-called collocation policy with units deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan and with units being reorganized as a result of modularization.

Based on the information resulting from the discussions with the Army, the committee believes that a detailed review of the implementation of the 1994 Department of Defense policies is in order. The committee has taken action in this bill to assume more proactive control over assignment policies governing units involved in ground combat. In addition, the committee intends to undertake a full review of those assignment policies and the rationale underpinning them. Among the areas of immediate concern to the committee is the application of the collocation policy. Given this concern, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the collocation policy to determine its current and future implementation, with the objective of ensuring that women assigned to units and positions that support direct ground combat units are minimally exposed to direct ground combat. The Secretary of Defense shall present his report to the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services no later than March 1, 2006.

In the meantime, the committee urges that the Secretary of Defense ensure that any reorganization of Army units take particular care to minimally expose female members of that service, either by doctrine or employment, to direct ground combat.

Simultaneous Service of Family Members in a Combat Zone

The committee has observed that combat operations in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom have prompted concern about the simultaneous service of family members in high risk areas. The committee notes that the DOD policy regarding the simultaneous assignment of family members to high risk areas does not preclude such assignments, but does allow service members to voluntarily exempt themselves from such assignments when family members are killed or disabled. Advocates for change have suggested that family members should be given the option to decline assignment to a high risk area or request assignment from a high risk area when another family member is assigned or will be assigned to such an area. The committee, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, has examined such proposals during previous conflicts and recognizes that it is useful to periodically review the related policies to assess the need for change.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the policies and procedures involved in the assignment of family members to high risk areas and the implications of a policy that would allow service members to voluntarily exempt themselves from such service. The Secretary shall at a minimum consider:

(1) The administrative burden and related costs associated with a voluntary exemption policy;

(2) The potential impact of a voluntary exemption policy on individual and unit morale;

(3) The potential impact of a voluntary exemption policy on unit combat capability;

(4) The various types of family relationships that might be considered in a voluntary exemption policy and the numbers of service members that would be involved within each type of relationship;

(5) The number of families and service members that would be eligible for exemption and the number that would be expected to execute the exemption;

(6) The various methods that might be employed by service members to abuse the intent of a voluntarily exemption policy and avoid their fair share exposure to high risk operations; and

(7) The advantages and disadvantages of different options for defining a high risk area that could be used to implement a voluntary exemption policy.

The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report of his findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2006.

State and Federal Agency Partnerships to Address the Post-Mobilization Needs of Reservists and National Guardsmen and Their Families

The committee recognizes that to effectively provide for the needs of national guard and reserve personnel and their families following demobilization requires the cooperative efforts of both state and federal agencies. One such cooperative effort results from a memorandum of understanding between the State of Washington, the U.S. Department of Veterans' Affairs, the U.S. Department of Labor and the state veterans' service providers. As a result, there will be a systematic, comprehensive transition service provided when service members return from active duty. All national guard units will be required to conduct a family activity day within three to six months following return from Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom or Noble Eagle. The family activity day will bring together the experts from the various federal and state agencies with service members and their families to provide information in such areas as family support, education and assistance, veterans benefits and entitlements, employment assistance, and medical support, including mental health services. The memorandum of understanding will also create long-term community support services, including an Adopt an Armory program, a family support network, employee and training services and data sharing agreements. The State of Washington is looking at ways to expand this program to all reserve component personnel in the state. The committee commends this cooperative effort and urges the Secretary of Defense, heads of other federal agencies and other states to consider a similar approach to improve and expand post mobilization services for our nation's citizen soldiers and their families.

Study of Genocide and Its Cultural, Ethical and Moral Impact

The systematic elimination of entire ethnic groups continues in today's modern world. The committee recognizes that officers of the Armed Forces are encountering genocide during operational deployments and believes that officers should be prepared to deal with its cultural, ethical and moral effects. The study of historical events like the Holocaust provides important opportunities to learn about genocide and its impact on the humanity. The committee notes that there are a number of organizations, such as the Auschwitz Jewish Center, that already provide cadets and midshipmen at the military academies with opportunities to learn about the cultural, ethical and moral impact genocide has on today's society. The committee commends this educational effort and believes that it should be continued.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY

Section 501—Temporary Increase in Percentage Limits on Reduction of Time-In-Grade Requirements for Retirement in Grade Upon Voluntary Retirement

This section would increase the percentage of lieutenant colonels (or commanders in the Navy) and colonels (or captains in the Navy)

that the secretary of a military department, when authorized by the Secretary of Defense, may approve for retirement with less than three years time-in-grade from two percent to four percent of the officers authorized in that grade for that fiscal year within the respective service. The authority provided to the secretaries of the military departments in this section would begin on October 1, 2005, and would end on December 31, 2007.

Section 502—Two-Year Renewal of Authority to Reduce Minimum Commissioned Service Requirement for Voluntary Retirement as an Officer

This section would reestablish the authority for the secretaries of the military departments to reduce the number of years of service required as an officer to retire as an officer from 10 to 8 years beginning October 1, 2005, and ending on December 31, 2007.

Section 503—Separation at Age 64 for Reserve Component Senior Officers

This section would extend from 62 to 64 the age at which the chiefs of the Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve, and the directors of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard must retire.

Section 504—Improved Administration of Transitions Involving Officers in Senior General and Flag Officer Positions

This section would improve the ability of the military services to permit senior general and flag officers, that is those holding three- and four-star rank, to continue to hold their rank while in transition to a new position requiring that or higher rank. The section would also permit a general or flag officer whose assignment to a senior general or flag officer position requires promotion to the three- or four-star rank to be promoted to the higher rank at the time the officer begins serving in the position. To facilitate these transitions, the section would temporarily exclude for no more than 30 days the senior general and flag officers moving to positions of equal rank from counting against the statutory limits on senior general and flag officers. If the transition is not completed within the 30 days, the officer would revert to his or her lower permanent grade. The section would also eliminate, with respect to senior general and flag officer positions, the frocking authority of the Secretary of Defense. That authority permits an officer, with the advice and consent of the Senate, who has been ordered to or is serving in a higher graded position to wear the grade, but not receive the pay of the higher position.

Section 505—Consolidation of Grade Limitations on Officer Assignment and Insignia Practice Known as Frocking

This section would establish one limit of 85 on the number of promotable colonels, Navy captains, brigadier generals and rear admirals (lower half) who would be authorized to be frocked, that is wear the rank and insignia of the next higher grade prior to their date of promotion. The establishment of a single limit will provide increased flexibility in managing frocked officers. Current law es-

tablishes a separate limit of 30 for the number of brigadier generals and rear admirals (lower half) who can be frocked, and 55 for the numbers of colonels and Navy captains who can be frocked.

Section 506—Authority for Designation of a General/Flag Officer Position on the Joint Staff To Be Held by Reserve Component General or Flag Officer on Active Duty

This section would increase from 10 to 11 the number of general or flag officers positions that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff can designate to be held only by reserve general and flag officers on active duty. Under current law, 10 of those positions must be designated on the staffs of the combatant commands. This section would permit one position to be designated on the Joint Staff.

Section 507—Authority to Retain Permanent Professors at the Naval Academy Beyond 30 Years of Active Commissioned Service

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to retain beyond 30 years of active commissioned service Navy and Marine Corps officers who are on active duty as permanent professors at the U.S. Naval Academy. Depending on an officer's grade, the statutory years-of-service-retirement point for military officers is 28 or 30 years. While this section also would permit the Secretary of the Navy to determine how long a permanent professor remained on active duty beyond 30 years of service, this section would require retirement of the officer at age 64. This section would provide to the Secretary of the Navy the same authority for retaining permanent professors as is provided to the secretaries of the Army and Air Force for permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy and U.S. Air Force Academy, respectively. The committee expects that the Secretary would continue permanent professors on active duty beyond 28 years only at the recommendation of the Superintendent and with the concurrence of the Chief of Naval Operations or Commandant of the Marine Corps, depending on the service of the officer concerned.

Section 508—Authority for Appointment of Coast Guard Flag Officer as Chief of Staff to the President

This section would amend title 14, United States Code, to authorize the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, to appoint a Coast Guard flag officer to be the chief of staff to the President.

Section 509—Clarification of Time for Receipt of Statutory Selection Board Communications

This section would clarify that regular and reserve officers intending to provide written communications to selection boards must submit those communications so that they arrive no later than the 11:59 p.m. on the day before the date the board convenes. Current law provides that communications from officers must reach selection boards no later than the date the board convenes.

Section 510—Standardization of Grade of Senior Dental Officer of the Air Force With That of Senior Dental Officer of the Army

This section would require that the officer serving as the senior dental officer in the Air Force be appointed in the grade of major general. This is the same grade to which the officer serving as the Chief of the Dental Corps in the Army is appointed.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE COMPONENT MANAGEMENT

Section 511—Use of Reserve Montgomery GI Bill Benefits and Benefits for Mobilized Members of the Selected Reserve and National Guard for Payments for Licensing or Certification Tests

This section would authorize service members eligible for the Reserve Montgomery GI Bill benefits to use up to $2,000 of their benefits to pay for a licensing or certification test.

Section 512—Modifications to the New Reserve Education Benefit for Certain Active Service in Support of Contingency Operations

This section would clarify that service members who were mobilized and served on active duty in support of a contingency operation on or after September 11, 2001, are eligible for benefits under the education assistance program for reserve component members supporting contingency operations authorized in section 527 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375). The section would also clarify that service members remain eligible for benefits under the program with a break in service in the Selected Reserve of less than 90 days, if the members continues to serve in the Ready Reserve.

Section 513—Military Technicians (Dual Status) Mandatory Separation

This section would direct the Secretary of the Army to implement policies allowing a military technician (dual status) to serve beyond a mandatory removal date for officers, or beyond a years-of-service limitation for enlisted personnel, until reaching age 60 and attaining eligibility for an unreduced annuity.

Section 514—Military Retirement Credit for Certain Service by National Guard Members Performed While in a State Duty Status Immediately After the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001

This section would authorize reserve retirement credit for members of the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard who were mobilized in a State active duty status in response to the declaration of Federal emergencies in the counties of New York State surrounding New York City and in Arlington County, Virginia, following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

Section 515—Use of National Guard to Provide Military Support to Civilian Law Enforcement Agencies for Domestic Counter-Terrorism Activities

The section would authorize the governor of a state to order personnel of that state's national guard to active duty under title 32, United States Code, to provide military support to a civilian law

enforcement agency, on a reimbursable basis, for domestic counter-terrorism activities. The section would define domestic counter-terrorism as measures taken to prevent, deter and respond to terrorism within a state. The section also would require that the chief of the National Guard Bureau, or the designee of the chief in each state, accept the monetary reimbursements and to deposit them into appropriations accounts used to fund the activities under this section.

SUBTITLE C—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Section 521—Repeal of Limitation on Amount of Financial Assistance Under Reserve Officers' Training Corps Scholarship Programs

This section would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to pay the costs of room and board for Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) scholarship students when those costs exceed the cost of tuition, fees, books and laboratory expenses. Current law allows ROTC scholarships to cover the cost of room and board, but limits the amount of room and board to the cost of tuition, fees, books, and laboratory expenses.

Section 522—Increased Enrollment for Eligible Defense Industry Employees in the Defense Product Development Program at Naval Postgraduate School

This section would increase by 15 the number of defense industry civilians who could enroll in the Naval Postgraduate School's defense product development program and expand the program to include systems engineering curricula.

Section 523—Payment of Expenses to Obtain Professional Credentials

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security, with respect to the Coast Guard when it is operating as a service of the Navy, to pay the expenses for service members to obtain an accreditation, a license, a certification, or other State or professionally imposed credential so long as the credential is not a prerequisite for appointment in the armed forces.

Section 524—Authority for National Defense University Award of Degree of Master of Science in Joint Campaign Planning and Strategy

This section would authorize the president of the National Defense University to award a masters of science degree in joint campaign planning and strategy to graduates of the university who fulfill the requirements of the program of the Joint Advanced Warfighting School at the Joint Forces Staff College. This section would authorize the award of the degree to qualified graduates after May 2005.

Section 525—One-year Extension of Authority to Use Appropriated Funds to Provide Recognition Items for Recruitment and Retention of Certain Reserve Component Personnel

This section would extend for one year, to December 31, 2006, the authority of the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to provide items of modest value to members of the Army Reserve and Army and Air National Guard, and to their families, in recognition of their service or substantial activities in support of the Army Reserve and National Guard.

Section 526—Report on Rationale and Plans of the Navy to Provide Enlisted Members an Opportunity to Obtain Graduate Degrees

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the plans of the Secretary to provide enlisted members of the Navy with opportunities to pursue graduate degree programs. The committee understands that the budget request contained a proposal that would have authorized a pilot program at the Naval Postgraduate School to award graduate degrees to enlisted personnel. The committee believes that before it could approve such an initiative, far more perspective is required on how the award of graduate degrees fits into an integrated, progressive, coordinated and systematic approach to enlisted career development and professional education.

Section 527—Increase in Annual Limit on Number of Reserve Officers' Training Corps Scholarships Under Army Reserve and National Guard Program

This section would increase from 208 to 416 the maximum number of Reserve Officers' Training Corps scholarships the Army may provide to cadets desiring to remain in the reserve components. This increase will help the Army Reserve and Army National Guard meet manning requirements.

Section 528—CAPSTONE Overseas Field Studies Trips to People's Republic of China and Republic of China on Taiwan

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to direct the National Defense University to ensure that field study visits to China and Taiwan are integral components of the CAPSTONE program carried out by the University.

Section 529—Sense of Congress Concerning Establishment of National College of Homeland Security

This section would express the Sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, should establish within the National Defense University an educational institution to be known as the National College of Homeland Security.

SUBTITLE D—GENERAL SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

Section 531—Uniform Enlistment Standards for the Armed Forces

This section would clarify who may be lawfully enlisted and would standardize enlistment eligibility criteria for the armed services.

Section 532—Increase in Maximum Term of Original Enlistment in Regular Component

This section would increase the maximum duration of an enlistment in a regular component from six years to eight years

Section 533—Members Completing Statutory Initial Military Service Obligation

This section would require every person at the commencement of their initial period of military service to be provided with the date on which that initial military service obligation ends. The section also would require the secretaries of the military departments to notify members of the Individual Ready Reserve of the date when their initial military service obligation ends and to provide those members before that date an opportunity, if they are qualified, to continue voluntarily in the Ready Reserve or to transfer voluntarily to an active component. Finally, the section would prohibit the involuntary mobilization, or a recall to active duty, that commences after the expiration of the military service obligation of members of the Individual Ready Reserve.

Section 534—Extension of Qualifying Service for Initial Military Service Under National Call to Service Program

This section would clarify that mandatory service obligations in the selected reserve specified for participants in the national call to service program apply to officers who were initially enlisted under the program for the purpose of entering an officer training program.

SUBTITLE E—MATTERS RELATING TO CASUALTIES

Section 541—Requirement for Members of the Armed Forces to Designate a Person To Be Authorized to Direct the Disposition of the Member's Remains

This section would require the secretary concerned to establish a program for service members to designate an individual to direct the disposition of the members' remains should they die while in a military status. The section would require that service members shall make such a designation upon entering the service or deploying in support of a contingency operation after a 30 day period following the date of enactment. The remainder of the force would be required to make such a designation after a 180 day period following date of enactment. The committee believes that this section is required to avoid challenges to the Department of Defense policy on the disposition of remains such as those that occurred as a result of recent family disputes concerning the disposition of remains of service members who died while serving in support of Operations

Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom. The committee strongly encourages the secretaries concerned to carefully explain to service members the serious implications of their designation of a person to manage the disposition of their remains each and every time the service member is afforded the opportunity to confirm or modify the designation.

Section 542—Enhanced Program of Casualty Assistance Officers and Seriously Injured/Ill Assistance Officers

This section would permanently codify the requirement to appoint a casualty assistance officer (CAO) to provide surviving family members of service members who die information, counseling, advice on obtaining information and services, administrative assistance, and advocacy representation when dealing with military authorities. The section would also establish a new requirement to appoint a seriously injured/ill assistance officer (SIAO) to provide the same range of services to a service member and the member's family who are determined under criteria established by the Secretary of Defense to be seriously injured or ill. In addition, the section would require that both CAOs and SIAOs are:

(1) Continuously assigned to assist families regardless of location until the Secretary determines that the families are no longer in need of assistance;

(2) Trained using standards for performance of duties specified by the Secretary; and

(3) Monitored by the secretaries of the military departments to ensure that their performance meets the training standards.

The committee has become increasingly concerned that the military departments are not adequately training casualty assistance officers and monitoring their performance. The committee has received anecdotal evidence that suggests consistent standards governing the performance of CAOs have not been established and the secretaries of the military departments are not adequately training and monitoring the performance of CAOs to ensure that the highest performance standards are consistently executed. Areas of particular concern to the committee include:

(1) Additional training on the proper techniques and language to be used by CAOs during initial death notifications;

(2) Consideration of the need for mandatory involvement of the service member's unit commander or other senior commander, professional grief counselors, and chaplains during initial death notifications;

(3) Consideration of minimum experience requirements for CAOs;

(4) Consideration of establishing three years after the death of the service member as the minimum period of assistance that should be provided to surviving family members;

(5) Consideration of establishing a list of automatic actions required by CAOs for such assistance as providing the service member's awards and decorations with explanations;

(6) Consideration of establishing a cadre of experienced professionals to assist the CAO in presenting the detailed briefing on benefits that follows initial notification and to assist the CAO in answering questions that follow the benefits briefing; and

(7) Consideration of establishing annual mandatory meetings to ensure that surviving families have no unanswered questions for a minimum of three years after the death of the service member.

Section 543—Standards and Guidelines for Department of Defense Programs to Assist Wounded and Injured Members

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to examine the service programs to provide assistance to service members who incur severe wounds or injuries, to include the Army Disabled Soldier Support Program and the Marine for Life Injured Support Program, and develop the standards and guidelines necessary to coordinate and standardize the service programs with the activities of the Severely Injured Joint support Operations Center of the Department of Defense. The Secretary would be required to publish regulations to implement the standards and guidelines within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 544—Authority for Members on Active Duty With Disabilities to Participate in Paralympic Games

The committee recognizes that there are increasing numbers of service members with physical disabilities remaining in the military upon completion of their medical rehabilitation. The committee further recognizes that these young men and women are often at the peak of physical conditioning with the potential of being competitive in the World Class Athlete Program which prepares members of the armed forces for approved international athletic competition. The committee notes that military personnel are authorized to compete in the Olympic Games and believes that a similar authorization is appropriate to permit service members with disabilities who remain on active duty to participate at a similar level of athletic competition. Therefore, this section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to permit members of the armed forces, if eligible, to participate in the Paralympic Games and the qualifying events and preparatory competition for those games.

SUBTITLE F—MILITARY JUSTICE AND LEGAL ASSISTANCE MATTERS

Section 551—Clarification of Authority of Military Legal Assistance Counsel to Provide Military Legal Assistance Without Regard to Licensing Requirements

This section would clarify section 1044 of title 10, United States Code, so that licensed Department of Defense military legal assistance officers would have the authority to practice law in connection with their official duties independent of state regulations for those states where they are unlicensed.

Section 552—Use of Teleconferencing in Administrative Sessions of Courts-Martial

This section would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to use video-teleconferencing or similar technologies during certain pre-trial events, such as arraignments, guilty plea inquiries, advisements of right, motion sessions and various other ad-

ministrative tasks when counsel is physically present with the accused.

Section 553—Extension of Statute of Limitations for Murder, Rape and Child Abuse Offenses Under the Uniform Code of Military Justice

This section would amend the statute of limitations for murder, rape, rape of a child and child abuse. It would include all murders in the class of offenses that have no statute of limitations and would clarify that rape is an offense with an unlimited statute of limitations. This section would also extend the statute of limitations for certain child abuse offenses. Current law precludes prosecution in these offenses after the child attains the age of twenty-five. This section would allow prosecutions during the life of the child/victim or within five years from the date of the offense, whichever is greater. In addition, this section would expand the definition of "child abuse offense" to include pornography involving a child and add kidnapping of a child to the list of offenses covered in the life of the child/victim statute of limitations.

Section 554—Offense of Stalking Under the Uniformed Code of Military Justice

This section would establish stalking of another individual as an offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The section would model the Uniform Code of Military Justice after the Federal Model Anti-stalking Code for the states by requiring a course of conduct to include emotional distress, specifically including sexual assault as one example of bodily harm, and including members of the victim's immediate family or intimate partner of the individual.

The committee understands that the definitions of the section are to be included in the Manual for Courts-Martial. However, the committee is concerned that the definitions accurately convey the behaviors associated with the offense of stalking. For example, the committee urges the Department of Defense to include, within its definition of "threatening acts," any course of unwanted communication.

Section 555—Rape, Sexual Assault, and Other Sexual Misconduct Under the Uniform Code of Military Justice

The Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), required the Secretary of Defense to propose changes regarding sexual offenses in the Uniformed Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) to conform more closely to other federal laws and regulations that address sexual assault. This section would amend section 920 of title 10, United States Code, by aligning the statutory language of sexual assault law under the UCMJ with federal law under sections 2241 through 2247 of title 18, United States Code. This section would amend article 120 of the UCMJ to provide a series of graded offenses relating to rape, sexual assault and other sexual misconduct, based on the presence or absence of aggravating factors. The section would also provide a precise description of each offense and set interim maximum punishments based on the degree of the offense.

SUBTITLE G—ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION

Section 561—Enrollment in Overseas Schools of Defense Dependents' Education System of Children of Citizens or Nationals of the United States Hired in Overseas Areas as Full-time Department of Defense Employees

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide dependent children of full-time, locally hired Department of Defense (DOD) employees who are U.S. citizens or nationals a space-required, tuition free education in DOD Dependents Schools overseas.

Section 562—Assistance to Local Educational Agencies That Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would provide $50.0 million for assistance to local educational agencies that had military dependent students comprising at least 20 percent of the students in average daily attendance during a year. The section would also provide $10.0 million of assistance to local educational agencies that experience significant increases or decreases in the average daily attendance of military dependent students due to military force structure changes, the relocation of military forces from one base to another, and from base closures and realignments. The committee makes this recommendation in connection with its continuing strong support of the need to help local school districts with significant concentrations of military students.

Section 563—Continuation of Impact Aid Assistance on Behalf of Dependents of Certain Members Despite Change in Status of Member

This section would temporarily adjust the process for computing the amount of funding provided by the Department of Education to certain local educational agencies heavily impacted by dependents of military personnel. The adjustment, limited to school year 2005–2006, would require that certain children continue be counted as a child enrolled in school when computing the average daily attendance, which is a key component of the amount of aid the school might receive. Such children include, those who attend the school but who no longer live on a military base because both parents are deployed, or are children who temporarily reside in military base housing following the death on active duty of a military parent.

SUBTITLE H—DECORATIONS AND AWARDS

Section 565—Cold War Victory Medal

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to design and issue a Cold War Victory Medal to person who served honorably in the armed forces for a minimum of 180 days during the period beginning on September 2, 1945 and ending on December 26, 1991.

Section 566—Establishment of Combat Medevac Badge

This section would require the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to design and issue a Combat Medevac Badge to be awarded to service members who served on or after June 25, 1950 as pilots or crew members on helicopter medical evacuation ambulances.

Section 567—Eligibility for Operation Enduring Freedom Campaign Medal

This section would establish September 11, 2001 as the beginning date of Operation Enduring Freedom for the purpose of awarding the Operation Enduring Freedom campaign medal.

SUBTITLE I—OTHER MATTERS

Section 571—Extension of Waiver Authority of Secretary of Education With Respect to Student Financial Assistance During a War or Other Military Operation or National Emergency

This section would extend for two years, through September 30, 2007, the authority provided by the Higher Education Relief Opportunities for Students Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–76). Under this authority, the Secretary of Education may waive or modify any requirement or regulation applicable to the student financial assistance programs with respect to an affected individual who:

(1) Is serving on active duty during a war or other military operation or national emergency;

(2) Is performing qualifying national guard duty during a war, operation, or emergency;

(3) Resides or is employed in an area that is declared a disaster area by any federal, state, or local official in connection with a national emergency; or

(4) Suffered direct economic hardship as a direct result of a war or other military operation or national emergency.

Section 572—Adoption Leave for Members of the Armed Forces Adopting Children

This section would permit a member of the armed forces who is authorized reimbursement for qualified adoption expenses to be granted up to 21 days leave annually in connection with the adoption.

Section 573—Report on Need for a Personnel Plan for Linguists in the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to review the career paths available to officer and enlisted linguists to determine if a change in the career management of linguists would assist them in achieving their full linguistic and analytical potential. The section would also require the Secretary to report his findings, results, and conclusions not later than 180 days after the date of enactment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Section 574—Ground Combat and Other Exclusion Policies

This section would codify the Department of Defense policy, issued in 1994, that set out limitations on the assignment of female members of the Armed Services to combat units. Specifically, the section would prohibit the assignment of women to units below the brigade level whose primary mission is to engage in direct combat on the ground. The section also would codify the definition of direct ground combat. As under the Department's current policy, the section would permit the Secretary of Defense, or the secretaries of the military services to further exclude female members of the Armed Forces from the assignments to units and positions based on the following factors: Collocation with a direct ground combat unit; performance of long-range reconnaissance and Special Operations missions; prohibitive costs of berthing and privacy arrangements; or, job-related physical requirements that exclude the vast majority of female members. The section would also require the continued closure of military occupational specialties relating to military ground operations that the secretaries of the military services had closed to the assignment of women as of May 18, 2005. The section would also require the Secretary of Defense, or secretaries of the military services, as appropriate, to notify the Committee on Armed Services in the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services in the House when opening previously closed positions to the assignment of female members of the Armed Forces.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATIONS AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

OVERVIEW

The committee continues to support strong and flexible compensation and benefits programs needed to recruit and retain a quality force in a wartime environment. Accordingly, the committee recommends an across-the-board pay raise of 3.1 percent, increases in the maximum amounts that may be paid for certain enlistment and retention bonuses and special pays, expanded eligibility criteria to add flexibility to certain enlistment and retention bonuses and special pays, and restructured compensation programs to provide stronger incentives for enlistment and retention of members in reserve components.

The committee remains committed to protecting and enhancing military exchange and commissary benefits. Accordingly, the committee has included provisions that would protect commissaries from unfair competition from contractors, ensure that the cost of shipping exchange products for sale to overseas members and their families is not added to the price of goods paid by military consumers, and facilitate efficient management practices by the military exchange systems.

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Defense Commissary Agency Produce Procurement Test

The committee is impressed with the early results of the Defense Commissary Agency's (DeCA) six-month test program to procure

produce through a small business contractor for 20 stores in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia beginning in January 2005. The test employs the private sector's best business practices and has already produced evidence of more efficient distribution, improved quality, reduced procurement costs for DeCA, and lower prices for the military patron. The committee commends DeCA and the Department of Defense for their innovative initiative and their desire to improve service and quality for the military consumer. The committee encourages managers at DeCA to continue the test program and evaluate the results expeditiously. If the test program proves successful, the committee would be receptive to swift adoption of the policies and procedures of the program throughout the DeCA system. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report of his findings and recommendations regarding the produce procurement test program by March 31, 2006, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Hooked-on-Fishing/Not-on-Drugs Pilot Program

The committee recognizes that the current operational tempo is placing significant stress on the families of military personnel. The committee believes that the morale, welfare, and recreation programs operated by installation commanders can help to alleviate the stress of service life in today's environment by facilitating family-oriented activities. The committee observes that fishing offers members and their families a challenging outdoor activity that can be enjoyed by all family members.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to consult with the Future Fisherman Foundation and the Armed Forces Foundation to continue to explore options for implementing the Hooked-on-Fishing/Not on Drugs program at military installations. The committee notes that a modest pilot program could establish this very effective and low cost program at as many as 20 military installations in the first year. The committee is convinced that these programs would prove to be highly popular in the military community and that the Secretary would choose to rapidly expand the program to target those installations with the highest deployment rates. The committee strongly recommends that the Secretary seek the assistance of the Future Fisherman Foundation and the Armed Forces Foundation. With the assistance of these organizations, the committee is confident that this valuable program can be established at over 100 installations in just 3 years. The committee encourages the Secretary to thoroughly examine the Hooked-on-Fishing/Not on Drugs program and submit a report on his findings and recommendations by March 31, 2006, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Section 601—Increase in Basic Pay for Fiscal Year 2006

This section would increase basic pay for members of the armed forces by 3.1 percent. This raise would continue to fulfill Congress' commitment to enhanced pay raises for the armed forces and would

reduce the pay gap between military and private sector pay increases from 5.1 percent to 4.6 percent.

Section 602—Additional Pay for Permanent Military Professors at United States Naval Academy With Over 36 Years of Service

This section would allow permanent military professors at the United States Naval Academy with over 36 years service to receive the same $250-per-month pay increase that such professors receive at the other service academies.

Section 603—Basic Pay Rates for Reserve Component Members Selected to Attend Military Service Academy Preparatory Schools

This section would clarify that reserve component members who are attending military service academy preparatory schools shall be paid at the rate prescribed for the member's pay grade unless the standard rate of compensation provided to cadets and midshipmen is greater. The section would establish a compensation policy for reserve members that is consistent with the policy applicable to active component members.

Section 604—Clarification of Restriction on Compensation for Correspondence Courses

This section would clarify that national guard members as well as other members of reserve components are not authorized to be compensated for work associated with participation in a correspondence course of a uniformed service.

Section 605—Permanent Authority for Supplemental Subsistence Allowance for Low-Income Members with Dependents

This section would make permanent the authority for the secretary concerned to pay a supplemental subsistence allowance to members whose family income level would qualify that family to receive government food stamps.

Section 606—Basic Allowance for Housing for Reserve Members

This section would eliminate the requirement to pay a reduced rate of basic allowance for housing to reserve component members when mobilized to serve on active duty for periods greater than 30 days and less than 140 days. Such reserve members would receive the full amount of basic allowance for housing authorized for similarly situated active component members at their permanent duty location. The section would also clarify that full basic allowance for quarters would be paid to reserve component members when mobilized to serve on active duty for less than 30 days in connection with a contingency operation.

Section 607—Overseas Cost of Living Allowance

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to continue to pay a family residing overseas a cost of living allowance notwithstanding the reassignment of the service member that is the sponsor of the family when it is in the best interests of the government and the family. The section would also redefine the standard used to justify reimbursement to service members for expenses incurred

overseas but not typically in the United States from an expense that is a one- time payment to an expense that is unusual and extraordinary. Reoccurring expenses that meet the new standard would be permitted for reimbursement.

Section 608—Income Replacement Payments for Reserves Experiencing Extended and Frequent Mobilization for Active Duty Service

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to pay involuntarily mobilized reserve members on a monthly basis the amount necessary to replace the income differential between their regular military compensation (RMC) plus any special or incentive pays and allowances paid to the member on a monthly basis and the average monthly income received by the member during the twelve months preceding the month during which the member was mobilized. This section would define the income differential as the amount by which the member's average monthly income prior to mobilization exceeds the member's RMC plus any special or incentive pays and allowances paid to the member on a monthly basis. Reserve members with private sector income that exceeds their active duty income would be eligible for the income replacement payment for any full month following the date that the member completes 18 continuous months of service on active duty or 24 months on active duty during the previous 60 months, or for any month during a mobilization that occurs within 6 months of the member's last active duty tour. Payments would be limited to a minimum of $50 each month and a maximum of $3,000 each month.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL INCENTIVE PAY

Section 611—Extension or Resumption of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces

This section would extend or resume the authority for the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus, 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 until December 31, 2006.

Section 612—Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Certain Health Care Professionals

This section would extend the authority for the nurse officer candidate accession program, the accession bonus for registered nurses, the incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists, the special pay for Selected Reserve health care professionals in critically short wartime specialties, the accession bonus for dental officers, the accession bonus for pharmacy officers until December 31, 2006. The provision would also extend the authority for repayment of educational loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve until January 1, 2007.

Section 613—Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers

This section would extend the authority for the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending a period of active service, nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus until December 31, 2006.

Section 614—One-year Extension of Other Bonus and Special Pay Authorities

This section would extend the authority for 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 with critical military skills, and the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills until December 31, 2006.

Section 615—Expansion of Eligibility of Dental Officers for Additional Special Pay

This section would eliminate the restriction barring military dentists from being paid additional special pay while they are undergoing dental internship or residency training.

Section 616—Increase in Maximum Monthly Rate Authorized for Hardship Duty Pay

This section would increase the maximum monthly rate of hardship duty pay from $300 to $750.

Section 617—Flexible Payment of Assignment Incentive Pay

This section would authorize assignment incentive pay to be paid on a monthly basis, in a lump sum or in installments other than monthly.

Section 618—Active-Duty Reenlistment Bonus

This section would increase the maximum selective reenlistment bonus that may be paid to an active component member from $60,000 to $90,000. The section would also extend the maximum years of service beyond which a reenlistment bonus may not be awarded from 16 years to 20 years and would authorize the secretary concerned to waive eligibility criteria established in law during war and national emergency.

Section 619—Reenlistment Bonus for Members of Selected Reserve

The section would extend the maximum years of service beyond which a reenlistment bonus may not be awarded from 16 years to 20 years and would authorize the secretary concerned to waive eligibility criteria established in law during war and national emergency.

Section 620—Combination of Affiliation and Accession Bonuses for Service in the Selected Reserve

This section would set the maximum amount that may be paid to members who affiliate with selected reserve units to $15,000 and

would specify new installment or lump sum payment options. The section would also authorize an accession bonus for enlistment in the selected reserve with the same $15,000 maximum and installment or lump sum payment options authorized for the affiliation bonus.

Section 621—Eligibility Requirements for Prior Service Enlistment Bonus

This section would eliminate the requirement that members with prior military service must first complete their military service obligation before being eligible to receive a bonus for enlisting in the selected reserve.

Section 622—Increase in Authorized Maximum Amount of Enlistment Bonus

This section would increase the maximum amount of the enlistment bonus that may be paid to new recruits from $20,000 to $30,000.

Section 623—Discretion of Secretary of Defense to Authorize Retroactive Hostile Fire and Imminent Danger Pay

The section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to retroactively designate the period during which duty in a specific area would qualify the member to receive hostile fire or imminent danger pay.

Section 624—Increase in Maximum Bonus Amount for Nuclear-Qualified Officers Extending Period of Active Duty

This section would increase the maximum amount of the bonus paid to nuclear-qualified officer who extend their active duty service from $25,000 to $30,000.

Section 625—Increase in Maximum Amount of Nuclear Career Annual Incentive Bonus for Nuclear-Qualified Officers Trained While Serving as Enlisted Members

This section would increase the maximum amount of the nuclear career annual incentive bonus from $10,000 to $14,000.

Section 626—Uniform Payment of Foreign Language Proficiency Pay to Eligible Reserve Component Members and Regular Component Members

This section would establish one authority for foreign language proficiency pay that specifies the same maximum amount and installment or lump sum payment options for both active component and reserve component members.

Section 627—Retention Bonus for Members Qualified in Certain Critical Skills or Satisfying Other Eligibility Criteria

This section would authorize the critical skill retention bonus to be paid to reserve component members and would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish such other criteria for payment of the bonus as the Secretary considers appropriate in addition to the

critical skill criteria. The section would also eliminate the prohibition of payment for service beyond 25 years for members serving in special operations skills designated as critical and members qualified for duty in connection with supervision, operation, and maintenance of naval nuclear power plants.

Section 628—Availability of Critical-Skills Accession Bonus for Persons Enrolled in Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps Who Are Obtaining Nursing Degrees

This section would authorize nursing students enrolled in Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs to receive a critical skills accession bonus of $5,000 or less under section 324 of title 10, United States Code so long as they have completed the second year of an accredited baccalaureate degree program and they execute an agreement to serve on active duty as a commissioned officer in the Army Nurse Corps. The section would clarify that agreements paid under this subsection are retroactively authorized if executed on or after October 5, 2004.

SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

Section 641—Authorized Absences of Members for Which Lodging Expenses at Temporary Duty Location May be Paid

This section would expand the circumstances under which members may continue to receive the lodging portion of their temporary duty per diem during absences from the temporary duty location to include absences approved by the member's unit commander in addition to authorized leave.

Section 642—Extended Period for Selection of Home for Travel and Transportation Allowances for Dependents of Deceased Member

This section would increase the period of time allowed for surviving family members of service members who die while on active duty to select a residence for which they may be receive travel and transportation allowances from one year to three years after the death of the member.

Section 643—Transportation of Family Members Incident to Repatriation of Members Held Captive

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to provide travel and transportation allowances for three family members of a member of the uniformed services on active duty who was held captive or was otherwise missing to the location where the members has been repatriated.

Section 644—Increased Weight Allowances for Shipment of Household Goods of Senior Noncommissioned Officers

This section would increase the authorized weight allowance for the shipment of household goods for members with and without dependents serving in enlisted grades of E–9, E–8, and E–7.

SUBTITLE D—RETIRED PAY AND SURVIVOR BENEFITS

Section 651—Monthly Disbursement to States of State Income Tax Withheld From Retired or Retainer Pay

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to pay state officials monies voluntarily withheld from retired pay for tax purposes on a monthly basis and not a quarterly basis as provided in current law.

Section 652—Revision to Eligibility for Nonregular Service Retirement After Establishing Eligibility for Regular Retirement

This section would allow service members who are qualified for active duty retirement to continue to serve in an active reserve status and remain eligible for a reserve retirement at age 60 without being required to be formally retired under the applicable active duty authority as required by current law. This section would eliminate an unnecessary administrative burden for service members who are qualified for both active duty and reserve retirement.

Section 653—Denial of Military Funeral Honors in Certain Cases

This section would expand the reasons for denying military honors at the funeral or burial service of a member or former member by prohibiting the secretary of a military department from providing such honors when the circumstances surrounding the death of the individual or other circumstances involving the individual as specified by the Secretary of Defense would bring discredit to the military department concerned.

Section 654—Child Support for Certain Minor Children of Retirement-Eligible Members Convicted of Domestic Violence Resulting in Death of Child's Other Parent

This section would authorize the payment of child support from a member's disposable retired pay to a dependent child of the member when the member's retired pay eligibility has been terminated because of the member's abuse of a spouse that resulted in the death of the spouse. The dependent child would become eligible to receive child support after effective service of a court order providing for such payment.

Section 655—Concurrent Receipt of Veterans Disability Compensation and Military Retired Pay

This section would curtail the 10-year phased implementation of full concurrent receipt of veterans disability compensation and military retired pay for military retirees receiving veterans disability compensation at the rate payable for 100 percent disability by reason of a determination of individual unemployability and would authorize such retirees to receive full concurrent receipt of veterans disability compensation and military retired pay on October 1, 2009, four years and three months earlier then scheduled.

Section 656—Military Survivor Benefit Plan Beneficiaries under Insurable Interest Coverage

This section would allow veterans who participate in the Survivor Benefit Plan and elect the insurable interest coverage to rename their insurable interest if their beneficiary dies.

SUBTITLE E—COMMISSARY AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY BENEFITS

Section 661—Increase in Authorized Level of Supplies and Services Procurement From Overseas Exchange Stores

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to increase the maximum amount that may be paid to exchange services to procure goods and services overseas for use by U.S. military forces from $50,000 to $100,000 per contract.

Section 662—Requirements for Private Operation of Commissary Store Functions

This section would establish a moratorium on studies to compare the cost effectiveness of commissary operations employing federal civilian employees and such operations employing private sector employees through December 31, 2010. The section would provide the Defense Commissary Agency the opportunity to reengineer their workforce to increase effectiveness and efficiency prior to competing with private sector entities.

Section 663—Provision of Information Technology Services for Accommodations Provided by Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities for Wounded Members of the Armed Forces and Their Families

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to provide information technology equipment and Internet access to service members and their families residing in facilities operated by nonappropriated funds while the member receives medical treatment.

Section 664—Provision of and Payment for Overseas Transportation Services for Commissary and Exchange Supplies

This section would mandate that appropriated funds be used to pay for all expenses to ship goods for sale to service members and their families by commissaries and exchanges at overseas locations. The committee is extremely disappointed that the budget request would reduce to $66.4 million the funding for Army support of second destination transportation of goods shipped to overseas Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES) stores. The committee believes that this reduction to approximately one-half of the programmed requirement for fiscal year 2006 will result in either increased prices for military consumers overseas, a greatly reduced contribution to morale, welfare, and recreation accounts from the AAFES profits, or a reduction in the quality of AAFES services and facilities. The committee considers any of these potential consequences unacceptable.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the addition of $65.0 million to Army operations and maintenance accounts to support second destination transportation expenses in support of AAFES.

Section 665—Compensatory Time Off for Certain Nonappropriated Fund Employees

This section would authorize managers to grant nonappropriated fund employees compensatory time off instead of overtime pay for overtime work when requested by the employee. This section would make the nonappropriated fund personnel system rules on overtime pay and compensatory time off consistent with similar rules within the federal civilian personnel system.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 671—Inclusion of Senior Enlisted Advisor for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Among Senior Enlisted Members of the Armed Forces

This section would add the Senior Enlisted Advisor for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the list of senior enlisted positions designated to receive the highest level of pay for an enlisted member effective on the date on which an enlisted member is appointed to serve in that position. The section would also specify that the enlisted member appointed to the position of Senior Enlisted Advisor for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is authorized to receive a personal money allowance, to receive the pay associated with the position while hospitalized or while on terminal leave, and to receive retired pay based on the pay associated with the position.

Section 672—Special and Incentive Pays Considered for Saved Pay Upon Appointment of Members as Officers

This section would clarify that the pay and allowances of an enlisted or warrant officer grade formerly held by an officer may continue to be paid to the officer only when the officer continues to perform the duty that creates the entitlement to or the eligibility for the pay or allowance.

Section 673—Repayment of Unearned Portion of Bonuses, Special Pays, and Educational Benefits

This section would consolidate the authority outlining the policy and procedures for repayment of unearned portions of bonuses, special pays, and educational benefits into one section with legislative references to that section within the specific authorities for 31 programs codified in title 37, United States Code, 15 programs codified in title 10, United States Code, and one program codified in title 14, United States Code. The section would also clarify that the secretary concerned may establish for all such programs procedures for determining the amount of the repayment required and the circumstances under which an exception to the required repayment may be granted.

Section 674—Leave Accrual for Members Assigned to Deployable Ships or Mobile Units or to Other Designated Duty

This section would clarify that service members assigned to a deployable ship or mobile unit, or other designated units may be authorized by the secretary concerned to accumulate up to 120 days of leave without having to serve on active duty for a continuous period of 120 days.

Section 675—Army Recruiting Pilot Program to Encourage Members of the Army to Refer Other Persons for Enlistment

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to conduct a pilot program to pay up to $1,000 in a lump sum to a member of the armed services who persuades a person to contact a recruiter seeking information about enlistment. The bonus would be paid to the service member after the referred person successfully completes basic training and individual advanced training. The pilot program would be limited to a maximum of 1,000 bonus payments in the first year and the authority to accept referrals would expire on December 31, 2007. Immediate family members of persons referred and members serving in recruiting and retention assignments would not be eligible to participate.

Section 676—Special Compensation for Reserve Component Members Who Are Also Tobacco Farmers Adversely Affected by Terms of Tobacco Quota Buyout

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to reimburse reserve members who suffered reduced compensation under the Fair and Equitable Tobacco Reform Act of 2004 because of mobilization to serve on active duty for more than 30 days. The section would require the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, to pay members who have been a producer of quota tobacco for at least two of the three tobacco marketing years before the 2002 marketing year an amount equal to 70 percent of the difference between the amount the member will receive under the Act and the amount the member would have likely received had the member remained a full-time producer of quota tobacco and had not been ordered to active duty.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE

OVERVIEW

The committee continues to be concerned about the capability of the Defense Health Program to provide quality, accessible health care to the members of the armed forces and their families, along with retirees and their families. As the nation fights the global war on terrorism, the Department of Defense must provide health care for our wounded service members regardless of whether their wounds are physical or emotional. To that end, the committee recommends expanding the capacity of the military health system to provide mental health care to service members and their families and to assist service members and their families to recognize potential mental health issues. The committee also recommends several enhancements to TRICARE Reserve Select that would expand

eligibility for members and their families and provide families a period of transitional health care beyond the death of a reserve member enrolled in the program. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the dental readiness of the reserve components and recommend improvements to ensure the dental readiness of members of the reserve components.

The committee is steadfast in its view that planned changes to the military health services must not disrupt beneficiary health care, and that any changes that seek to optimize military treatment facilities must preserve access to high quality health care. Thus, the committee is concerned that military service plans to convert military medical positions to civilian positions may have a negative effect on beneficiary access to health care. Given that concern, the committee recommends halting further conversions until the Secretary of Defense can certify that additional conversions would not increase cost, decrease quality of care or access to care.

ITEMS SPECIAL INTEREST

Comptroller General Study of the Viability of TRICARE Standard

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) required the Secretary of Defense to survey the TRICARE market areas in the United States to determine how many health care providers are accepting new patients under TRICARE Standard. In addition, the Comptroller General was required, on an ongoing basis, to review the processes, procedures, and analysis used by the Department of Defense to determine the adequacy of the number of health care providers that accept TRICARE Standard and submit a semiannual report on the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. The committee recognizes that the Comptroller General was unable to complete the required review because the Department had not completed the mandated surveys of the TRICARE market areas. Consequently, the data was not available for analysis by the Comptroller General. The committee understands that the Department has now completed the surveys and the data is now available for review. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General to complete the review of TRICARE Standard, as described by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), and to submit the first semi-annual report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2006.

Cooperative Activities on Post Traumatic Stress Disorder

The committee supports efforts to ensure that the needs of our service members who suffer from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) are being met. While the Government Accountability Office is currently conducting a study on ways to improve services to members of the Armed Forces suffering from PTSD, the committee remains concerned that service members are provided with the most effective and up-to-date programs available. The committee notes that Israeli researchers have collected substantial information on PTSD that has allowed the development of pre-accession

psychological screenings, a comprehensive repository of information on all veterans with PTSD in Israel, as well as several other databases that are used to study PTSD among soldiers and civilians. The committee urges the Department of Defense to collaborate with the Israeli Ministry of Defense, Military Medical Division, and the U.S. Department of Veterans' Affairs to look at best practices to address PTSD among service members.

Dental Readiness of the Reserve Components

The committee is concerned that improvements are needed in addressing the dental needs of the reserve components. The Army, for example, found that 20 percent of its citizen soldiers arrived at mobilization sites with dental conditions that made them non-deployable. While such individuals receive dental care during the pre-deployment stage that allows them to deploy, the resource intensive effort to correct dental problems takes time away from other unit deployment requirements. The committee took action in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) to provide the military services additional authority to provide dental screening and care from the time a reserve component unit is alerted for mobilization. The committee is interested in assessing how the secretaries of the military departments have used that authority. Moreover, the committee is increasingly concerned that the time available to reservists during the post deployment process does not allow for the completion of annual dental exams when such exams are due. This has a direct impact on force readiness because individuals without an annual exam cannot deploy again until that examination is completed. To address these issues, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the pre- and post-deployment process to determine how to best to ensure dental readiness of the troops and develop recommendations for inclusion in the implementation plan mandated in section 731 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375). The review at a minimum should:

(1) Determine whether and to what extent the services are utilizing current authorities to improve pre-deployment dental readiness of their personnel;

(2) Determine whether and to what extent the services are implementing processes and procedures to ensure dental readiness of their personnel during post-deployment;

(3) Determine whether annual dental exams should be required as part of the demobilization process;

(4) Consider whether the Transitional Health Care Benefits that are provided following separation from active duty should include a dental benefit for members of the reserve components as a way of improving their dental readiness; and

(5) Make recommendations, as appropriate, for any additional legislative authorities that are needed to ensure the dental readiness of that Armed Forces

The committee directs the Secretary to submit this report by April 1, 2006, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Depleted Uranium

The committee remains interested in the potential health impact depleted uranium may have on service members. The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense and other federal agencies have undertaken a number of studies on the health effects of depleted uranium. The committee urges the Department to continue its efforts to minimize exposure to the troops, continue to ensure testing using the most sophisticated testing methods available in the scientific community and continue its research efforts on potential health impacts and treatments for service members.

Eligibility for the Reimbursement of Travel Expenses Incurred as a Result of Referral for Medical Specialty Care

The committee recognizes that beneficiaries of the military health system often reside in remote areas with little or no availability of specialty medical care within a reasonable travel distance. This is particularly true for beneficiaries residing in the flag territories of the United States who routinely have to travel off-island for specialty care. Until recently, Pacific Air Forces funded commercial air travel for retirees and their family members living within their area of responsibility. In October 2004, the Air Force discontinued this benefit, placing the burden on the beneficiary to fund the travel to needed specialty care. The committee believes that specialty care should be available to beneficiaries without placing undue financial hardship on the beneficiary. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to reassess the decision by the Air Force to discontinue funding support, or revise the Department of Defense's policy for reimbursement of certain travel expenses covered in section 1074i, title 10, United States Code, to include all eligible TRICARE beneficiaries residing in the flag territories of the United States.

Non-Monetary Benefits Package for the President of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences

The committee is aware that the Secretary of Defense is seeking to appoint a new president of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS). The committee values the service provided by USUHS and is particularly impressed with the professionalism and dedication of USUHS graduates to the uniformed services. For that reason, the committee is concerned that the level of remuneration established for the USUHS president under current law might preclude outstanding candidates from competing for this otherwise highly prestigious position. As such, the committee directs the Secretary to develop a non-monetary benefits package for the person holding the office of president of USUHS. The committee believes that in developing that package the Secretary should evaluate government furnished housing on the installation of the National Naval Medical Center. The Secretary shall submit a report of his recommendations for a non-monetary benefits package to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2006.

Respiratory Therapists to Serve as Commissioned Officers

Respiratory therapists are trained and skilled professionals, many of whom have completed a bachelors in science or bachelors in arts degree as part of their training. However, respiratory therapists, who have the comparable educational backgrounds to other military health professionals who hold officer commissions, can serve only in the enlisted grades. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess whether respiratory therapists should serve as commissioned officers in the armed forces, based on a review of the requirements of the military services. If the assessment indicates that respiratory specialists should be commissioned, the Secretary should also discuss the pre-commissioning requirements for respiratory therapists. The Secretary should submit a report by April 1, 2006, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Review of TRICARE Policy Regarding Treatment of Other Health Insurance

The Department of Defense policy since 1995 is that when a TRICARE beneficiary with other health insurance incurs a health care cost, TRICARE will act as a second payer to the other health insurance. However, if a balance remains after the other health insurance payment is applied, TRICARE will only pay if the amount remaining is less than the TRICARE covered portion. This policy results in greater out-of-pocket costs for service members, retirees and their families. Furthermore, this policy is inconsistent with the Department of Defense methodology for reimbursement under TRICARE for Life, which covers all out-of-pocket costs for TRICARE covered benefits. The committee is concerned that the current policy may discourage beneficiaries from using other health insurance. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on the impact of changing the policy to mirror TRICARE for Life reimbursement for other health insurance. The report should:

(1) Determine whether the current policy unfairly penalizes beneficiaries with other health insurance by requiring out of pocket expenses for covered TRICARE benefits;

(2) Compare the cost of reimbursing beneficiaries with other health insurance all out-of- pocket costs for TRICARE covered benefits to those beneficiaries with only TRICARE coverage; and

(3) Determine how the current policy has impacted customer service demand and associated costs on TRICARE contractors.

The committee directs the Secretary to submit the report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2006.

Review of TRICARE Reimbursement Rates for Obstetrics, Gynecology, Pediatrics and Mental Health

The committee is concerned that the CHAMPUS Maximum Allowable Charge (CMAC) for obstetrics, gynecology, pediatrics and mental health remain fair and equitable. CMAC rates are based upon Medicare rates; however, Medicare does not have a robust experience particularly in the areas of pediatrics and obstetrics or in

traumatic stress related mental health. While there is a process to address differences in experience between TRICARE and Medicare, there is growing concern that the reimbursement rates need to be reviewed. The committee is concerned that if significant inequity exists, access to these services may decrease. In particular, children's hospitals provide services to military children with the most complex illnesses and treatment needs and availability of adult and family oriented mental health services are critical to the success of the Department of Defense post-deployment support programs. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study that compares the CMAC rates for obstetrics, gynecology, pediatrics and mental health to other federal health programs in at least two TRICARE regions. The committee directs the Secretary to submit this report by March 31, 2006, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—TRICARE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS

Section 701—Services of Mental Health Counselors

This section would allow mental health counselors, without prior physician referral or supervision, to be reimbursed for services provided to TRICARE beneficiaries. It would also amend section 704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337) to allow mental health counselors to enter into personal service contracts with the Department of Defense for the purpose of providing mental health services to TRICARE beneficiaries. Further, it would require that mental health counselors meet the licensure or certification requirements for "health care professional" established by section 1094 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 702—Additional Information Required by Surveys on TRICARE Standard

This section would expand the scope of the survey of the TRICARE Standard health care program that is required by section 723 of the National Defense Act for the Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). The committee believes that to improve TRICARE Standard it is necessary to obtain more detailed information from health care providers. Therefore, this section would require future surveys to include specific questions to determine the extent to which health care providers are aware of the TRICARE program; whether providers' patient populations use TRICARE; and the extent to which providers who participate in Medicare also accept new Medicare patients.

Section 703—Enhancement of TRICARE Coverage for Members Who Commit to Continued Service in the Selected Reserve

This section would allow members of the Selected Reserve to extend health care coverage in TRICARE Reserve Select (TRS) if they become eligible for additional periods of coverage through recall to active duty as prescribed by section 1076d of title 10, United States

Code. In addition, the section would permit qualified reserve component members who are involuntarily retired to continue receiving health care under TRS following retirement until their coverage period ends. Furthermore, the section would allow certain Individual Ready Reserve (IRR) members a period of one year following release from active duty to find a position in the Selected Reserves without loosing eligibility for TRS. Such IRR members would be those who would otherwise qualify for benefits under TRS but for the fact that they cannot meet the requirement for continued service in the Selected Reserves because positions are not available. Health care coverage will begin for these members after transfer to the Selected Reserves. Reserve component members who are involuntarily separated from the Selected Reserves, and who are enrolled in TRS at the time of their separation, would retain their TRS coverage provided they remain in the IRR. The committee also recognizes that the demobilization period for reserve component members is often short and highly stressful. Under current law, a reserve component member who desires to obtain coverage under TRS must decide prior to being demobilized to extend service in the Selected Reserve. The committee believes that such a decision ought to be made more deliberatively. Therefore, this section would extend to 120 days after the member's release from active duty the time a member has to elect participation in TRS. In addition, the committee recognizes that a member of the reserves may die while they are enrolled in TRS requiring the family to find other health care coverage. This section would extend TRS coverage for family members for six months beyond the death of the member. Finally, this section would clarify that the TRICARE Standard benefit for enrollees in TRS includes access to care in military medical treatment facilities.

Section 704—Study and Plan Relating to Chiropractic Health Care Services

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has not fully implemented section 702 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) that required chiropractic care to be provided for all members of the uniformed services through military treatment facilities. Currently only 42 medical treatment facilities in the military health system, all within the continental United States, offer chiropractic health care services. The committee understands that approximately 300,000 military members still do not have access to chiropractic care. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan for providing chiropractic health care services to all members of the uniformed members, as required by Public Law 106–398. In addition, this section would require the Secretary to study the cost, feasibility, health benefit and potential cost savings of providing chiropractic care for active duty family members, members of the reserves and their family members and retirees and their family members. The study would also include the cost of providing chiropractic care on a space available basis in those medical treatment facilities currently providing chiropractic care. The Secretary shall submit a report, including the plan and the study, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2006.

Section 705—Surviving-Dependent Eligibility Under TRICARE Dental Plan for Surviving Spouses who Were on Active Duty at Time of Death of Military Spouse

This section would amend Section 1076a of title 10, United States Code, by adding to the definition of "eligible dependent," surviving spouses who were on active duty at the time their military spouse died. The committee is aware that there are many dual military couples in the armed forces. Currently, a surviving spouse who is on active duty at the time the other spouse dies and subsequently separates from active duty, is ineligible for the TRICARE Dental Program because they were not enrolled in the program at the time of the spouse's death.

Section 706—Exceptional Eligibility for TRICARE Prime Remote

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive all restrictions with regard to TRICARE Prime Remote medical care coverage for active duty family members that reside at a remote location without regard to their sponsor's current or past assignment. Such a waiver would occur if the Secretary determines that there are extenuating circumstances such that waiving the restrictions is consistent with the intent of the law.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS

Section 711—Authority to Relocate Patient Safety Center; Renaming MedTeams Program

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to relocate the Patient Safety Center from the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology as currently required by section 754 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001(Public Law 106–398). Repealing the requirement for the Patient Safety Center to be located within the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology provides flexibility for future placement of the Patient Safety Center at a location that may be better suited to improve alignment and communication between TRICARE Management Activity and the Patient Safety Center and thereby improve patient safety and clinical quality within the military health system.

This section also would remove the name of a trademarked product used in an on-going medical program to reflect the termination of the Department of Defense contract with the proprietary owner of the product.

Section 712—Modification of Health Care Quality Information and Technology Enhancement Reporting Requirement

This section would change the terminology used in the required elements of the Annual Report on the Quality of Health Care Furnished under the Health Care Programs of the Department of Defense. This report is required by section 723 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). Changing the terminology better aligns the report with current standards and initiatives advocated by federal agencies and civilian health care organizations so that the military health system can better compare itself to civilian benchmarks.

Section 713—Correction to Eligibility of Certain Reserve Officers for Military Health Care Pending Active Duty Following Commissioning

This section would authorize military health benefits for Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps graduates, without health insurance or other health benefits, who have been commissioned and received orders to active duty in advance of the active-duty report date.

Section 714—Prohibition on Conversions of Military Medical Positions to Civilian Medical Positions Until Submission of Certification

The committee is concerned that the military departments' plans to convert military medical positions to civilian positions have the potential to negatively affect access to care for beneficiaries of the military health system. For example, one of the underlying assumptions in the military-to-civilian conversion is that civilian medical practitioners, in the proper numbers with the right medical skills will be available to replace the military medical personnel in the locations where military reductions are taking place. Another assumption appears to be that civilian medical practitioners can be hired or contracted for approximately the same cost or less cost than the cost of maintaining military medical personnel. Thus, for example, the committee is aware that one service is budgeting to hire civilian general dentists at a salary of $113,000 which is what military dentists in that service are paid. However, the committee questions the feasibility of such an approach when average salaries for civilian general dentists are $150,000. Given these concerns, the committee believes that more analysis is required before further conversions should take place.

Therefore, this section would require the Comptroller General to conduct a study on the effect of the conversions of military medical positions to civilian positions on the defense health program. In addition, the section would require the secretaries of the military departments to halt further conversions of medical positions until they certify that any further conversions will not increase cost, decrease quality of care or access to care. The certification by the secretaries of the military departments is due not earlier than April 1, 2006. The Comptroller General should submit a report by March 1, 2006.

Section 715—Clarification of Inclusion of Dental Care in Medical Readiness Tracking and Health Surveillance Program

The committee is concerned that there may be confusion about the inclusion of dental care in the various tracking and surveillance activities undertaken by the Department of Defense to assess the health status of the armed forces. This section would clarify that in the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), references to medical readiness, health status and health care include dental care.

Section 716—Cooperative Outreach to Members and Former Members of the Naval Service Exposed to Environmental Factors Related to Sarcoidosis

The section would require the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, to conduct an outreach program to contact all members and former members of the naval service who in connection with service aboard Navy ships may have been exposed to environmental factors related to sarcoidosis. Such factors include exposure to the aerosolized particles of aluminum, titanium, silica, barium sulfate, fibrous glass and other materials generated during the grinding removal of non-skid coating used on the decks of Navy ships. Sarcoidosis is a disease due to inflammation that is most frequently a disease of the lungs. In January 2004, a study by the Naval Health Research Center found that African-American seaman and aviation boatswains mates who served between 1965 and 2001 had approximately twice the risk of sarcoidosis compared to other Navy African-American enlisted personnel, and that assignment to an aircraft carrier was associated with a two-fold increased risk for sarcoidosis in African-Americans and a 1.5-fold increased risk in whites. Two epidemiological studies done in connection with the report identified an association between service aboard on an aircraft carrier and certain occupations with an increased risk of sarcoidosis. The committee believes that follow-up to this report is required and the outreach effort required by the section is intended to:

(1) Develop additional data aimed at determining a causative link between sarcoidosis and military service;

(2) Inform members and former members of the naval service of the findings of the Navy studies concerning sarcoidosis; and

(3) Assist former members of the naval service who may be suffering from sarcoidosis to get medical evaluations to clarify linkages between their disease and service aboard Navy ships.

Section 717—Early Identification and Treatment of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Disorders

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct an internal media communication effort to foster a change in attitudes of members of the armed forces, regarding treatment for mental health and substance abuse. The committee believes that the media communication effort would build on the family, peer-support, and command programs that the services have implemented for service members and their families to help recognize and assist uniform personnel or family members who exhibit signs of mental health or substance abuse problems.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

OVERVIEW

The committee is deeply concerned with the state of Department of Defense (DOD) acquisition policy, acquisition management, the defense industrial base and related matters. In particular, the com-

mittee is concerned that the current Defense Acquisition Management Framework is not appropriately developing realistic and achievable requirements within integrated architectures for major weapons systems based on current technology, forecasted schedules and available funding. Conversely, the committee is concerned that the Department is not sufficiently utilizing streamlined acquisition procedures to capitalize on a wide variety of commercially available goods and services that could be innovatively applied to meet emerging defense requirements in a fiscally prudent manner, primarily in acquisitions not related to major weapon systems purchases.

In regard to the major systems acquisitions, DOD compliance with internal directives, such as compliance with DOD 5000 series, the appropriate use of commercial item contracting vehicles for major weapon systems purchases, and accurate identification of requirements that are technologically and economically attainable are of paramount concern. The committee believes that in order to maximize available funding, DOD should focus on developing more stable and achievable requirements. In particular, the committee recommends that the Department increase internal scrutiny of acquisition programs before approving them for the System Development and Demonstration (SDD) phase without mature technologies, requirements and firm information technology architectures.

In a 2004 Technology Readiness Assessment of the Army's Future Combat System (FCS) for calendar year 2003, the Department noted that of 31 technologies identified as critical technologies, 24 presented a level of risk that should receive special attention and planning in the form of risk mitigation plans. Despite assurances at that time from the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Science and Technology (DUSD(S&T)) that "technologies were in fact sufficiently mature or that program management had established effective risk mitigation plans to support entry into SDD," the overall cost of the Army's Future Combat Systems (FCS) program has increased from an original estimate of $19.0 billion to a fiscal year (FY) 2005 estimate of $22.0 billion to its current estimate of $30.3 billion. In addition, the committee notes that original cost estimates for the Joint Strike Fighter were approximately $26.0 billion upon passing Milestone B and that current estimates have risen to approximately $41.0 billion. The committee believes that many of these cost increases result from premature entry into the SDD phase without sufficient levels of technological maturity.

The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense should certify entry of any Major Defense Acquisition Program (MDAP) into the Milestone B or SDD phase of performance. This should include a mechanism to require an analysis of alternatives when the Department finds an MDAP has surpassed 15 percent of its original baseline estimate. These measures should ensure that the Department procures technologically viable and economically responsible systems designed to meet the military's needs in the 21st century while carefully balancing current and desired capability, available economic resources, and current and future needs for military presence.

The committee notes that despite a decade of reform, the current DOD acquisition system is unable to leverage the most innovative

services and products commercially available for imaginative defense applications. The acquisition system has not kept pace with an increasingly service and technology oriented economy. This diminishes DOD's ability to effectively and efficiently manage acquisition programs and provide for our national defense. The committee remains committed to providing for the adoption of appropriate business-like acquisition practices within the Department, facilitating the acquisition of commercial services by building on prior reforms in the acquisition of commercial items, and enabling the Department to access cutting-edge technology.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Program Cost Increases

The committee is concerned with the dramatically increasing costs of Department of Defense major weapon systems acquisitions. While today's weapon systems produce unmatched capability, the committee is concerned that the per-unit cost of today's programs may result in an ill-advised tradeoff, choosing increased capability at the expense of maintaining sufficient force structure to ensure appropriate military presence. Increasing research and development costs in multiple programs have already resulted in a decrease in total orders to remain within a fiscally viable budget. The committee recommends that the Department aggressively pursue means of consolidating requirements, avoiding duplication of systems across services, and pursuing technological solutions with multi-service applications.

Procurement of Ball and Roller Bearings

The Committee recognizes that actions taken since December, 2004, by the Department of Defense in the interpretation of Sections 252.225–7014; 252.225–7016; and other relevant sections of the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations (DFAR), has had the effect of precluding domestic bearing manufacturing companies from protections under the Berry Amendment. These actions are decreasing the domestic industry's ability to produce bearings critical to our national security and increasing our reliance upon foreign produced bearings. The Committee believes that domestic ball and roller bearing manufacturers should be wholly manufactured in the United States or Canada. However, if no domestic provider exists for certain bearing components such as cages and rings, the imported components have had additional post processing in the United States, and the component satisfies all domestic content requirements of the Buy America Act and the Berry Amendment using the committee's understanding of raw materials, the committee believes bearings containing such components should be considered compliant with the Berry Amendment. Every effort should be taken by the Department to encourage a strong domestic bearing industry and develop a qualified domestic source for raw material currently procured by bearing producers from foreign sources.

Report on Defense Ethics Programs

The committee is aware of a recent report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) entitled "Defense Ethics Program" (GAO–05–341), which points out potential gaps in the Department of Defense's (DOD) ethics program. The committee believes DOD action is necessary to prevent future violations of conflict-of-interest laws and post-employment restrictions. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review and report on the following items related to personnel subject to conflict-of-interest laws and post-employment restrictions:

(1) Methods used by the Department to identify affected personnel;

(2) Training required of identified personnel;

(3) Methods for tracking training;

(4) Methods for determining the optimal quality and content of training;

(5) Methods by which the Defense Contract Management Agency, the Defense Contract Audit Agency, and other relevant agencies ensure the appropriate hiring of current and former DOD employees by industry; and

(6) Methods by which the Department plans to track the number of allegations of conflict-of-interest and misconduct, and to make Congress aware of progress in decreasing such incidents.

The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report by April 1, 2006 to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Requirements Identification

The committee is concerned about the ability of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the military services senior acquisition officials to respond in a timely manner to emerging and urgent requirements identified by in-theater operational commanders at all levels. The committee believes that the Department of Defense (DOD) should thoroughly review the joint requirements generation and review processes used to acquire items through service acquisition channels. In addition, the Department should de-conflict these bureaucratic processes expeditiously to create a seamless interservice acquisition methodology ensuring that operational units' requirements are rapidly met. These requirements should be based on the immediate needs of combatant commanders or projected urgent scenario-based combat needs attributed to long-term DOD-wide conflict preparations, rather than to a specific service requirement.

Use of Streamlined Acquisition Procedures

The committee recognizes the value in the multiple reforms of the 1990s including the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355), the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–106) and the Services Acquisition Reform Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–136). These reforms were designed to streamline the acquisition process and to take advantage of commercial items and commercial services. These reforms, however, are not without a degree of risk. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense is not adequately complying with internal directives re-

lated to the purchase of commercial items and services. The committee therefore recommends that the Secretary review internal management controls and utilization of Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 13 contracts. The Secretary should stringently review its use of alternative contracting vehicles such as "other transaction authorities" and "commercial-off-the-shelf" purchases for large weapons platforms.

Utilization of Rapid Acquisition Authority

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense is not capitalizing on the rapid acquisition authority authorized in section 811 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375). This authority allows the Secretary "to waive any provision of law, policy, directive, or regulation" that would "unnecessarily impede the rapid acquisition and deployment of needed equipment to prevent combat fatalities." In its first use of the authority the Department is projecting the procurement of approximately 10,000 improvised explosive device jammers in roughly 60 days. The committee notes that, prior to use of the rapid acquisition authority, the projected delivery schedule exceeded 13 months.

The committee also notes that although the Secretary established a Joint Rapid Acquisition Cell (JRAC) he has failed to provide sufficient resources and authority to allow the JRAC to make a significant impact on rapid acquisition initiatives.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PROVISIONS RELATING TO MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

Section 801—Requirement for Certification By Secretary of Defense Before Major Defense Acquisition Program May Proceed to Milestone B

This section would amend chapter 139 of title 10, United States Code, by requiring the Secretary of Defense to make a certification before a major defense acquisition program (MDAP) enters Milestone B or Key Decision Point B in the case of a space system. A MDAP may not receive Milestone B approval, or Key Decision Point B approval in the case of a space program, until the Secretary certifies that:

(1) The technology in the program has been demonstrated in a relevant environment;

(2) The program demonstrates a high likelihood of accomplishing its intended mission;

(3) The program is affordable when considering the per unit cost and total acquisition cost in the context of the total available resources available during the period covered by the future years defense program submitted during the fiscal year in which the certification is made;

(4) The program is affordable when considering the ability of the Department of Defense (DOD) to accomplish the program's mission using alternative systems;

(5) The Joint Requirements Oversight Council has accomplished its duties with respect to the program as required in

section 181(b) of title 10, United States Code, including an analysis of the operational requirements for the program; and

(6) The program complies with all relevant policies, regulations, and directives of the Department of Defense.

This section would require the Secretary to submit the certification to the congressional defense committees no fewer then 30 days before approval of Milestone B or Key Decision Point B in the case of a space system. The Secretary could waive the certification requirement for national security reasons. Such a waiver would require a subsequent report to the congressional defense committees outlining the rationale for the waiver within 30 days after authorizing the waiver. The certification required would be non-delegable.

As stated in a March 2004 report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), Defense Acquisitions: Assessments of Major Weapons Programs, "production maturity cannot be attained if the design is not mature, and design maturity cannot be attained if the key technologies are not mature."

Section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, (Public Law 107–107) directed the Secretary to report annually to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the maturity of technology at the initiation of major defense acquisition programs. The Act requires a report during each year from 2003 to 2006 on a requirement in DOD's policy that technology must have been demonstrated in a relevant environment (or preferably in an operational environment) to be considered mature enough to use for product development in systems integration. To date, the committee has received and reviewed with interest the reports from fiscal years 2002–2004. The committee strongly believes that MDAPs should not enter the Systems Development and Demonstration phase prior to the demonstration of mature technologies.

The committee believes that the Secretary should personally make this certification in light of the significance of the weapon systems. The committee does not believe such a requirement is too burdensome. The committee notes that in the past 10 years only 63 MDAPs have gone through Milestone B.

Section 802—Requirement for Analysis of Alternatives to Major Defense Acquisition Programs

This section would require an analysis of alternatives (AoA) for major defense acquisition programs (MDAP) when the procurement unit cost rises more then 15 percent above the acquisition unit cost or procurement unit cost established at Milestone B. The secretary of the military department concerned would conduct the AoA at the 15 percent threshold. The AoA would be required within one year after initiation and submitted to congressional defense committees within 30 days of completion.

This section directs that every analysis of alternatives (AoA) for major defense acquisition programs (MDAP) performed prior to execution of the MDAP must include a list of commercially available technologies that have applicability to the stated program element requirement within the MDAP. All comprehensive efforts should be made to utilize these technologies in the MDAP.

The committee believes once an MDAP evidences significant departure from the baseline estimate, such as the acquisition unit

cost or procurement unit cost exceeding 15 percent, the service secretary concerned should begin the process of evaluating other options. The committee recommends that the Department of Defense (DOD) utilize the Defense Acquisition Challenge Program as one possible alternative.

The required analysis of alternatives should be built on the original analysis of alternatives conducted prior to Milestone B. Such an approach could alleviate the cost and time requirements for conducting an AoA. The committee does not intend that the initiation of an AoA necessarily result in all work stopping for an affected program. The AoA is intended to foster development of alternatives, not to stifle current programs or innovation.

With this in mind, the committee recommends that DOD recognize the potential for an analysis of alternatives during the Systems Development and Demonstration (SDD) phase and that appropriate precautions be taken to avoid unnecessary costs associated with a required AoA. The committee believes that no program the size of an MDAP should proceed without thoroughly examining available alternatives and that such alternatives should remain viable throughout the acquisition life cycle should they be needed to deal with unexpected technological delays or changing requirements.

It is the intention of the committee that this section applies to both MDAPs and to the start of a National Security Space program.

Section 803—Authority for Secretary of Defense to Revise Baseline for Major Defense Acquisition Programs

This section would identify the baseline established at Milestone B as the only baseline to be utilized for purposes of chapter 144 of title 10, United States Code. The committee believes the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments have improperly avoided reporting requirements in chapter 144 by rebaselining programs.

This section would allow rebaselining only when a major defense acquisition program (MDAP) has a percentage increase in program acquisition unit cost or procurement unit cost exceeding 25 percent of the original baseline estimate. Upon breach of the 25 percent barrier, the Secretary must return the MDAP back to Milestone B and perform a rebaselining or comply with the requirements of section 2433 (e)(2)(B) of title 10, United States Code.

This section would also require the secretary of a military department to notify the congressional defense committees within 30 days of a rebaselining action.

SUBTITLE B—ACQUISITION POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

Section 811—Applicability of Statutory Executive Compensation Cap Made Prospective

This section would amend section 808(e)(2) the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) to clarify that the underlying provision is prospective from the date of enactment. Currently, compensation of certain executives in excess of a "benchmark" set by regulations is unallowable. As a result, in

General Dynamics Corporation v. *United States,* 47 Fed.Cl. 514 (Fed. Cl. 2000), the Court held that application of the statutory cap to a contract awarded prior to the enactment section 808(e)(2) constituted a breach of contract, and that the government was liable for breach damages due to the retroactive application of the cap. This executive compensation would still be subject to a test of reasonableness.

Section 812—Use of Commercially Available Online Services for Federal Procurement of Commercial Items

This section would require the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy to revise the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) to maximize the use of commercially available online procurement services to purchase commercial items, including those procurement services that allow the heads of federal agencies to conduct reverse auctions.

Section 813—Contingency Contracting Corps

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a contingency contracting corps through a joint policy developed by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This corps would be directed by a senior commissioned officer with appropriate acquisition experience and qualifications who, when deployed, would report directly to the combatant commander in an area of operations requiring contingency contracting support. The joint policy would provide that contingency contracting operations during combat operations would utilize the rapid acquisition authority authorized in section 811 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), to the maximum extent appropriate. In addition, this section would attempt to leverage contingency contracting assets in both deployed and non-deployed locations to efficiently carry out the mission of the contingency contracting corps. Training of the corps would take into account all relevant laws, regulations and polices related to contingency contracting and would be required even when the corps is not deployed.

The committee intends that the commander of the contingency contracting corps be appointed at a grade senior enough to interact effectively with a combatant commander. The committee believes that an officer in the rank of Lieutenant General, or Vice Admiral for the Navy, is appropriate for this responsibility. The committee intends that the contingency contracting corps maintains a sufficient level of readiness in peacetime to be able to rapidly deploy to emerging contingency operations. The commander of the contingency contracting corps should consider the development of a standardized contingency contracting handbook which summarizes all relevant laws, directives and regulations related to contingency contracting to assist the day-to-day operations of the contingency contracting workforce. Finally, the committee urges that contingency contracting corps utilize an integrated contracting and financial management system to ensure that contracting operations are not hindered by technological limitations that can be easily avoided through the use of readily available systems.

Section 814—Requirement for Contracting Operations to be Included in Interagency Planning Related to Stabilization and Reconstruction

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to include contracting operations in all applicable interagency planning operations. The committee is concerned that the recently created Department of State Office of Stabilization and Reconstruction does not include contracting and acquisition as a key area for review and future planning. Contracting and acquisition are key components of successful stabilization and reconstruction operations and should be considered in the earliest planning stages.

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to identify "lessons learned" by the Coalition Provisional Authority contracting office, the Program Management Office, and the Project Contracting Office. Matters covered would include:

(1) Development of an appropriate acquisition strategy before obligation of funds, including the scope of the planned acquisition operations, project management, logistics and financial considerations;

(2) Flow of appropriated funds;

(3) Ability to obtain military and civilian acquisition workforce personnel;

(4) Ability to obtain country clearance for such personnel; and

(5) Ability to reprogram funds and to coordinate interagency activities.

A report produced by the Secretary of Defense in conjunction with the Secretary of State should be submitted to the Senate Committees on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House International Relations Committee within 180 days of enactment of this Act. The committee believes that the knowledge obtained during the Iraq contracting process should be captured for use in planning and implementing future contingency contracting operations.

Section 815—Statement of Policy and Report Relating To Contracting With Employers of Persons With Disabilities

This section would extend for one year section 853 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375).

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Education to issue jointly a statement of policy related to further implementation of the Randolph-Sheppard Act of 1936 (RS) (20 U.S.C. 107) and the Javits Wagner O'Day (JWOD) program (41 U.S.C. 46–48c). This section would require the statement of policy to specifically address application of RS and JWOD to both operation and management of all, or any part, of a military mess hall, military troop dining facility, or any similar dining facility operated for the purpose of providing meals to members of the armed forces. This also includes preparation or serving of food or ordering, storing, or accounting for food or ingredients. The committee believes that procurement decisions on contracting for military troop dining services should be made in accordance with the

needs of the Department of Defense and the particular military activity requiring procurement of such services.

The statement of policy should take into account and address, to the extent practicable, the positions acceptable to persons representing programs implemented under RS and JWOD. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Education shall submit the statement of policy to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions and the House Committee on Education and the Workforce by April 1, 2006.

Section 816—Study on Department of Defense Contracting With Small Business Concerns Owned and Controlled by Service-Disabled Veterans

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has fallen short of the 3 percent contracting goal for service disabled veteran owned small businesses. This section would require the Department of Defense to conduct a detailed study on its progress toward increasing contracting with small businesses owned by service disabled veterans. The report to Congress is due 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 817—Prohibition on Procurement From Beneficiaries of Foreign Subsidies

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from entering into a contract with a foreign person (including a joint venture, cooperative organization, partnership or contracting team with that foreign person), which has received a subsidy from the government of a foreign country that is a member of the World Trade Organization, if the United States has requested a consultation with that foreign country on the basis that the subsidy is prohibited under the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures.

SUBTITLE C—AMENDMENTS TO GENERAL CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES, PROCEDURES AND LIMITATIONS

Section 821—Increased Flexibility for Designation of Critical Acquisition Positions in Defense Acquisition Workforce

This section would amend section 1733 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate differences in the authorities provided for the management of civilian and military critical acquisition positions. This section would reestablish the parity sought by the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (DAWIA) (Public Law 101–510) and provide the Secretary of Defense with the same authorities for the designation of both civilian and military critical acquisition positions. The committee believes that not all senior civilian personnel or senior commissioned officers in an "acquisition position" should be designated as critical acquisition positions. The committee believes that the Secretary should develop specific guidelines to identify outstanding acquisition personnel to fill critical acquisition positions.

Section 822—Participation by Department of Defense in Acquisition Workforce Training Fund

This section would amend section 37 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 433) to require the Secretary of Defense to use funds transferred from the Administrator of the General Services at the Defense Acquisition University to train students in matters relating to acquisition.

Section 823—Increase in Cost Accounting Standard Threshold

This section would amend section 26(f)(2)(A) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.) to increase the cost accounting standard (CAS) threshold to $550,000, which would correspond with the current Truth in Negotiations Act (TINA) (Public Law 87–653) threshold. Section 807 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) addressed inflation adjustments of acquisition related dollar thresholds. This section would ensure consistency henceforth regarding the CAS and TINA thresholds.

Section 824—Amendments to Domestic Source Requirements Relating to Clothing Materials and Components Covered

This section would amend section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, known as the Berry Amendment, to require the Secretary of Defense to notify the public when the Secretary exercises a waiver. In 1998 and 2002, the Department of Defense Inspector General (DOD–IG) identified multiple deficiencies in application of the Berry Amendment. In March 20, 2002, the DOD–IG report entitled "Acquisition: Buy American Act Issues on Procurements of Military Clothing" stated 60 percent of the reviewed contracts failed to include the appropriate Buy American Act or the Berry Amendment contract clause. The DOD–IG report also stated that contracting officers at 13 military installations procured military clothing and related items manufactured or produced abroad without determining whether those items were manufactured in the United States. As a result, DOD–IG estimated that $593,004 worth of items manufactured abroad may have been available from domestic suppliers. This section would prevent a repeat of this deficiency.

This section would also amend section 2533a to clarify the covered item described as clothing.

Section 825—Rapid Acquisition Authority to Respond to Defense Intelligence Community Emergencies

This section would grant the Secretary of Defense the authority to procure critical intelligence capabilities in order to address a demonstrable, imminent and urgent threat to national security that would likely result in combat fatalities or grave harm to the national security of the United States. The committee intends that the funds utilized under this section include only those avaialble to the Secretary under title 10, United States Code.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MANAGEMENT

Section 901—Restoration of Parity in Pay Levels Among Under Secretary Positions

This section would amend Sections 5314 and 5315 of title 5, United States Code, to raise the level of basic pay for the under secretaries of the military departments from Executive Level IV to Executive Level III. Currently, the under secretaries of the military departments are paid at Executive Level IV, the same level as the assistant secretaries of the military departments. This section would provide that the under secretaries of the military departments would be paid at Executive Level III, the same level as the under secretaries of defense.

Section 902—Eligibility Criteria for Director of Department of Defense Test Resource Management Center

This section would amend section 196 of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Secretary of Defense with greater latitude in selecting a director of the Department of Defense Test Resource Management Center. Since the center was established in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), the Department has experienced difficulty in recruiting a director and deputy director who met statutory requirements. This section would provide the Secretary with maximum flexibility in selecting a qualified director and would abolish the statutory requirement for a deputy director, while preserving the statutory authorities and responsibilities of this important organization.

Section 903—Consolidation and Standardization of Authorities Relating to Department of Defense Regional Centers for Security Studies

This section would streamline the management of Department of Defense Regional Centers for Security Studies, which to date have operated under different authorities. It would allow the centers to pursue research in addition to communication and exchange of ideas involving United States and foreign military officers, civilian governmental personnel, and non- governmental personnel.

The section would allow foreign governments and United States federal agencies to fund foreign participation in center activities and the Secretary of Defense to waive reimbursement of costs of activities for military officers and civilian officials from developing countries. It would continue an annual requirement for the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report on the regional centers' status, objectives, budgets, international participation, and foreign gifts and donations.

This section would also streamline the provisions under which the Department of Defense Regional Centers for Security Studies may accept gifts and donations, providing a uniform and consistent authority. Funds accepted by the Secretary would be credited to ap-

propriations available to the Department of Defense for the regional centers and merged with the appropriations to which credited. Such funds would then be available under the same conditions as those appropriations.

Section 904—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps

This section would designate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps and change the title of its Secretary to the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps. This provision would formally recognize the responsibility of the Office of the Secretary of the Navy over both the Navy and Marine Corps and the Marine Corps' status as an equal partner with the Navy.

SUBTITLE B—SPACE ACTIVITIES

SECTION 911—SPACE SITUATIONAL AWARENESS STRATEGY

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to develop a formal strategy, systems architecture, and a capabilities roadmap for space situational awareness and update the strategy every two years. The committee intends that upon development of a new strategy covering the prescribed 20–year period, the start of the time period will shift such that coverage should begin with the year following submittal of the report.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense lacks a coherent or comprehensive plan on how to conduct space situational awareness. The plan for the current system does not appear to be based on threat analysis and has been cobbled together from legacy tools, inherited programs, and concept demonstrators. The committee believes space situational awareness is the foundation for protection and defense of our space assets and should receive more emphasis.

Section 912—Military Satellite Communications

This section would direct the National Security Space Office to conduct an independent assessment of options to evolve the capabilities of the Advance Extremely High Frequency and Wideband Gapfiller Systems until the high-risk technologies proposed for the Transformational Satellite Communications System (TSAT) can be further developed and matured. The committee is concerned with the ability of the space acquisition community to manage risk associated with the leap in technology proposed by the TSAT program.

Section 913—Operationally Responsive Space

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to create or designate an organization to focus development payload technology for small satellites. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has neglected the development of small satellite payload technology. This organization would develop an annual master plan describing focus areas for technology development and would distribute appropriated funds for projects within those focus areas.

SUBTITLE C—CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM

Section 921—Transfer to Secretary of the Army of Responsibility for Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives Program

This section would transfer program management responsibility for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) program (formerly the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment program) from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)) to the Secretary of the Army by January 1, 2006; would provide for management of the program as a part of the Department of the Army organization for management of the chemical weapons demilitarization program as specified in section 1521(e) of title 50, United States Code; and would require the Army to implement fully the alternative technologies previously selected for destruction of lethal chemical munitions at Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado, and Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky.

Section 142 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) provides that the program manager (PM), ACWA shall manage the development and testing, including demonstration and pilot-scale testing, of technologies for the destruction of lethal chemical munitions that are potential or demonstrated alternatives to the baseline program, which uses incineration for destruction of the stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions. This provision further requires that the PM, ACWA shall act independently of the Program Manager for Chemical Demilitarization (PMCD) and shall report to the USD(AT&L).

Numerous Government Accountability Office (GAO) reports and testimony to Congress state that effective management of the chemical demilitarization program has been hindered by its complex management structure. GAO specifically cites the division of program responsibility between the director of the Army's Chemical Materials Agency (formerly the PMCD), who reports to the Secretary of the Army as executive agent for the program and is responsible for destruction of all elements of the chemical weapons stockpile except that stored at the Blue Grass Army Depot and the Pueblo Army Depot; and the PM, ACWA, who reports directly to the USD(AT&L) and has responsibility only for destruction of those parts of the stockpile stored at Blue Grass Army Depot and Pueblo Army Depot. During the Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities subcommittee's hearing on the chemical demilitarization program in April 2005, the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical) and the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) again testified to the need to bring together the management of the program.

In 2003, the Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the USD(AT&L), established the Chemical Material Agency, which is responsible for management of the chemical weapons destruction program and operation of the chemical weapons destruction plant facilities and stockpile storage sites. With the concurrence of the USD(AT&L), the Secretary of the Army assigned the PM, ACWA as the director of the Chemical Materiel Agency. The committee believes that the establishment of a new management structure,

which brings together all elements of the program under a single activity, will eliminate many of the management complexities cited by the GAO, contribute to the elimination of duplicative management overhead and support, and ensure more efficient management of the total program, while at the same time addressing the equities and concerns of those sites using assembled chemical weapons alternatives for destruction of the stockpile.

The transfer of management of the ACWA program to the Secretary of the Army in no way abrogates the responsibility of the USD(AT&L) for oversight of the chemical weapons demilitarization program, including ACWA, nor the USD(AT&L)'s role and responsibilities as defense acquisition executive for this Acquisition Category ID program.

Section 922—Clarification of Cooperative Agreement Authority Under Chemical Demilitarization Program

This section would clarify that the authority conferred upon the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army by section 1521(c)(4) of title 50, United States Code, which was originally enacted in section 107(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102–190), applies to cooperative agreements with federally-recognized Indian tribal governments, as well as state and local governments.

SUBTITLE D—INTELLIGENCE RELATED MATTERS

Section 931—Department of Defense Strategy for Open-Source Intelligence

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to create and submit to Congress a strategy for the use of open-source intelligence by January 31, 2006. The strategy would have 10 components focusing on application of open-source intelligence in the intelligence process, as well as associated management, training, and personnel issues.

Section 932—Comprehensive Inventory of Department of Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-Related Programs and Projects

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that provides a comprehensive inventory of Department of Defense (DOD) intelligence and intelligence-related programs and projects.

The committee notes that the Department is working with the Intelligence Community to provide greater visibility into those intelligence-related programs funded within the Department. The committee understands that Department initiatives currently underway to develop a Military Intelligence Program (MIP) will provide greater visibility for congressional committees with oversight responsibility for defense intelligence. The committee believes that it does not have complete visibility into some defense intelligence programs that do not clearly fall into the Joint Military Intelligence Program (JMIP) or under the Tactical Intelligence and Related Ac-

tivities (TIARA) categories. Specifically, the committee notes that individual services may have intelligence or intelligence-related programs such as science and technology projects or information operations programs related to defense intelligence that are embedded in other service budget line items. Greater transparency into these programs and projects will enhance congressional oversight and permit identification of potentially duplicative programs in other services.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, where appropriate, to provide to the appropriate congressional committees a comprehensive inventory of Department of Defense intelligence and intelligence-related programs and projects. It is not intended that this inventory encompass military operations or military activities. This inventory shall abide by existing procedures for the handling of special access programs referenced in section 119 of title 10, United States Code, and applicable Department of Defense directives.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Overview

The budget request contained $895.7 million for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, in addition to $120.8 million, for operational tempo which is included within the operating budgets of the military services. The budget is organized in fiscal year 2006 to address four broad national priorities: (1) international support; (2) intelligence and technology; (3) domestic support; and (4) demand reduction.

The committee recommends an authorization for fiscal year 2006 Department of Defense counter-drug activities as follows:

FY06 Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Request	$895,741
International Support	429,066
Intelligence Technology and Other	139,591
Domestic Support	199,071
Demand Reduction	128,013
Recommended Decreases:	
PACOM Operations Support	4,000
Air Force Tanker Support	3,000
Naval Reserve Support	4,000
International Support	10,000
Recommended Increases:	
Southwestern Border Fence	7,000
Joint Task Force North	6,000
Participating Nation Support	2,000
Support to National Security Agency	6,000
Recommendation	895,741

Items of Special Interest

Air Force tanker support

The budget request contained $4.8 million for tanker support of Air Force operations. Reductions in support activities are planned in light of other worldwide commitments. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $3.0 million.

Budget requests

The fiscal year 2006 drug interdiction and counter-drug activities budget request of $895.7 million covers all counter-narcotics resources in the Department of Defense (DOD) with the exception of those resources in the operating budget for the military services for operational tempo, military personnel, and military construction. The committee notes that the services' budget requests include an additional $120.8 million for operational tempo expenses in their respective appropriations. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense to identify in the DOD's drug interdiction and counter-drug activities budget justification material for fiscal year 2007, and thereafter, the associated operational tempo costs contained in the services budgets for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities.

International support

The budget request contained $429.1 million for international support and $139.6 million for intelligence and technology. The budget request for international support, intelligence and technology in fiscal year 2005 was $522.6 million. In addition, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109–13) appropriated $242.0 million for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities by the Department of Defense. The committee understands the importance of international support and notes that the request for international support will result in significant increased operational support for the United States Central Command, the United States Pacific Command and the United States Europe Command. This support includes detection and monitoring platforms and assets, command and control support, and provides equipment and supplies to other nations that are key in the national drug strategy and defense security cooperation goals.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $419.1 million for international support, a decrease of $10.0 million. The recommended funding represents a significant increase over the fiscal year 2005 authorization. This small decrease will not result in any diminished activities as the bulk of this account is funded through The Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109–13).

Joint Task Force North

The Joint Task Force North (JTF–N) located at Fort Bliss, Texas, performs counter-narcotics missions to support the United States Northern Command. The task force has traditionally supported federal law enforcement agencies in drug interdiction efforts. On September 28, 2004, it was re-designated as JTF–N and its mission was expanded to include homeland defense support. The new homeland security mission includes supporting the interdiction of suspected transnational threats within and along the approaches of the continental United States, and the collection and dissemination of intelligence regarding international terrorism, drug-trafficking, and the trafficking of weapons of mass destruction. The additional mission adds new costs: building operation and maintenance, headquarters oversight, and command, control, communication, computer and intelligence systems.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million for this purpose.

Naval Reserve support

The budget request contained $11.2 million for operations by a Naval Reserve squadron in the United States Southern Command's area of responsibility. Reductions in support activities are planned in light of other worldwide commitments.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $4.0 million.

PACOM operations support

The budget request contained $7.5 million for United States Pacific Command (PACOM) and participating nation support for PACOM operations. Reductions in support activities are planned in light of other worldwide commitments.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $4.0 million.

Participating nation support

This classified program would provide enhanced intelligence capability to nations supporting Department of Defense counter-drug activities.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for this activity.

Report on Department of Defense role in Afghanistan

The committee strongly supports the U.S. government's efforts to combat the narcotics problem in Afghanistan, a problem that could both fuel terrorism and undermine the new government's stability. However, the committee notes that in Afghanistan, the Department of Defense (DOD) has responded to an increasing number of requests for support from the Department of State and the Drug Enforcement Administration to help the Afghan Counter-narcotics Police develop the capacity to address the narcotics problem in their country. For instance, the Department has provided tactical training, field equipment and communications to police forces, especially the National Interdiction Unit and the Border Police. As part of these efforts, the Department is also constructing numerous bases of operations for Afghan Counter-narcotics Police, Border Police, Highway Police, and National Police. The bases of operation include: (1) smaller bases of operation for brigade to company level police along the Afghan border with Pakistan; (2) medium size forward operating bases of operation for interdiction forces, such as a forward operating base in Kandahar; and (3) larger projects, such as the permanent base of operations for the National Interdiction Unit and a temporary Counter-narcotics Judicial Center, both in Kabul.

The committee is concerned that, despite the development of an inter-agency implementation plan for U.S counter-narcotics activities in Afghanistan, the Department is being asked to fund and manage activities that are well beyond its core mission. The construction of the $8.4 million Counter-narcotics Judicial Center, while certainly critical to the efforts to detain, try, and imprison those charged and ultimately convicted of drug crimes in Afghani-

stan, is exemplary of the activities the committee believes are more appropriately undertaken by the Department of State. The committee understands that there may be unique circumstances surrounding this example, but finds it appropriate for the agencies involved in the counter-narcotics efforts in Afghanistan to reevaluate the division of labor to ensure that each agency is contributing in those areas in which they are able. The Department of Defense must continue to play an important role in the fight against narcotics in Afghanistan, but it must not take on roles in which other agencies have core capabilities.

To that end, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and the Director of the Drug Enforcement Administration, to submit a report updating the inter-agency counter-narcotics implementation plan for Afghanistan. This report should include a consideration of what activities should be reallocated based on the capabilities of each department and agency involved. It should also address any measures necessary to clarify the legal authority required to complete the mission, and the measures necessary for the U.S. government to successfully complete its counter-drug efforts in Afghanistan. This report should be submitted to the congressional defense committees and the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House Committee on International Relations by December 31, 2005.

Southwest border fence

As part of the San Diego 14-Mile Border Infrastructure System, the Southwest Border Fence has served as an invaluable counter-narcotics resource for United States Border Patrol agents since the project's inception in 1997. However, the border fence project is still under construction and the area remains one of the nation's most heavily utilized drug smuggling corridors. Since 1998, the California National Guard and other military personnel have been responsible for fence construction and general support of the border infrastructure system. Completion of the border fence would constitute a cohesive barrier against vehicle and pedestrian narcotics trafficking and allow counter-drug assets to be redeployed in other areas.

In addition, the committee is aware that innovative high-tech fencing, such as fiber-optic-laced, is available and encourages the California National Guard to review these options for future fence construction.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million for this purpose.

Support to National Security Agency

This classified program would provide counter-drug intelligence support to the National Security Agency.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million for this activity.

FINANCIAL MATTERS

Congressional Budget Justification Material

Beginning with the Department of Defense budget submission for fiscal year 2007, the Department shall provide as part of the congressional budget justification material with documents annotated as the P–1, R–1, and 0–1, the future years defense program, summarized by appropriation, at an appropriate place at the beginning of the publication.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Civilian Casualties

The estimates of the number of injuries and deaths among foreign non-combatants attributable to various U.S. military actions, particularly in Iraq, vary widely among non-governmental organizations. Currently, the U.S. military has no consistent means of clarifying these estimates because it does not track non-combatant deaths and injuries. The existence of accurate data would improve the ability of the military to defend itself when confronted with propaganda, may enable it to implement measures to reduce the number of civilian casualties in the future, and could significantly improve the U.S. military's relationship with the local communities in which it operates, particularly in the Arab and Muslim worlds.

For these reasons, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to establish a consistent means of tracking the number of foreign non-combatant casualties believed to be the result of U.S. military operations. The Secretary is also urged to develop a means of systematically analyzing these data to develop recommendations for decreasing the number of such casualties in future conflicts.

Counter Terrorism Surveillance Technologies

The committee remains concerned that effective, counter-terrorism, force protection initiatives are too often not fielded to the troops in theater due to persistent bureaucratic delay. The committee recognizes and applauds the Department of Defense (DOD) for its efforts to follow committee guidance and implement rapid fielding initiatives. Even so, entrenched, cumbersome processes persist to a distressing degree. In one instance, an innovative static aerostat providing persistent real time intelligence to deployed troops was touted repeatedly as a success by DOD officials. When the committee asked about the necessity for more such systems, the response from the military department concerned was that there was no "requirement," meaning that the validating paperwork had not yet entered official service acquisition channels. Yet, when this single deployed system was damaged, an urgent request for a replacement came from the field, demonstrating the value of the system. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to take full advantage of the rapid fielding authorities available to him to provide the Commander of U.S. Central Command with necessary persistent surveillance assets that are required by deployed units. Given the fluid nature of ongoing combat operations, the committee will not require a formal report but will monitor this situation diligently.

Emergency Response Coordination

The committee is concerned by the seemingly confused federal, state, and local government response to the reports of anthrax contamination in two Department of Defense (DOD) Washington, DC area mailrooms in March 2005. The committee understands that internal DOD procedures were followed, but is nonetheless concerned about the overall confusion among local first responders and DOD employees. The challenging aspect of effective response to a weapon of mass destruction incident is the smooth cooperation and coordination among disparate federal, state, and local jurisdictions. In that regard, this incident demonstrated more clearly than carefully prepared exercises that much work needs to be done. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with Secretary of Homeland Security, to examine this incident and submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2006, on lessons learned and steps that will be taken to improve coordination among all participating entities in any future weapons of mass destruction incident.

Homeland Defense and Homeland Security

The committee is heartened by the Department of Defense's effort to develop and publish a "Strategy for Homeland Defense and Civil Support" which has been reviewed in final draft. The committee believes this strategy will be the foundation for Department of Defense and Department of Homeland Security cooperative efforts and is sorely needed. The committee supports the proposed strategy's core principle of an active layered defense supporting priority objectives to achieve maximum awareness of threats and interdict and defeat threats at a safe distance. The committee further notes and endorses the strategy's proposed heavy reliance on the reserve components and sensor and unmanned aerial vehicle technology to achieve those priority objectives. In that regard, the committee believes that the authority provided under section 512 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) provides the Secretary with the flexibility to creatively employ the national guard in a number of missions that support this strategy.

The committee also notes the strategy's acknowledgement of the reality that the U.S. military must be prepared, upon the President's order, to conduct military operations on domestic soil. The committee believes that some of these contingencies will arise with little warning, and that any necessary military response must therefore be carefully planned and rehearsed. In addition, any military action envisioned within the borders of the United States must be coordinated with the Department of Homeland Security, local jurisdictions, and first responders.

The committee believes that contingency planning for a domestic military response is needed and should be a priority of the Commander, U.S. Northern Command. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to publish the strategy as soon as possible, in order that necessary coordination may be effected with the Secretary of Homeland Security, state and local governments and that

implementing guidance may be issued to combatant commanders and the Director of the National Guard Bureau.

Report on Casualties and Damage Caused by Improvised Explosive Devices

The committee notes that insurgents in Iraq continue to use improvised explosive devices (IED) against U.S. forces and that the Department of Defense force protection efforts would benefit greatly from collecting and analyzing critical, timely data on casualties sustained by members of the armed forces and damage to their vehicles. Such analysis would prove essential in monitoring insurgents' tactical trends, understanding equipment vulnerabilities, evaluating add-on and up-armor solutions, and designing improved force protection. It could then help to reduce the number and severity of future casualties sustained as the result of IED use on the battlefield.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2006, a report on personnel casualties and vehicle damage resulting from hostile action in Iraq and Afghanistan since October 2002. The report shall include: a detailed analysis of the number and types of casualties sustained by members of the armed forces which have been linked to IEDs; an analysis of whether and how types of personnel casualties sustained in IED attacks have varied depending on the level of vehicle armor of the vehicle attacked; the number of attacks on vehicles carrying technology referred to as IED-defeat technology in which a member was killed or injured; and the number and percentage of vehicles equipped with IED-defeat technology that were fully operational within one week after an IED attack. The Secretary should include within this report a plan to systematically track any future personnel casualties and vehicle damage linked to an IED attack.

Separation and Coordination of Information Operations and Public Affairs

The committee believes that the Department of Defense should maintain a clear, functional distinction between information operations that attempt to affect potential adversaries' information-collection efforts and public affairs activities that are designed to release timely, reliable, and accurate information to American and allied audiences. Noting that information operations and public affairs both involve the release of information in support of military commanders' objectives, the committee believes that appropriate coordination of these two operationally important functions is essential to realize success in both areas.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to work to ensure that information operations and public affairs functions remain separate, to the maximum extent possible, and that information operations and public affairs entities coordinate on their efforts, as appropriate.

Update Future Years Defense Program—Modify Strategic Forces Major Force Program to Reflect New Triad

The committee notes that the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) includes a Major Force Program (MFP) for Strategic Forces. However, this MFP does not include all program elements that are either totally or partially dedicated to the New Triad outlined in the 2001 Nuclear Posture Review and its periodic assessments. The New Triad consists of non-nuclear and nuclear strike capabilities, active and passive defenses, and a responsive infrastructure. The identification and aggregation of program elements supporting the New Triad is an essential step in enabling senior policy makers and Congress to assess investment strategies for the New Triad.

Commencing with the fiscal year 2007 budget, the Secretary of Defense is directed to modify the Future Years Defense Program budget submission to establish a virtual major force program for the New Triad that identifies and aggregates relevant program elements which are associated with the activities and capabilities identified for the New Triad.

Update to and Guidance for the National Security Strategy

The current Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) is broadly reviewing the way in which the military provides for the national defense, including the national defense strategy, the military's needed joint capabilities, roles and missions of the Department of Defense (DOD), and how to man and balance the force. The QDR will likely be influenced by the conduct of operations in the global war on terrorism and Operation Iraqi Freedom since the publication of the last QDR in September 2001.

The Department of Defense, however, is only one department with a significant role to play in defeating global terrorism, preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and deterring regional conflict. The role of all national security-related departments and agencies is brought together in the National Security Strategy, required to be produced annually under Title 50 of the United States Code. The committee notes that the Department of Defense has sought to capture lessons learned from the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan and strongly believes that the next iteration of the National Security Strategy must also fully explore and adjust to the lessons learned from experience in Iraq and Afghanistan by other departments and agencies. The National Security Strategy should provide a clear vision for how our nation may attain its security goals in a comprehensive manner, using all instruments of national power, including both military assets and non-military means such as communications and diplomacy, economic cooperation and foreign aid, cultural exchanges, and investments in educational disciplines such as science, engineering and foreign language skills. In crafting the strategy, the administration should pay careful attention to appropriate roles for each department and agency and the legislative authorities that may be needed to make each most effective. Such an analysis would benefit U.S. overall national security.

To this end, the committee urges the President to update the National Security Strategy immediately, so that the Department can

fully implement the National Security Strategy as it develops the QDR. Further, as part of this effort, the committee strongly encourages the President to direct an analysis of department and agency roles and missions and needed legislative authorities that would make each most effective in achieving the goals of the National Security Strategy.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1001—Transfer Authority

This section would provide fiscal year 2006 transfer authority to the Department of Defense for amounts up to $4,000 million.

Section 1002—Authorizations of Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2005

This section would authorize amounts enacted in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109–13) for the Department of Defense.

Section 1003—Increase in Fiscal Year 2005 General Transfer Authority

This section would amend section 1001(a)(2) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) to increase the fiscal year 2005 transfer authority from $3,500 million to $6,185 million.

Section 1004—Reports on Feasibility and Desirability of Capital Budgeting for Major Defense Acquisition Programs

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the feasibility and desirability of capital budgeting for major defense acquisition programs by July 1, 2006.

SUBTITLE B—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

Section 1011—Conveyance, Navy Drydock, Seattle, Washington

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell the yard floating drydock, YFD–70 to Todd Pacific Shipyards Corporation, the current user of the drydock. This vessel will be sold at fair market value. The Secretary of the Navy would be authorized to set additional terms and conditions on the transfer as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

Section 1012—Conveyance, Navy Drydock, Jacksonville, Florida

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell the medium auxiliary floating drydock SUSTAIN (AFDM–7), to Atlantic Marine Property Holding Company, the current user of the drydock. This vessel will be sold at fair market value and will continue

to be available to the Navy to serve ships stationed at the U.S. Naval Station, Mayport, Florida. The SUSTAIN will likely be scrapped if it is not purchased since it is in need of a major overhaul at a cost estimated at between $25.0 million and $30.0 million. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to set additional terms and conditions on the transfer as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

Section 1013—Conveyance, Navy Drydock, Port Arthur, Texas

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey the inactive medium auxiliary floating drydock, AFDM–2 to the city of Port Arthur, Texas. This conveyance will be at no cost to the government. The Secretary of the Navy would be authorized to set additional terms and conditions on the transfer as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

Section 1014—Transfer of USS Iowa

This section would direct the Secretary of the Navy to transfer the historic USS Iowa to the Port of Stockton, California, subject to the submission of a satisfactory donation application. The committee understands that the Port of Stockton's application will include its plans to donate 1,000 feet of dock space to make the USS Iowa available to visitors, a 90,000 square foot building to be used as a museum and ten acres of land for parking, a donation valued at approximately $65.0 million. The committee further understands that the port has specific plans to ensure an adequate number of visitors to the ship each year.

Section 1015—Transfer of Ex-USS Forrest Sherman

This section would direct the Secretary of the Navy to transfer the decommissioned destroyer ex-USS Forrest Sherman (DD–931) to a nonprofit organization of the same name for historic preservation and public viewing, subject to the submission of a satisfactory donation application. This authority will expire five years after enactment of this Act.

Section 1016—Limitation on Leasing of Foreign-Built Vessels

This section would prohibit the secretary of a military department from entering into a contract for lease or charter of a vessel for a term of more than 24 months, including all options to renew or extend the contract if the hull, or superstructure of the vessel is constructed in a foreign shipyard. The President may waive this prohibition if he determines it is in the interests of national security of the United States.

SUBTITLE C—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Section 1021—Extension of Department of Defense Authority to Support Counter-Drug Civilities

This section would extend the expiring authority of the Department of Defense to provide specified support for the counter-drug activities of any other department or agency of the federal government or of any state, local, or foreign law enforcement agency

through fiscal year 2011. The current authority expires at the end of fiscal year 2006.

Section 1022—Resumption of Reporting Requirement Regarding Department of Defense Expenditures to Support Foreign Counter-Drug Activities

This section would reinstate the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to submit a report detailing expenditures of funds by the Secretary during fiscal year 2005 in direct and indirect support of the counter-drug activities of foreign governments.

Section 1023—Clarification of Authority for Joint Task Forces to Support Law Enforcement Agencies Conduction Counter-Terrorism Activities

This section would clarify that a joint task force supporting law enforcement agencies conducting counter-drug activities may use funds available for that activity to also support counter-terrorism activities by those law enforcement agencies. This section would provide the flexibility for the Department of Defense to use its resources, capabilities, and structures to not only assist other agencies in their counter-drug activities but also in their counter-terrorism activities. The fiscal authority provided here is a clarification of authority for joint task forces to support law enforcement agencies in both counter-drug and counter-terrorism missions originally provided by Congress in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). The committee notes that the Department has not yet issued policy guidance that would allow combatant commands and military services to use this authority. The committee urges the Department to issue such guidance immediately to permit intended missions to go forward.

SUBTITLE D—MATTERS RELATING TO HOMELAND SECURITY

Section 1031—Responsibilities of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense Relating to Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Emergency Response

This section would amend section 1413 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) by designating the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense as the Department of Defense (DOD) official responsible for coordinating DOD assistance to federal, state, and local government officials dealing with chemical and biological emergency response. This section would also expand those responsibilities to include nuclear, radiological and high yield explosives and other federal agencies besides the Department of Energy.

Section 1032—Testing of Preparedness for Emergencies Involving Nuclear, Radiological, Chemical, Biological, and High-Yield Explosives Weapons

This section would amend section 1415 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) to clarify the federal official responsible for testing of preparedness of federal, state, and local agencies to respond to emergencies involving nuclear, radiological, biological, and chemical weapons. Since

the enactment of section 1415, the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296) created the Department of Homeland Security and assigned these responsibilities to the Secretary of Homeland Security. This section would also make other conforming amendments.

Section 1033—Department of Defense Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and High-Yield Explosives Response Teams

This section would amend section 1414 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) to designate the Secretary of Homeland Security, rather than the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency as the federal official who would request Department of Defense (DOD) assistance in a weapons of mass destruction emergency response; update the title of the DOD teams to more accurately reflect current capabilities; and require that the Secretary of Homeland Security coordinate plans to use these teams with the Secretary of Defense.

Section 1034—Repeal of Department of Defense Emergency Response Assistance Program

This section would repeal section 1412 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201). Section 1412 requires the Secretary of Defense to carry out a program to train other federal agency, state, and local agency personnel regarding emergency response to threats or incidents involving weapons of mass destruction. The Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296) subsequently assigned those responsibilities to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1041—Commission on the Long-Term Implementation of the New Strategic Posture of the United States

This section would establish a Commission on the Long-Term Implementation of the New Strategic Posture of the United States to assess and make recommendations about current U.S. strategy as described in the Nuclear Posture Review and other planning documents, as well as possible alternative strategies that could be pursued over the next 20 years. The commission would have broad purview to consider matters of policy, force structure, stockpile stewardship, and estimates of threats and force requirements, and would have the authority to hold hearings and take testimony.

The Nuclear Posture Review, dated December 31, 2001, marked a transition from a strategic posture dominated by nuclear weapons to one dominated by non-nuclear capabilities. In particular, it sought to replace the triad of offensive land-, sea-, and air-based strategic nuclear delivery platforms with a triad of nuclear and non-nuclear delivery platforms, defense, and a responsive infrastructure tied together with advanced command, control, communications, intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, and adaptive planning capabilities that would lessen the overall United States dependence on nuclear weapons. The committee believes that the commission would play an important role in identifying the systemic processes and capabilities needed to implement that con-

struct. In order to rapidly meet the staffing and administrative needs of the commission, this section would direct the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract with a Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC) to carry out support tasks. The committee expects that such a contract would be entered into after consultation with the commissioners in order to ensure they receive the support they require. This section further requires approval of the FFRDC by the Chairman of the commission. Additionally, the committee notes that FFRDCs have the capability to quickly respond to evolving commission needs through the execution of new contracts and new task orders on old contracts. The committee expects that the FFRDC selected by the Secretary of Defense would seek to maximize the commission's flexibility, particularly in response to the needs identified by the commission.

Section 1042—Reestablishment of EMP Commission

This section would reestablish and extend the life of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States From Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack, originally created in the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398). The Commission reported its findings and recommendations to Congress in the summer of 2004 and subsequently terminated its existence. Concerned that asymmetric and disruptive threats using EMP weapons are not receiving the continued attention they require, the committee recommends a provision that would reconstitute the commission and extend its mission through 2010, while changing its duties and focusing it on the evolution of EMP threats and the implementation of appropriate countermeasures.

Section 1043—Modernization of Authority Relating to Security of Defense Property and Facilities

This section would allow the delegation of authority to issue security regulations at certain facilities to civilian directors of those facilities under the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 81–831). Currently, such authority is limited to uniformed military officers. The section would make additional technical adjustments to the Internal Security Act of 1950 in order to reflect other changes in law made since the Internal Security Act's adoption.

Section 1044—Revision of Department of Defense Counterintelligence Polygraph Program

This section would clarify and make permanent the standards by which the Department of Defense (DOD) conducts its counterintelligence polygraph program. This section would also expand the DOD counterintelligence polygraph authority to allow the Department to administer polygraph examinations to individuals whose duties involve assistance in intelligence or military missions where the misuse of information could jeopardize human life or safety; result in the loss of unique or uniquely productive intelligence sources or methods vital to U.S. national security; or compromise technologies, operational plans, and security procedures vital to the strategic advantage of the United States and its allies.

Section 1045—Repeal of Requirement for Report to Congress Regarding Global Strike Capability

This section would repeal the requirement in section 1032 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) for the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on Global Strike for fiscal year 2006.

Section 1046—Technical, Clerical, and Conforming Amendments

This section would make various non-substantive clerical, conforming, and technical corrections. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, Congress adopted general definitions for the terms "congressional defense committees" and "base closure laws", both located in section 101 of Title 10, United States Code. With that enactment, much of the unnecessary repetition was corrected by conforming amendments to other sections of title 10. This section addresses the remaining conforming amendments to the United States Code that were not made in the 2004 Act as well as other technical corrections.

Section 1047—Deletion of Obsolete Definitions in Titles 10 and 32, United States Code

This section would update titles 10 and 32 of the United States Code by deleting the obsolete term "Territory" with a capital "T", defined in 1956 to refer to Alaska and Hawaii before statehood, and to make conforming changes. In the amended sections the reference to Puerto Rico is updated to reflect its status as a Commonwealth, thus "Commonwealth of Puerto Rico" is inserted in place of "Puerto Rico".

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

OVERVIEW

The Secretary of Defense is on the eve of promulgating final rules and regulations that will transform the Department of Defense (DOD) civilian workforce. Congress recognized the need for a more flexible workforce and granted the Secretary significant authority to develop and implement the National Security Personnel System (NSPS) in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136). The committee believes the Secretary can attain the full benefits of this authority by meeting the spirit and specificity of the law. Employee representatives must be included in the process and the proposed rules must be fair and credible.

Implementation of NSPS is not the only significant matter to affect the DOD civilian workforce in fiscal year 2006. The upcoming base closure and realignment process will also impact the workforce. To aid these employees, the committee is recommending several provisions that provide authority for the Secretary of Defense to minimize negative personnel actions that result from U.S. military installation closures or realignments.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1101—Extension of Eligibility to Continue Federal Employee Health Benefits

This section would amend section 8905a(d) of title 5, United States Code, by extending, until the end of fiscal year 2010, authority for certain individuals to elect continued health benefits coverage for up to 18 months after an involuntary or voluntary separation due to a reduction in force. Criteria for eligibility would remain in section 8905a(d) of title 5, United States Code, and would not be amended.

Section 1102—Extension of Department of Defense Voluntary Reduction in Force Authority

This section would amend section 3502(f)(5) of title 5, United States Code, by striking "September 30, 2005" and inserting "September 30, 2010". This would extend, for five years, the Secretary of Defense or the secretaries of the military departments' authority to substitute an employee's voluntary separation for another employee who would otherwise be separated under a reduction in force. This section would not amend the rules or regulations associated with this authority.

Section 1103—Extension of Authority to Make Lump Sum Severance Payments

This section would amend section 5595(i)(4) of title 5, United States Code, by striking "October 1, 2006," and inserting "October 1, 2010". This would extend, until the end of fiscal year 2010, the Secretary of Defense or the secretaries of the military departments authority to pay to an employee the total amount of the severance pay in one lump sum. This section would not amend the rules or regulations associated with this authority.

Section 1104—Authority for Heads of Agencies to Allow Shorter Length of Required Service by Federal Employees After Completion of Training

This section would amend section 4108 of title 5, United States Code, to provide the head of an agency authority to determine the appropriate length of service an employee must perform in return for training paid for by the U.S. government. Currently, a civilian employee must agree in writing to continue service for a period equal to three times the length of the training period. This section would authorize the head of the agency to limit the three-to-one requirement. When it is in the federal agency's best interest, the head of the agency would use the following factors to determine the length of service obligation: cost of training, labor-market conditions, the success of recent efforts to attract or retain individuals with special qualifications, protection of the agency's interest, and workforce planning efforts.

Section 1105—Authority to Waive Annual Limitation on Total Compensation Paid to Federal Civilian Employees

This section would authorize the heads of executive agencies to waive the annual limitation on total compensation established in section 5547 of title 5, United States Code, for federal civilian employees supporting military operations in the area of responsibility of the Commander of the United States Central Command for calendar year 2006. The annual limitation in section 5547 currently restricts the aggregate of basic and premium pay that a civilian employee may earn in a calendar year, which results in employees who have reached the annual limitation having to work additional overtime hours without pay. This section would increase the total amount of compensation permitted for a civilian employee to $200,000 for one calendar year. This section would apply to employees directly supporting a military operation, including a contingency operation, or an operation in response to a declared emergency.

Section 1106—Transportation of Family Members Incident to Repatriation of Federal Employees Held Captive

This section would add a new section in chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, to authorize the head of an agency to transport family members to the repatriation site of an employee who had been held in captivity.

Section 1107—Permanent Extension of Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation Defense Scholarship Program

This section would make permanent the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation program originated under section 1105 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375).

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Annual Report on Threat Posed to the United States by Weapons of Mass Destruction, Ballistic Missiles, and Cruise Missiles

In section 234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), Congress directed the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence, to submit an annual report on the threats posed by, as well as the proliferation of, nuclear, biological, and chemical (NBC) weapons, ballistic missiles, and cruise missiles. The committee commends the Defense Intelligence Agency for drafting this consistently comprehensive report, which has proven to be a useful and thorough intelligence assessment of worldwide NBC and missile threats. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense and those defense officials who work on such intelligence issues to maintain the high quality of this report while meeting the annual January 30 deadline for submitting this report to Congress.

Report on Implementation of the American Servicemembers' Protection Act

The committee is aware that several nations have not signed "Article 98" agreements to preclude the extradition of U.S. servicemembers to the International Criminal Court (ICC) for prosecution and that the Department of Defense has implemented the American Servicemembers' Protection Act (ASPA) as Congress intended. As a result, International Military and Education funds and other forms of military assistance are no longer available to countries that have not concluded Article 98 agreements with the United States.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to require the ICC Task Force within the Office of the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2006, on the results of ASPA implementation, both for the protection of American servicemembers and for bilateral defense relationships.

Report on Military and Defense Aspects of the Proliferation Security Initiative

The committee notes that since its inception in 2003, the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) has successfully focused high-level international attention on undertaking a multilateral, proactive approach to preventing proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, their means of delivery, and related materials among nation states and non-state actors of proliferation concern. The Department of Defense (DOD) has played a critical, practical role in defining military and defense aspects of proliferation prevention and in organizing, leading, and participating in robust discussions, operations, and exercises with foreign military and civilian forces on operational aspects of the PSI. The committee believes that such military and defense activities are important to prevent proliferation. The committee notes the positive contribution to proliferation prevention and international security represented by the participation of approximately 60 nations in PSI operational exercises and urges the administration to continue to expand international participation.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees, by February 1, 2006, a report on the military and defense activities carried out under the PSI since May 2003, including: a description of the activities carried out using any DOD assets; the amounts obligated or expended by the Department for such activities; the purposes, goals, and objectives for which such amounts were obligated or expended; and the success of each activity, including the objectives achieved for each. The report shall also include a description of DOD's future goals and objectives, planned activities, estimated funding requirements, proposed funding plans, and a strategy to support partner capacity-building, as these items relate to the PSI. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to identify in the fiscal year 2007 budget request the funding that would be associated with PSI activities.

Security and Stabilization Assistance

The Department of Defense requested authority to provide up to $200.0 million in reconstruction, stabilization, and security assistance to a foreign country for the purposes of restoring or maintaining peace and security in that country. According to Department of Defense (DOD) officials, the Department would exercise that authority by providing up to $200.0 million in resources to the Department of State's newly-created Office of Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS). Most observers and several officials from the Executive Branch have testified before the committee that ultimate success in Iraq and Afghanistan depends on mobilizing all federal resources to rebuild both countries. The committee notes that DOD resources and personnel have been used extensively to conduct non-combat operations, such as organizing local governments, conducting reconstruction activities, establishing judicial and law enforcement procedures, restoring and managing the electric grid, and boosting agricultural output. While the armed services improvise extraordinarily well, skills for most of these activities are resident elsewhere in the federal government. Moreover, such activities are inconsistent with DOD's warfighting strengths. Recognizing the desirability of improving the federal government's capabilities in these areas, the Department of State created S/CRS to coordinate non-military efforts in these areas. The committee applauds the decision to create S/CRS and encourages the Department of Defense to work with S/CRS, but believes that S/CRS should be funded through the normal budgetary process for the Department of State.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

Section 1201—Extension of Humanitarian and Civic Assistance Provided to Host Nations in Conjunction with Military Operations

This section would increase funding authorization for equipment, services, and supplies provided in support of Department of Defense (DOD) activities to detect and clear landmines, effective at the beginning of fiscal year 2006. It would also add "surgical" to types of humanitarian and civic assistance in rural, underserved areas of the world, bringing the statute in line with language used to describe relevant DOD projects, and allow DOD officials to provide education, training, and technical assistance to host nation officials in connection with the humanitarian and civic assistance provided.

Section 1202—Commanders' Emergency Response Program

This section would permit the Secretary of Defense to make up to $500.0 million in funding authorized for operations and maintenance in title XV available to United States military commanders to continue the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP). The administrator of the Coalition Provisional Authority initially created CERP from assets seized from the Hussein regime in order to provide resources to local coalition forces for short-term, humanitarian restoration and reconstruction projects designed to

assist in the establishment of civil society in Iraq following the collapse of the Hussein regime. A similar program has since been initiated in Afghanistan. The committee notes that military commanders have praised the program as fundamental to their efforts in combating the insurgency and recommends funding the program at a level identical to that of fiscal year 2005. The committee is concerned, however, that the Department of Defense has not complied with the requirements of section 1201 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), which required the Secretary of Defense to identify those laws and regulations that would prohibit, restrict, limit, or otherwise constrain the exercise of CERP activities. The committee continues to believe that this report will be critical in streamlining the process of funding CERP and ensuring that military commanders can use the resources provided to them efficiently and effectively.

Section 1203—Military Educational Exchanges Between Senior Officers and Officials of the United States and Taiwan

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish and conduct exchanges of senior defense officials and officers with the Republic of China on Taiwan at the level of Deputy Assistant Secretary and flag-rank officers or above. The committee notes that the United States currently conducts reciprocal visits with senior defense officials and military officers from the People's Republic of China. The committee believes that similar programs with the Republic of China are appropriate. More importantly, the committee believes that maintaining a balance of power across the Taiwan straits is critical to ensuring deterrence and preserving peace, security, and stability in Asia. China's National People's Congress recently adopted an anti-secession law that essentially authorizes China's Central Military Commission to use non-peaceful means against Taiwan if the latter declares independence. The committee is concerned that this law, in conjunction with an excessive military buildup by the People's Republic of China, may signal a weakening of deterrence across the Taiwan straits. The committee believes that the exchange program, by helping to strengthen Taiwan's defense, would help preserve and strengthen deterrence, thereby encouraging the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China to resolve their differences peacefully.

Section 1204—Modification of Geographic Restriction Under Bilateral and Regional Cooperation Programs for Payment of Certain Expenses of Defense Personnel of Developing Countries

Section 1051 of title 10, United States Code, allows the Secretary of Defense to pay the travel, subsistence, and similar personal expenses for defense personnel from developing countries to attend a conference, seminar, or similar meeting if the Secretary determines that attendance is in the best interests of U.S. national security. Such travel may occur within the area of responsibility of the unified combatant command in which the developing country is located or in connection with travel to Canada or Mexico.

This section would authorize the Secretary to pay for such travel between areas of responsibility, effective at the beginning of fiscal

year 2006. This change would allow sponsoring unified combatant commands to avoid the need for extraordinary approvals to conduct a given conference or meeting across areas of responsibilities.

Section 1205—Authority for Department of Defense to Enter into Acquisition and Cross-servicing Agreements with Regional Organizations of Which the United States is not a Member

This section would permit the Secretary of Defense to enter into acquisition and cross-servicing agreements (ACSA) with regional international organizations of which the United States is not a member. Under existing law, sections 2341 through 2344 of title 10, United States Code, the United States may enter into such agreements only with governments of members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), NATO itself, and international organizations of which it is a member. Acquisition and cross-servicing agreements are an important tool in supporting U.S. military operations. The committee recommends expanding the Secretary's authority to enter into such agreements in order to improve the Secretary's ability to prosecute the global war on terrorism. However, the committee does not recommend granting the request to eliminate existing monetary caps on amounts that could be accrued or obligated by the Secretary. The committee understands that the Department has not yet needed to exceed those caps and believes that monetary ceilings reduce the risks of creating significant liabilities or surpluses.

Section 1206—Two-Year Extension of Authority for Payment of Certain Administrative Services and Support for Coalition Liaison Officers

Section 1051a of title 10, United States Code, allows the Secretary of Defense to provide administrative services and support for the performance of duties by a coalition liaison officer of another nation while assigned temporarily to the headquarters of a United States combatant command, component command, or subordinate operational command. Section 1051a also allows the Secretary to pay travel, subsistence, and duty-related personal expenses of a coalition liaison officer of a developing country while so assigned. This authority expires on September 30, 2005.

The committee recommends that this authority be extended until September 30, 2007.

SUBTITLE B—NONPROLIFERATION MATTERS AND COUNTRIES OF CONCERN

Section 1211—Report on Acquisition by Iran of Nuclear Weapons

This section would express the Sense of Congress that preventing Iranian acquisition or development of weapons of mass destruction and their associated delivery systems remains the paramount policy goal of U.S. policy towards Iran. This section would further require the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to assess the strategic implications of Iranian acquisition of nuclear weapons. The committee notes that European Union negotiations with Iran have, thus far, failed to convince Iran to forego its pursuit of the nuclear fuel cycle, despite years of effort

in which the European Union has offered several incentives to Iran. The committee notes Iranian acquisition of nuclear weapons would have adverse consequences for security in the region and recommends a study of those consequences in order to better prepare the United States.

Section 1212—Procurement Sanction against Foreign Persons that Transfer Certain Defense Articles and Services to the People's Republic of China

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from purchasing goods or services from any entity that knowingly transfers an item that is on the United States Munitions List (USML) to the People's Republic of China (PRC). The committee notes that China's military modernization has proceeded apace with roughly double-digit increases in its defense budget almost every year for the last decade and a half. The committee is concerned that China's military modernization now exceeds its legitimate security needs, is undermining the balance of power that has maintained peace and security in the Western Pacific for decades, may be undermining deterrence in the region, and may be contributing to the increasingly bellicose nature of Chinese foreign policy.

In response to the Tiananmen Square massacre of 1989, the United States and the European Union (EU) imposed embargoes on trading arms with China. Despite China's continuing poor record on human rights and the adverse implications for peace and security in Asia, the EU has announced that it intends to lift the embargo in the near future. In response to those concerns, Chairman Henry Hyde of the House Committee on International Relations introduced House Resolution 57, which states in part that the House of Representatives "deplores the recent increase in arms sales by member states of the European Union to the People's Republic of China and the European Council's decision to finalize work toward lifting its arms embargo on China, actions that place European security policy in direct conflict with United States security interests and with the security interests of United States friends and allies in the Asia and Pacific region [and] declares that such a development in European security policy is inherently inconsistent with the concept of mutual security interests that lies at the heart of United States laws for transatlantic defense cooperation at both the governmental and industrial levels and would necessitate limitations and constraints in these relationships that would be unwelcome on both sides of the Atlantic." The House of Representatives adopted House Resolution 57 on February 22, 2005, by a vote of 411 to 3.

On April 14, 2005, the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee International Relations held a joint hearing to further explore the implications of any EU decision to lift the arms embargo. During the hearing, Assistant Secretary of Defense Peter Rodman testified that "[a]ny decision by the European Union to lift its embargo on arms to China * * * is a bad idea and it would have serious consequences for U.S.-European relations. [A] lift of the EU embargo raises the prospect of European advanced technology aiding the military modernization drive of the People's Republic of China—with direct implications for the safety of U.S. personnel whose mission it is to carry out the commitments the

United States has made to allies and friends." R. Nicholas Burns, the Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs, further noted, "We believe that lifting the embargo would be detrimental to peace and security in the Asia/Pacific region, and that it would be the wrong signal to send given continued, serious human rights abuses taking place in China." This section would create disincentives for potential arms exports to China by denying sellers access to Department of Defense procurement opportunities and would provide incentives for foreign persons to choose not to export arms to China in order to maintain their ability to sell goods and services to the Department of Defense.

Section 1213—Prohibition on Procurements from Communist Chinese Military Companies

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from purchasing goods or services from any foreign person connected to the Chinese military or security forces.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1221—Purchase of Weapons Overseas for Force Protection Purposes

This section would permit the Secretary of Defense to purchase weapons from any foreign person, foreign government, international organization, or other entity located in a country in which United States combat personnel are engaged in military operations for the purposes of protecting those personnel. The Secretary of Defense has conducted so-called weapons "buy back" programs in the past in order to protect United States military personnel using authority to expend funds for "emergency and extraordinary expenses" contained in section 127 of Title 10, United States Code. The section, however, has generally been reserved for unique circumstances. The length of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, suggests that so-called weapons "buy backs" may occur more frequently and regularly than would be suited to section 127. Therefore, the committee recommends granting the Secretary permanent authority to conduct such a program in order to improve the force protection of U.S. military personnel.

Section 1222—Requirement for Establishment of Certain Criteria Applicable to On-Going Global Posture Review

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop criteria for assessing the costs and benefits of deploying to particular overseas locations and for improving those facilities. The Department of Defense and the Department of State are in the process of conducting a Global Posture Review to update and alter deployment and basing options for the United States armed forces. In conjunction with the transition to a more expeditionary Army, the Global Posture Review seeks to shift from a limited number of permanent overseas bases to a larger number of more austere facilities across a wider range of countries. The committee acknowledges the need to update overseas deployment plans and maintain operational flexibility, but is concerned that the strategic and cost criteria for making investment and deployment decisions remain

vague and vary across the regional combatant commands. Decisions may be based in part on careful consideration of current and foreseeable threat environments, fair cost-sharing arrangements with host nations, the judicious use of low-density/high-demand assets, and the ability of allies and partner nations to share responsibility for regional or other defense requirements. For example, the United States maintains the presence of four F–15 Eagle fighter aircraft, as well as search and rescue helicopters and tanker aircraft to support the fighter aircraft, in the Republic of Iceland at a cost to the United States of more than $250.0 million each year. A relic of the United States force posture during the Cold War, this presence offers no military benefit to the Republic of Iceland or the United States, which could fulfill bilateral treaty requirements by providing for Icelandic defense using other aircraft stationed on continental Europe and in the United Kingdom. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary to establish criteria and analytical mechanisms for weighing the costs and benefits of one site over another in order to avoid creating similar circumstances as a result of the Global Posture Review. The committee believes that such criteria and analytical tools will prove instrumental in assessing future proposals for overseas military construction.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

OVERVIEW

FUNDING OVERVIEW

The budget request for Cooperative Threat Reduction contained $415.5 million for fiscal year 2006, representing an increase of $7.6 million from the amount authorized for fiscal year 2005. This request includes: $30.0 million for nuclear transportation security; significant increases for strategic arms elimination in Russia and for administration and support; and a $49.4 million decrease for chemical weapons destruction in Russia.

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Border Security

The committee notes that the Departments of Defense, Energy, Homeland Security, Justice, and State each implements programs to prevent the cross-border movement of weapons of mass destruction-related materials and technologies, narcotics, or other materials that support proliferation or terrorist efforts. For example, the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration requested almost $100.0 million in fiscal year 2006 funding to install equipment at border crossings and ports in Russia and other regions of concern to prevent and detect nuclear material smuggling. The Department of Defense is receiving over $40.0 million in fiscal year 2005 to provide non-Russian former Soviet states with equipment, training, and support to prevent cross-border proliferation of weapons of mass destruction-related materials. The Department of State also works with former Soviet states, providing more

than $40.0 million annually in technical assistance, training materials, and support to enhance export controls and border security capabilities. In addition to Department of Defense and Department of State counter-narcotics efforts, the Departments of Justice's Drug Enforcement Administration has a robust program to detect illicit cross-border transfers of narcotics, which represent an important element of terrorist funding.

While such programs play a significant role in efforts to combat proliferation and terrorism, the committee is concerned that inadequate coordination may lead to unnecessary duplication, unforeseen gaps, or contradictory efforts. The committee is particularly concerned by the conclusions of a January 2005 report, "Weapons of Mass Destruction: Nonproliferation Programs Need Better Integration," in which the Government Accountability Office noted the poor coordination of threat reduction and nonproliferation programs within the federal interagency process. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with other relevant federal departments and agencies, to develop a joint plan for integrating all United States border security-related activities with those of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy. This plan shall be submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within six months of the enactment of this Act.

Given the absence of a clear, coordinated plan to integrate United States programs that address border security, including but not limited to programs affecting domestic borders, the committee recommends that Congress reconsider providing future funding for improving the security of foreign borders.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds

This section would define the programs and funds that are Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds as those authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this Act and specify that Cooperative Threat Reduction funds shall remain available for obligation for three fiscal years.

Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would authorize $415.5 million for the Cooperative Threat Reduction program. This section would authorize specific amounts for each Cooperative Threat Reduction program element and would require notification to Congress 30 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2006 funds for purposes other than those specifically authorized. This section would also provide limited authority to obligate amounts for a Cooperative Threat Reduction program element in excess of the amount specifically authorized for that purpose.

Section 1303—Authority to Obligate Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation Prevention Funds for Nuclear Weapons Storage Security

In a February 2005 joint statement, the President of the United States and the President of Russia declared their intent to expand and deepen cooperation on nuclear security with the goal of enhancing the security of nuclear facilities. As a result, it may be possible to expand the funding authority for nuclear weapons storage security during fiscal year 2006. The Department of Defense has indicated additional funds could be used for nuclear weapons storage security if the Russian government will cooperate on more projects.

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to obligate fiscal year 2006 funds appropriated for the Cooperative Threat Reduction weapons of mass destruction proliferation prevention initiative for nuclear storage security, provided that the Secretary submits written notification and justification to Congress 15 days prior.

Section 1304—Extension of Limited Waiver of Restrictions on Use of Funds for Threat Reduction in States of the Former Soviet Union

This section would provide the President with the authority for calendar years 2005, 2006 and 2007 to waive a former Soviet state's eligibility requirements, section 5852 of title 22, United States Code, for funds, providing that the President certifies to Congress that a waiver is important to the national security interests of the United States and submits a more detailed report to Congress on that state's activities and the President's plan for addressing eligibility shortfalls. The committee recommends shifting the waiver authority from a fiscal year to a calendar year in order to minimize the risk of unintended interruptions in the program that could occur when fiscal year waiver authority is not renewed before the end of a fiscal year.

The committee does not recommend providing permanent waiver authority because it believes that effective oversight of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs requires the issue to be reviewed on a more frequent basis.

Section 1305—Report on Elimination of Impediments to Nuclear Threat-Reduction and Non-Proliferation Programs in the Russian Federation

This section would require the President to submit to the Congress a report on impediments to the effective execution of threat reduction programs in the states of the former Soviet Union. The committee notes that the United States has successfully assisted the states of the former Soviet Union to eliminate excess strategic nuclear delivery vehicles in Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan and that its programs to eliminate other weapons of mass destruction-related programs and infrastructure in the states of the former Soviet Union have been quite successful. The past success of such programs has depended almost entirely on their cooperative nature and the pursuit of mutual interests held by the United States and the partnering country. In some areas, the Russian Federation has

been less cooperative than the other former Soviet Republics, leading to delays in program implementation that limit the efficiency with which U.S. threat reduction programs are conducted. Rather than blaming such inefficiencies on Russia or the terms under which United States assistance is provided, the committee believes it is important to isolate the causes of those inefficiencies and direct threat reduction programs into areas where there is mutual interest in completing the task and achieving the non-proliferation goal. Therefore, the committee recommends a Presidential report that would help identify those areas where different approaches and expectations by the Russian Federation and the United States are causing inefficiencies and make recommendations for addressing those problems.

TITLE XIV—CONTRACT DISPUTE ENHANCEMENT

OVERVIEW

This title would provide for a consolidation of the myriad of small agency-specific boards of contract appeals into an enhanced appeals system centered in two consolidated boards; one for most of the government's civilian agencies and another for our defense agencies and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency (NASA). The consolidation would eliminate multiple board rules, increase management efficiency, and improve access to the appeals process for businesses including small businesses. The title would, for the most part leave in place, to the extent they are consistent with the new structure, the current Contract Dispute Act of 1978, (Public Law 95–563, sections 601–614 of title 41, United States Code), provisions regarding board procedures and jurisdiction.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 1411—Definitions

The section would amend the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.) to provide the definitions of "Defense Board," "Civilian Board," "Board Judge," "Chairman," "Board concerned," and "executive agency".

SUBTITLE B—ESTABLISHMENT OF CIVILIAN AND DEFENSE BOARDS OF CONTRACT APPEALS

Section 1421—Establishment

The section would amend the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (Disputes Act) (41 U.S.C. 607) to provide for the establishment of a Department of Defense Board of Contract Appeals in the Department of Defense and a Civilian Board of Contract Appeals in the General Services Administration. The two Boards shall review appeals by contractors of decisions by a contracting officer in accordance with the Disputes Act.

Section 1422—Membership

The section would amend the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.) to provide for the selection of judges for the Defense Board of Contract Appeals (Defense Board) by the Secretary of Defense in accordance with rules issued by the Defense Board. The selection shall be without regard to political affiliation and on the basis of professional qualifications. The section also would provide for the selection of judges for the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals (Civilian Board) by the Administrator of Federal Procurement Policy (Administrator) under rules issued by the Office for Federal Procurement Policy and from a register maintained by the Administrator. The selection, as in the case of the Defense Board, shall be without regard to political affiliation and on the basis of professional qualifications. The members of the Boards shall be selected and appointed as are administrative law judges under section 3105 of title 5, United States Code, with the additional requirement that they have at least 5 years experience in public contract law.

This section would provide further that members of the current Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals would serve as members of the new Defense Board while members of the current agency boards of contract appeals other than the Armed Services Board shall serve on the new Civilian Board. Judges of both Boards shall be subject to removal in the same manner as administrative law judges under section 7521 of title 5, United States Code, and they will be compensated under section 5372a of title 5, United States Code. In any event, current members of the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals will serve as members of the Defense Board and current members of the other agency boards will serve as members of the Civilian Board.

Finally, this section would provide that members of the Defense and Civilian Boards would be subject to removal in the same manner as administrative law judges under section 7521 of title 5, United States Code, while compensation for the chairs of both Boards and all other members shall be determined under section 5372a of title 5, United States Code.

Section 1423—Chairmen

The section would amend the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.) to provide for the designation of the Chairman of the Defense Board of Contract Appeals by the Secretary of Defense. The Chairman would serve for five years and be selected of Contract Appeals from among sitting judges having at least five years service as a member of the current Armed Services Board. Similarly, this section would provide for the selection of the Chairman of the Civilian Board by the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy from among the sitting judges of Contract Appeals serving at least five years on agency boards of contract appeals other than the Armed Services Board. The Chairman of the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals would serve for five years.

The Chairman of each respective Board would be responsible for: (1) appointment and fixing compensation of Board personnel pursuant to part III of title 5 of the United States Code; (2) supervision of Board personnel; (3) operation of a Clerk's Office, including re-

ceipt of filings, assignment of cases and maintenance of records; and (4) prescription of necessary rules and regulations for the administration and management of the Board. Finally, this section provides that the Chairmen of the respective Boards may each appoint up to two other Board judges as Vice Chairmen to act in the place of the Chairman in the Chairman's absence.

Section 1424—Rulemaking Authority

This section would amend the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.) to provide that the Chairmen of the Defense and Civilian Boards in consultation with the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall jointly issue and maintain procedural rules and regulations necessary for the functioning of the Boards as well as statements of policy of general applicability.

Section 1425—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would amend the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.) to provide that funds are to be authorized for fiscal year 2006 and succeeding fiscal years to carry out this title and to provide that funds for the activities of each Board shall be appropriated separately.

SUBTITLE C—FUNCTIONS OF DEFENSE AND CIVILIAN BOARDS OF CONTRACT APPEALS

Section 1431—Contract Disputes

This section would amend the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.) to provide that the Defense Board of Contract Appeals and the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals shall have jurisdiction as provided by the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 607(a) and (b)).

Section 1432—Enhanced Access for Small Business

This section would amend section 9(a) of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 608) to provide that the Defense Board of Contract Appeals and the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals shall provide for expedited disposition of appeals of small businesses where the amount in dispute is $150,000 or less.

Section 1433—Applicability to Certain Contracts

This section would amend the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.) to provide that the authority conferred on the Defense Board of Contract Appeals and the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals is applicable to contracts not greater than the simplified acquisition threshold and to contracts for the procurement of commercial items.

SUBTITLE D—TRANSFERS AND TRANSITION, SAVINGS, AND CONFORMING PROVISIONS

Section 1441—Transfer and Allocation of Appropriations and Personnel

This section would provide for the transfer of the personnel, unexpended appropriations and assets of the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals (ASBCA) to the Defense Board of Contract Appeals and for the transfer of the personnel, unexpended appropriations, and assets of the agency boards of contract appeals, other than the ASBCA, the Tennessee Valley Authority Board, and Postal Service Board to the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals. Finally, this section would provide that the personnel transferred could not be separated or reduced in compensation for one year after the transfer and would set forth the standards to be followed by the Boards for possible later reductions in force.

Section 1442—Terminations and Savings Provisions

This section would provide for the termination of the affected agency boards of contract appeals and for the rules for affect on pending proceedings before the agency boards.

Section 1443—Contract Disputes Authority of Boards

This section would provide conforming amendments to the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (Disputes Act) (41 U.S.C. 601) needed by the establishment of the Defense Board of Contract Appeals and the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals (Civilian Board) regarding contract disputes. This section also would establish the Postal Service Board of Contract Appeals to decide appeals under the Disputes Act for contracts awarded by the United States Postal Service or the Postal Rate Commission and provide for the selection and appointment of Board judges by the Postmaster General in the same manner as judges of the Civilian Board.

Section 1444—References to Agency Boards of Contract Appeals

This section would provide that any reference to the current Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals (ASBCA) be treated as referring to the Defense Board of Contract Appeals and that any reference to an agency board of contract appeals other than the ASBCA, the Tennessee Valley Authority Board, or Postal Services Board be treated as referring to the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals.

Section 1445—Conforming Amendments

This section would provide for the necessary conforming amendments to title 5 and the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.).

SUBTITLE E—EFFECTIVE DATE; REGULATIONS AND APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMEN

Section 1451—Effective Date

This section would provide that title II of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.) as added by this title and the amendments and repeals shall take effect within one year of enactment of this Act.

Section 1452—Regulations

This section would provide that within one year after the enactment of this Act, the Chairmen of the current Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals (ASBCA) and the current General Services Board of Contract Appeals (GSBCA) in consultation with the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy (Administrator) jointly issue procedural rules, regulations, and statements of policy for the Defense Board of Contract Appeals and Civilian Board of Contract Appeals. This section would further provide that within one year of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the ASBCA shall issue rules governing the establishment of a register of applicants and selection of judges for the Defense Board and the Administrator shall do the same for the Civilian Board.

Section 1453—Appointment of Chairmen of Defense Board and Civilian Board

This section would provide that notwithstanding section 1451 above, within one year of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall appoint the Chairman of the Defense Board of Contract Appeals and the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall appoint the Chairman of the Civilian Board of Contract Appeals.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF INCREASED COSTS DUE TO OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

OVERVIEW

The committee recommends authorization of $49,069.2 million in funds to be appropriated available upon enactment of this Act to support the defense activities principally associated with Operation Iraqi Freedom and the Operation Enduring Freedom. These funds are designated for emergency contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism pursuant to H. Con. Res. 95, establishing the congressional budget for the United States government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010, as passed by the House of Representative on March 17, 2005.

SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATIONS

The following table summarizes authorizations included in the bill for ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Title XV - EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	Committee Authorization Recommendation	Committee Budget Authority Recommendation
PROCUREMENT		
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles Procurement, Army	574,627	574,627
Ammunition Procurement, Army	105,700	105,700
Other Procurement, Army	1,945,350	1,945,350
Weapons Procurement, Navy	36,800	36,800
Ammunition Procurement, Navy / Marine Corps	144,721	144,721
Other Procurement, Navy	15,300	15,300
Procurement, Marine Corps	445,400	445,400
Procurement, Defense-wide	103,900	103,900
Total Procurement	**3,371,798**	**3,371,798**
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION		
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Defense-Wide	75,000	75,000
Total Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**75,000**	**75,000**
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
Operation and Maintenance, Army	20,305,001	20,305,001
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	26,400	26,400
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	159,500	159,500
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	1,838,000	1,838,000
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	1,791,800	1,791,800
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	3,195,352	3,195,352
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	2,870,333	2,870,333
Total Operation and Maintenance	**30,186,386**	**30,186,386**
OTHER PROGRAMS		
Defense Working Capital Funds	1,700,000	1,700,000
Defense Health Program	846,000	846,000
Iraqi Freedom Fund	1,000,000	1,000,000
Classified Programs	2,500,000	2,500,000
Total Other Programs	**6,046,000**	**6,046,000**
MILITARY PERSONNEL		
Military Personnel, Army	6,689,334	6,689,334
Military Personnel, Army Reserve	137,200	137,200
Military Personnel, Army National Guard	67,000	67,000
Military Personnel, Navy	300,000	300,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	662,600	662,600
Military Personnel, Air Force	1,011,022	1,011,022
Military Personnel, Benefits	522,854	522,854
Total Military Personnel	**9,390,010**	**9,390,010**
Title XV Total	**49,069,193**	**49,069,193**
SERVICE SUMMARY		
Army	30,010,112	30,010,112
Navy	2,334,821	2,334,821
Marine Corps	2,899,800	2,899,800
Air Force	4,206,374	4,206,374
Defense-Wide	9,618,087	9,618,087
Total	**49,069,193**	**49,069,193**

Title XV - EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	Committee Authorization Recommendation	Committee Budget Authority Recommendation
PROCUREMENT		
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles Procurement, Army		
Gun Trucks	2,450	2,450
Stryker - combat losses	30,000	30,000
Small Arms and Modifications		
M16 rifle mods (budget realignment)	2,000	2,000
M16 rifle mods	55,300	55,300
M240 medium machine gun mods (budget realignment)	7,100	7,100
M240 medium machine gun mods	9,372	9,372
M240 medium machine gun (7.62mm) (budget realignment)	14,100	14,100
M240 medium machine gun (7.62mm)	107,944	107,944
M4 carbine mods (budget realignment)	44,800	44,800
M4 carbine mods	29,595	29,595
M4 carbine (budget realignment)	3,200	3,200
M4 carbine	168,237	168,237
M249 SAW mods (budget realignment)	3,100	3,100
M249 SAW mods	5,728	5,728
M249 SAW machine gun (5.56mm)	54,111	54,111
M107, Cal. 50 sniper rifle (budget realignment)	9,700	9,700
M107, Cal. 50 sniper rifle	9,274	9,274
Small Arms Equipment (Soldier Enhancement Program) (budget real	5,200	5,200
Small Arms Equipment (Soldier Enhancement Program)	3,416	3,416
M2HB Enhanced .50 Caliber Machine Gun Kits	10,000	10,000
Total Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles , Army	574,627	574,627
Ammunition Procurement, Army		
First Destination Transportation	2,000	2,000
Ammunition Production Force Protection	103,700	103,700
Total Ammunition Procurement, Army	105,700	105,700
Other Procurement, Army		
Up-Armor HMMWVs: M1114, M1151, M1152	250,000	250,000
Add-on-Armor plate for level III and ballistic glass	20,000	20,000
TWV Recap Modernization Program		
HMMWV Recap (budget realignment)	32,800	32,800
HMMWV Recap	208,000	208,000
FMTVs	50,000	50,000
HEMTT Recap	60,400	60,400
HEMTT Recap (budget realignment)	40,700	40,700
M915A1 Replacements	15,000	15,000
SINCGARS Family (budget realignment)	55,500	55,500
SINCGARS Family	117,000	117,000
Defense advanced global positioning system receiver (DAGR) (budget r	22,350	22,350
Defense advanced global positioning system receiver (DAGR)	5,000	5,000
Mounted Battle Command on the Move (MBCOTM)	30,000	30,000
Prophet/COBRA	145,000	145,000
IED Jammers	35,000	35,000
Low cost ECM production	10,000	10,000
Night Vision Devices (budget realignment)	164,700	164,700
Night Vision Devices	62,300	62,300
Force XXI Battle Command BDE and Below (FBCB2)	183,000	183,000
Tactical Common Data Link	72,000	72,000
Biometrics Automated Toolset (BAT)	14,700	14,700
Tactical Operations Centers	84,000	84,000
Construction Equipment SLEP	25,000	25,000
Hemorrhage Control	20,000	20,000
HMMWV and Tactical Truck Crew Trainers	25,000	25,000

Title XV - EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	Committee Authorization Recommendation	Committee Budget Authority Recommendation
Counter Rocket, Artillery and Mortar (C-RAM)	182,900	182,900
Persistent Threat Detection System (PTDS), OIF Operational Loss Repl:	15,000	15,000
Total Other Procurement, Army	1,945,350	1,945,350
Weapons Procurement, Navy		
EOD/Naval Coastal Warfare Small Arms	36,800	36,800
Total Weapons Procurement, Navy	36,800	36,800
Ammunition Procurement, Navy / Marine Corps		
Ammunition Requirements for FSRG	20,221	20,221
155mm Fuze-Electronic Time M762A1	10,000	10,000
Igniter-Time Blasting Fuze M81	5,000	5,000
Detonator, Non-Electric MK154	10,000	10,000
66mm Rocket-High Explosive M72A7	11,000	11,000
155mm Multi Option Fuze M782	6,000	6,000
120mm Tank Ammunition-M1028 Canister	3,000	3,000
155mm High Explosive Projectile M795	15,000	15,000
.50 Caliber Cartridges	13,000	13,000
7.62mm Cartridges	1,500	1,500
40mm M430 HEDP	30,000	30,000
120mm Cartridges M830A1 HEAT-MP-T	10,000	10,000
C4 Charges M58A4 HE	10,000	10,000
Total Ammunition Procurement, Navy / Marine Corps	144,721	144,721
Other Procurement, Navy		
EOD/Naval Coastal Warfare Equipment Allowance	7,000	7,000
EOD/Naval Coastal Warfare Equipment Allowance	8,300	8,300
Total Other Procurement, Navy	15,300	15,300
Procurement, Marine Corps		
Miniature Transceiver (Blue Force Tracker)	7,400	7,400
Light Armored Vehicle (LAV) - 48 vehicles to support FSRG	104,000	104,000
Weapons under $5 million	10,800	10,800
Night Vision Equipment	276,000	276,000
PSS-14 Metal Detectors and other items	1,300	1,300
Tactical Radios (PRC-117 and PRC-150 radios)	25,000	25,000
JTRS Legacy Bridge - EPLRS	17,900	17,900
Advanced Compact Optical Gunsights	3,000	3,000
Total Procurement, Marine Corps	445,400	445,400
Procurement, Defense-wide		
MH-47 infrared engine exhaust suppressor	7,700	7,700
High performance mobility FLIR (ground)	10,800	10,800
High performance mobility FLIR (maritime)	6,000	6,000
Multi-band inter/intra team radio	13,500	13,500
Multi-band multi mission radio	65,900	65,900
Total Procurement, Defense-wide	103,900	103,900
Total Procurement	**3,371,798**	**3,371,798**
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION		
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Defense-Wide		
Counter-Terrorism Technical Working Group	25,000	25,000
Quick Reaction Special Projects	50,000	50,000
Total RDTE, Defense-Wide	75,000	75,000
Total Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**75,000**	**75,000**

Title XV - EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	Committee Authorization Recommendation	Committee Budget Authority Recommendation
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
Operation and Maintenance, Army		
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	18,000,630	18,000,630
Incremental ONE wartime costs	181,000	181,000
Base support - mobilization and demobilization costs related to OIF/OEF	420,500	420,500
Operational tempo - ground miles (budget realignment)	115,700	115,700
Repair parts - ground and air (budget realignment)	54,900	54,900
Rapid Fielding Initiative sustainment (budget realignment)	102,800	102,800
Unit of Action Experimentation and Exercises (budget realignment)	37,236	37,236
Depot maintenance (budget realignment)	269,800	269,800
Second destination transportation	33,700	33,700
NATO support (budget realignment)	11,835	11,835
Sustainment System Technical Support (budget realignment)	116,000	116,000
Sustainment System Technical Support	52,000	52,000
Virtual convoy combat trainer	7,700	7,700
Sustainment costs related to end strength increase	792,000	792,000
Recruiting and retention initiatives	81,000	81,000
Community based health care organizations	22,600	22,600
Post deployment health care screening	5,600	5,600
Total Operations and Maintenance, Army	20,305,001	20,305,001
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve		
Recruiting and retention initiatives	13,900	13,900
Army Reserve family support centers	12,500	12,500
Total Operations and Maintenance, Army Reserve	26,400	26,400
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard		
Recruiting and retention initiatives	147,000	147,000
National Guard family support centers	12,500	12,500
Total Operations and Maintenance, Army National Guard	159,500	159,500
Operation and Maintenance, Navy		
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	1,638,000	1,638,000
Operational tempo - steaming days (budget realignment)	180,000	180,000
Navy recruiting advertising	20,000	20,000
Total Operations and Maintenance, Navy	1,838,000	1,838,000
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps		
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	1,241,000	1,241,000
Operational tempo - ground miles (budget realignment)	95,900	95,900
M1A1 depot maintenance (budget realignment)	51,800	51,800
Reset costs - spare parts	250,000	250,000
Depot maintenance	40,000	40,000
Personnel Clothing and Equipment	65,100	65,100
Sustainment costs related to end strength increase	48,000	48,000
Total Operations and Maintenance, Marine Corps	1,791,800	1,791,800
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force		
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	2,211,990	2,211,990
Incremental ONE wartime costs	270,062	270,062
Operational tempo - flying hour program (budget realignment)	476,000	476,000
Deployable phase maintenance kit	86,000	86,000
Depot purchased equipment maintenance	151,300	151,300
Total Operations and Maintenance, Air Force	3,195,352	3,195,352
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide		

Title XV - EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	Committee Authorization Recommendation	Committee Budget Authority Recommendation
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	2,870,333	2,870,333
Total Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide	2,870,333	2,870,333
Total Operation and Maintenance	**30,186,386**	**30,186,386**
OTHER PROGRAMS		
Defense Working Capital Funds		
Fuel price increase	1,700,000	1,700,000
Total Defense Working Capital Funds	1,700,000	1,700,000
Defense Health Program		
Incremental wartime costs	660,000	660,000
Army costs related to end strength increase	161,000	161,000
USMC costs related to end strength increase	23,000	23,000
Army rehabilitation for severely wounded and injured	2,000	2,000
Total Defense Health Program	846,000	846,000
Iraqi Freedom Fund	1,000,000	1,000,000
Classified Programs	2,500,000	2,500,000
Total Other Programs	**6,046,000**	**6,046,000**
MILITARY PERSONNEL		
Military Personnel, Army		
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	5,043,534	5,043,534
Army active end strength increase	1,580,000	1,580,000
Recruiting and retention initiatives	65,800	65,800
Total Military Personnel, Army	6,689,334	6,689,334
Military Personnel, Army Reserve		
Recruiting and retention initiatives	68,000	68,000
Special training	47,000	47,000
Branch officer basic course	22,200	22,200
Total Military Personnel, Army Reserve	137,200	137,200
Military Personnel, Army National Guard		
Initial entry training	67,000	67,000
Total Military Personnel, Army National Guard	67,000	67,000
Military Personnel, Navy		
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	300,000	300,000
Total Military Personnel, Navy	300,000	300,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps		
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	435,600	435,600
Marine Corps active end strength increase	227,000	227,000
Total Military Personnel, Marine Corps	662,600	662,600
Military Personnel, Air Force		
Incremental OIF/OEF wartime costs	785,622	785,622
Incremental ONE wartime costs	225,400	225,400
Total Military Personnel, Marine Corps	1,011,022	1,011,022
Military Personnel, Benefits		
Hardship duty pay (budget realignment)	36,000	36,000
Family separation allowance (budget realignment)	100,000	100,000

Title XV - EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	Committee Authorization Recommendation	Committee Budget Authority Recommendation
Imminent danger pay (budget realignment)	85,854	85,854
Death gratuity permanent increase	100,000	100,000
Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance permanent increase	118,000	118,000
Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance monthly premium for OEF/OIF	39,000	39,000
Allowance for housing for dependents of deceased members permanent	7,000	7,000
Travel for family of hospitalized Servicemembers in the US permanent e	3,000	3,000
Prohibition on charges for meals during medical recuperation permanent	1,000	1,000
Traumatic injury protection	30,000	30,000
Special pay during rehabilitation for combat injuries	3,000	3,000
Total Military Personnel, Benefits	522,854	522,854
Total Military Personnel	**9,390,010**	**9,390,010**
Total	**49,069,193**	**49,069,193**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Budget Realignment

The committee's recommendation in this title includes a realignment of $2.1 billion from the budget request for programs and projects relating to the global war on terror. The committee's recommendation would ensure that funding relating to the global war on terror is accurately consolidated in this title as well as facilitate proper execution of the funds during fiscal year 2006.

Procurement

The committee's recommendations for procurement in this title include continued support of the force protection needs of units deployed and engaged in the global war on terrorism. Included in the force protection recommendation is funding for Up-Armor High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles (HMMWV), tactical wheeled vehicle recapitalization and modernization programs for the most heavily used vehicles in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, night vision devices and improvised explosive device jammers. In addition, the committee recognizes the need to replenish critical small arms and ammunition procurement programs. Included in the small arms and procurement recommendation is funding for the M16 rifle, M240 medium machine gun and M4 carbine modifications and .50 caliber cartridges, 120mm tank ammunition canister, and 155mm high explosive projectiles

The budget request contained $129.7 million for Special Operations Forces (SOF) rotary wing upgrades and sustainment, but included no funds for the MH–47 infrared engine exhaust suppressor. The committee understands that these helicopter heat suppressors are a critical force protection requirement for the Army SOF MH–47 fleet now operating in a hostile environment, and believes that the entire fleet should be protected as soon as these suppressors can be manufactured. The committee notes that this item is on the unfunded priority list of the Commander, Special Operations Command. The committee recommends $137.5 million for SOF rotary wing upgrades and sustainment, an increase of $7.8 million for the procurement of additional MH–47 infrared engine exhaust suppressors.

Operations and Maintenance

The military departments and defense agencies need operations and maintenance funds to pay for food, fuel, spare parts, maintenance, transportation, camp, post, and base expenses associated with Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). Without additional funding at the start of fiscal year 2006, the military departments will be forced to use third and fourth quarter funds in the initial months of fiscal year 2006 to pay for OIF and OEF costs. The committee's recommendation includes costs associated with Operation Noble Eagle as well as the additional costs incurred by stateside installations for increased mobilizations and demobilizations due to OIF and OEF.

Military Personnel

Over the past three years, the committee has recommended increases in the active component manpower to sustain the full range of capabilities required of the mission assigned to the armed forces. The committee recommends funding in this title a cumulative active component increase of 30,000 for the Army and 4,000 for the Marine Corps over and above the budget request. Included in the committee's recommendation are the costs associated with Operation Noble Eagle as well as continued support for the recent benefit increases to the death gratuity and Survivor's Group Life Insurance.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—GENERAL INCREASES

Section 1501—Purpose

This section would establish this title and make emergency authorization of appropriations available upon enactment of this Act for the Department of Defense, in addition to amounts otherwise authorized in this Act, to provide for additional costs due to the Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

Section 1502—Army Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $2.6 billion for Army procurement.

Section 1503—Navy and Marine Corps Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $642.2 million for Navy and Marine Corps procurement.

Section 1504—Defense-Wide Activities Procurement

This section would authorize an additional $103.9 million for Defense-Wide Activities procurement.

Section 1505—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide Activities

This section would authorize an additional $75.0 million for Defense-Wide Activities research, development, test and evaluation.

Section 1506—Operations and Maintenance

This section would authorize an additional $30.2 billion for operations and maintenance programs.

Section 1507—Defense Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize an additional $1.7 billion for Defense Working Capital Funds.

Section 1508—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize an additional $846.0 million to the Defense Health Program for operations and maintenance.

Section 1509—Military Personnel

This section would authorize an additional $9.4 billion for military personnel.

Section 1510—Iraq Freedom Fund

This section would authorize an additional $1.0 billion for the Iraq Freedom Fund to remain available for transfer until April 30, 2006.

Section 1511—Classified Programs

This section would authorize an additional $2.5 billion for the classified programs.

Section 1512—Treatment as Additional Authorization

This section would authorize an additional $49.0 billion for emergency contingency operations related to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

Section 1513—Transfer Authority

This section would provide transfer authority of $3.0 billion to the Department of Defense for the authorizations contained in this title.

Section 1514—Availability of Funds

This section would require the funds provided in this title to be made available for obligation by the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 2006.

SUBTITLE B—PERSONNEL PROVISIONS

Section 1521—Increase in Active Army and Marine Corps Strength Levels

This section would increase the active strengths for the Army and Marine Corps for fiscal year 2006 by 30,000 and 4,000 respectively above the authorizations contained in section 401. These increases would provide fiscal year 2006 authorized end strengths for the Army of 512,400 and for the Marine Corps of 179,000. This section would also establish new minimum active duty end strengths for the Army and Marine Corps as of September 30, 2006, that reflect the committee's recommendations for Army and Marine Corps end strengths provided by this section. This section would require that the fiscal year 2006 end strength increases authorized by this section over those authorized by section 401 be paid from funds provided in a contingent emergency reserve fund or emergency supplemental.

Section 1522—Additional Authority for Increases of Army and Marine Corps Active Duty End Strengths for Fiscal Years 2007 Through 2009

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to increase the Army's active end strengths up to 532,400 by the end of fiscal year 2009, a strength that would be 20,000 above the fiscal year

2006 authorization provided by section 1521. The section also would reaffirm the authorization for future growth in the active end strengths for the Marine Corps that was provided by the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375): a growth of up to 184,000 by the end of fiscal year 2009, which is 5,000 above the fiscal year 2006 authorization provided in section 1521. The section would require the Secretary to provide the funding in the budget request in fiscal year 2007 and thereafter, if he proposes to increase the Army or the Marine Corps active duty personnel end strengths as authorized by this section.

Section 1523—Military Death Gratuity Enhancement

This section would authorize an increased death gratuity of $100,000 to be paid to designated beneficiaries of military deaths resulting from wounds, injuries, and illnesses incurred as a result of combat related circumstances to include armed conflict, hazardous service, performance of duty under conditions simulating war, or through an instrumentality of war, or incurred in a combat operation or zone as designated by the Secretary of Defense. The section would continue the death gratuity increase authorized in section 1013(e)(2) of division A of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109–13).

Section 1524—Permanent Prohibition Against Requiring Certain Injured Members to Pay for Meals Provided by Military Treatment Facilities

This section would preclude service members undergoing medical recuperation, therapy, or other forms of continuous care at a military treatment facility from being charged for meals provided by that medical facility so long as the injury, illness or disease was incurred or aggravated while serving on active duty in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom, or any other combat operation or zone designated by the Secretary of Defense. The section would continue the restriction against charging for meals that was authorized in section 1023 of division A of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109–13).

Section 1525—Permanent Authority to Provide Travel and Transportation Allowances for Dependents to Visit Hospitalized Members Injured in Combat Operation or Combat Zone

This section would expand the authority for family members to travel within the Untied States at government expense to visit hospitalized wounded service members who are not seriously ill or injured or near death when the injury was incurred while the member was serving in a combat operation or zone as designated by the Secretary of Defense. This section would continue the transportation benefits that were authorized in section 1026 of division A of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109–13).

Section 1526—Permanent Increase in Length of Time Dependents of Certain Deceased Members May Continue to Occupy Military Family Housing or Receive Basic Allowance for Housing

This section would increase the period that surviving family members of service members who die on active duty would be authorized to reside in government quarters or to receive basic allowance for housing to support a private sector residence from 180 days to 365 days. This section would continue increased housing benefits that were authorized in section 1022 of division A of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109–13).

Section 1527—Availability of Special Pay for Members During Rehabilitation From Combat-Related Injuries

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to pay $430 per month to a service member with a combat related injury sustained in a combat operation or zone designated by the Secretary of Defense. The pay would begin the month immediately following medical evacuation from the area of the combat operation or the combat zone after the member incurred a wound, injury, or illness that resulted from armed conflict, hazardous service, performance of duty under conditions simulating war, or through an instrumentality of war. The pay would terminate at the end of the first month during which one of the following occurs:

(1) The member is paid a benefit under the traumatic injury rider of the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance (SGLI) authorized section 1032 of division A of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (Public Law 109–13).

(2) The member is no longer hospitalized in a military treatment facility or in a facility under the auspices of the military heath care system.

Section 1528—Allowance to Cover Monthly Deduction From Basic Pay for Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance Coverage for Members Serving in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom

This section would require the secretaries concerned to pay members serving in the theater of operations for Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) a monthly allowance equal to the deduction in pay required to pay the premium for Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance (SGLI) coverage obtained by the member, or an amount equal to the deduction in pay the member would incur if the member had elected the maximum amount of coverage under SGLI. The section would also require the secretaries to provide information about the allowance to members serving in the OEF and OIF theaters and members projected to serve there and to afford such members the opportunity to obtain SGLI insurance coverage or increase their existing coverage.

SUBTITLE C—MATTERS INVOLVING SUPPORT PROVIDED BY FOREIGN NATIONS

Section 1531—Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse foreign military forces for costs they incur in support of U.S. military operations. Since September 11, 2001, several countries have undertaken military operations specifically in support of U.S. military operations in the global war on terrorism. These include Pakistan, Jordan, and other states that would otherwise lack the financial means to support U.S. military operations. In supplemental appropriations, the Congress has provided the Secretary with funds to be used to reimburse those countries. By April 2005, the Secretary is expected to reimburse Pakistan for roughly $704.0 million in expenses it incurred in fiscal year 2004. In fiscal year 2005, the Secretary expects to reimburse the government of Pakistan for roughly $1.2 billion in expenses it incurs, largely as a result of military operations along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border. This section would enable the Secretary to continue reimbursing countries for their support during fiscal year 2006.

TITLE XVI—CONTRACTORS ON THE BATTLEFIELD REGULATORY ACT

OVERVIEW

This title would address the myriad of issues related to contractors on the battlefield. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not taken the actions necessary to regulate and account for this growing segment of personnel present in the Department's various areas of operations. This title would define both contractors "accompanying the force" and "not- accompanying the force." This title would specifically address combatant commander policy regarding contractors on the battlefield. Additionally, this title would address the issue of force protection for contractors on the battlefield and policies related to contractors on the battlefield carrying weapons. The committee is concerned that the Department has not adequately addressed the issues of communication and open-source intelligence sharing between the military and contractors on the battlefield.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1601—Short Title

The section would provide that this title may be cited as the "Contractors on the Battlefield Regulatory Act."

Section 1602—Findings

This section would express the findings of Congress that contract personnel have provided invaluable services in support of combat, humanitarian, peacekeeping and reconstruction operations worldwide. Further, contract personnel would be recognized for their contributions, including in some instances the loss of their lives, in

support of military, humanitarian and reconstruction operations. This section would also express that contract personnel are appropriately prohibited from performing "inherently governmental functions." Finally, included is an acknowledgment that contractor personnel will be present on, and in support of, the battlefield of tomorrow providing crucial goods and services to military, humanitarian, peacekeeping and reconstruction operations.

Section 1603—Definitions

This section would clarify the definition of "contractors accompanying the force" as it is applied under the Contractors on the Battlefield Regulatory Act. This category of contractors have a contract, subcontract or task order at any tier with the Department of Defense, are paid using funds appropriated to the Department, directly support military forces overseas, and operationally interact with these military forces.

This section clarifies the definition of "contractors not accompanying the force" as it is applied under the Contractors on the Battlefield Regulatory Act. This category of contractors has a contract, subcontract or task order at any tier with the Federal Government. These contracts, subcontracts or task orders are for the performance of work related to private security, reconstruction, humanitarian assistance, peacekeeping or other activities in an area of responsibility of a commander of a combatant command.

This section would define "combatant command" as a military command which has broad, continuing missions and which is normally composed of forces from a single military department or two or more military departments.

Section 1604—Requirements for Commanders of Combatant Commands Relating to Contractors Accompanying and Not Accompanying the Force

This section would establish combatant commander responsibilities related to contractors accompanying and not accompanying the force. Specifically, it would require the combatant commanders to:

(1) More adequately ensure the force protection of contractors by including their force protection requirements in operational planning;

(2) Improve communications between contractors and the military by including a communications plan in the combatant commander's operational plan; and

(3) Avoid hostile and friendly fire incidents and further the missions of both the military and contractors by sharing, when it does not threaten operational security, open-source intelligence, threat assessments, and information related to contractor movement.

The committee believes that if the combatant commander does not apply the requirements in this section to contractors not accompanying the force, that he should at a minimum make recommendations regarding appropriate force protection measures.

Section 1605—Requirements for Contractors Relating to Possession of Weapons

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations describing the type of weapons and circumstances under which employees of contractors accompanying the force may carry a weapon for self-defense, and information that these contractors must provide relating to these weapons. The regulations shall include requirements that:

(1) The contractor request in writing the combatant commander's approval for employees to carry weapons for self-defense;

(2) The combatant commander determine whether it is appropriate for that contractor's employees to carry weapons for self-defense;

(3) In the case of a contract awarded by the Department in which a contractor is authorized to carry a weapon to perform the work of the contract, the contracting officer for the contract shall notify the commander of this authorization, and the employee be deemed to have the approval of the commander to possess appropriate weapons;

(4) A contractor employee only be issued a U.S. military-specification, personal defense firearm that is loaded with U.S. military-specification ammunition; and

(5) The employee have appropriate, as defined by the Secretary, training for using a firearm for self-defense.

Finally, the committee believes that no contractor, either accompanying the force or not accompanying the force, should carry a weapon for the performance of an inherently governmental function as described in subpart 7.5 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

Section 1606—Battlefield Accountability

This section would afford the combatant commander better visibility and operational control of the battlefield by requiring him to better account for contractors accompanying the force and, when appropriate, contractors not accompanying the force. Specifically, this section would require the combatant commander to obtain a quarterly list of contractor personnel present in his area of responsibility. This list shall include information pertaining to each employee on the list, such as whether the employee is authorized to carry a weapon, proof of appropriate training on that weapon, and proof of citizenship. This section would require combatant commanders to maintain a central database to manage the information required under this section. To ensure standard information collection across each command, the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe the design of the information collection, which shall be inspired by, to the extent practicable, existing methods and models used elsewhere in the Department of Defense. The committee does not intend for this title to result in duplication of effort and hopes that the Department will utilize data previously collected to the maximum extent practicable in order to ease any administrative burden.

This section would also obligate contractors to provide information required under this section and sought by the combatant commander. Lastly, this section would require the combatant com-

mander to meet regularly with representatives of contractors present in his area of responsibility in order to provide both information about his responsibilities to contractors and recommendations to the contractors regarding force protection.

The committee believes that application of this section to contractors not accompanying the force is appropriate in areas deemed hostile environments by the combatant commander.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

PURPOSE

Division B provides military construction, family housing, and related authorities in support of the military departments during fiscal year 2006. As recommended by the committee, Division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of $12,146,611,000 for construction in support of the active forces, reserve components, defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security infrastructure fund for fiscal year 2006.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW

The Department of Defense (DOD) requested $5,551,149,000 for military construction, $2,258,293,000 for base realignment and closure (BRAC) activities, and $4,242,169,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2006. The committee recommends authorization of $5,996,657,000 for military construction, $1,948,293,000 for BRAC activities, and $4,201,661,000 for family housing in fiscal year 2006. The committee's recommendations are consistent with a total budget authority level of $12,146,611,000 for military construction, BRAC, and family housing in fiscal year 2006.

The Department's fiscal year 2006 request for military construction, family housing, and BRAC activities was another disappointment. Not only was the request for non-BRAC military construction $400.0 million less than the level appropriated for fiscal year 2005, but it was $1.0 billion less than the amount forecast for fiscal year 2006 by the fiscal year 2005 budget.

In addition, the Department's request of $1.9 billion for implementation of BRAC decisions in fiscal year 2006 was submitted to the Congress without adequate justification. While the committee recognizes the importance of BRAC funding to meet one-time costs of implementation, the lack of analysis used—or at least analysis provided to the committee—to establish this level of funding is troubling.

According to Mr. Phil Grone, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment, in his testimony before the Subcommittee on Readiness on March 15, 2005, "The services concerns over closing costs [in past BRAC rounds] forced them not to take certain [BRAC] actions." This explanation falls far short of justifying an increase in funding of nearly 50 percent over first year implementation of the 1993 BRAC round, even after adjusting funding for the effects of inflation. In addition, the committee notes that the appendix of the Fiscal Year 2006 Budget of the U.S. Government indicates that anticipated expenditures from this account will

leave $376.0 million in unobligated balances at the end of the fiscal year.

For these reasons, the committee has reduced the level of funding authorized for BRAC 2005 activities by $310.0 million, leaving approximately $1.6 billion for BRAC 2005 activities. The committee believes that this level of funding will be sufficient to meet the Department's implementation costs in fiscal year 2006, and expects the Secretary to provide better justification of BRAC budgets in future years.

The committee has a long history of recognizing the importance of facilities to military readiness and quality of life. DOD facilities should be treated as assets worthy of investment, maintenance, and regular modernization. In the committee's view, the fiscal year 2006 budget request does not treat the DOD's facilities as assets. This approach erodes military readiness and diminishes quality of life for military personnel. As such, the committee again urges the Department to renew its commitment to increase its facilities-related budgets, including military construction, family housing, base operations, sustainment, restoration, and maintenance programs.

A tabular summary of the authorizations provided in Division B for fiscal year 2006 follows:

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVIII - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
Military Construction					
Military Construction, Army	1,479,841	121,930	121,930	0	1,601,771
Military Construction, Navy	1,029,249	79,928	121,547	(41,619)	1,109,177
Military Construction, Air Force	1,069,640	101,698	101,698	0	1,171,338
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	1,042,730	(66,066)	10,400	(76,466)	976,664
NATO Security Investment Program	206,858	0	0	0	206,858
BRAC (prior)	377,827	0	0	0	377,827
BRAC 2005	1,880,466	(310,000)	0	(310,000)	1,570,466
Military Construction, Army National Guard	327,012	83,612	83,612	0	410,624
Military Construction, Air National Guard	165,256	60,471	60,471	0	225,727
Military Construction, Army Reserve	106,077	32,348	32,348	0	138,425
Military Construction, Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	45,226	0	0	0	45,226
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	79,260	31,587	31,587	0	110,847
Total Military Construction	**7,809,442**	**135,508**	**563,593**	**(428,085)**	**7,944,950**
Family Housing					
Family Housing Construction, Army	549,636	0	0	0	549,636
Family Housing Support, Army	812,993	(9,000)	0	(9,000)	803,993
Family Housing Construction, Navy	218,942	0	0	0	218,942
Family Housing Support, Navy	593,660	(5,000)	0	(5,000)	588,660
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	1,251,108	(14,888)	0	(14,888)	1,236,220
Family Housing Support, Air Force	766,939	(11,620)	0	(11,620)	755,319
Family Housing Support, Defense-Wide	46,391	0	0	0	46,391
Family Housing Improvement Fund	2,500	0	0	0	2,500
Total Family Housing	**4,242,169**	**(40,508)**	**0**	**(40,508)**	**4,201,661**
Total Military Construction and Family Housing	**12,051,611**	**95,000**	**563,593**	**(468,593)**	**12,146,611**

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
1	Alabama	Army	Anniston Army Depot	Upgrade 33 THAAD Storage Igloos		3,150	3,150
2	Alabama	Army	Fort Rucker	System Test and Int. Lab/Flight Test Supp. Fac.		9,700	9,700
3	Alabama	Army	Redstone Arsenal	Ammunition Handling Instruction Facility		4,700	4,700
4	Alabama	Air Force	Maxwell AFB	SOC Lodging Facility	14,900	0	14,900
5	Alabama	Army National Guard	Fort Payne	Readiness Center Add/Alt		4,145	4,145
6	Alabama	Marine Corps Reserve	ARNGRC Mobile	Reserve Training Center and Vehicle Maint. Facility	7,463	0	7,463
7	Alabama	Air National Guard	Montgomery Regional APT	Replace Composite Operation and Training Facility	9,100	0	9,100
8	Alaska	Army	Ft Wainwright	Barracks Complex	33,560	0	33,560
9	Alaska	Air Force	Clear AS	Dormitory (100 Room)	20,000	0	20,000
10	Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	C-17 Maintenance Complex, Phase 1	54,000	0	54,000
11	Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	C-17 Add/Alter Survival Equipment Shop	820	0	820
12	Alaska	Air Force Reserve	Elmendorf AFB	C-17 Convert Hangar for AFRC Group Headquarters	3,100	0	3,100
13	Arizona	Army	Fort Huachuca	Effluent Reuse System		5,100	5,100
14	Arizona	Marine Corps	MCAS Yuma	Rotary Wing Fueling Apron	3,637	0	3,637
15	Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	CSAR Squadron Complex	8,600	0	8,600
16	Arizona	Air Force	Luke AFB	Dormitory (144 Room)	13,000	0	13,000
17	Arizona	Air Force Reserve	Luke AFB	944th Civil Engineer Squadron Facility		5,900	5,900
18	Arizona	Air Force Reserve	Davis-Monthan AFB	Alter Rescue Squadron Operations Facility	1,500	0	1,500
19	Arizona	Army National Guard	Marana	Fire Station		1,499	1,499
20	Arizona	Defense Logistics Agency	Yuma PG	Rotary Wing Hydrant System	7,300	0	7,300
21	Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	Airmen Dining Facility		6,400	6,400
22	Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	Parallel Taxiway AALZ	2,500	0	2,500
23	California	Army	Ft Irwin	Land Acquisition, Phase 3	5,000	0	5,000
24	California	Army	Ft Irwin	Military Operations Urban Terrain, Phase 1	12,000	0	12,000
25	California	Army	Ft Irwin	Replace Dining Facility		4,250	4,250
26	California	Army	NWS Concord	Upgrade Outload Facilities	3,250	0	3,250
27	California	Army	NWS Concord	Pier Security Upgrade	8,600	0	8,600
28	California	Navy	NAF El Centro	Apron & Hangar, Increment 2	18,666	0	18,666
29	California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	Replace Air Traffic Control Tower	8,480	0	8,480
30	California	Navy	NAS North Island	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - Shipboard Ashore	13,700	0	13,700
31	California	Navy	NAWC China Lake	Advanced Sensor Lab	19,158	0	19,158
32	California	Navy	Naval Postgraduate School	Glasgow Hall Addition		6,500	6,500
33	California	Marine Corps	29 Palms	MOUT Facility (Phase 1)		21,000	21,000
34	California	Marine Corps	29 Palms	Improve Wastewater Treatment Facility		3,000	3,000
35	California	Marine Corps	MCAS Miramar	Provost Marshall Screening Facility		5,070	5,070
36	California	Marine Corps	MCAS Camp Pendleton	Flight Line Security Fence	1,400	0	1,400
37	California	Marine Corps	MCB Camp Pendleton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	19,620	0	19,620
38	California	Marine Corps	MCB Camp Pendleton	Reclamation/Conveyance, Phase 1	25,436	0	25,436

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
39	California	Marine Corps	MCB Camp Pendleton	Assault Breacher Vehicle Facility	5,160	0	5,160
40	California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Global Hawk Two Bay Maintenance Hangar	14,200	0	14,200
41	California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Mainbase Runway, Phase 1	37,000	0	37,000
42	California	Air Force	Travis AFB	C-17 Maintenance Training Facility	8,100	0	8,100
43	California	Air Force	Travis AFB	C-17 Add/Alter Composite Shop	3,200	0	3,200
44	California	Air Force	Travis AFB	C-17 Add/Alter Life Support	1,300	0	1,300
45	California	Air Force	Travis AFB	AMOG Global Reach Deployment Center	19,000	0	19,000
46	California	Air Force	Vandenberg AFB	Fitness Center	16,845	0	16,845
47	California	Army National Guard	ANGRC Roseville	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	2,941	0	2,941
48	California	Army Reserve	Ft Hunter Liggett	Urban Assault Course	1,500	0	1,500
49	California	Army Reserve	Ft Hunter Liggett	Shoot House	1,700	0	1,700
50	California	Air National Guard	Fresno	ASA-Fresno Alert Crew Quarters	3,000	0	3,000
51	California	Air Force Reserve	Travis AFB	C-17 Wheel and Tire Shop		3,900	3,900
52	California	Defense Logistics Agency	Def Dist Depot Tracy	Replace General Purpose Warehouse	33,635	0	33,635
53	California	Defense Logistics Agency	Miramar	Replace Storage and Distribution System	23,000	0	23,000
54	California	Special Operations Command	NSWC Coronado	SOF Applied Instruction Facility (NSWC)	4,000	0	4,000
55	California	Special Operations Command	NSWC Coronado	SOF Seal Team Operation / Support Facility (NGWG 1)	11,000	0	11,000
56	California	Special Operations Command	NSWC Coronado	SOF Training Support Facilities (NSWC)	13,350	0	13,350
57	California	Tri-Care Management Activity	Beale AFB	Clinic Addition/Alteration	18,000	0	18,000
58	California	Tri-Care Management Activity	NAVHOSP San Diego	Patient Parking Facility	15,000	0	15,000
59	Colorado	Army	Ft Carson	Barracks Complex	25,522	0	25,522
60	Colorado	Army	Ft Carson	Shoot House (USASOC)	1,250	0	1,250
61	Colorado	Army	Ft Carson	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	28,000	0	28,000
62	Colorado	Army	Ft Carson	Shoot House	1,250	0	1,250
63	Colorado	Army	Ft Carson	A/DACG Complex, Phase 1B	14,600	0	14,600
64	Colorado	Air Force	Air Force Academy	Upgrade Academic Facility, Phase 4A	13,000	0	13,000
65	Colorado	Air Force	Buckley AFB	Leadership Development Facility	5,500	0	5,500
66	Colorado	Air Force	Buckley AFB	Add/Alter Communications Complex	10,600	0	10,600
67	Colorado	Air Force	Buckley AFB	Consolidated Services Facility	4,000	0	4,000
68	Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	76th Space Control Facility		12,700	12,700
69	Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	West Gate Force Protection/Access	12,800	0	12,800
70	Colorado	Air National Guard	Greeley ANG Station	Space Warning Squadron Support Facility		6,400	6,400
71	Colorado	Tri-Care Management Activity	Peterson AFB	Life Skills Support Center	1,820	0	1,820
72	Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	C-17 Alter Facilities for Parts Storage	1,000	0	1,000
73	Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	Dormitory (144 Room)	13,000	0	13,000
74	Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	C-17 Flight Simulator Facility	5,000	0	5,000
75	District of Columbia	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Force Protection Main Gate	4,500	0	4,500
76	District of Columbia	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Construct Operations Facility	10,400	0	10,400

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
77	District of Columbia	Defense Intelligence Agency	Bolling AFB	PEPCO Feeder Line	7,900	0	7,900
78	Florida	Navy	NAS Jacksonville	Helo Hangar Replacement, Increment 1	45,179	0	45,179
79	Florida	Navy	NAS Pensacola	Water Treatment Facility	8,710	0	8,710
80	Florida	Navy	NDSTC Panama City	Joint Aquatic Combat Diving Training	9,678	0	9,678
81	Florida	Navy	NS Mayport	Consolidated Maintenance Facility		4,470	4,470
82	Florida	Navy	NS Mayport	Expand Flight Trainer	2,930	0	2,930
83	Florida	Navy	NS Mayport	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - Shipboard Ashore	7,820	0	7,820
84	Florida	Air Force	Hurlburt Fld	Weapons Instructor Course Facility	2,540	0	2,540
85	Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Security Forces Facility	11,200	0	11,200
86	Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	CENTCOM Joint Intel Center	67,000	0	67,000
87	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	1st Air Force Operations Center (Phase 2)		10,000	10,000
88	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	Dormitory (120 Room)	9,000	0	9,000
89	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	F/A-22 Add Fuels Maintenance	2,500	0	2,500
90	Florida	Army National Guard	Camp Blanding	Regional Training Institute Complex (Phase 2)		20,049	20,049
91	Florida	Air Force Reserve	Homestead ARB	Visiting Quarters		6,900	6,900
92	Florida	Air Force Reserve	Patrick AFB	Alter Rescue Squadron Operations Facility	2,090	0	2,090
93	Florida	Special Operations Command	Hurlburt Field	AT/FP Main Gate/Soundside Access		6,500	6,500
94	Florida	Special Operations Command	Eglin AFB	SOF Mobility/Ads Facility	12,800	0	12,800
95	Georgia	Army	Ft Benning	Squad Defense Range		2,050	2,050
96	Georgia	Army	Ft Benning	Shoot House (USASOC)	1,700	0	1,700
97	Georgia	Army	Ft Benning	Infantry Platoon Battle Course	4,300	0	4,300
98	Georgia	Army	Ft Benning	Shoot House	1,250	0	1,250
99	Georgia	Army	Ft Benning	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	20,961	0	20,961
100	Georgia	Army	Ft Gillem	Forensic Lab Addition	3,900	0	3,900
101	Georgia	Army	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	17,814	0	17,814
102	Georgia	Army	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	Shoot House (USASOC)	1,250	0	1,250
103	Georgia	Army	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	Urban Assault Course	1,350	0	1,350
104	Georgia	Army	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	Barracks Complex	37,566	0	37,566
105	Georgia	Navy	NSB Kings Bay	Armored Fighting Vehicle Support Facility		3,890	3,890
106	Georgia	Navy	NSB Kings Bay	U&SI Waterfront Security Emergency Generator	3,000	0	3,000
107	Georgia	Marine Corps	MCLB Albany	Combat Vehicle Maintenance and Preservation Facility		4,000	4,000
108	Georgia	Marine Corps	MCLB Albany	Satellite Fire Station		1,840	1,840
109	Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	51st Combat Comm. Squadron Operations Facility		5,600	5,600
110	Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	Approach Lighting System	2,000	0	2,000
111	Georgia	Air National Guard	Savannah/HH IAP	Replace CRTC Operations, Medical Training Complex	7,200	0	7,200
112	Georgia	National Security Agency	Augusta	Regional Security Operations Center	61,466	0	61,466
113	Georgia	Special Operations Command	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	SOF Equipment Maintenance Complex	10,000	0	10,000
114	Georgia	Defense Education Activity	Ft Stewart/Hunter AAF	RCI - New Elementary School	16,629	0	16,629

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
115	Hawaii	Army	Helemano Mil. Res.	Drum Road Upgrade, Phase 2	41,000	0	41,000
116	Hawaii	Army	Pohakuloa Tng Area	Tactical Vehicle Wash Facility	9,300	0	9,300
117	Hawaii	Army	Pohakuloa Tng Area	Battle Area Complex	34,000	0	34,000
118	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Barracks Complex, Phase 1	48,000	0	48,000
119	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Vehicle Maintenance Facility, Increment 2	24,656	0	24,656
120	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Modified Urban Assault Course	5,900	0	5,900
121	Hawaii	Navy	NB Pearl Harbor	Pacific Warfighting Center	29,700	0	29,700
122	Hawaii	Marine Corps	MCAS Kaneohe Bay	Camp Smith Fire Station	5,700	0	5,700
123	Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Upgrade Electrical Distribution System (Phase 3)		7,700	7,700
124	Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	DCGS Construct Intelligence Squadron Operation Facility	5,678	0	5,678
125	Hawaii	Air National Guard	Hickam AFB	F-15 Aircraft Rinse Facility	2,500	0	2,500
126	Hawaii	Air Force Reserve	Hickam AFB	Consolidated Training	6,450	0	6,450
127	Hawaii	National Security Agency	Kunia	Regional Security Ops Center Replacement	61,466	(61,466)	0
128	Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Base Operations/Rapcon Facility	9,835	0	9,835
129	Idaho	Army National Guard	Gowen Field	Railhead Project (Phase 1)		8,415	8,415
130	Illinois	Army	Rock Island Arsenal	Combined Fire/Police Station		7,400	7,400
131	Illinois	Navy	RTC Great Lakes	Recruit Training Center Infrastructure Upgrade Inc 1	32,730	0	32,730
132	Illinois	Navy	RTC Great Lakes	Recuit Training Center Barracks	38,720	0	38,720
133	Illinois	Navy	RTC Great Lakes	Drill Hall Replacement	16,610	0	16,610
134	Illinois	Navy	RTC Great Lakes	Recruit Training Center Barracks	33,840	0	33,840
135	Indiana	Army	Crane Army Ammunition Activity	High Performance Magazines (Phase 1)		5,700	5,700
136	Indiana	Army National Guard	Camp Atterbury	Fire Station (ADRS)	2,454	0	2,454
137	Indiana	Air Force Reserve	Grissom ARB	Radar Approach Control Facility	7,000	0	7,000
138	Iowa	Army National Guard	Fort Dodge	Field Maintenance Shop Add/Alt		1,500	1,500
139	Kansas	Army	Ft Leavenworth	Lewis and Clark Instructional Facility, Increment 3	42,642	0	42,642
140	Kansas	Army	Ft Riley	Deployment Facility Ramp Expansion	5,500	0	5,500
141	Kansas	Army	Ft Riley	Digital Multipurpose Training Range	17,500	0	17,500
142	Kansas	Army National Guard	Pittsburg	Readiness Center		5,683	5,683
143	Kansas	Army Reserve	ARC New Century	OMS/AMSA/UNH Storage	6,376	0	6,376
144	Kansas	Defense Logistics Agency	McConnell AFB	Hydrant Fuel System	15,800	0	15,800
145	Kentucky	Army	Ft Campbell	Airfield Support Facility		3,600	3,600
146	Kentucky	Army	Ft Campbell	Barracks Complex - 52nd Street	49,575	0	49,575
147	Kentucky	Army	Ft Campbell	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility, Phase 2	10,300	0	10,300
148	Kentucky	Army	Ft Campbell	Urban Assault Course	1,700	0	1,700
149	Kentucky	Army	Ft Campbell	Barracks Complex, Increment 2	24,650	0	24,650
150	Kentucky	Army	Ft Campbell	Barracks Complex - Glider Rd	43,000	0	43,000
151	Kentucky	Army	Ft Knox	Trainee Barracks Complex 1, Increment 2	21,000	0	21,000
152	Kentucky	Army National Guard	W.H.Ford Regional Training Center	Training Complex, Phase 6	9,720	0	9,720

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
153	Kentucky	Special Operations Command	Ft Campbell	SOF Company Operation and Supply Facility	7,800	0	7,800
154	Kentucky	Special Operations Command	Ft Campbell	SOF Group Operations Complex	30,000	0	30,000
155	Louisiana	Army	Ft Polk	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	28,887	0	28,887
156	Maryland	Navy	NSWC Indian Head	Joint EOD Technical Support Center		13,460	13,460
157	Maryland	Navy	NAS Patuxent River	Presidential Helicopter Program Support Facility Inc 2	40,700	0	40,700
158	Maryland	Navy	Naval Academy Annapolis	Wesley Brown Field House, Increment 1	24,930	0	24,930
159	Maryland	Navy	NAWC Patuxent River	MMA Aircraft Test Facility	5,800	0	5,800
160	Maryland	National Security Agency	Ft Meade	South Campus Mail Facility	4,010	0	4,010
161	Maryland	National Security Agency	Ft Meade	Classified Material Conversion	12,030	0	12,030
162	Maryland	National Security Agency	Ft Meade	Fanx Generator Plant	12,009	0	12,009
163	Maryland	Tri-Care Management Activity	Ft Detrick	USAMRIID Sterilization Plant	21,200	0	21,200
164	Maryland	Tri-Care Management Activity	Ft Detrick	Joint Medical Logistics Center	34,000	0	34,000
165	Maryland	Tri-Care Management Activity	NNMC Bethesda	Academic Program Center/GSN Addition	10,350	0	10,350
166	Massachusetts	Air Force	Hanscom AFB	Fourth Cliff Erosion Control Stabilization System, Phase 1	10,000	0	10,000
167	Massachusetts	Army National Guard	ANGRC Westfield	Fire Station	2,129	0	2,129
168	Massachusetts	Army National Guard	ARNGRC Camp Curtis Guild (Reading)	Organizational Maintenance Shop (ADRS)	17,136	0	17,136
169	Massachusetts	Army National Guard	ARNGRC Camp Edwards	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	2,542	0	2,542
170	Massachusetts	Air National Guard	Barnes Municipal Airport	Upgrade Aircraft Maintenance Facilities		7,100	7,100
171	Massachusetts	Air Force Reserve	Westover ARB	Munitions Storage and Maintenance	3,000	0	3,000
172	Michigan	Army National Guard	Camp Grayling	Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	1,901	0	1,901
173	Michigan	Air National Guard	W.K. Kellogg Airport	Replace Civil Engineering Complex		7,400	7,400
174	Minnesota	Air National Guard	Minneapolis-St. Paul IAP	Composite Maintenance Complex		8,800	8,800
175	Minnesota	Air Force Reserve	Minneapolis-St.Paul IAP	Joint Use Small Arms Range		3,000	3,000
176	Mississippi	Air Force	Keesler AFB	Student Dormitory (300 Room)	30,100	0	30,100
177	Mississippi	Air Force	Keesler AFB	Technical Training Facility	17,400	0	17,400
178	Mississippi	Army National Guard	Camp Shelby	Modified Record Fire Range	3,000	0	3,000
179	Mississippi	Army National Guard	Camp Shelby	CAA Wetlands Crossings, Phase 1	5,263	0	5,263
180	Mississippi	Air National Guard	Gulfport	Replace Munitions Training & Storage Complex		3,000	3,000
181	Mississippi	Tri-Care Management Activity	Keesler AFB	Surgery Suite Addition/Alteration	14,000	0	14,000
182	Missouri	Army	Ft Leonard Wood	Countermine Training Complex, Phase 2	8,100	0	8,100
183	Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	B-2 Conventional Munitions Storage		5,721	5,721
184	Missouri	Army National Guard	Springfield	Aviation Classification & Repair Activity Depot (Phase 1)		8,234	8,234
185	Missouri	Army National Guard	Ft Leonard Wood	MK 19 Range	1,878	0	1,878
186	Montana	Army National Guard	Townsend	Qualification Training Range		2,558	2,558
187	Montana	Army National Guard	Helena	Army Aviation Support Facility, Phase 2 (Aviation Training)	5,942	0	5,942
188	Montana	Army National Guard	Helena	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	1,324	0	1,324
189	Nebraska	Air Force	Offutt AFB	Repair Runway	19,870	0	19,870
190	Nebraska	Air Force	Offutt AFB	Construct Headquarters Air Force Weather Agency	30,410	0	30,410

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
191	Nevada	Air Force	Indian Springs AAF	Predator Operations Facilities	23,314	0	23,314
192	Nevada	Air Force	Indian Springs AAF	Predator Training Facilities	8,820	0	8,820
193	Nevada	Air Force	Indian Springs AAF	Predator Maintenance and Logistics Complex	19,260	0	19,260
194	Nevada	Air Force	Indian Springs AAF	Predator Munitions Complex	9,330	0	9,330
195	Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	Airfield Rescue Stations (Phase 1)		3,741	3,741
196	Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	F/A-22 Add/Alter Weapons School	10,240	0	10,240
197	Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	F/A-22 Add/Alter Low Observable Composite Facility	9,330	0	9,330
198	Nevada	Tri-Care Management Activity	Nellis AFB	Bio Environmental Engineering Facility Replacement	1,700	0	1,700
199	New Hampshire	Navy	Portsmouth Naval Shipyard	Acoustic Test and Calibration Facility		8,100	8,100
200	New Jersey	Army	Picatinny Arsenal	Fire Station		4,450	4,450
201	New Jersey	Navy	NWS Earle	General Purpose Berthing Pier, Increment 3	54,432	0	54,432
202	New Jersey	Air Force	McGuire AFB	Electrical Distribution System	13,185	0	13,185
203	New Jersey	Army National Guard	NAES Lakehurst	Consolidated Logistics and Training Facility	26,685	0	26,685
204	New Jersey	Air National Guard	Atlantic City IAP	Arm/Disarm Apron		1,500	1,500
205	New Jersey	Army Reserve	Ft Dix	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility		12,271	12,271
206	New Jersey	Army Reserve	Ft Dix	Shoot House/AAR/Breach Facility	1,569	0	1,569
207	New Mexico	Air Force	Kirtland AFB	HC-130P Simulator Facility	6,600	0	6,600
208	New Mexico	Defense Logistics Agency	Cannon AFB	Replace Fuel Storage and Loading Facility	13,200	0	13,200
209	New York	Army	Ft Drum	Airfield Vehicle Support		9,700	9,700
210	New York	Army	Ft Drum	Physical Fitness Facility	6,800	0	6,800
211	New York	Army	Ft Drum	Barracks Complex 10300 Block, Increment 1	38,500	0	38,500
212	New York	Army	Ft Drum	Army Supply Plant Pallet Processing Facility	1,850	0	1,850
213	New York	Army	USMA West Point	Library and Learning Center, Increment 2	25,470	0	25,470
214	New York	Army	USMA West Point	Modified Record Fire Range	4,000	0	4,000
215	New York	Army National Guard	ANGRC Leeds	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	3,065	0	3,065
216	New York	Army National Guard	ARNGRC Kingston	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	6,039	0	6,039
217	New York	Army National Guard	ARNGRC Latham	Readiness Center (ADRS)	5,580	0	5,580
218	New York	Army National Guard	ARNGRC Rochester	Army Aviation Support Facility (Aviation Training)	19,944	0	19,944
219	New York	Navy Reserve	ARNGRC Albany	Joint Reserve Center	19,970	0	19,970
220	New York	Air National Guard	Hancock Field	Upgrade Squadron Operations Facility		5,600	5,600
221	New York	Air National Guard	Stewart IAP	Replace Fire Crash/Rescue Station	10,200	0	10,200
222	New York	Air Force Reserve	Niagara Falls IAP	Visiting Quarters	9,200	0	9,200
223	North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg	Barracks - Addition to 3rd Brigade Complex		11,400	11,400
224	North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg	Urban Assault Course	2,100	0	2,100
225	North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg	Barracks Complex 2nd Brigade, Increment 1	32,000	0	32,000
226	North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg	Barracks Complex, Increment 2	30,611	0	30,611
227	North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg	Barracks Complex - Divarty, Increment 1	35,600	0	35,600
228	North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg	Courthouse	4,450	0	4,450

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
229	North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg	Company Operations Facility	7,300	0	7,300
230	North Carolina	Army	Ft Bragg	Barracks Complex - 3rd Brigade, Increment 1	50,000	0	50,000
231	North Carolina	Navy	MCAS Cherry Point	V22 Rotor Blade Replacement Facility	4,760	0	4,760
232	North Carolina	Navy	MCAS Cherry Point	V22 Gear Box Repair and Test Facility	15,390	0	15,390
233	North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCAS Cherry Point	Ordnance Field Maintenance and Operations Building		2,000	2,000
234	North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCAS Cherry Point	AICUZ Land Acquisition	1,890	0	1,890
235	North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCAS Cherry Point	High Explosives Magazines	5,107	0	5,107
236	North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCAS New River	Aircraft Fire and Rescue Facility		4,310	4,310
237	North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCAS New River	Main Gate Security Upgrades	2,530	0	2,530
238	North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCB Camp Lejeune	Enlisted Dining Facility - Courthouse Bay	11,840	0	11,840
239	North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCB Camp Lejeune	Assault Breacher Vehicle Facility	4,040	0	4,040
240	North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCB Camp Lejeune	Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	5,370	0	5,370
241	North Carolina	Marine Corps	MCB Camp Lejeune	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters - Camp Johnson	20,340	0	20,340
242	North Carolina	Army National Guard	Lenoir	Field Maintenance Shop		5,858	5,858
243	North Carolina	Army National Guard	ANGRC Tarboro	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	1,154	0	1,154
244	North Carolina	Air National Guard	Charlotte/Douglas IAP	Vehicle Maintenance Complex	3,400	0	3,400
245	North Carolina	Defense Logistics Agency	Seymour Johnson AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	18,500	0	18,500
246	North Carolina	Special Operations Command	Ft Bragg	Resistance Training Complex (JSOC)	2,569	0	2,569
247	North Carolina	Special Operations Command	Ft Bragg	SOF Training Facility (SWCS)	8,500	0	8,500
248	North Carolina	Special Operations Command	Ft Bragg	SOF Headquarters Building	3,700	0	3,700
249	North Carolina	Defense Education Activity	Ft Bragg	RCI - New Elementary /Junior HS Addition	18,075	0	18,075
250	North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Security Forces Vehicle Alert Facility	8,700	0	8,700
251	North Dakota	Army National Guard	Minot AFB	Field Maintenance Shop	10,950	0	10,950
252	North Dakota	Army National Guard	Camp Grafton	Harden Perimeter Upgrade		870	870
253	Ohio	Army	Joint Sys. Man. Center, Lima	Office Facility		11,600	11,600
254	Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	New Academic Building		12,950	12,950
255	Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	Add/Alter Intelligence Production Complex	19,670	0	19,670
256	Ohio	Army National Guard	ARC North Canton	Army Aviation Support Facility (Aviation Training)	7,923	0	7,923
257	Ohio	Army National Guard	Mansfield Lahm APT (ANG)	Fire Station (ADRS)	1,293	0	1,293
258	Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Youngstown Air Reserve Station	Joint Services Lodging Facility (Phase 1)		7,500	7,500
259	Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Alter Maintenance Shops	800	0	800
260	Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Alter Fuel Hydrant System	1,600	0	1,600
261	Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Alter Flight Simulator Facility	800	0	800
262	Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Squadron Operations Facility	5,750	0	5,750
263	Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Airfield Pavements, Phase 2	4,400	0	4,400
264	Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Scheduled Maintenance Hangar	15,300	0	15,300
265	Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	C-5 Fuel Systems Maintenance Hangar	10,500	0	10,500
266	Oklahoma	Army	Ft Sill	Fire Station		3,150	3,150

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
267	Oklahoma	Army	Ft Sill	Railroad Equipment Facility	2,700	0	2,700
268	Oklahoma	Army	McAlester AAP	High Explosive Magazine Installation		1,100	1,100
269	Oklahoma	Army	McAlester AAP	Ammunition Container Facility	5,400	0	5,400
270	Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Upgrade Building 3001 Infrastructure, Phase 2	20,000	0	20,000
271	Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	31St Combat Communication Squadron Operation	11,960	0	11,960
272	Oregon	Army National Guard	Salem	WMD-CST Ready Building		2,735	2,735
273	Oregon	Navy Reserve	ARNG Eugene	Reserve Center w/Land	6,132	0	6,132
274	Pennsylvania	Army	Letterkenny Army Depot	LTL Ammunition Shipping Facility		6,300	6,300
275	Pennsylvania	Navy	NSWC Ship Syst. Engineering, Phila.	Machinery Networks Development & Integration Facility		4,780	4,780
276	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	ANGRC Erie	Readiness Center (SBCT)	11,008	0	11,008
277	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	ANGRC Erie	Field Maintenance Shop (SBCT)	5,136	0	5,136
278	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Live Fire Shoot House (SBCT)	2,346	0	2,346
279	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Modified Record Fire Range Upgrade (SBCT)	2,683	0	2,683
280	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Unit Storage Site (SBCT)	2,961	0	2,961
281	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	MK 19 40mm (Gren) Machine Gun Qualifying Range	4,344	0	4,344
282	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Mission Support Training Facility	4,363	0	4,363
283	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Sniper Range (SBCT)	2,898	0	2,898
284	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	UAV Training Facility	2,482	0	2,482
285	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Urban Assault Course (SBCT)	2,459	0	2,459
286	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Battalion Training Facility, Phase 1 (SBCT)	22,190	0	22,190
287	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Infantry Squad Battle Course (SBCT)	2,859	0	2,859
288	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	16,706	0	16,706
289	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Ft Indiantown Gap	Multipurpose Machine Gun Range (SBCT)	4,202	0	4,202
290	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Philadelphia	Field Maintenance Shop (SBCT)	6,207	0	6,207
291	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Philadelphia	Readiness Center (SBCT)	11,925	0	11,925
292	Pennsylvania	Army Reserve	Johnstown	Airfield Runway Upgrade		17,780	17,780
293	Pennsylvania	Army Reserve	ARC Bellefonte	AR Center/OMS/UNH Storage	8,355	0	8,355
294	Pennsylvania	Army Reserve	Erie	AR Center/OMS/UNH Storage	9,367	0	9,367
295	Pennsylvania	Air National Guard	Harrisburg IAP	193rd Special Operation Taxiway		5,000	5,000
296	Pennsylvania	Defense Logistics Agency	Def Dist Depot New Cumberland	Replace Physical Fitness Facility	6,500	0	6,500
297	Rhode Island	Navy	NS Newport	Combat Training Pool Replacement		4,870	4,870
298	South Carolina	Army	Fort Jackson	Urban Assault Course		1,600	1,600
299	South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Add/Alter Fitness Center	2,583	0	2,583
300	South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	Munitions Facility		6,300	6,300
301	South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	USCENTAF Communications Squadron Facility	9,730	0	9,730
302	South Carolina	Army Reserve	ARC Greenville	Add/Alter Army Reserve Center	15,524	0	15,524
303	South Carolina	Marine Corps Reserve	Charleston	Marine Corps Reserve Center	6,424	0	6,424
304	South Carolina	Tri-Care Management Activity	Charleston	Consolidated Medical Clinic	35,000	0	35,000

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
305	South Dakota	Air National Guard	Joe Foss Field, Sioux Falls	Security Force Facility and Communications Upgrade		5,500	5,500
306	Tennessee	Air National Guard	Memphis IAP	C-5 Maintenance Hangar and Shops	39,000	0	39,000
307	Tennessee	Air National Guard	Memphis IAP	C-5 Fuel Cell Maintenance Hangar	23,000	0	23,000
308	Texas	Army	Ft Bliss	Vehicle Bridge		5,000	5,000
309	Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Fire Station		4,650	4,650
310	Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Physical Fitness Center		6,800	6,800
311	Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Multipurpose Squad Qual Course-Scout	8,000	0	8,000
312	Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Battalion Command and Control Facilities	6,600	0	6,600
313	Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	21,645	0	21,645
314	Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Fire Station	4,100	0	4,100
315	Texas	Army	Ft Hood	Qualification Training Range	6,093	0	6,093
316	Texas	Navy	NAS Kingsville	T-10 Jet Engine Test Cell		10,030	10,030
317	Texas	Navy	NAS Kingsville	Airfield Lighting (NALFOG)	6,010	0	6,010
318	Texas	Air Force	Goodfellow AFB	Chapel Center		4,300	4,300
319	Texas	Air Force	Laughlin AFB	Aircraft Maintenance Complex		7,900	7,900
320	Texas	Air Force	Sheppard AFB	T-6 Combs Warehouse	3,000	0	3,000
321	Texas	Air Force	Sheppard AFB	Student Dormitory (300 Room)	33,000	0	33,000
322	Texas	Army Reserve	Grand Prairie	AR Center, Phase 2	5,685	0	5,685
323	Texas	Air Force Reserve	NAS Fort Worth JRB	Aircraft Generation Facility		1,750	1,750
324	Texas	Tri-Care Management Activity	Lackland AFB	Military Working Dog Medical Facility	11,000	0	11,000
325	Utah	Army	Dugway PG	Michael Army Airfield Runway, Phase 2	25,000	0	25,000
326	Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	Software Support Facility Addition	19,500	0	19,500
327	Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	F/A-22 Aircraft Battle Damage Repair Training/Storage	4,600	0	4,600
328	Utah	Army National Guard	Camp Williams	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	3,279	0	3,279
329	Vermont	Army National Guard	Camp Ethan Allen	Modified Record Fire Range	3,000	0	3,000
330	Virginia	Army	Ft A.P. Hill	Modified Record Fire Range	2,700	0	2,700
331	Virginia	Army	Ft Belvoir	Defense Access Road, Phase 1	5,000	0	5,000
332	Virginia	Army	Ft Lee	49th Quartermaster Group Operations Storage		3,900	3,900
333	Virginia	Army	Ft Myer	Child Development Center	15,200	0	15,200
334	Virginia	Navy	NAB Little Creek	Replace Piers and Quaywall	36,034	0	36,034
335	Virginia	Navy	NAS Oceana	F/A 18 Facility Upgrades	11,680	0	11,680
336	Virginia	Navy	NS Norfolk	Ship Repair Pier 3 Replacement, Increment 1	47,729	0	47,729
337	Virginia	Navy	NS Norfolk	Pier 11 Replacement, Increment 3	40,200	0	40,200
338	Virginia	Navy	NS Norfolk	Aircraft Maintenance Maintenance Hanger (MH-60S CV)	21,565	0	21,565
339	Virginia	Navy	NS Norfolk	H60 Trainer Building	10,680	0	10,680
340	Virginia	Marine Corps	MCAF Quantico	Aircraft Parking Apron (Green)	11,667	0	11,667
341	Virginia	Marine Corps	MCAF Quantico	Aircraft Parking Apron (White)	8,031	0	8,031
342	Virginia	Marine Corps	MCB Quantico	Religious & Family Services Center		4,270	4,270

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
343	Virginia	Marine Corps	MCB Quantico	White Side Complex, Increment 2	34,730	0	34,730
344	Virginia	Marine Corps	MCB Quantico	Hockmuth Hall Addition, Increment 1	2,600	(2,600)	0
345	Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Repair West Parking Apron/Taxiway		5,700	5,700
346	Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	F/A-22 Munitions Storage Complex	20,925	0	20,925
347	Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Repair Primary Parking Apron/Taxiway	17,740	0	17,740
348	Virginia	Army National Guard	Winchester	Readiness Center		7,619	7,619
349	Virginia	Army National Guard	Ft Belvoir	Total Army School System Complex, Phase 1	13,596	0	13,596
350	Virginia	Army National Guard	Ft Pickett	MOUT Shoot House (SB)	1,552	0	1,552
351	Virginia	Navy Reserve	NAS Oceana	C-40 Hangar	2,259	0	2,259
352	Virginia	Defense Logistics Agency	Ft Belvoir	Alter Air Intakes	4,500	0	4,500
353	Virginia	Defense Logistics Agency	NS Norfolk	Replace Lube Oil Tanks	6,700	0	6,700
354	Virginia	Tri-Care Management Activity	Ft Belvoir	Hospital Replacement, Phase 2	57,000	0	57,000
355	Washington	Army	Ft Lewis	Barracks Complex-North Fort, Phase 5	49,949	0	49,949
356	Washington	Army	Ft Lewis	Barracks Complex	50,000	0	50,000
357	Washington	Navy	NS Everett	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Homeport Ashore, Increment 1	49,950	0	49,950
358	Washington	Navy	NSWCCD DET, Bangor	Lab Consolidation (Phase 2)		9,430	9,430
359	Washington	Navy	NSB Bangor	Enclose Motor Transfer Facility	2,860	0	2,860
360	Washington	Navy	NSB Bangor	Waterfront Security Enclave	41,520	0	41,520
361	Washington	Navy	NSB Bangor	Limited Area Production & Storage Complex, Increment 2	47,095	0	47,095
362	Washington	Navy	NSB Bangor	Mission Support for SSBN/SSN	15,780	0	15,780
363	Washington	Navy	NAS Whidbey Island	High Performance Magazines		4,010	4,010
364	Washington	Army National Guard	Camp Murray	Homeland Security Multi-Functional Education Center		1,424	1,424
365	Washington	Special Operations Command	Ft Lewis	SOF Expand Compound	18,500	0	18,500
366	Washington	Special Operations Command	Ft Lewis	SOF Training Facility (SWCS)	4,800	0	4,800
367	Washington	Special Operations Command	Ft Lewis	SOF Aviation Battalion Complex	30,000	0	30,000
368	West Virginia	Air National Guard	Martinsburg ANG	C-5 Jet Fuel Stor, Hydr Sys/Park Apron	20,000	0	20,000
369	West Virginia	Air National Guard	Martinsburg ANG	C-5 Corrosion Control Hangar	23,000	0	23,000
370	Wisconsin	Army National Guard	Camp Williams	Readiness Center	5,357	0	5,357
371	Wisconsin	Army Reserve	ARC Wausau	AR Center/OMS/UNH Storage	11,098	0	11,098
372	Wisconsin	Army Reserve	Ft McCoy	Public Safety Center	5,365	0	5,365
373	Wisconsin	Army Reserve	Ft McCoy	NCO Academy, Phase 1	15,405	0	15,405
374	Wisconsin	Army Reserve	Ft McCoy	Modified Record Fire Range	3,038	0	3,038
375	Wisconsin	Army Reserve	Ft McCoy	Shoot House/AAR/Breach Facility	1,700	0	1,700
376	Wyoming	Army National Guard	Casper	Add/Alter Readiness Center (ADRS)	2,802	0	2,802
377	Wyoming	Air National Guard	Cheyenne IAP	Composite Airlift Support Center	7,000	0	7,000
378	Bahrain	Tri-Care Management Activity	SWA	Medical Clinic Addition/Alteration	4,750	0	4,750
379	Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Brigade Complex-Forward Support	40,681	0	40,681

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
380	Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Shoot House	1,800	0	1,800
381	Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Urban Assault Course	1,600	0	1,600
382	Germany	Army	Grafenwoehr	Barracks Complex	40,000	0	40,000
383	Germany	Army	Vilseck	Barracks Complex, Phase 2	13,600	0	13,600
384	Germany	Air Force	Ramstein AB	Airfield Maintenance Compound	8,600	0	8,600
385	Germany	Air Force	Ramstein AB	Munitions Maintenance Facility	3,050	0	3,050
386	Germany	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	Control Tower	7,100	0	7,100
387	Germany	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	Large Vehicle Inspection Station	5,374	0	5,374
388	Germany	Defense Education Activity	Landstuhl	Elementary and Middle School Classroom Addition	5,572	0	5,572
389	Germany	Defense Education Activity	Vilseck	Vilseck Elementary School Addition and Renovation	2,323	0	2,323
390	Greece	Defense Logistics Agency	Souda Bay	Replace Fuel Pipeline	7,089	0	7,089
391	Guam	Navy	NS Guam	Alpha/Bravo Wharves Improvements, Increment 1	25,584	0	25,584
392	Guam	Air Force	Andersen AFB	Replace Military Working Dog Facility	3,500	0	3,500
393	Guam	Air Force	Andersen AFB	AEF FOL Munitions Storage Igloos	15,000	0	15,000
394	Guam	Army National Guard	Barrigada	WMD-CST Ready Building		4,852	4,852
395	Guam	Defense Education Activity	NAS Agana	Elementary/Middle School Replacement	40,578	0	40,578
396	Italy	Army	Pisa	Ammunition Storage Facility	5,254	0	5,254
397	Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Air Control Squadron Warehouse	7,800	0	7,800
398	Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Family Support Center	4,010	0	4,010
399	Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Consolidated Support Center Facility	10,850	0	10,850
400	Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Barracks Complex	40,525	0	40,525
401	Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Barracks Complex	45,637	0	45,637
402	Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Barracks Complex	28,000	0	28,000
403	Korea	Army	Yongpyong	Urban Assault Course	1,450	0	1,450
404	Korea	Air Force	Kunsan AB	Consolidated Personnel Process/Theater Facility	6,800	0	6,800
405	Korea	Air Force	Kunsan AB	Dormitory (382 Room)	44,100	0	44,100
406	Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Dormitory (156 Room)	21,750	0	21,750
407	Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Add/Alter Squadron Operation/AMU Facility	18,969	0	18,969
408	Korea	Defense Education Activity	Taegu	Taegu Elementary/High School Replacement/Addition	8,231	0	8,231
409	Kwajalein	Missile Defense Agency	Kwajalein Atoll	Emergency Services Facility, Meck Island	4,901	0	4,901
410	Portugal	Air Force	Lajes Field	Fire/Crash Rescue Station	12,000	0	12,000
411	Puerto Rico	Army Reserve	Camp Santiago	Modified Record Fire Range	2,000	0	2,000
412	Spain	Defense Education Activity	NS Rota	Elementary and High School Multipurpose Building	7,963	0	7,963
413	Turkey	Air Force	Incirlik AB	Consolidated Communications Facility	5,780	0	5,780
414	United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Small Diameter Bomb Maintenance Facility	2,625	0	2,625
415	United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Small Diameter Bomb Storage Igloo and Addition	2,500	0	2,500
416	United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Mildenhall	Base Engineer Complex	13,500	0	13,500
417	United Kingdom	National Security Agency	RAF Menwith Hill Station	Operation/Tech Building	41,697	3,300	44,997

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
418	Worldwide Various	Navy	Various Worldwide	Wharf Upgrades, Increment 1	39,019	(39,019)	0
419	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	141,393	6,630	148,023
420	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design (Host Nation Support)	20,000	0	20,000
421	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	20,000	0	20,000
422	Worldwide Unspecified	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	46,148	8,171	54,319
423	Worldwide Unspecified	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,646	0	7,646
424	Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	14,416	2,297	16,713
425	Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,979	0	2,979
426	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	18,857	4,698	23,555
427	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	0	0	0
428	Worldwide Unspecified	Marine Corps	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	10,655	1,819	12,474
429	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	1,746	0	1,746
430	Worldwide Unspecified	Marine Corps Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	1,232	0	1,232
431	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	79,047	12,686	91,733
432	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	15,000	0	15,000
433	Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	12,856	10,171	23,027
434	Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,000	0	5,000
435	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	3,770	2,637	6,407
436	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,000	0	4,000
437	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Education Activity	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	1,096	0	1,096
438	Worldwide Unspecified	Joint Chiefs of Staff	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,543	0	7,543
439	Worldwide Unspecified	National Geospatial-Intell. Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	24,000	0	24,000
440	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	3,300	0	3,300
441	Worldwide Unspecified	OSD Planning & Design	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	26,110	0	26,110
442	Worldwide Unspecified	OSD Minor Construction	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,000	0	3,000
443	Worldwide Unspecified	Special Operations Command	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	15,575	600	16,175
444	Worldwide Unspecified	Special Operations Command	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,000	0	2,000
445	Worldwide Unspecified	Tri-Care Management Activity	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	65,000	0	65,000
446	Worldwide Unspecified	Tri-Care Management Activity	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,193	0	3,193
447	Worldwide Unspecified	Energy Conservation Imp. Program	Unspecified Worldwide	Energy Conservation Improvement Program	60,000	(10,000)	50,000
448	Worldwide Unspecified	NATO Security Investment Program	Unspecified Worldwide	NATO Security Investment Program	206,858	0	206,858
449	Worldwide Unspecified	OSD Contingencies	Unspecified Worldwide	Contingency Construction	10,000	(5,000)	5,000

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
450	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	BRAC, Army	Base Realignment and Closure	93,853	0	93,853
451	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	BRAC, Navy	Base Realignment and Closure	142,973	0	142,973
452	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	BRAC, Air Force	Base Realignment and Closure	134,727	0	134,727
453	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	BRAC, Defense	Base Realignment and Closure	6,274	0	6,274
454	Worldwide Unspecified	Base Closure V	Unspecified Worldwide	Base Realignment and Closure	1,880,466	(310,000)	1,570,466
455	Alaska	Army	Ft Richardson	Replace Family Housing	49,000	0	49,000
456	Alaska	Army	Ft Wainwright	Replace Family Housing	42,000	0	42,000
457	Alaska	Army	Ft Wainwright	Replace Family Housing	49,000	0	49,000
458	Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Replace Family Housing	37,650	0	37,650
459	Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Purchase Build/Lease Housing	18,144	0	18,144
460	Arizona	Army	Ft Huachuca	Replace Family Housing	31,000	0	31,000
461	Arizona	Army	Yuma PG	Replace Family Housing	11,200	0	11,200
462	California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Replace Family Housing	59,699	0	59,699
463	District of Columbia	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Replace Family Housing	48,711	(488)	48,223
464	Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 7	40,982	0	40,982
465	Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 7	56,467	0	56,467
466	Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	Replace Family Housing	26,917	0	26,917
467	Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Replace Family Housing	68,971	0	68,971
468	North Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 9	48,868	0	48,868
469	North Dakota	Air Force	Grand Forks AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase J	86,706	0	86,706
470	North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 12	44,548	0	44,548
471	Oklahoma	Army	Ft Sill	Replace Family Housing	24,000	0	24,000
472	South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Replace Family Housing	15,935	0	15,935
473	South Dakota	Air Force	Ellsworth AFB	Replace Family Housing	14,383	0	14,383
474	Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase 6	43,016	0	43,016
475	Virginia	Army	Ft Lee	Replace Family Housing	19,500	0	19,500
476	Virginia	Army	Ft Monroe	Replace Family Housing	6,000	0	6,000
477	Germany	Air Force	Ramstein AB	Replace Family Housing	62,952	0	62,952
478	Germany	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	Replace Family Housing	45,385	0	45,385
479	Guam	Navy	NS Guam	North Tipalo Phase I Replacement Construction	40,298	0	40,298
480	Turkey	Air Force	Incirlik AB	Replace Family Housing	22,730	0	22,730
481	United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Replace Family Housing	48,437	0	48,437
482	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	300,400	0	300,400
483	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	178,644	0	178,644

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
484	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	420,203	(11,100)	409,103
485	Worldwide Unspecified	Family Housing Improvement Fund	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Improvement Fund	2,500	0	2,500
486	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	39,465	0	39,465
487	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	213,990	0	213,990
488	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	309,123	(9,000)	300,123
489	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	68,188	0	68,188
490	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	1,345	0	1,345
491	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	17,536	0	17,536
492	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Privatization Support Costs	20,304	0	20,304
493	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	28,718	0	28,718
494	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	131,860	0	131,860
495	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	20,189	0	20,189
496	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	143,790	0	143,790
497	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	186,511	0	186,511
498	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	81,924	(5,000)	76,924
499	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Mortgage Insurance Premium	56	0	56
500	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Privatization Support Costs	17,928	0	17,928
501	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	45,421	0	45,421
502	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	97,841	0	97,841
503	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Debt Account	1	0	1
504	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	41,932	0	41,932
505	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	154,907	0	154,907
506	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance (RMPA & RMPC)	310,479	0	310,479
507	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	78,090	(11,620)	66,470
508	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	2,407	0	2,407
509	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	40,404	(3,300)	37,104
510	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Privatization Support Costs	36,437	0	36,437
511	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	25,740	0	25,740
512	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	116,946	0	116,946
513	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Intelligence Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	4,031	0	4,031
514	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Intelligence Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	30,130	0	30,130
515	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	40	0	40

Military Construction Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2006
(Dollars in Thousands)

Line	Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
516	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	404	0	404
517	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	299	0	299
518	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	80	0	80
519	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	427	0	427
520	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	25	0	25
521	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing Account	9,814	0	9,814
522	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	1,134	0	1,134
523	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	7	0	7
				Total Authorization of Appropriations	12,051,611	95,000	12,146,611

TITLE XXI—ARMY

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,479,841,000 for Army military construction and $1,362,629,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2006. The committee recommends authorization of $1,601,771,000 for military construction and $1,353,629,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2006.

The reduction of $9.0 million from the request for Army family housing operations and debt (maintenance) reflects the elimination of funding requested for the renovation of six general officer quarters located at Fort McNair, Washington, D.C. Each of these renovation projects is estimated to cost at least $1.5 million per unit. While the committee recognizes the historic nature of these units, such extraordinary costs for general officer housing are unacceptable in the absence of a comprehensive assessment of general and flag officer quarter requirements in the National Capital Region. Although section 2802 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) required the Secretary of Defense to provide this assessment to the congressional defense committees by March 30, 2005, it has not yet been received.

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $540,000—research acquisition building, Fort Detrick, Maryland

(2) $1,206,000—satellite communications facility, Fort Detrick, Maryland

(3) $211,000—National Ground Intelligence Center facility expansion, Ft. Belvoir, Virginia

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2006. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2102—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2006.

Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2006.

Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Army's budget for fiscal year 2006. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Army may spend on military construction projects.

Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2004 Project

This section would amend the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136) to reduce the authorization level for construction at Vilseck, Germany to a level conforming to the requirement for appropriations.

TITLE XXII—NAVY

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,029,249,000 for Navy military construction and $812,602,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2006. The committee recommends authorization of $1,109,177,000 for military construction and $807,602,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2006.

The reduction of $5.0 million from the request for Navy family housing operations and debt (management) reflects the committee's concern about significant per unit costs associated with the management account. Although the Navy's anticipated inventory of family housing units in the United States for fiscal year 2006 will average approximately one-half the number in fiscal year 2005, the budget request reflects a reduction to the management account of less than six percent. As a result, per unit costs for management expenses are budgeted to increase from $2,198 to $4,046. While the committee recognizes that the reduction of units is largely the result of housing privatization, and that some amount of management expenses will continue even after privatization of housing units, the committee expects each of the services to aggressively pursue efforts to reduce management costs commensurate with reductions in housing unit ownership and management.

The reduction of $2.6 million from the request for an addition to Hockmuth Hall, Marine Corps Base Quantico, Virginia, reflects adherence to longstanding practices which dictate that funding be approved in amounts sufficient to construct complete and useable facilities. The Hockmuth Hall project, as presented in the budget request, would be funded in three increments totaling $14.2 million. The first increment of $2.6 million is insufficient to complete any part of the project. As such, the committee recommends no funding for the Hockmuth Hall project in fiscal year 2006. The committee does not question the validity of this project, and recommends that the Secretary of the Navy realign the fiscal year 2007 budget request to fully fund this project in a single fiscal year.

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Navy complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $710,000—air traffic control tower, Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California

(2) $500,000—wharf upgrades, Naval Station Mayport, Florida

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2006. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2202—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2006.

Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2006.

Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Navy's budget for fiscal year 2006. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Navy may spend on military construction projects.

Section 2205—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2004 Project

This section would amend the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136) to increase the authorization level for a pier at Naval Weapons Station, Earle, New Jersey.

Section 2206—Modifications of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2005 Projects

This section would amend the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (division B of Public Law 108–375) to provide full authorization of a naval laboratory consolidation project at Strategic Weapons Facility Pacific, Bangor, Washington and to increase the level authorized for a presidential helicopter programs support facility at Marine Corps Air Field, Quantico, Virginia.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,069,640,000 for Air Force military construction and $2,018,047,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2006. The committee recommends authorization of $1,171,338,000 for military construction and $1,991,539,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2006.

The reduction of $11.6 million to the Air Force family housing operations and debt account (management) reflects the committee's concern about significant per unit costs associated with the management account. Although the Air Force's anticipated inventory of family housing units in the United States for fiscal year 2006 will average approximately one-half the number in fiscal year 2005, the budget request includes an increase of $10.8 million to the management account. As a result, per unit costs for management expenses are budgeted to increase from $1,069 to $2,693. While the committee recognizes that the reduction of units is largely the result of housing privatization, and that some amount of management expenses will continue even after privatization of housing units, the committee expects each of the services to aggressively pursue efforts to reduce management costs commensurate with reductions in housing unit ownership and management.

The reductions of $11.1 million to the Air Force family housing construction improvements account and $488,000 to the Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D.C., housing project reflect the elimination of funding requested for the renovation of 24 general officers quarters and construction of 2 general officer quarters located at Bolling Air Force Base. The committee is unwilling to make significant expenses for construction or renovation of general officer housing in the National Capital Region in the absence of a comprehensive assessment of general and flag officer quarter requirements in the area. As noted previously, although section 2802 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) required the Secretary of Defense to provide this assessment to the congressional defense committees by March 30, 2005, it has not yet been received.

The reduction of $3.3 million to the Air Force family housing construction account for planning and design reflects correction of an incorrect alignment of funding in the budget request.

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Air Force complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $900,000—consolidated mission support group facility, Columbus AFB, Mississippi

(2) $990,000—fitness center additions and alterations, Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana

(3) $550,000—Wyoming Boulevard project, Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico

(4) $900,000—base operations ramp, Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas

(5) $800,000—consolidation of missile storage facilities, Hill Air Force Base, Utah

(6) $706,000—mission support complex, Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington

(7) $900,000—storm water drainage project, F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2006. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2302—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2006.

Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2006.

Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Air Force's budget for fiscal year 2006. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Air Force may spend on military construction projects.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,042,730,000 for defense agency military construction and $48,891,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2006. In addition, the budget request contained $377,827,000 for activities related to prior base realignment and closure (BRAC) activities and $1,880,466,000 for activities related to the 2005 round of BRAC.

The committee recommends authorization of $976,664,000 for military construction and $48,891,000 for family housing for defense agencies for fiscal year 2006. In addition, the committee recommends authorization of $377,827,000 for prior BRAC round activities and $1,570,466,000 for 2005 BRAC activities.

The reduction of $310.0 million to the BRAC 2005 account reflects the unjustified nature of the BRAC 2005 budget request, which is significantly greater than the level appropriated for first year implementation after either of the past two BRAC rounds even after adjustments for inflation. In addition, this reduction is

intended to limit the likelihood of unobligated balances remaining in this account after fiscal year 2006.

The reduction of $5.0 million from the contingency construction account is justified by the large outstanding balance in this account and the expenditure of less than $10.0 million of contingency construction funding since fiscal year 2004.

The reduction of $61.5 million for replacement of the regional security operations center at Kunia, Hawaii is warranted by the anticipated construction timeline. According to the National Security Agency, contract award for construction is scheduled for December 2006—at least two full months into fiscal year 2007. The committee is not willing to "bank" resources by authorizing appropriations more than an entire fiscal year before obligation of the funds is anticipated.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized defense agencies construction projects for fiscal year 2006. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2402—Energy Conservation Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies

This section would authorize specific amounts for each line item contained in the defense agencies' budgets for fiscal year 2006. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the defense agencies may spend on military construction projects.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $206,858,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (NSIP) for fiscal year 2006. The committee recommends authorization of $206,858,000 for NSIP for fiscal year 2006.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this bill and the amount

of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO

This section would authorize $206,858,000 as the U.S. contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $722,831,000 for military construction of guard and reserve facilities for fiscal year 2006. The committee recommends authorization for fiscal year 2006 of $930,849,000 to be distributed as follows:

Army National Guard	$410,624,000
Air National Guard	225,727,000
Army Reserve	138,425,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	45,226,000
Air Force Reserve	110,847,000

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Planning and Design, Army National Guard

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $431,000—readiness center and field maintenance shop, Iowa City, Iowa

(2) $956,000—joint forces headquarters building, Lincoln, Nebraska

(3) $918,000—joint armed forces reserve center, Kingsport, Tennessee

(4) $602,000—readiness center, Tullahoma, Tennessee

Planning and Design, Air National Guard

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Air Force complete planning and design activities for the following projects:

(1) $960,000—aircraft maintenance hangar and shops, March Air Reserve Base, California

(2) $790,000—composite training facility, Peoria Regional Airport, Illinois

(3) $1,700,000—fighter aircraft alert complex, Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Michigan

(4) $850,000—northeast air defense sector support facility, Rome, New York

(5) $920,000—pararescue facility, Gabreski Air National Guard Base, New York

(6) $1,172,000—composite aircraft maintenance complex, Will Rogers Airport, Oklahoma

(7) $570,000—operations/communications training complex, Willow Grove Air Reserve Station, Pennsylvania

Planning and Design, Army Reserve

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following project:

(1) $990,000—reserve center, Worcester, Massachusetts

LEGISLATIVE PROVISION

Section 2601—Authorized Guard and Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction for the guard and reserve by service component for fiscal year 2006. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2701—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law

This section would provide that authorizations for military construction projects, repair of real property, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program, and guard and reserve projects will expire on October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later. This expiration would not apply to authorizations for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 2008, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2009, whichever is later.

Section 2702—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2003 Projects

This section would extend certain fiscal year 2003 military construction authorizations until October 1, 2006, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2007, whichever is later. The extended authorizations apply to the following projects: $15,906,000 to replace family housing at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida; $597,000 to replace the family housing office at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida; $16,505,000 to replace family housing at Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi; $14,311,000 to replace family housing at Randolph Air Force Base, Texas; $447,000 for a housing maintenance facility at Randolph Air Force Base, Texas; $5,000,000 to consolidate areas at Aviano Air Base, Italy; and $5,000,000 for a special operations training range at Stennis Space Center, Mississippi.

Section 2703—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2002 Projects

This section would extend fiscal year 2002 military construction authorizations until October 1, 2006, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2007, whichever is later. The extended authorizations apply to the following projects: $1,500,000 for land acquisition at Pohakuloa Training Area, Hawaii; and $7,300,000 for family housing at Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana.

Section 2704—Effective Date

This section would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, and XXVI of this bill shall take effect on October 1, 2005, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Alternative Methods of Providing Access to Fitness Facilities for Service Members and Dependents

The committee recognizes the importance of military fitness centers to both quality of life and military readiness. Although most military installations have fitness facilities available to service members and their families, 60 percent of these facilities are classified as inadequate. In light of the significant cost of replacement and renovation of the services' fitness centers, estimated at $3 billion over the course of a 20–year effort, the committee believes that the Department of Defense should explore alternative approaches to providing access to fitness centers to service members and their families.

The committee is aware that the Department recently conducted a study on fitness center privatization, including off-base fitness club membership buydowns, privatization of on-base fitness centers, and public-private construction of fitness center facilities. The Department is in the process of implementing the results of this study through tests of off-base membership buydowns at Fort Lewis, Washington and Fort Carson, Colorado, contract renovation and operation of a fitness center at Fort Gordon, Georgia, and public-private construction of a fitness center at Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Michigan.

While the committee applauds these efforts and looks forward to the results of these tests, it is disappointed by the lack of participation in these tests by the Navy and the Air Force. Considering that each service is facing significant fitness center recapitalization costs in the near future, the committee urges both the Navy and the Air Force to reconsider the use of alternative approaches to addressing fitness center requirements.

Finally, the committee expects the Department to report regularly to Congress on the progress of existing test projects as well as implementation of any additional projects.

Employment and Training Programs to Assist Communities Affected by Base Realignment and Closure Actions

The committee is aware that the Secretary of Defense has authority under section 2391(b) of title 10, United States Code, and under Executive Order 13378 to supplement funds available under federal programs administered by other agencies in order to assist state and local governments in planning community adjustments and economic diversification required as a result of the base closure and realignment process. The committee is further aware that the Secretary has previously used this authority to transfer funds to the Department of Labor (DOL) to fund employment and training assistance offered by the Department of Labor to assist civilians affected by base closures and realignments.

The committee believes that the funding provided by the Department of Defense to the Department of Labor following previous base realignment and closure rounds significantly enhanced the ability of Department of Labor to provide employment and training services to civilians in communities affected by these closures and realignments. This supplemental funding especially benefited those civilians who were otherwise ineligible for transition services or other direct economic adjustment assistance from programs administered by the Department of Defense.

Recognizing the value of the transition services offered by the Department of Labor and the need for the availability of such services to the civilian population affected by the 2005 base closure and realignment process, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to transfer such sums as he deems appropriate from the Base Closure Account 2005 to the Secretary of Labor for use in civilian worker transition assistance, employment, and training programs or other related purposes.

Facilities-Related Reporting Requirements

Many of the facilities-related authorities contained within chapters 159, 169, and 1803 of title 10, United States Code, contain "notice-and-wait" requirements. Over the past several budget cycles, the Department of Defense (DOD) has repeatedly requested relief from these requirements. While the committee has supported reductions of time periods associated with notice-and-wait requirements, it continues to believe that they serve as useful tools for oversight of DOD's military construction and other facilities programs. As such, the committee is not inclined to accommodate requests to further reduce or eliminate notice-and-wait requirements.

In addition, the committee has employed a unique approach to reducing notice-and-wait time periods by permitting shortened wait periods when notices are provided electronically. The committee reminds the Department that section 480 of title 10, United States Code, directs that all reports required by law to be submitted to Congress (except classified documents) be submitted in an electronic medium. In light of this statutory requirement, and the committee's interest in facilitating the rapid flow of information from the Department, the committee is concerned by reports that the Department has been unwilling or unable to recognize reduced notice-and-wait periods associated with electronic submissions. The committee urges the Department to implement a process by which

electronic submissions of reports are permitted shortened notice-and-wait periods.

As part of this process, the committee believes that the Department should explore options that include an internet-based reporting system. Such a system would provide a useful tool for tracking submission of reports to Congress, receipt of these reports, and an archive of past reports. While implementation of such a system for all DOD reports may be too ambitious a goal in the short term, the committee believes that such a system should be quickly developed and deployed to support the reporting requirements associated with chapters 159, 169, and 1803 of title 10, United States Code.

Facility Projects During the Base Realignment and Closure Process

On March 25, 2005, the Deputy Civil Engineer of the Air Force issued a memorandum informing its installation engineers that all contract awards for Air Force military construction, family housing, sustainment, restoration, and modernization projects would be placed on hold through May 16, 2005. The memo described this action as "a pause to ensure wise spending and quality management practices govern our daily course of action."

The committee is concerned about the effects of this pause on efforts to recapitalize the service's infrastructure and its ability to address problems directly affecting the life, health, and safety of service members and their families. However, in this resource-constrained environment, the Air Force's decision to delay contract awards was the correct one, and the committee is disappointed that the Secretary of Defense did not issue similar guidance to all of the services and defense agencies.

Although the Department of Defense will release base realignment and closure (BRAC) recommendations by May 16, 2005, the binding recommendations of the BRAC commission will not become effective until the end of calendar year 2005. As a result, contract awards for the construction, sustainment, and improvement of military facilities prior to the conclusion of the BRAC 2005 process may improve or construct facilities that are never utilized by military personnel. As such, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to issue risk-based direction to the services and defense agencies to guide decisions to award facility construction, sustainment, and improvement contracts during the remainder of calendar year 2005.

Inclusion of Analysis of Excess Capacity at Military Medical Facilities in GAO Report on DOD's Process and Recommendations for the 2005 BRAC Round

The committee is aware that the Comptroller General is required by section 2903(d)(5)(B) of the Base Realignment and Closure Act of 1990 to submit an analysis of the Department of Defense's 2005 process and recommendations for closure and realignment to the congressional defense committees by July 1, 2005. The committee directs the comptroller general to specifically address the following points in his analysis of the proposals:

(1) The methodology for determining excess capacity at military medical facilities, and whether the methodology complies with the requirements of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990;

(2) The costs that would be shifted to TRICARE and other agencies of federal, state, and local governments, with costs itemized by agency for each proposed military medical facility closure or realignment;

(3) Whether the personnel effects of the recommended closures and realignments for military medical activities comply with the requirements of 10 USC Sec. 129c;

(4) The effects of the reduction in services and procedures provided at military medical facilities on recruitment, retention, training, and morale of military medical personnel;

(5) The out-of-pocket costs to military personnel, retirees, and dependents, and the effects on the availability of care, quality of care, and continuity of care provided to personnel, retirees, and military families; and

(6) The effects of the closure or realignment of military medical facilities on cooperative agreements, sharing agreements, joint services, joint research, and other arrangements with facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs and other agencies.

In all estimates of savings and costs, the committee directs that the estimate of net costs or savings from increases or reductions in personnel be listed separately from the estimate of net costs or savings derived from facility closure, realignment, or relocation.

Medical Treatment Facility Construction

In the committee report (House Report 108–106) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), the committee encouraged the Department of Defense (DOD) to explore the potential for a joint DOD-Veterans Affairs (VA) medical facility at the University of Colorado Hospital (UCH) at the Fitzsimons Campus in Aurora, Colorado.

The committee continued its support for joint DOD–VA medical treatment facilities through passage of section 2811 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), which requires the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of Veterans Affairs to consult on the feasibility of establishing a joint medical treatment facility before proposing construction of a new facility.

The committee remains committed to encouraging DOD to explore facility-sharing arrangements as part of efforts to reduce overhead costs associated with medical treatment facilities. For this reason, the committee appreciates DOD's efforts to comply with direction to explore the potential for a joint facility at the UCH Fitzsimons Campus. The committee understands that construction of a joint DOD–VA facility at this location is not likely to occur in a timely fashion. As such, the committee supports the efforts of the Air Force to enter into a legal relationship with UCH under which the hospital would provide clinical and administrative space to the Air Force. Such an arrangement holds the potential to reduce costs to the Air Force while expanding the availability of care from 7,500 to 12,000 beneficiaries and providing "one-stop shopping" for military personnel and family members attached to Buckley Air Force Base, Colorado.

Use of Authorities to Privatize Unaccompanied Housing

The committee understands that the Secretary of the Army has conducted a recent study of the viability of using authorities provided by subchapter IV, chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, to privatize unaccompanied housing facilities. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit to the House Committee on Armed Services the results of the recent Unaccompanied Personnel Housing Task Force Study by July 1, 2005. The Secretary should also submit his recommendations and plans to utilize privatization authorities to build, construct, or maintain Army unaccompanied housing for single noncommissioned officers.

Use of Electronic Marking Systems to Document Underground Infrastructure Systems

The Department of Defense is continually upgrading or repairing electric, gas, water, information technology, and other underground infrastructure systems at its military installations. The use of advanced electronic marking systems to document underground infrastructure represents an opportunity for the Department to reduce inadvertent damage to critical assets and improve efficiency during future repair and modernization efforts. As such, the committee encourages the military services to consider the use of underground electronic marking systems that provide both location and identification of underground infrastructure systems during future infrastructure upgrades.

Use of Temporary Facilities to Support Long-Term Military Requirements

In support of the Department of the Army's plans to increase the number of active modular Brigade Combat Team Units of Action from 33 to 43 by fiscal year 2006, the Department of Defense (DOD) will spend more than $1.0 billion to purchase and install "temporary" facilities to provide living and working space for these units. These temporary facilities, consisting of modular buildings and trailers, have a design life of five to seven years, and many do not meet minimal DOD standards. Despite the already substandard conditions and the finite lifespan of these facilities, the Army has not included funds to sustain or replace these trailers with permanent facilities in the Future Years Defense Plan.

The committee is troubled by the Army's reliance on such facilities to support its modularity initiative, as well as its failure to budget for permanent replacements. In addition, the committee is concerned that the Army and other services may utilize a similar strategy of utilizing temporary facilities to meet facility needs resulting from the 2005 base realignment and closure (BRAC) round and the return of military personnel to the United States from overseas locations.

While rapid implementation of BRAC decisions is desirable, as is the swift return of military personnel to the United States, the committee urges the Department to consider the fiscal, readiness, and quality of life costs associated with accelerating such changes if the use of substandard temporary facilities will be required to support them. As such, the committee directs the Secretary of the

Army to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2006 on:

(1) An inventory of the temporary facilities installed to meet modularity requirements;

(2) An estimate of the scope and costs to maintain the temporary facilities through the end of their planned use;

(3) A timeline for replacement of temporary facilities with permanent facilities;

(4) A description and cost estimate for construction of permanent facilities required to replace temporary facilities;

(5) An assessment of the scope and cost to add to or alter existing facilities required to support military personnel and their families; and

(6) An estimate of the date that the Army will meet the DOD's goal to eliminate inadequate unaccompanied housing.

In addition, the report should include a description of Department of Defense guidance relating to the procurement and use of temporary facilities to support personnel relocations resulting from BRAC 2005 and global posture changes.

Utilities Privatization

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) authorized the Department of Defense (DOD) to privatize installation utility systems, including electric, water, wastewater, and natural gas systems. Although this authority has been in place for nearly eight years, and the Department has spent approximately $250.0 million on implementation, the services privatized less than 10 percent of their utility systems through December 31, 2004.

The sizeable cost associated with incremental progress in utilities privatization raises concerns about the viability and value of the utilities privatization program. In addition, a recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) report (GAO–05–433) calls into question the services' methodology for estimating costs and savings resulting from utilities privatization proposals and highlights DOD's failure to effectively manage and oversee the program.

While the Department seems to view utilities privatization as the only affordable approach to improving aging utilities infrastructure, the committee reminds the Department that utility system privatization projects, by law, must have long-term economic benefits that exceed the long-term economic costs and must reduce the long-term costs of utility services. In spite of this clear legal requirement, the GAO report indicates that the services have employed methodologies for conducting economic analyses of proposed utilities privatization efforts that result in an unrealistic sense of savings. Furthermore, GAO found that the Department does not require independent review of these analyses, a contributing factor in permitting several past analyses to include inaccuracies that favored utilities privatization over continued government ownership.

In addition, DOD's failure to consistently apply requirements to receive fair market value for utility system conveyances may have resulted in unnecessary costs to the government. For instance, a recent privatization effort at Dobbins Air Reserve Base, Georgia resulted in the contractor paying $741,000 for the conveyance of electrical infrastructure but recovering this cost by charging the Air

Force $1,322,000 over time. Likewise, the Department has not issued oversight guidance to the services, raising questions about whether contractor performance is meeting requirements or expectations.

Finally, DOD's approach to utilities privatization includes the permanent conveyance of utility systems to private contractors. This approach differs from private sector practices of outsourcing operations and maintenance but retaining system ownership. As a result, the Department is ceding a significant advantage when negotiating service contract changes or renewals, as the services will either be forced to deal with the current contractor or incur large costs associated with constructing new utilities systems to replace those conveyed.

The committee continues to believe that utilities privatization may, in certain cases, be a cost-effective approach to the revitalization of military utilities infrastructure. However, whether the benefits of utilities privatization outweigh increased costs to taxpayers remains unclear. In addition, the committee is not convinced that the practice of conveying ownership of utilities systems and inconsistently collecting fair market value for system conveyances is in the nation's best interest.

As such, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to proceed with the solicitation or award of a utilities privatization contract during the remainder of fiscal year 2005 no sooner than 21 days after notification of the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services of the intent to do so. This notification should include complete economic justification for each project as well as details of the contract proposed to be awarded. In addition, the committee recommends a provision (section 2812) that would suspend the utilities privatization program for a period of time, allowing sufficient time for congress and DOD to review the program. The committee has adjusted funding levels in title III to reflect suspension of this program during fiscal year 2006.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

Section 2801—Modification of Congressional Notification Requirements for Certain Military Construction Activities

This section would reduce by seven days the notice and wait periods related to use of the contingency construction authority (10 U.S.C. 2804) and the authority to acquire existing facilities in lieu of construction (10 U.S.C. 2813).

Section 2802—Improve Availability and Timeliness of Department of Defense Information Regarding Military Construction and Family Housing Accounts and Activities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish and make available to Congress an internet-based system containing regularly updated information on the status of all defense agency and service military construction and family housing projects as well as operations, maintenance, and other support accounts authorized by the annual Military Construction Authoriza-

tion Act. The committee anticipates that this information will provide greater transparency of the progress, costs, and actual expenditures of military construction and family housing budgets.

Section 2803—Expansion of Authority to Convey Property at Military Installations to Support Military Construction

This section would amend section 2869 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the secretaries of the military departments to exchange surplus property for construction projects, land, or housing.

Section 2804—Effect of Failure to Submit Required Report on Need for General and Flag Officers Quarters in National Capital Region

This section would prohibit the use of fiscal year 2006 funds for the operation, maintenance, or repair of housing units for general and flag officers in the National Capital Region until receipt of a report on the need for general and flag officer housing in the National Capital Region.

Section 2802(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (division B of Public Law 108–375) required the Secretary of Defense to submit by March 30, 2005, a report containing an analysis of anticipated needs in the National Capital Region for family housing units for general and flag officers. Despite long-standing committee interest in oversight of general and flag officer housing, and clear legislative direction to submit a report by March 30, 2005, the Secretary notified the committee without explanation on April 8, 2005, that this report would be received by May 31, 2005.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary to suspend the expenditure of fiscal year 2005 family housing construction, maintenance, and repair funding for general and flag officer housing units in the National Capital Region until submission of the required report. The Secretary may proceed with projects that are necessary to correct any deficiency that is life-, health-, or safety-threatening.

In addition, the committee has not provided funding requested for fiscal year 2006 for the construction and renovation of general and flag officer housing in the National Capital Region. The committee is unwilling to expend scarce family housing resources in the absence of justification for the number of general and flag officer housing units on military installations in the region.

Section 2805—One-Year Extension of Temporary, Limited Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects Outside the United States

This section would extend for one year the authority provided by section 2808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), which permits the Secretary of Defense to utilize operation and maintenance funds to construct facilities necessary for temporary operational requirements related to a declaration of war, national emergency, or contingency. The section would also amend the section 2808 authority to require that the Department of Defense notify Congress seven days in advance of obligation of funds for each project and to provide for suspension

of the authority if quarterly reports on use of the authority are not provided in a timely manner.

Section 2806—Clarification of Moratorium on Certain Improvements at Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico

This section would amend section 1507 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) to clarify the moratorium on construction activities at Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico to permit the conversion, rehabilitation, improvement, and repair of facilities at the installation.

SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Section 2811—Consolidation of Department of Defense Land Acquisition Authorities and Limitations on Use of Such Authorities

This section would consolidate provisions of chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, which govern the acquisition of land by the Department of Defense and make several technical corrections. This section makes no substantive change to the law.

Section 2812—Report on Use of Utility System Conveyance Authority and Temporary Suspension of Authority Pending Report

This section would suspend the use of current authorities related to the privatization of utility systems until enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, or one year after receipt of a report on the program, whichever is later. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress by March 15, 2006, on: the Department of Defense's (DOD) methodology for conducting economic analyses of potential utility system conveyances; steps taken to ensure the reliability of completed economic analyses, including after-privatization reviews of actual costs and savings; a review of costs and savings resulting from each of the systems already privatized; the effects of permanent conveyance of ownership in privatization contracts; the effects of requiring fair market value for conveyed utility systems; DOD oversight of implementation of the adequacy of utilities services after privatization; and the effects on base operating budgets of utilities privatization.

As noted previously, the committee is concerned by DOD's application of utilities privatization authorities. The committee expects that this section will allow Congress and the Department to reevaluate the use and effects of these authorities after an extended period of use. While legal authorities for the Department to continue to privatize its utility systems will remain in effect until enactment of this section, elsewhere in this report the committee has directed the Secretary to notify the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services 21 days prior to award of any utilities privatization contract during the remainder of fiscal year 2005.

Section 2813—Authorized Military Uses of Papago Park Military Reservation, Phoenix, Arizona

This section would amend the Act of April 7, 1930, which authorized the use of land at Papago Park Military Reservation, Arizona for a rifle range only, to reflect current usage of the land.

SUBTITLE C—BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT

Section 2821—Additional Reporting Requirements Regarding Base Closure Process and Use of Department of Defense Base Closure Accounts

This section would amend reporting requirements contained in the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510) to require additional information relating to base realignment and closure properties and proposed budgets as part of the annual budget justification documents.

Section 2822—Termination of Project Authorizations for Military Installations Approved for Closure in 2005 Round of Base Realignments and Closures

This section would cancel authority for any military construction project, land acquisition, or family housing project authorized in this or any prior military construction authorization act at a facility approved for closure in the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round. This section would not apply to projects for which appropriated funds have already been obligated. This section is intended to ensure that the Department of Defense does not waste funds by initiating military construction, family housing, or land acquisition projects at installations closed during the 2005 BRAC process.

Section 2823—Expanded Availability of Adjustment and Diversification Assistance for Communities Adversely Affected by Mission Realignments in Base Closure Process

This section would amend section 2391 of title 10, United States Code, to strike limits on the Secretary of Defense's authority to aid communities adversely affected by base realignments and closures and other defense program changes.

Section 2824—Sense of Congress Regarding Consideration of National Defense Industrial Base Interests During Base Closure and Realignment Commission Review of Department of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Recommendations

This section would express the Sense of Congress that national defense industrial base interests are part of military value and that the Base Closure and Realignment Commission should consider such interests when reviewing and analyzing the Secretary of Defense's closure and realignment recommendations.

SUBTITLE D—LAND CONVEYANCES

PART I—ARMY CONVEYANCES

Section 2831—Modification of Land Conveyance, Engineer Proving Ground, Fort Belvoir, Virginia

This section would amend section 2836 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (division B of Public Law 107–107) to change the type of facility received by the Army as part of an exchange related to construction of the Fairfax County Parkway Extension. Current law provides for the Army to receive funds for replacement of an administrative building located on land provided by the Army. This section would allow for the construction of the higher priority fire station instead.

Section 2832—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Bothell, Washington

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey approximately one acre at the Army Reserve Center in Bothell, Washington, for the purpose of supporting the provision of fire and emergency medical aid services. In exchange, the Army shall receive in-kind consideration equal to not less than the fair market value of the conveyed property.

PART II—NAVY CONVEYANCES

Section 2841—Land Conveyance, Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar, San Diego, California

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey approximately 230 acres along the eastern boundary of Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, California, to the County of San Diego, California, for the purpose of permitting the county to preserve the property as open space and reopen the tract known as the Stowe Trail to public use. In exchange, the Navy shall receive in—kind consideration equal to not less than the fair market value of the conveyed property.

PART III—AIR FORCE CONVEYANCES

Section 2851—Purchase of Build-To-Lease Family Housing, Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to purchase the interest of the developer of a 300-unit military family housing project at Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska. This project is currently leased by the Secretary as "section 801" housing.

Section 2852—Land Conveyance, Air Force Property, Jacksonville, Arkansas

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, for consideration, approximately 45 acres around an existing railroad in Jacksonville, Arkansas.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2861—Lease Authority, Army Heritage and Education Center, Carlisle, Pennsylvania

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease portions of the Army Heritage and Education Center, Carlisle, Pennsylvania to the Military Heritage Foundation for revenue-generating activities and other purposes. As consideration, the foundation would pay amounts not to exceed the costs of operation of the facility. This authority is consistent with section 4772 of title 10, United States Code, which provides leasing authority to the Secretary of the Army related to the use of the National Museum of the United States Army.

Section 2862—Redesignation of McEntire Air National Guard Station, South Carolina, as McEntire Joint National Guard Base

This section would redesignate McEntire Air National Guard Station, South Carolina as McEntire Joint National Guard Base in recognition of the use of the installation to house both Air National Guard and Army National Guard assets.

Section 2863—Assessment of Water Needs for Presidio of Monterey and Ord Military Community

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of current and future needs of the Department of Defense for water for the Presidio of Monterey and the Ord military community by April 7, 2006, and to provide the results of that assessment to Congress.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $16.4 billion for the national security activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2006. Of this amount, $9.4 billion is for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration, and $7.0 billion is for environmental and other defense activities. The committee recommends $16.4 billion, the amount of the budget request.

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
Weapons Activities					
Directed stockpile work (DSW)	[1,421,031]				
Life extension programs					
B61 life extension program	50,810				50,810
W76 life extension program	162,268				162,268
W80 life extension program	135,240				135,240
W87 life extension program					
Subtotal, Life extension programs	348,318				348,318
Stockpile systems					
B61 stockpile systems	66,050				66,050
W62 stockpile systems	8,967				8,967
W76 stockpile systems	63,538				63,538
W78 stockpile systems	32,632				32,632
W80 stockpile systems	26,315				26,315
B83 stockpile systems	26,391				26,391
W84 stockpile systems	4,402				4,402
W87 stockpile systems	50,678				50,678
W88 stockpile systems	32,831				32,831
Subtotal, Stockpile systems	311,804				311,804
Retired warheads stockpile systems	35,245				35,245
Stockpile services					
Stockpile services production support	267,246				267,246
Stockpile services research & development support	66,753				66,753
Stockpile services research & development certification and safety	211,727				211,727
Stockpile services management, technology and production	166,587				166,587
Stockpile services robust nuclear earth penetrator	4,000	(4,000)		(4,000)	
Stockpile services reliable replacement warhead (replaces ACI)	9,351				9,351
Subtotal, Stockpile services	725,664				
Program decrease		(44,400)		(44,400)	(44,400)
Total, Directed stockpile work	**1,421,031**	(48,400)		**(48,400)**	**1,372,631**
Science campaign	[261,925]				
Primary assesment technologies	45,179				45,179
Test readiness	25,000				25,000

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
Dynamic materials properties	80,894				80,894
Advanced radiography	49,520				49,520
Secondary assessment technologies	61,332				61,332
Total, Science campaigns	**261,925**				**261,925**
Engineering campaign	[229,756]				
Enhanced surety	29,845				29,845
Weapons systems engineering assessment technology	24,040				24,040
Nuclear survivability and effects	9,386				9,386
Enhanced surveillance	96,207				96,207
Microsystems and engineering sciences (MESA) other project costs (OPC)	4,714				4,714
Application (MESA) construction	65,564				65,564
Total, Engineering campaign	**229,756**				**229,756**
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign	[460,418]				
Ignition	75,615				75,615
Support of other stockpile programs	9,872				9,872
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	43,008				43,008
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	10,111				10,111
Univeristy grants/other IFC support	9,946				9,946
Facility operations and target production	54,623				54,623
Inertial fusion technology					
NIF demonstration program	112,330				112,330
High-energy petawatt laser development	3,000				3,000
NIF construction	141,913				141,913
Total, Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign	**460,418**				**460,418**
Advanced simulation and computing campaign					
Advanced applications development	137,580				137,580
Verification and validation	50,015				50,015
Physics and material modeling	67,745				67,745
Problem solving environment (PSE)	39,464				39,464
Distance computing (DisCom)	15,852				15,852

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
Pathforward	7,442				7,442
Data and visualization sciences (D&VS)	58,959				58,959
Physical infrastructure & platforms	99,220				99,220
Computational systems	59,921				59,921
Simulation support	59,759				59,759
Advanced architectures	2,977				2,977
University partnerships	44,095				44,095
1 Program/3 labs	17,801				17,801
Subtotal, Advanced simulation and computing	660,830				660,830
Reduction for cost growth					
Total, Advanced simulation and computing campaign	**660,830**				**660,830**
Pit manufacturing and certification campaign					
Pit maufacturing	120,926				120,926
Pit certification	61,895				61,895
Pit manufacturing capability	23,071				23,071
Modern pit facility	7,686				7,686
Pit campaign support activities at NTS	35,182				35,182
Total, Pit manufacturing and certification campaign	**248,760**				**248,760**
Readiness Campaign					
Stockpile readiness	31,400				31,400
High explosives (HE)/Assembly readiness	17,097				17,097
Non-nuclear readiness	28,630				28,630
Tritium readiness	62,694				62,694
Tritium readiness construction	24,894				24,894
Advanced design & production technologies	54,040				54,040
Total, Readiness campaign	**218,755**				**218,755**
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)					
Operations of facilities	[1,160,783]				
Kansas City Plant	98,548	5,600	5,600		104,148
LLNL	85,564	6,000	6,000		91,564

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
LANL	304,212				304,212
Nevada Test Site	67,057				67,057
Pantex Plant	96,763	10,000	10,000		106,763
Sandia National Laboratories	140,347				140,347
Savannah River Site	94,378				94,378
Y-12 National Security Complex	208,262				208,262
Institutional site support	65,652				65,652
Program readiness	105,738				105,738
Special projects	6,619				6,619
Material recycle and recovery	72,730				72,730
Containers	17,247				17,247
Storage	25,222				25,222
Subtotal, operations & maintenance	1,388,339	21,600	21,600		1,409,939
Construction:	[243,047]				
06-D-140 Project engineering design, VL	14,113				14,113
06-D-402, NTS Replace fire stations #1 and #2, NSO	8,284				8,284
06-D-403, Tritium facility modernization, LLNL	2,600				2,600
06-D-404, Building B-3 remediation, restoration, and upgrade NSO	16,000				16,000
05-D-140, Project engineering and design, VL	5,000				5,000
05-D-401 Building 12-64 upgrade, Pantex	11,000	5,600	5,600		16,600
05-D-402 Berylium capability (BEC) project, Y-12 National Security	7,700				7,700
04-D-103 Project engineering and design, VL	2,000				2,000
04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) facility replacement, LANL	55,000				55,000
04-D-128, Criticality experiments facility (formerly TA-18 mission relocation project), LANL	13,000				13,000
03-D-103 Project engineering and design, VL	29,000				29,000
01-D-103 Project engineering and design, VL	9,000				9,000
01-D-124 HEU materials facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	70,350				70,350
Y-12 HEU Chemical Project		1,700	1,700		1,700
Y-12 Uranium metallurgy project (UPF support)		3,400	3,400		3,400
Y-12 Uranium Processing Facility (06-05)		10,000	10,000		10,000
Pantex High Explosives Pressing Facility design (04-02)		1,000	1,000		1,000
Pantex Component Evaluation Facility design (05-03)		2,000	2,000		2,000
LLNL Beryillium safety improvements--Contained Firing Facility		2,100	2,100		2,100

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
LLNL size reduction station for radioactive waste		1,000	1,000		1,000
Subtotal, Construction	243,047	26,800	26,800		269,847
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**1,631,386**	**48,400**	**48,400**		**1,679,786**
Secure transportation asset					
Operations and equipment	143,766				143,766
Program direction	68,334				68,334
Subtotal, Secure transportation asset	212,100				212,100
Use of prior year balances					
Total, Secure transportation asset	**212,100**				**212,100**
Nuclear weapons incident response					
Emergency response	101,682				101,682
Emergency management	6,615				6,615
Operations support	10,499				10,499
Total, nuclear weapons incident response	**118,796**				**118,796**
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program					
Operations and maintenance	[233,484]				
Recapitalization	162,728				162,728
Facility disposition	45,000				45,000
Infrastructure planning	25,756				25,756
Subtotal, operations & maintenance	233,484				233,484
Construction:	[50,025]				
06-D-160, FIRP project engineering and design	5,811				5,811
06-D-601, Electrical distribution system upgrade	4,000				4,000
06-D-602, Gas main and distribution system upgrade	3,700				3,700
06-D-603, Steam plant life extension	729				729
05-D-160 FIRP project engineering and design (PED), various locations	10,644				10,644
05-D-601Compressed air upgrades project, Y-12, National security complex	9,741				9,741
05-D-602 Power grid infrastructure upgrade (PGIU), LANL	8,500				8,500
05-D-603 New master substation, TA 1 & 4, SNL	6,900				6,900
04-D-203 FIRP project engineering and design (PED), various locations					

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
Subtotal, Construction	50,025				50,025
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	**283,509**				**283,509**
Environmental projects and operations					
Program	156,504	(156,504)		(156,504)	
Program direction	17,885	(17,885)		(17,885)	
Total, Environmental projects and operations	**174,389**	(174,389)		(174,389)	
Safeguards and security					
Operations and maintenace					
Physical security	621,651				621,651
Cyber Security	77,827				77,827
Subtotal, operations and maintanence	699,478				699,478
Construction:	[41000]				
05-D-170 Project engineering and design, various locations	41,000				41,000
Subtotal, Construction	41,000				41,000
Subtotal, Safeguards and security	740,478				740,478
Offset for S&S Work for Others	(32,000)				(32,000)
Total, Safeguards and security	**708,478**				**708,478**
Subtotal, Weapons Activities	6,630,133	(174,389)	48,400	(222,789)	6,455,744
Adjustments					
Use of prior year balances					
Less security charge for reimbursable work	[-32000]				
Total, Adjustments					
Total, Weapons Activities	**6,630,133**	(174,389)	48,400	(222,789)	**6,455,744**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation					
Nonproliferation and verification R&D					
Operations and maintenance					
Proliferation detection	152,471				152,471

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
Nuclear explosion monitoring	108,642				108,642
Supporting activities	6,105				6,105
Subtotal, O&M	267,218				267,218
Design-PNNL Area 300 replacement facilities (06-D-180)	5,000	8,000	8,000		13,000
Total, Nonproliferation and verification R&D	**272,218**	**8,000**	**8,000**		**280,218**
Nonproliferation and international security					
Nonproliferation policy	25,321				25,321
Export control	19,970				19,970
International safeguards	26,045				26,045
Treaties and agreements	2,000				2,000
International emergency management and cooperation	6,837				6,837
Total, Nonproliferation and international security	**80,173**				**80,173**
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation (MPC&A)					
Navy complex	6,500				6,500
Strategic rocket forces	47,500				47,500
Rosatom weapons complex	86,185				86,185
Civilian nuclear sites	47,320	10,000	10,000		57,320
Material consolidation and conversion	28,001				28,001
National programs and sustainability	30,000	10,000	10,000		40,000
Second line of defense	97,929				97,929
Total, International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	**343,435**	**20,000**	**20,000**		**363,435**
Global initiatives for proliferation prevention (former RTI)					
Program direction	37,890				37,890
Total, Global initiatives for proliferation prevention	**37,890**				**37,890**
HEU transparency implementation	**20,483**				**20,483**
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production (EWGPP)					
Seversk Pu production elimination	127,500				127,500
Zheleznogorsk Pu production elimination	2,500	75,000	75,000		77,500

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
Crosscutting and technical support activities	2,000				2,000
Total, EWGPP	**132,000**	**75,000**	**75,000**		**207,000**
Fissile materials disposition					
U S surplus materials disposition O&M	226,500				226,500
Russian surplus materials disposition	64,000				64,000
Thorium fuel project		5,000	5,000		5,000
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	290,500				290,500
Construction:					
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, SRS	24,000				24,000
99-D-143 Mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication facility, SRS	338,565	(250,000)		(250,000)	88,565
Subtotal, Construction	362,565	(250,000)		(250,000)	112,565
Total, Fissile materials disposition	**653,065**	**(245,000)**	**5,000**	**(250,000)**	**408,065**
Global threat reduction initiative					
Reduced enrichment for research and rest reactors	24,732				24,732
Russian research reactor fuel return	14,703				14,703
Kazakhstan spent fuel	8,000				8,000
Nuclear fuel return	8,712				8,712
US radiological threat reduction	12,750				12,750
International radiological threat reduction	24,078				24,078
Emerging threats	5,000				5,000
Program increase for activities outside the U.S.		20,000	20,000		20,000
Total, Global threat reduction initiative	**97,975**	**20,000**	**20,000**		**117,975**
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,637,239	(122,000)	128,000	(250,000)	1,515,239
Adjustments:					
Use of prior year balances					
Total, Adjustments					
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**1,637,239**	(122,000)	128,000	(250,000)	**1,515,239**

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
Naval Reactors					
Naval reactors development					
Operation and maintenance	738,800				738,800
Construction:					
05-D-900 Materials development facility	9,900				9,900
06-D-901, Central office building #2	7,000				7,000
Subtotal, Construction	16,900				16,900
Program direction	30,300				30,300
Total, Naval reactors development	**786,000**				**786,000**
Total, Naval Reactors	**786,000**				**786,000**
Office Of The Administrator					
Office of the Administrator	343,869				343,869
Total, Office of the Administrator	**343,869**				**343,869**
Defense Site Acceleration Completion					
2006 Accelerated completions					
Operation and maintenance	1,016,508				1,016,508
Total, 2006 Accelerated Completions	**1,016,508**				**1,016,508**
2012 Accelerated Completions					
Operation and maintenance					
Construction projects	1,148,745				1,148,745
Construction project increases					
Waste treatment plant (ORP-0060)	625,893	64,100	64,100		689,993
Nuclear facility D&D (RL-0041)	168,501	13,000	13,000		181,501
Total, 2012 Accelerated Completions	**1,943,139**	**77,100**	**77,100**		**2,020,239**
2035 Accelerated Completions					
Operation and maintenance					
Construction projects	1,613,512				1,613,512

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization disposition (ORP-0014)	301,942	44,900	44,900		346,842
Total, 2035 Accelerated Completions	**1,915,454**	**44,900**	**44,900**		**1,960,354**
Safeguards and security					
S&S Funding	287,223				287,223
Total, Safeguards and security	**287,223**				**287,223**
Technology development and deployment					
Eliminating technical barriers to accelerated closure/alternative products	19,338				19,338
Risk reduction assistance program	1,500				1,500
Small business innovative research program	551				551
Total, Technology and development and deployment	**21,389**				**21,389**
Environmental projects and operations transfer from NNSA to EM		174,389	174,389		**174,389**
Total, Defense Site Acceleration Completion	**5,183,713**	296,389	296,389		**5,480,102**
Defense Environmental Services					
Community and regulatory support	62,032				62,032
Federal contribution to the uranium enrichment fund	451,000				451,000
Non-closure environmental activities	87,368				87,368
Program direction	230,931				230,931
Total, Defense Environmental Services	**831,331**				**831,331**
Other Defense Activities					
Security and safety performance assurance					
Nuclear safeguards and security	176,878				176,878
Security investigations	48,725				48,725
Program direction	75,492				75,492
Total, Energy security and assurance	**301,095**				**301,095**
Environment, safety & health					
Environment, safety and health (defense)	56,483				56,483

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
Program direction	20,546				20,546
Total, Environment, safety and health	**77,029**				**77,029**
Legacy Management					
Legacy management	31,421				31,421
Program direction	13,655				13,655
Total, Office of Legacy Management	**45,076**				**45,076**
Nuclear energy					
Infrastructure					
Idaho facilities management	17,762				17,762
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	75,008				75,008
Program direction	31,103				31,103
Subtotal, Nuclear energy	123,873				92,770
Less security charge for reimbursable work	(3,003)				(3,003)
Total, Nuclear energy	120,870				**120,870**
Defense related administrative support	**87,575**				**87,575**
Hearings and appeals	**4,353**				**4,353**
Total, Other Defense Activities	**635,998**				**635,998**
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal					
Yucca Mountain project	351,447				351,447
Total, Defense nuclear waste disposal	**351,447**				**351,447**
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities	6,630,133	(174,389)	48,400	(222,789)	6,455,744
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,637,239	(122,000)	128,000	(250,000)	1,515,239
Naval reactors	786,000				786,000

Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2006 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2006 Committee Authorization
Office of the administrator	343,869				343,869
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration	9,397,241	(296,389)	176,400	(472,789)	9,100,852
Environmental and other defense activities:					
Defense site acceleration completion	5,183,713	296,389	296,389		5,480,102
Defense environmental services	831,331				831,331
Other defense activities	635,998				635,998
Defense nuclear waste disposal	351,447				351,447
Total, Environmental & other defense activities	7,002,489	296,389	296,389		7,298,878
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**16,399,730**		472,789	(472,789)	**16,399,730**
Other activities					
Energy Supply	12,000				12,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	22,032				22,032
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program - Corps of Engineers	[140,000]				[140,000]
Total, Other activities	**34,032**				**34,032**
Total, Department of Energy (053)	**16,433,762**		**472,789**	**(472,789)**	**16,433,762**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Overview

The budget request contained $9.4 billion for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2006. The committee recommends $9.1 billion, a decrease of $296.4 million.

Weapons Activities

Directed stockpile work

The budget request contained $1,421.0 million for directed stockpile work. The committee recommends $1,372.6 million, a decrease of $48.4 million.

Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator

The budget request contained $4.0 million for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP) study.

The committee understands that the Commander, United States Strategic Command has stated that the results from the sled test conducted under this program have applicability to various types of penetrators that may be options for use against Hard and Deeply Buried Targets (HDBTs). Based on the applicability of the sled test results to various options for HDBT defeat, the committee believes that this study is more appropriately conducted under a program element within the Department of Defense.

The committee recommends no funding for the RNEP study under the Department of Energy, but instead authorizes a related study effort within the Department of Defense elsewhere in this Act.

Reliable Replacement Warhead program

The budget requests $9.4 million within Directed Stockpile Work for the Reliable Replacement Warhead program.

The committee notes that in the aftermath of the Cold War, the Stockpile Stewardship Program was designed to enable the continued certification of the existing stockpile in the absence of nuclear testing. The National Nuclear Security Administration's Life Extension Program is a component of the Stockpile Stewardship program to ensure the continued safety, surety and certification of the stockpile by extending the life of nuclear weapons that have already undergone testing. The 2001 Nuclear Posture Review and other studies by the Department of Defense and Department of Energy have highlighted the importance of looking past the Cold War-era designed defense nuclear complex to a responsive infrastructure of the future, one objective of which is to be able to produce replacement warheads.

The committee firmly believes that the nation must ensure that the nuclear stockpile remains reliable, safe, and secure and that national security requires transforming the Cold War-era nuclear complex. Thus, the committee supports the Reliable Replacement Warhead program. To clearly articulate the congressional intent underlying this program authorization, the committee further states the key goals of the program.

First and foremost, in order to serve as a credible strategic deterrent, the stockpile must be reliable, safe, and secure. The committee understands that by designing and replacing components and warheads in our existing arsenal, the nuclear weapons complex can take full advantage of modern design techniques, more environmentally safe materials, and efficient manufacturing processes in a way that can make our arsenal more reliable, safe, and secure. The committee believes that the Reliable Replacement Warhead program offers the opportunity to improve certain safety features. In particular, the committee expects the National Nuclear Security Administration to inform Congress about the extent to which the Reliable Replacement Warhead program can improve security features to prevent accidental or unauthorized detonations. The committee expects that the budgeting and reporting of the Reliable Replacement Warhead program will be consistent with the traditional nuclear weapon acquisition process of designating work related to new weapon or weapon modification development and production. Based on Nuclear Weapons Council briefings, the committee encourages the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy to focus initial Reliable Replacement Warhead efforts on replacement warheads for Submarine Launched Ballistic Missiles. The committee understands that the purpose of the program is to fulfill the current mission requirements of the stockpile.

A second objective of this program is to further reduce the likelihood of the resumption of nuclear testing by increasing warhead design margin and manufacturability.

The third objective of utilizing components whose basic design parameters are well understood, or are certifiable without the need to resume underground nuclear testing reinforces the second objective. As part of the report required by section 3111 (c), the committee expects a discussion of how these two objectives will be accomplished, including the degree to which reliable replacement warheads will be based on design parameters that have been proven through prior successful nuclear tests.

Fourth, the Reliable Replacement Warhead program has a goal of ensuring the country has a nuclear infrastructure that is flexible enough to meet future requirements that cannot be predicted today. The goal of achieving a more flexible nuclear infrastructure was identified in the 2001 Nuclear Posture Review, but has not been realized in large part due to a lack of program focus. The Reliable Replacement Warhead Program will try to provide that focus.

Fifth, the Reliable Replacement Warhead program may permit reductions in the size of the nuclear stockpile since fewer weapons should have to serve as a hedge against technical uncertainty and reliability concerns. As part of the report required by section 3111 (c), the committee expects an estimate of the reductions that can be achieved if the Reliable Replacement Warhead program is successfully implemented. The report should discuss options for future dismantlement based on stockpile reductions that may be achieved if the Reliable Replacement Warhead program is successful.

Sixth, and related to the responsive infrastructure objective, is the goal of ensuring that the human capital aspect is not neglected. The nuclear complex is rapidly losing its design and production expertise, a concern highlighted by several studies in the past decade. The Reliable Replacement Warhead program will help train and

sustain the weapons designers and engineers whose expertise is essential in ensuring the stockpile remains, reliable, safe and secure into the future.

Finally, the Reliable Replacement Warhead program should serve as a complement to and potential future replacement for, the existing Life Extension Programs. The potential of the Reliable Replacement Warhead program to provide for a credible nuclear deterrent and a flexible, responsive infrastructure in a cost-effective manner is an important aspect of this program. At some future point, the committee would expect a life-cycle cost estimate for the Reliable Replacement Warhead program in addition to the requirement to provide five-year cost estimates in the annual budget justification documents. This life-cycle cost estimate would specifically address the issue of pit production, and whether a modern pit facility is still required if the program leads to a significantly reduced arsenal. For the purposes of the report required by section 3111, the committee understands that submission of life-cycle costs estimates would be premature. The report required by section 3111 should, however, provide an assessment as to when a life-cycle cost estimate, to include all construction and decommissioning costs, would be feasible based on projected program milestones. The report should also discuss the impact on the Department of Defense, specifically its delivery platforms, of introducing reliable replacement warheads, to include a cost estimate of the potential impacts.

The report required by section 3111 should detail the planned use of fiscal year 2006 and prior year funds. The report is required by March 1, 2007, but the committee also requires an interim report due by March 1, 2006, that provides as much information on the required report topics as can be provided.

The committee recommends $9.4 million for the Reliable Replacement Warhead program, the amount of the budget request. Should additional funds be required above those authorized and appropriated, the committee directs the Secretary of Energy to submit a reprogramming request to the congressional defense committees.

Stockpile Stewardship Campaigns

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160) directed the Department of Energy to "establish a stewardship program to ensure the preservation of the core intellectual and technical competencies of the United States in nuclear weapons." In response, the Department of Energy developed the Stockpile Stewardship Program to "increase the understanding of the basic phenomena associated with nuclear weapons, to provide better predictive understanding of the safety and reliability of weapons, and to ensure a strong scientific and technical basis for future United States nuclear weapon policy objectives." Subsequently in 1999, the Department developed a new program activity structure for Stockpile Stewardship that included a series of what the Department called "campaigns," which are technically challenging, multiyear, multifunctional efforts designed to develop and maintain the critical capabilities needed to enable continued certification of the stockpile into the foreseeable future, without underground testing. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) is responsible for carrying out the Stockpile Stewardship Program.

Six individual science campaigns are intended to provide the scientific capability to support the stockpile. Two campaigns-Primary Assessment Technologies and Secondary Assessment Technologies-set the requirements for the experimental data and computer models needed to assess and certify nuclear weapons. Four other campaigns-Dynamic Materials, Advanced Radiography, Advanced Simulation and Computing, and Inertial Confinement Fusion-provide experimental and computational support. Since fiscal year 2001, NNSA has spent $5.8 billion on these activities.

The Department set a series of goals and related milestones for the campaigns to achieve by the 2005–2010 time frame. Achieving these goals was technically challenging and depended on the timely completion of major facilities such as the National Ignition Facility and the Dual Axis Radiographic Hydrodynamic Test Facility, both of which have experienced major delays due to problems with project management.

Recently, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) told the committee that the GAO was limited in its ability to assess the performance of the campaigns in achieving their goals because NNSA did not have an adequate planning process for approving and tracking campaign plans and milestones. In addition, GAO found that the original goals for the Primary Assessment Technologies and Secondary Assessment Technologies Campaigns had been modified and extended to the 2010–2014 timeframe. GAO also found that despite their interdependency, NNSA's campaigns were not well integrated.

GAO's findings are consistent with the committee's observations about NNSA's fiscal year 2006 budget request, where the goals for the campaigns are related principally to the conduct of experiments on certain facilities and the development of the quantification of margins and uncertainties methodology. The budget request does not clearly discuss the campaigns' goals and the extent to which they have been achieved. In addition, the budget request makes little mention of how the campaigns' actions are integrated to achieve these goals.

The committee notes that NNSA is proposing to spend several billion dollars more on these activities over the next five years. Therefore, before such large funds are expended, the committee believes that NNSA should provide a full accounting of what has been achieved to date and what NNSA expects to achieve over the next five years. Specifically, the committee directs the Administrator of the NNSA to provide, with the fiscal year 2007 budget submission, a report detailing:

(1) The original goals of the six campaigns intended to provide the scientific capability to support the stockpile;

(2) The degree to which these goals have been achieved and, where applicable, the reasons for NNSA's failure to achieve these goals;

(3) The impact of NNSA's success or failure to achieve these goals on its ability to assess the safety and reliability of the stockpile;

(4) The specific goals NNSA plans to achieve over the next five years in order to ensure that it has the capability to continue to assess the stockpile without underground nuclear testing; and

(5) How the NNSA plans to integrate and prioritize the activities of the campaigns in order to achieve these goals in a cost effective manner.

Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities

The budget request contained $1,631.4 million for Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF).

The committee has been encouraged by the progress made in the reduction of deferred maintenance backlogs in the defense nuclear complex. The committee also supports the Administrator's efforts to reduce safeguards and security costs throughout the complex by consolidating nuclear material storage and by accelerating certain construction projects that will permit even further consolidation of nuclear materials.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.6 million for design and construction at the Pantex Production Plant for the following projects: $1.0 million to complete the design of the High Explosives Pressing Facility (Project 04–02), $2.0 million to complete the design of the Component Evaluation Facility (Project 05–03), and $5.6 million to accelerate work on the Pantex Plant Building 12–64 Production Bays Upgrade (project 05–D–401).

The committee understands that accelerated completion of the Uranium Processing Facility (UPF) will shrink the overall footprint of the Y–12 complex. The committee recommends an increase of $15.1 million to accelerate project design at the Y–12 plant as follows: $10.0 million for the UPF (Project 06–05), $1.7 million for the Highly Enriched Uranium Chemical Project, and $3.4 million for the Uranium Metallurgy Project, the latter two projects directly supporting the UPF.

The committee provides an additional $3.1 million for Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory as follows: $2.1 million for one-time Beryllium safety improvements at the Contained Firing Facility and $1.0 million for a size-reduction station for radioactive waste.

The committee provides additional funds for replacement of aging equipment, correction of deferred maintenance, and disposition of legacy materials consistent with the National Nuclear Security Administration approved 10 year comprehensive site plan as follows: $5.6 million at the Kansas City Plant, $6.0 million at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory specifically for configuration management requirements related to the Superblock, and $10.0 million at the Pantex Production Plant.

The committee recommends $1,679.8 million, an increase of $48.4 million for RTBF.

Environmental Projects and Operations

The fiscal year 2006 National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) budget request contained $174.4 million for Environmental Projects and Operations due to the proposed transfer of responsibility for certain environmental management activities from the Department of Energy's Office of Environmental Management to the NNSA. The reason stated for this realignment is that the transfer aligns responsibility with accountability for environmental activities at NNSA sites consistent with the intent of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (Public Law 106–65, title 32).

Contrary to what is stated in the budget request, the intent of Congress in drafting the National Nuclear Security Administration Act ("NNSA Act") was expressly to not permit a transfer of environmental activities to NNSA. While section 3291(a) of the NNSA Act transferred certain functions from the Department of Energy to NNSA, section 3291(c), "Environmental Remediation and Waste Management Activities," states that the Secretary may determine to transfer responsibility for that activity to another element of the Department. That "activity," specifically environmental remediation and waste management components of those activities transferred to NNSA in section 3291(a), was never transferred to the NNSA. The accompanying conference report language specifically states that section 3291 would "permit the Secretary of Energy to transfer environmental and waste management activities to other elements of the Department in consultation with the Administrator and Congress."

In short, the fiscal year 2006 budget request for NNSA Environmental Projects and Operations conflicts with the NNSA Act. The committee therefore authorizes no funds for these activities within NNSA, but instead authorizes the requested amount elsewhere in this Act under the Department of Energy's Office of Environmental Management.

The committee also understands that both the Government Accountability Office and the Secretary of Energy are currently reviewing the relationship between the Department of Energy and the NNSA under the NNSA Act. The committee encourages the Secretary to inform the congressional defense committees of any concerns relating to the environmental transfer issue or other NNSA Act compliance concerns at the earliest opportunity. While it is the intent of the committee to leave these environmental activities under the Department of Energy's Office of Environmental Management, the committee is open to hearing additional justification from the Secretary why such a transfer should occur in the future.

Safeguards and Security

The committee continues to be deeply concerned with safeguards and security practices throughout the complex. The committee understands that the fiscal year 2006 safeguards and security budget request fully funds activities that will bring the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) complex into compliance with the April 2003 Design Basis Threat (DBT) by the end of fiscal year 2006. The committee also understands that in October 2004, the Secretary of Energy directed certain changes in the DBT requirements for the complex with a target compliance goal of the end of fiscal year 2008. The committee notes that updated site vulnerability assessments for compliance with the October 2004 DBT changes are due to the Administrator in July 2005.

The committee is concerned that the increased security requirements resulting from the October 2004 DBT have not been subjected to an independent risk and cost analysis. The committee directs the Secretary to conduct a risk and cost analysis study of the increase in security requirements from the April 2003 DBT to the October 2004 DBT. The Secretary shall submit a report on this analysis to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2006.

The committee supports the Administrator's efforts to enhance security practices through consolidation of nuclear material at individual sites and throughout the complex. The committee notes that the Nuclear Weapons Complex Infrastructure Task Force is currently evaluating options for consolidation of nuclear material in the broader context of transforming the defense nuclear complex. The committee directs the Administrator to submit with the fiscal year 2007 budget materials its plans to achieve consolidation of nuclear material throughout the complex.

The committee notes that the Department of Energy's Office of Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance submitted a report in January 2005 on federal oversight of security operations within the NNSA complex, which detailed certain shortcomings. The committee directs the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees a follow-up report on the status of corrective actions for federal oversight recommended in the January 2005 report by March 1, 2006.

National Nuclear Security Administration Advisory Committee

The committee notes that shortly after the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) was created, the first NNSA Administrator established an independent committee to advise the Administrator on a wide range of issues, particularly technical areas. This advisory committee was not renewed after the first two years for several reasons, including the administrative burden of supporting the committee. The committee recognizes the complexity and importance of the NNSA's mission, and notes it faces important decisions about ensuring the reliability of our nuclear stockpile, exploring new initiatives such as the Reliable Replacement Warhead program, and maintaining a high level of security in a cost-effective manner. The committee further recognizes the value of sound, balanced information and counsel from independent, credible sources on a range of technical and security matters. The committee encourages the NNSA Administrator to consider reinstating the advisory committee to assist the NNSA in its deliberations on the important challenges it faces.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation

The budget request contained $1,637.2 million for defense nuclear nonproliferation programs. The committee fully supports the goals of the Department of Energy's nuclear nonproliferation programs but remains concerned with uncosted, uncommitted balances in several of the nonproliferation accounts due to the inability to resolve government to government agreements, especially liability agreements, for critical projects. The committee shifts funds within the nonproliferation account into programs that have experienced greater success or that are viewed as more executable based on the above concerns noted with government to government agreements. The committee authorizes $1,515.2 million, a decrease of $122.0 million.

Nonproliferation and verification research and development

The budget request contained $272.2 million for nonproliferation and verification research and development activities.

The committee notes that the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, which performs critical nonproliferation research and development work for the NNSA, is scheduled to vacate their facilities at Hanford Site Area 300 in 2009 and that replacement facilities are required. The budget contains $5.0 million for project engineering and design for replacement research facilities (project 06–D–180). The committee recommends $280.2 million, an increase of $8.0 million to accelerate design of the replacement facility.

International Materials Protection and Cooperation

The budget request contained $343.4 million for International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation (MPC&A). The committee is encouraged by the progress made in several MPC&A programs, especially those associated with the Russian Naval Complex and Strategic Rocket Forces. The committee recommends $363.4 million, an increase of $20.0 million as follows: $10.0 million for Civilian Nuclear Sites and $10.0 million for National Programs and Sustainability.

Elimination of Weapons Grade Plutonium Production

The budget requests $132.0 million for the Elimination of Weapons Grade Plutonium Production (EWGPP) program. The committee understands that the EWGPP program is seeking international funding to support the Zheleznogorsk reactor project. While fully supporting the concept of international funding for this project, the committee also wants to ensure that sufficient financial support is demonstrated early enough in the project to keep the Zheleznogorsk reactor shutdown on schedule. The committee recommends $207.0 million, an increase of $75.0 million for the Zheleznogorsk project.

Mixed Oxide Fuel Facility

The budget request contained $653.1 million for Fissile Materials Disposition, the goal of which is to eliminate surplus Russian plutonium and surplus U.S. plutonium and highly enriched uranium. With respect to the plutonium disposition programs, the goal is to eliminate 68 metric tons of United States and Russian surplus weapons-grade plutonium in accordance with the September 2000 United States-Russia Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement, and with Congressional direction to conduct both the United States and Russian disposition programs in parallel. This effort, based on the use of Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facilities to be built in both the United States and Russia, is referred to as the MOX program.

Of the $653.1 million requested for Fissile Materials Disposition, approximately $460.0 million is for the United States-Russia MOX program, of which $338.6 million is for construction of the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility at the Savannah River Site. Due to an inability to resolve disagreements regarding liability protections for U.S. work performed in Russia, the MOX program has experienced significant delays. When the MOX project was first authorized in 1999, the projected start date for physical construction of the Savannah River Site MOX facility was in 2002. During the period covered by fiscal years 1999–2005, $961.1 million has been appropriated for the Savannah River Site MOX facility, yet actual

construction has not commenced. According to data received from the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration as of March 31, 2005, the Savannah River Site MOX construction project had an unobligated balance of $552.1 million.

The committee fully supports the objective of the Fissile Materials Disposition program, including the objectives of the MOX program. The committee also recognizes that resolution of the liability issue between the United States and Russia is being pursued at the highest levels of the Administration. However, given other pressing budgetary needs, the committee can no longer continue to fully fund the MOX project given the apparent lack of progress in liability agreement negotiations and the significant funds that remain unobligated from prior year MOX program appropriations.

The committee supports the overall objectives of the nonproliferation program and will look to fund those activities that can be reasonably executed. The committee recommends $88.6 million for the Savannah River Site Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility, a decrease of $250.0 million. Of the $88.6 million authorized for the Savannah River MOX construction project in fiscal year 2006, no more than $50.0 million may be obligated prior to certification by the Secretary of Energy that both the United States and Russia agree that the MOX liability issue has been satisfactorily resolved. In the event that additional funds are required (above prior year balances and this $88.6 million authorization), the Secretary of Energy is directed to submit a reprogramming request to the congressional defense committees.

Section 3182 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) establishes that the Secretary of Energy shall commence certain payments to the state of South Carolina if the MOX production objective is not met by January 1, 2011. Based on the liability agreement incurred delays in MOX facility construction, the committee is concerned that this production objective may not be met and that these payments will impact future year budgets for not only the MOX program, but for all defense nuclear nonproliferation programs. The committee directs the Secretary to submit, with the fiscal year 2007 budget request, a report that outlines various options for MOX program funding in the event that the MOX production objective is not met, as well as alternative plutonium disposition strategies in the event that MOX liability issues are not resolved and the program is terminated.

Thorium fuel project

The committee is concerned that disposition of surplus plutonium in Russia remains a significant challenge. Even if the MOX project is successful in the long-term, the committee notes that there remain stocks of plutonium for which there is no disposition path. The committee believes that pursuing other plutonium disposition options, including the thorium-based fuel cycle, is important. The committee recommends $5.0 million to continue the thorium-based fuel program currently being conducted by the Radkowsky Thorium-Plutonium Incinerator (RTPI) project in Russia.

In particular, the Department of Energy is directed to continue design studies to optimize the design for plutonium disposition, to fabricate and irradiate plutonium alloy fuel, and to initiate other

qualification tasks to implement the coordinated RTPI program. The $5.0 million shall be made available for this work in Russia on the conditions and only to the extent that the Federal Atomic Energy Agency agrees that the RTPI project should be conducted under the Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement of 2000 and that Department of Energy personnel are granted access to the fabrication facilities at Elemash and the Siberian Chemical Combine in order to further evaluate the work performed.

The committee further directs the Department to submit with the fiscal year 2007 budget its recommendations for the future of the thorium fuel program.

Global Threat Reduction Initiative

The budget request contained $97.9 million for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative (GTRI). The committee supports the goal of this program, especially those activities conducted outside the United States. The committee recommends $117.9 million, an increase of $20.0 million to be used solely for GTRI activities outside the United States.

Section 3132 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) stated that it was the sense of Congress that the security, including the rapid removal or secure storage of high-risk, proliferation-attractive materials, radiological materials, and related equipment worldwide is a matter of national security. Although section 3132 contains a detailed list of activities that may be included as part of the GTRI (also referred to as "Global Cleanout"), it was the intent of Congress to grant broad authority to conduct a range of activities to seize and secure nuclear related materials in order to reduce the threat of nuclear proliferation. It was not the intent of Congress that the enumerated activities in section 3132 be narrowly construed. For example, Congress would expect that other materials and activities not expressly listed, but that are of concern from a nuclear non- proliferation perspective would be covered by the authority granted in section 3132. Though not explicitly called out, Congress would clearly envision the following activities to be covered by the authority granted in this section: safeguarding and securing a nuclear weapon, and securing or converting the fuel from critical assemblies and pulsed reactors, isotope production reactors, and icebreaker reactors. This enumeration is meant to be illustrative but not exhaustive.

The Secretary of Energy should broadly interpret the Department of Energy's authority under section 3132 to carry out those activities worldwide involving the removal or storage of materials that will reduce the threat posed by nuclear proliferation. The committee expects that the final report and plan required under section 3132 will include a prioritized listing of all types of high-threat facilities, including those discussed above, and that the plan required by section 3132 will include steps to address all of those facilities judged to pose high-priority threats.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Overview

The budget request contained $7,002.5 million for environmental and other defense activities. The committee recommends $7,298.9 million, an increase of $296.4 million.

Environmental Management Authority Transfer

The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) budget contained $174.4 million for environmental projects and operations at NNSA sites that were proposed by the Secretary of Energy to be transferred from the Office of Environmental Management to the Administrator of the NNSA commencing in 2006. As noted above, the committee finds that the proposed transfer is contrary to the intent of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (Public Law 106–65, title 32) and does not authorize these activities within the NNSA budget request.

The committee authorizes $174.4 million for these same activities under the Office of Environmental Management and directs the Secretary to realign the NNSA site environmental projects and operations funding to the appropriate accounts within the Office of Environmental Management.

Hanford Defense Site Acceleration Completion Activities

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2006 budget request proposed an overall reduction of $550.0 million for Environmental Management Activities, with over $290.0 million of the cleanup funding reductions proposed at the Hanford site in Washington. While noting that the Department of Energy (DOE) had rational justifications for many of the proposed reductions at Hanford, the committee also understands that the cleanup efforts at Hanford, the largest cleanup site in the complex, must move forward in those areas where progress can be made in fiscal year 2006 and beyond.

The budget request contained $625.9 million for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (Project 01–D–416). It is the largest and most complex nuclear design and construction project in the nation, and is critically important for successful cleanup of the Hanford site. The project consists of three major nuclear facilities to pre-treat and vitrify high-level waste that is currently located in underground tanks at Hanford. The committee notes that while construction activities at the Waste Treatment Plant were curtailed in response to new seismic information, the effect of the pending engineering reevaluation of seismic design issues will most likely result in an overall increase in the cost of the project. The committee recommends an increase of $64.1 million for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (Project 01–D–416) to restore funding to the $690.0 million level established in the DOE's contract to build this facility. The committee does not want to see this project slowed down by a lack of funds. The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2006, on the overall cost analysis of the project and the impact of the new seismic data on both the design and construction of the WTP. The committee encourages the De-

partment to work with the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board to ensure full transparency into this engineering analysis effort.

The budget request contained $301.9 million for Radioactive Liquid Tank Waste Stabilization Disposition (Project ORP–0014). While the committee notes that there is continuing legal uncertainty over certain wastes associated with this project, there also are cleanup activities that can proceed if additional funding is provided. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $44.9 million for Radioactive Liquid Tank Waste Stabilization Disposition provided that the Secretary of Energy can assure the committee that these funds can be used for additional single-shell tank waste retrieval activities in a manner consistent with the DOE's understanding of the legal uncertainty associated with certain tank wastes. The committee encourages the Department to continue to work with the state of Washington to resolve these legal uncertainties.

The budget request contained $70.8 million for Nuclear Facility Decontamination & Decommissioning (D&D) at Hanford (Project RL–0040). The committee understands that increased funding is needed to ensure the River Corridor project meets its completion date to allow shrinkage of the Hanford site footprint. The committee recommends an increase of $13.0 million for Nuclear Facility D&D (Project RL–0040).

Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

The budget request contained $351.0 million within Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal for the Yucca Mountain Project, an increase of $122.3 million from the fiscal year 2005 defense appropriations. The committee fully supports the budget request and the need for a permanent deep geologic repository for high level radioactive waste (HLW).

This is a critical time for the Yucca Mountain regulatory process in preparation for submitting a construction license application to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

While the Yucca Mountain project has encountered a series of obstacles over the last year that have pushed the opening date back from 2010 to 2012, the need for transparency with the Licensing Support Network should be a priority. The recent discovery of faulty data from the United States Geological Survey has further stalled the licensing process, and the committee hopes this issue will be resolved soon in order to prevent further delays.

Additionally, until the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approves a new environmental radiation standard for storage at Yucca Mountain, the program will experience further delays in submitting the licensing application to the NRC, therefore opening in 2012. In July 2004, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit overturned the EPA's initial standard of projecting the Yucca storage compliance period out 10,000 years, citing that the EPA had violated the National Energy Policy Act (Public Law 102–486) by not authorizing a standard consistent with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) finding for the compliance period, which was over 400,000 years.

The recently published NAS study on the danger of storing spent nuclear fuel (SNF) in pools at nuclear power plants reinforces the need for tight security over SNF and the consolidation of HLW into

one repository, which could be stored underground and safe from a potential hostile attack. The committee fully supports the budget request for the Yucca Mountain project.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would authorize funds for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2006, including funds for weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, naval reactor programs, and the Office of the Administrator.

Section 3102—Defense Environmental Management

This section would authorize funds for defense environmental management activities for fiscal year 2006, including funds for defense site acceleration completion and defense environmental services.

Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize funds for other defense activities for fiscal year 2006.

Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

This section would authorize funds for defense nuclear waste disposal for fiscal year 2006.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 3111—Reliable Replacement Warhead Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Energy to carry out a Reliable Replacement Warhead program to develop reliable replacement components that are producible and certifiable for the existing nuclear weapons stockpile. This section establishes goals for the program and requires a report to Congress.

Section 3112—Report on Assistance for Comprehensive Inventory of Russian Nonstrategic Nuclear Weapons

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to submit a report to Congress evaluating past efforts of the United States to encourage a proper accounting for and securing of Russian nonstrategic nuclear weapons, and to recommend U.S. actions that are most likely to contribute to a complete inventory and security of such weapons. Following the fall of the Berlin Wall, the United States withdrew its nonstrategic nuclear weapons from Europe and Asia. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan all gave up the nuclear weapons they inherited from the Soviet Union. The Russian Federation, however, continued to produce and deploy new nuclear weapons while increasing their importance and role in war-fighting plans. Unfortunately, as these events occurred, many Russian and non-Russian

analysts expressed growing concern about the reliability of Russia's control over its nuclear capabilities, particularly its nonstrategic nuclear weapons. The committee believes that the United States should assist Russia to preserve that control and that the Secretary of Energy's report on the means by which it might do so could prove very helpful in guiding the future evolution of the Department's Nuclear Nonproliferation programs.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $22.0 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2006. The committee recommends the budget request.

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Waste Treatment Plant

The committee relies heavily on the technical expertise of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) to ensure that appropriate nuclear safety features are incorporated in the Waste Treatment Plant design. The DNFSB has and should continue to provide nuclear safety oversight in such areas as seismic and geotechnical engineering, concrete chemistry, fire protection, process chemistry, plant mechanical systems, safety systems, and hazard analysis.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISION

Section 3201—Authorization

This section would authorize $22.0 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2006, the amount of the request.

TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Sale of Strategic and Critical Materials

The National Defense Stockpile (NDS) operates under authority of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98, et seq.). The Act mandates that a stockpile of strategic and critical materials be maintained to decrease, and preclude, when possible, dependence upon foreign sources for supplies in times of national emergency. The Defense National Stockpile Center, a field activity of the Defense Logistics Agency, conducts the sale of strategic and critical materials in the NDS. Over 95 percent of the materials currently in the NDS have been determined to be excess to Department of Defense (DOD) needs and are now being disposed of. As a result of recent market conditions, particularly with respect to titanium, and the increasing reliance on foreign sources of supply for defense programs, the committee has concerns about the

DOD's ability to ensure the timely availability of materials to meet the current needs of the military services. The committee directs the Secretary to review the DOD's current policy to dispose of material and determine whether the NDS should be re-configured to adapt to current world market conditions to ensure future availability of materials required for defense needs. The committee directs the Secretary to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2006, on the findings and conclusions.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3301—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds

This section would authorize $52.1 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund for the operation and maintenance of the National Defense Stockpile for fiscal year 2006. The section would also permit the use of additional funds for extraordinary or emergency conditions 45 days after Congress receives notification.

Section 3302—Revision of Fiscal Year 1999 Authority to Dispose of Certain Materials in the National Defense Stockpile

This section would authorize increased sales of stockpile materials through the end of fiscal year 2011.

Section 3303—Revision of Fiscal Year 2000 Authority to Dispose of Certain Materials in the National Defense Stockpile

This section would authorize increased sales of stockpile materials through the end of fiscal year 2011.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize $18.5 million for fiscal year 2006 for the operation and maintenance of the Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for Maritime Administration for Fiscal Year 2006

This section would authorize a total of $138.2 million for fiscal year 2006, the amount contained in the budget request. Of the funds authorized, $113.6 million would be for operations and training programs, $3.5 million would be for administrative expenses related to the operation of the loan guarantee program authorized by title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, (46 App. United States Code 1271 et seq.), and $21.0 million would be for

the disposal of obsolete vessels. Within the funds included for operations and training programs, the committee recommends $10.0 million to establish a pilot program to provide for the reimbursement of non-emergency repairs for vessels enrolled in the Maritime Security Program, and $1.2 million for additional payments to the state maritime academies for increased fuel and operating costs.

Section 3502—Payments for State and Regional Maritime Academies

This section would increase the amount of assistance provided to the six state maritime academies which are located in Maine, Massachusetts, New York, Michigan, Texas, and California. These six schools currently receive limited federal support yet a substantial number of their graduates hold federal licenses and support our increasing mariner requirements in both the commercial and military sectors. The current law provides for a payment from the Maritime Administration of $200,000 dollars annually for cadet training and facilities support. That amount has not been raised since 1989. This section would raise the level of support to $300,000 dollars in fiscal year 2006, $400,000 dollars in fiscal year 2007, and $500,000 in fiscal year 2008, and for each fiscal year thereafter. This section would also require the Maritime Administration to provide modest payments to the aforementioned state maritime academies for the increasing cost of fuel used for the operation of the academies' training ships.

Section 3503—Improvements to the Maintenance and Repair Reimbursement Pilot Program

This section would require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a pilot program to provide for the reimbursement of certain U.S. Coast Guard required inspection, survey, and repair expenses incurred by contractors who are operating vessels enrolled in the Maritime Security Program. Section 3517 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) authorized the Secretary of Transportation to establish, beginning in fiscal year 2006, a pilot program to ensure that vessels enrolled in the Maritime Security Program obtained their dry dockings and repairs in facilities located in the United States. That same section required the Secretary of Transportation to submit an analysis of the need for maintenance and repair agreements to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation. The report was quite supportive of a pilot program concluding that "the most significant benefit of the program is to assist in maintaining an effective ship repair base that is available to support national defense requirements." The report went on to find that the direct benefit to U.S. shipyards would be $28.2 million annually, and that additional benefits include approximately $80.0 million in total economic impact on the U.S. economy which translates into about 1100 jobs throughout the economy. Federal taxes generated would be $16.5 million and state and local taxes generated would be $8.0 million.

As a result of these findings, the committee pursuant to this section will require current Maritime Security Program contractors to

enter into maintenance and repair agreements with the Secretary of Transportation. The Secretary of Transportation will be required to reimburse these contractors/owners for the difference between the fair and reasonable cost of obtaining the maintenance or repair in the United States and the fair and reasonable cost of obtaining the qualified maintenance or repair outside the United States, in the geographic region in which the vessel usually operates. With the funds provided in this fiscal year, the Secretary should phase in enrollments based on anticipated drydockings. Those vessels requiring or scheduled for drydockings within the next 2 years should, subject to the availability of appropriations, be enrolled first as part of the initial phase of this pilot program. These maintenance and repair agreements will at a minimum require that all work, including the dry docking, associated with the U.S. Coast Guard Certificate of Inspection (which is required of each vessel every five years) be completed in a ship repair facility located in the United States.

Section 3504—Tank Vessel Construction Assistance

This section would require the Secretary of Transportation to enter into a tank vessel construction contract with a prospective owner provided that appropriations are available.

Section 3505—Improvements to the Maritime Administration Vessel Disposal Program

This section would require the Secretary of Transportation to submit to Congress, within 120 days of enactment of this Act, a comprehensive plan for management of the vessel disposal program of the Maritime Administration (MARAD) in accordance with the recommendations made in the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report titled, "Maritime Administration: Improved Program Management Needed to Address Timely Disposal of Obsolete Ships," March 2005. The GAO report found that MARAD will likely fall 100 ships short of its September 30, 2006, Congressionally-mandated deadline to dispose of most of its obsolete ship inventory. This anticipated failure is very disappointing to the committee. The reason, according to GAO, for "MARAD's slow progress is due primarily to program leaders not developing a comprehensive management approach that could address the myriad of environmental, legal, and regulatory challenges that the program faces." The committee expects that the comprehensive management plan required of MARAD will result in more rapid ship disposal, better value to the government and improved communication with Congress on mission obstacles and realistic resource needs.

The committee assumes that is it not beyond the Department of Transportation's institutional competence to develop and implement a plan to dispose of MARAD's obsolete ship inventory with transparent contracting procedures. The section requires that the plan use full and open competition to secure ship disposal services, while utilizing domestic sources to the maximum extent practicable. The committee recognizes the need to maximize competition in order to obtain the best value to the government and the value of maintaining domestic ship disposal capacity. To maintain this capacity, MARAD should consider how to promote better com-

munication and coordination with the domestic ship disposal industry as to policy making. It is expected that MARAD will not cease ship disposal during the development of the plan rather, that MARAD will continue to dispose of ships in fiscal year 2006 using the funds authorized elsewhere in this Act.

The section also provides, however, that if the Secretary of Transportation fails to submit to Congress a timely and responsive plan, he must conduct a full and open competition to select a private ship disposal integrator to procure disposal services for the Ship Disposal Office. If this becomes necessary, the committee expects that the Department will establish eligibility requirements to ensure that such a contractor have sufficient project management and industry experience to expeditiously secure the best value to the government for disposal. If the Secretary submits an acceptable plan, but fails to implement it, the Department can expect that the committee will seriously consider whether the work of the Ship Disposal Office ought to be continued in its current form.

Finally, under this section, the Secretary is required to transfer no fewer than four obsolete combatant vessels to the Navy for disposal by their disposal contractors. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee has provided the U.S. Navy's ship disposal program budget an increase of $8.0 million for a total of $19.9 million. It is anticipated that these additional funds will be used by the Navy, in part, to dispose of the obsolete combatant vessels transferred from MARAD's inventory moored at the James River, Virginia, Suisun Bay, California and Beaumont, Texas facilities. For purposes of this section the committee understands the phrase "combatant vessels" to include all former U.S. Navy ships.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

The Department of Defense requested legislation, in accordance with the program of the President, as illustrated by the correspondence set out below:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2006.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

In the coming weeks, the Department will propose a few additional legislative initiatives for inclusion in the same Bill.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to

the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. HAYNES II, *General Counsel.*

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, April 25, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Department of Defense requests that the Congress enact the enclosed National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2006.

The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. HAYNES II, *General Counsel.*

COMMITTEE POSITION

On May 19, 2005 the Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 1815, as amended, by a vote of 61–1.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUNTER: Thank you for working with me in your development of H.R. 1815, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006," specifically:

(1) Section 561, Enrollment in Overseas Schools of Defense Dependents.

(2) Section 571, Extension of HEROES.

(3) Section 563, Continuation of Impact Aid on Behalf of Certain Members Despite Change in Status of Member.

(4) Section 825, Extension of Provision regarding Javits-Wagner-O'Day.

As you know, these provisions are within the jurisdiction of the Education and the Workforce Committee. While I do not intend to seek sequential referral of H.R. 1815, the Committee does hold an interest in preserving its future jurisdiction with respect to issues raised in the aforementioned provisions and its jurisdictional pre-

rogatives should the provisions of this bill or any Senate amendments thereto be considered in a conference with the Senate. We would expect to be appointed as conferees on these provisions should a conference with the Senate arise.

Again, I thank you for working with me in developing the amendments to H.R 1815 and look forward to working with you on these issues in the future.

Sincerely,

JOHN BOEHNER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. I agree that the Committee on Education and the Workforce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUNTER: On May 18, 2005, the Committee on Armed Services ordered reported H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. As ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services, this legislation contains a number of provisions that fall within the jurisdiction on the Committee on Energy and Commerce. These provisions include the following:

Section 314. Payment of Certain Private Cleanup Costs in Connection with Defense Environmental Restoration Program.

Section 601. Increase in basic pay for fiscal year 2006.

Section 1042. Reestablishment of the EMP Commission.

Section 3201. Defense Nuclear Safety Board Authorization.

Recognizing your interest in bringing this legislation before the House expeditiously, the Committee on Energy and Commerce agrees not to seek a sequential referral of the bill. By agreeing not to seek a sequential referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce does not waive its jurisdiction over these provisions or any other provisions of the bill that may fall within its jurisdiction. In

addition, the Committee on Energy and Commerce reserves its right to seek conferees on any provisions within its jurisdiction which are considered in the House-Senate conference, and ask for your support in being accorded such conferees.

I request that you include this letter and your response as part of the report on H.R. 1815 and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

Sincerely,

JOE BARTON, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. JOE BARTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, May 18, 2005.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On May 18, 2005, the Committee on Armed Services ordered reported H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. Thank you for working closely with the Committee on Government Reform on those matters within the Committee's jurisdiction and especially for including certain provisions of H.R. 2067, the Acquisition System Improvement Act, in H.R. 1815 as reported by your Committee. I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to the consideration of H.R. 1815.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 1815, the Committee on Government Reform will not request a sequential referral of the bill. However, the Committee does so only with the understanding that this procedural route will not prejudice the Committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives in this bill or similar legislation.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Government Reform should H.R.

1815 or a similar Senate bill be considered in conference with the Senate. Finally, I request that you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Armed Services Committee Report on H.R. 1815 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

TOM DAVIS, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. TOM DAVIS,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. I agree that the Committee on Government Reform has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Government Reform is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Homeland Security in H.R. 1815, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006." The coordination of the Nation's preparedness against the threat of weapons of mass destruction within the borders of the United States—a threat that is synonymous with terrorism—is of particular jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Homeland Security, as are immigration and homeland security education initiatives. This bill contains a number of provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security, including:

- Section 347, which requires the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to report on the impact on military readiness caused by undocumented immigrants whose entry into the United States involves trespassing upon operational military ranges;
- Section 1032, which would reassign existing responsibilities for developing and carrying out a program to test the Nation's preparedness for chemical, biological, radiological, nu-

clear, and related materials from the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of Homeland Security;

• Section 1033, which would expand the responsibilities of Department of Defense domestic response teams and require the Secretary of Homeland Security to incorporate such response assets into the National Response Plan and other existing Federal response plans;

• Section 1034, which would repeal section 1412 of the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 2312), which requires the Secretary of Defense to carry out a program to provide civilian personnel of Federal, State, and local agencies with training and advice regarding the emergency response to weapons of mass destruction; and

• an amendment agreed to by the full Committee on Armed Services, which adds a Sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, should establish a National College of Homeland Security at the National Defense University.

The Committee on Homeland Security acknowledges the importance of H.R. 1815 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a claim to jurisdiction over certain provisions of the bill, I agree not to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security, and that a copy of this letter and of your response will be included in the Committee report and in the Congressional Record when the bill is considered on the House Floor.

The Committee on Homeland Security also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER COX, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER, COX,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. I agree that the Committee on Homeland Security has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Homeland Security is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIMAN: I understand that on Thursday, May 19, 2005 the Committee on Armed Services ordered favorably reported H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. The bill includes a number of provisions that fall within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations pursuant to Rule X(k) of the House of Representatives.

The provisions within our Committee's jurisdiction are: (1) Section 814, Requirement for contracting operations to be included in interagency planning related to stabilization and reconstruction; (2) Section 1021, Extension of Department of Defense authority to support counter-terrorism; (3) Section 1022, Resumption of reporting requirement regarding Department of Defense expenditures to support foreign counter-drug activities; (4) Section 1023, Clarification of authority for joint task forces to support law enforcement agencies conducting counter-terrorism activities; (5) Section 1201, Extension of humanitarian and civic assistance provided to host nations in conjunction with military operations; (6) Section 1203, Military education exchanges between senior officers and officials of the United States and Taiwan; (7) Section 1204, Modification of geographic restriction under bilateral and regional cooperation programs for payment of certain expenses of defense personnel of developing countries; (8) Section 1205, Authority for Department of Defense to enter into acquisition and cross servicing agreements with regional organizations of which the United States is not a member; (9) Section 1211, report on acquisition by Iran of nuclear weapons; (10) Section 1212, Procurement sanctions against foreign persons that transfer certain defense articles and services of the People's Republic of China; (11) Title XIII, Cooperative Threat Reduction with States of the Former Soviet Union; (12) Section 1606, Battlefield Accountability; and (13) Section 3112, Report on assistance for comprehensive inventory of Russian non-strategic nuclear weapons.

Pursuant to Chairman Dreier's announcement that the Committee on Rules will move expeditiously to consider a rule for H.R. 815 and your desire to have the bill considered on the House Floor next week, the Committee on International Relations will not seek a sequential referral of the bill as a result of including these provisions in question. I will seek to have the Speaker appoint conferees from this Committee for these provisions during any House-Senate conference committee, and I would ask your support for that request.

I would appreciate your including this letter as a part of the report on H.R. 1815 and as part of the record during consideration of the bill by the House of Representatives.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. I agree that the Committee on International Relations has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on International Relations is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 18, 2005.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUNTER: In recognition of the desire to expedite Floor consideration of H.R. 1815, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006," the Committee on the Judiciary hereby waives consideration of the bill.

There are several provisions contained in H.R. 1815 within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. Specifically, section 551 clarifies the authority of military personnel to provide limited legal assistance to members of the military. This matter falls within the Committee's jurisdiction under rule X(1)(l)(1) ("The judiciary and civil proceedings, civil and criminal"). Sections 617 and 673 contain provisions related to flexible payment of incentive pay and the repayment of unearned portions of military bonuses. In relevant part, sections 617 and 673 modify the dischargeability of specified service pay and bonuses. These matters fall within the Committee's jurisdiction under rule X(1)(l)(4) ("Bankruptcy"). Section 1043 pertains to the modernization of authority relating to security of defense property and facilities. This provision falls within the Committee's jurisdiction under rule X(1)(l)(7) ("criminal law enforcement") and rule X(1)(l)(19)("subversive activities affecting the internal security of the United States"). In addition, sections 1421, 1432, and 1443 pertain to acquisition reform at the Defense Department, and provide authority to issue regulations pertaining to newly-established contract review boards. These provisions fall under the Committee's rule X(1)(l)(2) ("Administrative practice and procedure").

The Committee on the Judiciary takes this action with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdiction over these and other provisions in the legislation are in no way altered or diminished.

I would appreciate your including this letter in your Committee's report on H.R. 1815 and the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House Floor.

Sincerely,

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr., *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. I agree that the Committee on the Judiciary has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Judiciary is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Congratulations on your successful markup of H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. You should be commended for your leadership in marshaling this important legislation through your committee.

I have reviewed the following provisions that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Resources:

- Sections 331–336, Utah Test and Training Range;
- Section 1046, technical and clerical amendments;
- Section 2813, Papago Park military reservation; and
- Section 601, as it relates to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Corps.

Because of the longstanding history of these provisions, I will not seek a sequential referral of H.R. 1815 based on their inclusion in the bill. Of course, this waiver does not prejudice any future jurisdictional claims over these provisions or similar language. I also reserve the right to seek to have conferees named from the Committee on Resources on these provisions, should a conference on H.R. 1815 or a similar measure become necessary.

Once again, it has been a pleasure to work with you and your staff. I look forward to seeing H.R. 1815 enacted soon.

Sincerely,

RICHARD W. POMBO, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. RICHARD W. POMBO,
Chairman, Committee on Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. I agree that the Committee on Resources has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Resources is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Small Business in H.R. 1815, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006."

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1815 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over certain provisions in the bill, I will agree not to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forgo a sequential referral waives, reduces, or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Small Business.

In addition, the Committee on Small Business reserves its authority to seek conferee status on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Small Business to be conferees on H.R. 1815 or related legislation.

Lastly, I request that you include this letter and your response as part of your committee's report on the bill and the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Sincerely,

DONALD A. MANZULLO, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. DONALD A. MANZULLO,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. I agree that the Committee on Small Business has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Small Business is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. DUNCAN HUNTER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in matters being considered in H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1815 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over a number of provisions of the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, that every effort will be made to include any agreements worked out by staff of our two Committees in amendments as the bill is taken to the House Floor, and that a copy of this letter and of your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2005.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

FISCAL DATA

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee attempted to ascertain annual outlays resulting from the bill during fiscal year 2006 and each of the following five fiscal years. The results of such efforts are reflected in the committee cost estimate, which is included in this report pursuant to clause 3(d)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE

Under clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives and 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the committee has requested but not received a cost estimate for this bill from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Clause 3(d)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires an estimate and a comparison by the committee of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out this bill.

H.R. 1815 would authorize appropriations of $435.8 billion for fiscal year 2006 for the activities of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the national security programs of the Department of Energy (DOE). The budget authority implication of the authorization of appropriations in H.R. 1815 is $441.6 billion. It would also authorize an additional $49.1 billion emergency appropriation for fiscal year 2006 to support Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom.

The committee estimates that enacting H.R. 1815 would not increase mandatory budget authority for fiscal year 2005 or the following five years. In terms of discretionary and mandatory budget authority, H.R. 1815 is within the allocation provided by H.Con.Res. 95, which establishes the Congressional budget for the

United States Government for fiscal year 2006 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 and 2007 through 2010.

The committee has been in close and constant consultation with the Congressional Budget Office and has provided copies of H.R. 1815 as ordered reported on May 20, 2005, to develop an estimate and comparison as required under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The committee expects to receive this letter prior to the consideration of H.R. 1815 by the House of Representatives.

OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

With respect to clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation results from hearings and other oversight activities conducted by the committee pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X and are reflected in the body of this report.

With respect to clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this legislation does not include any new spending or credit authority, nor does it provide for any increase or decrease in tax revenues or expenditures. The bill does, however, authorize appropriations. Other fiscal features of this legislation are addressed in the estimate prepared by the committee under clause 3(d)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

With respect to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation would address several general and outcome-related performance goals and objectives. The general goal and objective of this legislation is to improve the quality of life for military personnel and their families, military readiness, the modernization and eventual transformation of the armed forces, to enhance the development of ballistic missile defenses, and to improve the condition of military housing and facilities.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of improving the quality of life for military personnel and their families, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Provide a 3.1 percent across-the-board pay raise for our men and women in uniform. The raise would reduce the gap between average military and private sector pay from 5.1 percent to 4.6 percent; and

(2) Eliminate the provision to pay reservists a reduced housing allowance when mobilized to serve on active duty for greater than 30 days and less than 140 days. It also clarifies that full basic housing allowance would be paid to Reservists who are mobilized for less than 30 days in connection with a contingency operation; and

(3) Address manpower needs with an increase of 10,000 personnel in the Army and 1,000 in the Marine Corps in 2006. That would bring the Army end strength to 512,400 and the Marine Corps to 179,000. In addition, the committee would provide the Secretary of Defense with the authority to continue

to grow the Army to 532,400 and the Marine Corps to 184,000 during the 2007 through 2009 period.

With respect to the outcome-related goal of improving force protection for our troops, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Provide several billion dollars in funding for force protection initiatives, including armor for vehicles, new munitions and improvised explosive device jammers; and

With respect to the outcome-related goal of successfully prosecuting continuing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Provide an additional $49.1 billion in contingency operations supplemental funding to be appropriated for fiscal year 2006 to support the war on terrorism's operational costs, personnel expenses and the procurement of new equipment; and

With respect to the outcome-related goal of improving military housing and facilities, the objective of this legislation is to:

(1) Provide $12.1 billion for military construction and military family housing programs; and

(2) Allow the secretaries of the military departments to exchange surplus property for construction projects, land, or housing.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to rule XIII, clause 3(d)(1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee finds the authority for this legislation in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL MANDATES

Pursuant to section 423 of Public Law 104–4, this legislation contains no federal mandates with respect to state, local, and tribal governments, nor with respect to the private sector. Similarly, the bill provides no federal intergovernmental mandates.

RECORD VOTES

In accordance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, record and voice votes were taken with respect to the committee's consideration of H.R. 1815. The record of these votes is attached to this report.

The committee ordered H.R. 1815 reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 61–1, a quorum being present.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
109TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 54 **Date: 5/18/05**

Description: **Annual disclosure of certain contract information by financial management modernization committee**

Offered by: McKinney

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Taylor			
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Reyes			
Mr. Thornberry		X		Dr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Hostettler				Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Jones		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Ryun (KS)		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Gibbons		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Hayes		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Calvert		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Simmons		X		Ms. Davis (CA)	X		
Mrs. Davis (VA)		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Israel	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Miller (FL)		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Wilson				Mr. Marshall	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Meek	X		
Mr. Bradley		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Ryan (OH)	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Mr. Udall	X		
Mrs. Miller (MI)		X		Mr. Butterfield	X		
Mr. Rogers		X		Ms. McKinney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Boren	X		
Mr. Shuster		X					
Mrs. Drake		X					
Dr. Schwarz		X					
Ms. McMorris		X					
Mr. Conaway		X					
Mr. Davis (KY)							

Roll Call Vote Total: **26 Aye** **31 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
109TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 29 **Date: 05/18/05**

Description: **Operational test & evaluation of BMD systems to be fielded** **Offered by: Tauscher**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Dr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Jones				Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Ryun (KS)		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Gibbons		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Hayes		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Calvert		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Simmons		X		Ms. Davis (CA)	X		
Mrs. Davis (VA)		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Israel	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Miller (FL)		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Marshall	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Meek			
Mr. Bradley		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Ryan (OH)	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Mr. Udall	X		
Mrs. Miller (MI)		X		Mr. Butterfield	X		
Mr. Rogers		X		Ms. McKinney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Boren	X		
Mr. Shuster		X					
Mrs. Drake		X					
Dr. Schwarz		X					
Ms. McMorris		X					
Mr. Conaway		X					
Mr. Davis (KY)		X					

Roll Call Vote Total: **27 Aye** **33 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
109TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 30 **Date: 05/18/05**

Description: **Termination of 2005 BRAC round & prohibition on closure of any installation** **Offered by: Bradley**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Skelton		X	
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Spratt		X	
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Meehan		X	
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry		X		Dr. Snyder		X	
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Jones		X		Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Ryun (KS)		X		Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Gibbons		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Hayes		X		Mr. Brady			
Mr. Calvert		X		Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Simmons	X			Ms. Davis (CA)		X	
Mrs. Davis (VA)	X			Mr. Langevin			
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Israel		X	
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Miller (FL)		X		Mr. Cooper			
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Marshall		X	
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Meek		X	
Mr. Bradley	X			Ms. Bordallo			
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Ryan (OH)		X	
Mr. Kline		X		Mr. Udall		X	
Mrs. Miller (MI)		X		Mr. Butterfield		X	
Mr. Rogers		X		Ms. McKinney		X	
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Boren		X	
Mr. Shuster		X					
Mrs. Drake		X					
Dr. Schwarz		X					
Ms. McMorris		X					
Mr. Conaway		X					
Mr. Davis (KY)		X					

Roll Call Vote Total: **50 Aye** **8 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
109TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 16 **Date: 05/18/05**

Description: **Report on plan for overseas military facilities** **Offered by: Meehan**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Reyes			
Mr. Thornberry		X		Dr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Jones		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Ryun (KS)		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Gibbons		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Hayes		X		Mr. Brady			
Mr. Calvert		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Simmons		X		Ms. Davis (CA)	X		
Mrs. Davis (VA)		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Israel	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Miller (FL)		X		Mr. Cooper			
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Marshall		X	
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Meek	X		
Mr. Bradley		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Ryan (OH)	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Mr. Udall	X		
Mrs. Miller (MI)		X		Mr. Butterfield	X		
Mr. Rogers		X		Ms. McKinney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Boren	X		
Mr. Shuster		X					
Mrs. Drake		X					
Dr. Schwarz		X					
Ms. McMorris		X					
Mr. Conaway		X					
Mr. Davis (KY)		X					

Roll Call Vote Total: **24 Aye** **35 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
109TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 2 2 **Date: 05/18/05**

Description: **DOD medical facilities to perform abortions overseas** **Offered by: Davis (CA)**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Skelton		X	
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Ortiz		X	
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Taylor		X	
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Dr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Smith			
Mr. Jones		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Ryun (KS)		X		Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Gibbons		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Hayes		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Calvert		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Simmons	X			Ms. Davis (CA)	X		
Mrs. Davis (VA)		X		Mr. Langevin			
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Israel	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Miller (FL)		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Marshall		X	
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Meek	X		
Mr. Bradley	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Ryan (OH)		X	
Mr. Kline		X		Mr. Udall	X		
Mrs. Miller (MI)		X		Mr. Butterfield		X	
Mr. Rogers		X		Ms. McKinney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Boren		X	
Mr. Shuster		X					
Mrs. Drake		X					
Dr. Schwarz		X					
Ms. McMorris		X					
Mr. Conaway		X					
Mr. Davis (KY)		X					

Roll Call Vote Total: **19 Aye** **41 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
109TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 97 **Date: 05/18/05**

Description: **TRICARE for reservists on a permanent basis** **Offered by: Taylor**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Dr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Jones	X			Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Ryun (KS)		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Gibbons		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Hayes		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Calvert		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Simmons	X			Ms. Davis (CA)	X		
Mrs. Davis (VA)	X			Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Israel	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr Miller (FL)		X		Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Marshall		X	
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Meek	X		
Mr. Bradley	X			Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Ryan (OH)	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Mr. Udall	X		
Mrs. Miller (MI)		X		Mr. Butterfield	X		
Mr. Rogers		X		Ms. McKinney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Boren	X		
Mr. Shuster		X					
Mrs. Drake		X					
Dr. Schwarz	X						
Ms. McMorris		X					
Mr. Conaway		X					
Mr. Davis (KY)		X					

Roll Call Vote Total: **32 Aye** **30 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
108TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 91 **Date: 05/18/05**

Description: **2nd degree amendment to McHugh #34** **Offered by: Snyder**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Dr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Jones		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Ryun (KS)		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Gibbons	X			Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Hayes		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Calvert		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Simmons	X			Ms. Davis (CA)	X		
Mrs. Davis (VA)		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Israel	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Miller (FL)		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Marshall	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Meek	X		
Mr. Bradley		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Ryan (OH)	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Mr. Udall	X		
Mrs. Miller (MI)		X		Mr. Butterfield	X		
Mr. Rogers		X		Ms. McKinney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Boren	X		
Mr. Shuster		X					
Mrs. Drake		X					
Dr. Schwarz		X					
Ms. McMorris		X					
Mr. Conaway		X					
Mr. Davis (KY)		X					

Roll Call Vote Total:

30 Aye **32 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
108TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 92 **Date: 05/18/05**

Description: DRL to McHugh #33 **Offered by: Snyder**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry	X			Dr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Jones		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Ryun (KS)		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Gibbons		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Hayes		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Calvert		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Simmons		X		Ms. Davis (CA)	X		
Mrs. Davis (VA)		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Israel	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Miller (FL)		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Marshall	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Meek	X		
Mr. Bradley		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Ryan (OH)	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Mr. Udall	X		
Mrs. Miller (MI)		X		Mr. Butterfield	X		
Mr. Rogers		X		Ms. McKinney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Boren	X		
Mr. Shuster		X					
Mrs. Drake		X					
Dr. Schwarz		X					
Ms. McMorris		X					
Mr. Conaway		X					
Mr. Davis (KY)		X					

Roll Call Vote Total:

29 Aye 33 Nay Present

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
108TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Final Passage of H. R. 1815 **Date: 05/19/05**
as Amended

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. McHugh	X			Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Everett	X			Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry	X			Dr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Jones	X			Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Ryun (KS)	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Gibbons	X			Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Hayes	X			Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Calvert	X			Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Simmons	X			Ms. Davis (CA)	X		
Mrs. Davis (VA)	X			Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Israel	X		
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Miller (FL)	X			Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Marshall	X		
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Meek	X		
Mr. Bradley	X			Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Ryan (OH)	X		
Mr. Kline	X			Mr. Udall	X		
Mrs. Miller (MI)	X			Mr. Butterfield	X		
Mr. Rogers	X			Ms. McKinney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Boren	X		
Mr. Shuster	X						
Mrs. Drake	X						
Dr. Schwarz	X						
Ms. McMorris	X						
Mr. Conaway	X						
Mr. Davis (KY)	X						

Roll Call Vote Total:

61 Aye **1 Nay** **Present**

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

The committee intends to take steps to make available the analysis of changes in existing law made by the bill, as required by clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

The 2006 defense authorization bill is a good one that makes advances on a variety of issues. We are pleased that the committee worked largely in accordance with its bipartisan tradition and that important initiatives were debated seriously. Our concerns associated with the provision on women in the military are addressed separately. A few of the bill's other provisions warrant special mention here.

Personnel benefits

We are gratified that the Committee was able to include provisions increasing Army end strength by 30,000 and Marine Corps end strength by 4,000. We are also pleased that these increases are paid for but believe they should be funded in the base defense bill rather than in the separately authorized "bridge" supplemental fund.

Increases in recruiting and retention incentives, such as special pays and reenlistment bonuses are particularly important because of the difficult recruiting environment the services are experiencing, and the Committee was wise to include such provisions. Similarly, the adoption of Mr. Butterfield's amendment providing that unemployable disabled retirees may receive both military retired pay and VA disability compensation is a vital step in ensuring that these veterans are not penalized by virtue of their military service. The Spratt amendment to ensure that service members serving in Iraq and Afghanistan have the option of $250,000 worth of no-cost life insurance is another beneficial action to ensure that service members who sacrifice so much for our great nation are adequately provided for. Finally, we regret that the Committee did not adopt the amendment offered by Mr. Andrews that would have established a $100,000 death gratuity for the families of service members who are killed, regardless of whether the death occurs in a combat zone or not.

National Defense Panel

The Department's ongoing Quadrennial Defense Review is likely to be the most significant QDR conducted by the Department of Defense. It will be the first to take full account of the global war on terrorism and of lessons learned from the war in Iraq. It must also deal with the coming budgetary trade-offs among weapons programs and between those programs and the people who serve. Because of the scope of the review and the magnitude and impact of its potential recommendations, Congress would benefit from an alternative view—a group of experts reporting directly to Congress who could both review the Department's work and offer competing analysis and recommendations where necessary.

Mr. Skelton and Mr. Thornberry's amendment to create a National Defense Panel would have done just that. It would have provided Congress with a valuable set of perspectives on issues of force structure, force sizing, and programmatic trade-offs and would have helped the Armed Services Committee make more informed decisions while conducting oversight and developing legislation. The Panel would not have been a substitute for, but a complement to, the committee's own oversight activities. We appreciate the Chairman's pledge to conduct vigorous analysis and oversight through a committee panel on these matters, but believe that the independent National Defense Panel would have benefited the Armed Services Committee's efforts.

Nonproliferation policy

During the 2004 Presidential campaign, both candidates agreed that the greatest risk to American national security is that posed by a terrorist acquiring nuclear weapons. The Cooperative Threat Reduction programs of the Department of Defense and the Nuclear Nonproliferation programs of the Department of Energy are critical for preventing this catastrophic outcome. They are cost-effective programs for dealing with a threat of this magnitude. The bipartisan Baker-Cutler Task Force recommended in 2001 that the United States should be spending $3 billion annually on these programs for the next ten years. Yet the budget request for these two departments this year is approximately $2 billion. From that figure, the Armed Services Committee cut $122 million for the mixed oxide fuel construction project at Savannah River.

The amendment offered by Mr. Spratt would have modestly increased funding for nonproliferation programs in the Departments of Defense and Energy by $80 million. It would have restored CTR funding to the level it was at before September 11, 2001—a wise move considering the threat of illicit materials getting into the hands of terrorists. It also would have increased funding in the Department of Energy for several activities that would greatly reduce the proliferation risk: putting foreign scientists to work in nonweapons activities, enhancing export controls to prevent the movement of dangerous materials or weapons; repatriating Russian-origin highly-enriched uranium from vulnerable research reactors while converting some of these reactors to using low enriched uranium; and for securing and facilitating the disposal of vulnerable nuclear material located in countries of high proliferation concern. All of this would have been accomplished with a modest decrease from the ground-based mid-course missile defense system that would have limited the number of silos at Fort Greeley to 26. This amendment would have still provided a preliminary missile defense capability while taking important steps to decrease the risk posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We hope that the committee's action will be reversed on the floor.

Ballistic missile defense

While ballistic missile defense (BMD) is an important mission, we believe that the resources devoted to it are out of proportion to the likelihood of the threat. We were therefore disappointed that the Spratt amendment to increase non-proliferation programs by

transferring a modest $80 million from the ground-based midcourse system—which has not had a successful intercept test flight since October, 2002—was rejected on a party-line vote. We are also puzzled by the party-line rejection of the Tauscher Amendment requiring the Office of Operational Test and Evaluation (OT&E) to devise the test plans for BMD systems being deployed rather than the Missile Defense Agency. Independent OT&E is standard operating procedure for every other major weapon system. We are encouraged that the Senate adopted language similar to the Tauscher Amendment in its version of the bill, and we will work for its enactment in conference.

Authorization of supplemental appropriations

We also want to note that the Committee in this bill authorizes almost $50 billion in fiscal year 2006 supplemental appropriations for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the global war on terror. These are funds separate and apart from the $440-plus billion dollars we are authorizing as a part of the regular fiscal year 2006 defense budget request.

Our concern is that the conflicts for which we are authorizing this additional money are mature enough that their costs are foreseeable and should be included in the regular budget request—they should not be authorized as a supplemental or "bridge" fund. Mr. Abercrombie's amendment in committee made this point.

Budgeting in this fashion has adverse consequences. First, by paying for the war by supplemental appropriations, the Department of Defense has not had as much "up front" money as it has needed to properly equip our troops with body armor, vehicle armor and other equipment to protect them from insurgent attacks. Budgeting for the war by supplemental effectively causes the services to "rob Peter to pay Paul" until supplementals are approved, and important activities like training have had to be postponed.

Second, the "emergency" designation that goes along with supplemental appropriations hides the true extent of the federal budget deficit because these expenses are not counted against the regular defense budget for the year in which they occur, but they do increase the size of the actual deficit. This is not the way we should be paying for these costs of war.

Although we may disagree with the practice of funding operations in Iraq and Afghanistan through supplemental appropriations, if we are going to go down this road, then it is important that we not short-circuit the authorization process. The effort to prescribe the purposes to which this money should be put and to limit the extent to which items unrelated to the war on terrorism are included is important. Unfortunately, when supplemental appropriations do not go through the authorization process, there has been a disappointing trend to include extraneous, parochial items.

America is a nation at war. The fiscal year 2006 defense authorization bill recognizes that exigency and provides those who protect America with many of the tools they need to do the job. We look forward to improving the bill even further as the legislative process moves forward.

IKE SKELTON.
LANE EVANS.

JOHN SPRATT.
MARTY MEEHAN.
LORETTA SANCHEZ.
SILVESTRE REYES.
JIM COOPER.
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO.
JIM LANGEVIN.
STEVE ISRAEL.
TIM RYAN.
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER.
NEIL ABERCROMBIE.
ADAM SMITH.
ROBERT A. BRADY.
VIC SNYDER.
RICK LARSEN.
MARK E. UDALL.
SUSAN A. DAVIS.
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ.
KENDRICK B. MEEK.
MIKE MCINTYRE.
ROBERT E. ANDREWS.
G.K. BUTTERFIELD.
GENE TAYLOR.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

We are disappointed that H.R. 1815 includes Section 574, policies designed to restrict the participation of women in our military. Although purportedly a mere codification of existing policy, what Congress is really saying to our brave women currently serving throughout the world is that it has seen the quality of their service and found it lacking. This is a terribly disrespectful message to send to our troops, especially in time of war. Worst of all, it is completely unfounded. Military women have and continue to serve with honor and distinction in the roles they've been assigned under the existing policy. They are outstanding service members serving equally alongside their male brothers-in-arms. In short, this is a provision that rolls back advances women have made in the armed services and will limit the future role of women in the military.

We found the circumstances surrounding the introduction of this issue and adoption of this language troubling in terms of both process and substance.

In terms of process, it is important to note that the Military Personnel Subcommittee has held no hearings this year on the topic of the role of female service members in our military. Neither has the Committee undertaken any sort of systematic study or analysis of this issue. We are not even aware of any anecdotal evidence suggesting that the current policy's implementation has been problematic in any respect. In short, we have seen no indication that a problem with the integration of women in the armed forces exists, let alone one that would warrant such a sweeping legislative solution.

The original amendment offered during the Military Personnel Subcommittee mark-up was made available to committee Democrats only the night before. This practice was repeated when a new, full committee amendment was unveiled the night before full committee mark up. Such actions, apparently intended to constrain our ability to address the issue as comprehensively as it deserved, are unfair, make for a less informed debate and do a disservice to both the institution and the country.

We are mindful of our constitutionally-mandated oversight role concerning the armed forces. We can responsibly exercise that role only when fully informed and properly prepared. An issue with such wide ranging impact as this deserves the full attention of the committee and the benefit of the complete oversight process, both of which were sadly lacking in this instance.

In terms of substance, the amendment offered in the Military Personnel Subcommittee applied only to the Army. It was seriously flawed. It referenced "Forward Support Companies" which is a term of art referring to a very specific type of Army unit. Those units were defined so broadly that the Army estimated that over 20,000 women soldiers would be precluded from serving in many

of the units in which they are currently serving—units that are making a huge contribution to the war in Iraq and the global war on terrorism. Both the Secretary of the Army and the Army Vice Chief of Staff wrote the committee voicing their strong opposition to this amendment. Nevertheless, the provision passed in subcommittee by party line vote.

During full committee mark up, we were surprised to see that the scope of the amendment had been expanded from applying only to the Army to now applying to women in all the military services. The amendment adopted in full committee is ostensibly meant to codify an existing policy based on a memorandum authored by Secretary of Defense Les Aspin in January 1994. However, there are some key differences between that memorandum and the provision now in this bill.

First, we do not think it is advisable to make statutory changes at this time without further study and deliberation. Codifing existing policies at this time without further study and deliberation is to limit the flexibility our military commanders require at the very time when they need it most—in time of war. They need to be able to adapt to changing battlefield conditions. The modern battlefield has changed so that there is no longer a clear distinction between the front lines and what has traditionally been regarded as relatively secure rear areas. By codifying the kinds of units in which service by women is forbidden and then further providing that these units "shall remain closed to the assignment of female members," it will now be much more difficult to adjust to this changed operational environment because a statutory change will be required every time a service wants to move women into a unit now on the prohibited list, regardless of whether the role of that type of unit has changed or what that type of unit is doing operationally. It is particularly unwise to inhibit flexibility in the case of the Army, because that service is undergoing a major force structure realignment. Although we cannot now say for sure what operational impact this provision will have, we believe that it will have an adverse effect on units in the field.

We note that the Army has evolved its tactics so that units where women serve can provide necessary support to combat units and still comply with existing policies regarding women in combat. Should this measure be passed into law, it will create serious complications for our units currently engaged in missions around the world. Those units will have to be significantly reorganized in order to comply with a new directive that requires "particular care to minimally expose female members of that service, either by doctrine or employment, to direct ground combat." Operations, including those in Iraq and Afghanistan, will be hindered as the Army develops new procedures and tactics to comply with this mandate. Unit readiness may be degraded as women are forced to leave units in which they currently serve. It is clear that it can only serve to constrain our commanders and in so doing, put our soldiers at risk. This new requirement further belies the assertion that only a codification of current policy is intended.

Secondly, the eleven year old Aspin policy was obviously meant to be a starting point for the role of women in the military. In what can only be a conscious omission on the part of those who drafted

the instant provision, the sentence "The Services will use this guidance to expand opportunities for women" was not included in the text of the amendment. What was once intended to be the base line from which advances were expected is now the limit beyond which no advance can be made without a further change in law. We believe that this will exacerbate an already difficult recruiting and retention environment.

Women play a key role in manning our forces. The message that the country does not value their service may well drive qualified women out of the service and away from already struggling recruiters. When the Army struggles to make its recruiting goal as it has recently, we need every qualified person who will consider serving. The message the bill's language sends can only compound the nation's already difficult challenge to fill the ranks.

The bottom line is that women have a long and distinguished record of military service to the country. Changes to their current role should be undertaken only after full analysis and careful deliberation. Process concerns aside, the language in this bill is nothing more than a clever attempt to roll back the current role of women in our military. We are concerned that confusion and uncertainty will be created within the ranks of our military during a time of war, battlefield operations may suffer, recruiting and retention may be made more difficult, and service members' lives may even be put at risk. The committee should be affirming the nation's commitment to and admiration of the quality, fidelity, and dedication of all our service members. It is troubling and sad that the majority has pursued such a misguided course.

IKE SKELTON.
VIC SNYDER.
JOHN SPRATT.
SILVESTRE REYES.
LORETTA SANCHEZ.
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER.
RICK LARSEN.
LANE EVANS.
DAN BOREN.
KENDRICK B. MEEK.
JIM COOPER.
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO.
JIM LANGEVIN.
STEVE ISRAEL.
MARTY MEEHAN.
NEIL ABERCROMBIE.
ADAM SMITH.
ROBERT A. BRADY.
MARK E. UDALL.
SUSAN A. DAVIS.
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ.
TIM RYAN.
ROBERT E. ANDREWS.
G.K. BUTTERFIELD.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

Committee Democrats believe that the provisions of H.R. 1815 addressing the Reliable Replacement Warhead and the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator are both steps in the right direction, but fall short of supporting a sensible, coherent strategy for nuclear weapons.

Reliable Replacement Warhead

The Administration included the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) program in its budget request this year for the first time, but provided scant justification for it. H.R. 1815 sets a legislative charter for the RRW program that includes several objectives included at our behest. From our perspective, the most significant of these are that the RRW should:

- Further reduce the likelihood of resuming nuclear testing;
- Rely on designs and components proven through testing as much as practicable;
- Achieve reductions beyond those currently envisioned for the nuclear stockpile;
- Not be used to produce warheads for new nuclear missions;
- Improve safety and security mechanisms on our warheads; and
- Be cost-effective and affordable.

As part of the stated rationale for the RRW program, the National Nuclear Security Administration has expressed concern that accumulated changes in aging weapons components could lead to inadequate performance margins and reduced confidence in the stockpile. This conjectural argument cannot and should not be dismissed, but we note that the NNSA also has stated that the Stockpile Stewardship program is working and that NNSA judges all of the performance margins of individual weapon types in the enduring stockpile to be adequate. Prominent scientific advisory panels have noted that there are opportunities for further enhancing weapon performance margins, such as adjusting the boost gas components during regularly scheduled maintenance.

Given the current satisfactory performance margins of the enduring stockpile and the lack of an immediate need for a new RRW warhead, Democrats strongly believe that the NNSA should exercise rigorous self-discipline and utilize designs and components that are well understood or have been previously been proven through testing. The RRW program should not be used as an excuse to resume nuclear testing. The statutory objectives to further reduce the likelihood of resuming nuclear testing and to rely upon designs and components that have been proven through testing were included at our insistence.

We were disappointed that the majority could not agree that the ultimate objective of the RRW program should be to help ensure

ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). If the RRW program is successful, technical uncertainty about the reliability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal should be erased. Consequently, the main rationale against the CTBT—that testing must be reserved as an option against technical uncertainty—will be removed. We believe strongly that ratification of the CTBT is the logical end-result of a successful RRW program, yet the committee majority adamantly refused to include ratification of the CTBT as an objective of the program.

Democrats are willing to explore the concept of the RRW program, but do not yet embrace it. In our opinion, the RRW program is only worth of support if it:

- Truly reduces or eliminates altogether the need for nuclear testing;
- Leads to dramatic reductions in the nuclear arsenal, including complete dismantlement of the weapons and safe disposal of fissile components;
- Does not introduce new mission or new weapon requirements, particularly for tactical military purposes;
- Reduces the reliance of the U.S. on nuclear weapons and de-emphasizes the military utility of nuclear weapons;
- Significantly reduces the cost of maintaining our nuclear weapon complex, to include avoiding the need to build a modern pit facility;
- Increases nuclear security and decreases the risk of unauthorized or accidental launch and/or detonation; and
- Leads to ratification and entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

The charter we have agreed to in H.R. 1815 points in the direction of these objectives, but not as explicitly as we would have preferred. We will continue to work with our colleagues to shape the RRW program to meet the above objectives, which we consider to be the foundation of a sensible nuclear strategy for our nation. It is important to bear in mind that the RRW program is simply a concept at this stage. Congress will not be in a position to know if the RRW program can meet these ambitious objectives until the Administration spells out its programmatic details. Many of the specific reporting requirements in the bill were included at our behest in order to produce a full accounting of the objectives, methods, and costs of the RRW program. We will reserve final judgment on the RRW program until we can evaluate this information.

Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator

Similarly, the committee Democrats appreciate the fact that the majority took the "Nuclear" portion out of the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator or "RNEP" program. Nonetheless, we are concerned that the committee report language is written vaguely enough that conventional testing of penetration weapons could be used as a proxy to inform nuclear applications as well.

Committee Democrats recognize the increasing proliferation of hard and deeply buried targets (HDBTs) and strongly support efforts to hold these facilities at risk and, if necessary, to defeat them militarily. However, we believe that conventional means of holding HDBTs at risk are inherently more credible than nuclear options

and also hold greater promise of military utility if used. Therefore, we believe the nation's security interests are best served by focusing our limited resources on conventional options.

The committee report as it currently stands supports a sled test that can "evaluate the feasibility of various options for different types of penetrators." This language could be construed to allow the sled test to inform whether a nuclear payload could be used in high-speed penetration of hard geologies. Moving the RNEP sled test out of the Department of Energy budget and into the Air Force budget strongly indicates the committee's preference for conventional payload penetration testing, but we believe the Congress should go even further. This sled test should be conducted in a manner that only informs conventional payloads, and if this is not technically feasible, there should be no further work in designing modified or new nuclear weapon designs based on the sled test data. We will strive to include this language in conference with the Senate.

H.R. 1815 as currently written also includes $4.5 million to evaluate how to integrate a conceptual nuclear "bunker buster" onto the B–2 bomber. We believe it is premature to begin integration engineering efforts for a weapon that should never be designed and, at a minimum, is years away from being designed. The committee's decision to delete RNEP funding from the Department of Energy request and re-orient the nature of the sled test to conventional penetrating weapons further undermines the rationale for this request. In order to maintain comity within the committee, we did not offer formal amendments to H.R. 1815 to delete this funding. We plan to work with our colleagues, however, during the remainder of the legislative process to find a better use of this $4.5 million.

Committee Democrats believe that the pursuit of a tactical nuclear RNEP impedes the nation's non-proliferation goals and undermines the security of the United States by increasing the appeal of nuclear weapons. It reduces the ability of our nation to build a global consensus against the development or potential use of nuclear weapons by our enemies or aspiring nuclear powers. It also undercuts our ability to orchestrate collective action against rogue nations or terrorists seeking to acquire nuclear weapons.

The timing of the Administration's request for funds for the RNEP is particularly sensitive given the current review of and efforts to strengthen the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The committee should send a clear signal that it in no way supports or approves an earth-penetrating nuclear warhead. While we are pleased to note that H.R 1815 moves in this direction, we will strive for further changes in this direction during the House-Senate conference on this bill.

IKE SKELTON.
SILVESTRE REYES.
JOHN SPRATT.
LORETTA SANCHEZ.
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER.
MARTY MEEHAN.
NEIL ABERCROMBIE.
TIM RYAN.

KENDRICK B. MEEK.
ADAM SMITH.
ROBERT A. BRADY.
VIC SNYDER.
RICK LARSEN.
ROBERT E. ANDREWS.
LANE EVANS.
JIM LANGEVIN.
STEVE ISRAEL.
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO.
MARK E. UDALL.
SUSAN A. DAVIS.
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ.
GENE TAYLOR.
G.K. BUTTERFIELD.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVES TERRY EVERETT, CURT WELDON, AND MIKE D. ROGERS HASC MARKUP FISCAL YEAR 2006 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES (A&AS) CONTRACTS

We commend Chairman Duncan Hunter's efforts to reform our acquisition process. These reforms are sorely needed and we look forward to working with him to implement these important policy changes.

We would like to bring to the committee's attention an issue that has been recently brought to our attention. In Section 813 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, Congress permitted extensions of performance periods for Multiyear Task and Delivery Order Contracts. However, this provision did not apply to advisory and assistance services (A&AS) contracts.

Some have argued that allowing A&AS contracts to have the same treatment as Multiyear Task and Delivery Order Contracts would save the government valuable dollars by not forcing a recompetition every 5 years. Additionally, they claim although they have different classifications that they perform the same type of work. However, others have told us that this extension should not apply to A&AS contracts in order to ensure proper oversight and to maintain the highest quality of performance for the government.

Due to the fact that these concerns were not brought to our attention until the authorization process was well underway, I would encourage the members to carefully review these issues as we go along with the hope of revisiting them in the future.

TERRY EVERETT.
CURT WELDON.
MIKE D. ROGERS.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

During Committee consideration of the Defense Authorization bill, I introduced an amendment to add $80 million dollars for Department of Defense (DoD) and Department of Energy (DOE) nonproliferation programs. To offset this expense, I would have cut premature, unneeded elements of the Groundbased Midcourse Defense (GMD) program. This amendment lost 33–27 in committee on a straight party line vote—a disappointing result on an issue that should enjoy widespread bipartisan support.

Last year during the Presidential debates, President Bush and Senator Kerry agreed on one thing—that the greatest threat facing the United States today was nuclear weapons in the hands of terrorists. Nonproliferation programs are our front line in this effort. In January, 2001, the Baker-Cutler task force recommended increasing non-proliferation funding under DOE to $3 billion per year for the next 10 years. They claimed: "The most urgent unmet national security threat to the United States today is the danger that weapons of mass destruction or weapons-usable materials in Russia could be stolen and sold to terrorists or hostile nation states and used against American troops abroad or citizens at home."

This year (4 years later), DOE's and DoD's non-proliferation budgets only contain $1.9 billion combined for nuclear nonproliferation. This is simply not enough. My amendment would have chipped away at this problem, bringing the total for non-proliferation to nearly $2 billion this year. The amendment was modest in sum and targeted at areas with real unmet funding needs.

First, it provided $27.9 million for Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR, or Nunn-Lugar), the United States' flagship program for securing, deactivating, and disposing of weapons of mass destruction in the Former Soviet Union. Since 1991, the CTR program has deactivated 6,564 warheads, destroyed 570 ICBMs, eliminated 543 SLBMs, eliminated 142 bombers, and dealt with a host of other potentially threatening missile and nuclear components. Unfortunately, the program has been virtually flat-funded since its inception. This year, the chairman's mark provides $416 million for CTR. This is $27.9 million below the money provided in 2001—pre September 11th. The terrorist threat has certainly not diminished since September 11th; it seems to me unthinkable to spend less money on CTR. My amendment would have plussed up the CTR budget to equal pre-September 11th levels with special focus on upgrading security at Russian nuclear weapon storage sites. DoD has indicated that to get all the nuclear security upgrades done at Russian sites that need it will cost $150 million more per year for the next five to seven years. My amendment was a down payment on this total.

My amendment also would have provided $52.1 million for DOE Nonproliferation programs. Because of the cut to the Mixed Oxide Fuel program in the Chairman's mark, the nonproliferation budget for DOE was decreased $122 million below the President's budget request. My amendment would have added back almost half of that total. This was a targeted investment in programs that have a proven record of success, including:

- $3 million for export controls to prevent sensitive technology from falling into the wrong hands—bringing the total to last year's appropriated level;
- $3 million for employing Russian nuclear scientists to make sure they don't go work for terrorists or rogue regimes, bring the total to last year's appropriated level;
- $14 million for the Russian Research Reactor Fuel Return program, doubling the President's budget request, to repatriate Russian-origin Highly Enriched Uranium from vulnerable research reactors around the globe and assist countries to convert their research reactors from weapons grade uranium to Low Enriched Uranium; and
- $32.1 million in additional funding to identify, secure, recover, and facilitate the disposal of high risk, vulnerable nuclear material located in countries of high proliferation concern.

My amendment was offset by decreasing the overall budget for Groundbased Midcourse Defense (GMD) by $80 million. This still left an increase for GMD of $45 million over the budget request.

The $80 million in savings would have been achieved simply by limiting the number of silos at Fort Greely to 26. Combined with the 4 silos at Vandenberg Air Force Base California, the amendment allowed the unimpeded deployment of 30 ground-based interceptors (GBIs). The MDA is planning to provide 34 silos for the first 30 GBIs; the four extra silos are for "swing space." At $15.8 million per silo, this is an unnecessary luxury. The amendment assumed $60 million can be saved by eliminating these four extra silos.

The FY 2006 budget request also includes $20.7 million for a "downpayment" on 10 additional silos (which would mean a total of 44 silos at Greely and Vandenberg for the first 40 GBIs). The majority's mark cut 5 of the next 10 missiles, but made no corresponding cut to the silos that would house them. My amendment would have taken out this unneeded money.

Nonproliferation programs have a proven track record of success, and there is no better way to stop terrorists from getting their hands on nuclear weapons than securing and disposing of nuclear material at its source. By contrast, Groundbased Midcourse Defense has not been sufficiently tested, and in two of the last three tests, the missile has not even left the tube.

It is not difficult to see that the risk of a terrorist bringing a nuclear weapon over the border is far greater than the risk of a rogue nation hitting us with a missile. By rejecting my amendment, the Majority has chosen to invest in the remote risk rather than addressing the threat looking us square in the eye.

JOHN SPRATT.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF JIM GIBBONS

Noting for the record; as a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee I would like to state my opposition to the amendment offered by Congressman John McHugh of New York to ban female soldiers from serving in certain support units. This was an effort to keep women out of "direct ground combat". It is unfortunate these amendments were voted on and approved by the House Armed Services Committee as part of the 2006 Defense Authorization Bill.

It has been from my personal military experience that female soldiers perform remarkably well in the most difficult of circumstances. It is my belief that as long as a female passes the same standards as their male counterparts, there should be no discrimination regarding job assignments in the military.

Additionally, banning women from these critical support roles comes at one of the worst possible times, as a result of the ongoing developments in the Global War on Terror. With recruitment levels low, Congress needs to look at ways to more effectively utilize the existing human resources of the military, as opposed to limiting them. In addition, senior Army leadership has expressed deep concerns, saying that if this provision is adopted than it is possible that over 21,000 positions could be limited Army leadership has also relayed that the changes could cause a great deal of confusion within the military's ranks.

Banning women from the current positions simply sends the wrong message at the wrong time. Women have performed admirably in these positions for several years now. I see no reason to change this policy at this time. For these reasons, I did not support either of the McHugh amendments.

JIM GIBBONS.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my concern with Mr. Taylor's amendment to expand TRICARE coverage for reserve component personnel.

Let me first be clear in saying that my vote against increasing health care coverage for reservists is in no way a reflection of my feelings toward our reserve personnel. I have the utmost respect and admiration for these individuals and the sacrifices they and their families have made for our nation, especially during the ongoing conflict in Iraq. The men and women of the reserve, and their families, deserve our nation's heart felt gratitude for their dedication to the cause of advancing freedom and keeping our nation safe and secure.

My concern with this proposal stems from a matter of policy. Proponents of this amendment, while they were well intentioned, did not present the relevant facts and analysis necessary to make an informed decision of this magnitude. My first and foremost concern is that the cost for this proposal is unknown. All that was offered to assess the cost was a dated CBO estimate that provides a guess at the expenses for the first year of coverage. What we do not know; however, is how accurate this estimate is, how much these costs will add up to in the long run, or how to pay for this mandatory entitlement.

In offering this amendment, Mr. Taylor proposed to pay for the first $180,000,000 of first year coverage out of the $1.9 billion that was originally allocated for the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process. In passing this provision, we reduced the resources available to communities to aid in the BRAC transition process. I believe it is shortsighted to divert this money that will desperately be needed by communities to deal with the closure of military installations and the loss of jobs and economic impact the closures will have.

Additionally, I believe that we need to consider the effect this provision will have on the parity between the reserve and active duty components. While we certainly want to compensate our reservists for their commitment and service, we need to be careful not to eliminate the benefit differences between the components. As citizen-soldiers, reservists have options not available to active duty personnel.

A related concern centers on whether employers may opt to drop health care coverage for employees in the reserve if they know that coverage will be extended by the federal government. There is a significant financial incentive to drop coverage when premiums for TRICARE family coverage are compared to employer premiums. There are no safeguards built in to prevent employer abuse of the system.

I understand the desire to provide additional benefits for our reservists that are being deployed multiple times or for extended periods during this current conflict. The intent is admirable and I, too, support efforts to protect these individuals from difficulties caused by their service. However, I do not believe that it is prudent to rush to create a new entitlement with no forethought on what the ultimate impact will be on the budget and the structure of our armed forces.

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SUSAN A. DAVIS

I am concerned and disappointed by Section 1014 of the Committee's bill, which circumvents normal procedures by directing the Navy to transfer a decommissioned battleship, the U.S.S. IOWA (BB–61), to the Port of Stockton, California.

In most circumstances, Section 7306 of title 10 provides for the transfer of vessels which have been stricken from the Naval Vessel Register. Section 7306 provides the Secretary of the Navy with a significant degree of flexibility to determine optimum suitability for each such transfer and to ensure the transferred vessel's satisfactory use and maintainability. This is standard practice, and it is the procedure the Navy strongly prefers.

In a departure from normal practice, Section 1014 of the committee bill forces the Secretary of the Navy to strike the U.S.S. IOWA from the Naval Vessel Register and transfer it to the Port of Stockton. In effect, Section 1014 strips all control from the Navy with regard to this process and forces the Secretary to accept the Port of Stockton's donation application in lieu of any other application that might be submitted by any other locality.

I support any effort to provide a suitable home to decommissioned naval vessels, but I cannot support this circumvention of laws that were designed to ensure the quality and integrity of this process. Section 1014 ignores the proper level of deference we should accord the Secretary of the Navy on these matters, and I disagree with this Section strongly for this reason.

SUSAN A. DAVIS.

DISSENTING VIEWS OF CYNTHIA MCKINNEY

War

I dissent from war and from preparations for war. I stand with Jeannette Rankin, a former Member of this body in saying that I cannot vote for war.

"When will we ever learn?" When I was young, that refrain echoed through a popular song of the time. If this defense authorization bill is any evidence, the answer at best would have to be: "Not yet."

The Administration exploiting for the full propaganda value its own tragic failure of intelligence on 9/11, promptly adopted a National Security Strategy justifying to itself (though not convincingly to the rest of the nation and world) the pre-emptive use of force and other measures undermining the framework of Constitutional protections fought for by previous generations. Then without completing its stated mission of bringing al-Qaeda to justice for the crimes it has accused them of, it launched an illegal and pre-emptive war against Iraq, based on cooked intelligence. The plan followed a prescription originally drafted by Richard Perle ("A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm") to advance Israeli foreign policy, which was rejected at the time by the Netanyahu administration (according to James Bramford's A Pretext to War).

Now the British press has published the minutes of a meeting between Prime Minister Blair and British intelligence discussing the Bush administration's intention to cook intelligence for the purpose of justifying its war against and occupation of Iraq.

Meanwhile any steps toward meaningful security for our nation are stymied by a Congress and administration which seem intent on ignoring the looming and grave consequences of peak oil and global warming.

The Bush administration's NSS fails to provide the basis for true and meaningful security.

Security does not grow from the barrel of a gun. Nor can it be fostered in a culture of fear. It is not fostered by a neo-colonial occupation of people who live around the resources we might want to consume.

True security starts with food security. It begins with energy security. It grows from self-sufficiency, personal and global responsibility. True security respects both personal and national sovereignty. It flourishes in the context of cooperative relationships with the nations of the global community, and a just relationship with the people whose labor produces the wealth which our nation has enjoyed.

But most of the basis for a meaningful and affordable national security strategy is being sacrificed by a Bush Administration budget that rips to shreds the social safety net, exacerbates strati-

fication and division among the American people, and is based on a war machine paid for with historic budget deficits, a growing national debt, and all-time high trade deficits. The President has rewarded the wealthy of America to the detriment of our most vulnerable populations.

While this $441.6 billion bill may have enjoyed broad support in Committee, the policy it implements faces eroding support among the citizens of this nation and of the world. Current news reports find that 61% of survey respondents in this country disapprove of Bush's approach to the war on Iraq and that only 26% are confident that Bush policies in Iraq will succeed; whatever success is supposed to look like.

The President's decision to go to war and his policy of occupation of Iraq are wrong. Threats and intimidation of other countries in the Middle East are not the way to find peace and will only result in more war. The United States must pursue a policy of peace and respect for human rights. The budget and this authorization bill should reflect that priority, but sadly it does not.

The Pentagon has been wracked with accusations of mismanagement. Still reeling from its admission of the loss of $2.3 trillion, it continues its abysmal management practices. Sadly, Pentagon leadership refuse to provide information for proper Congressional oversight of their spending practices.

For example, I offered an amendment, which lost on a 26–31 largely Party line vote that would have merely required the inclusion in an existing annual report a list of the vendors and contract awards associated with the $20 billion DoD program to upgrade the financial accounting computer systems which serve Defense Department operations. For years, as the DoD Inspector General and the GAO have documented trillions of dollars in unsupported transactions, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) Tina W. Jonas (and her predecessors) have told us that they are "working to make the Department computers talk to one another". But this issue has persisted. It was in the FY–99 audit that the IG found that $2.1 trillion of transactions were "not fully documented". Now we are on the verge of authorizing the FY–06 budget, we still don't have auditable books at DoD and there exists scant information on which we as Members of Congress might use to exercise our oversight responsibilities.

The Committee rejected an amendment I offered to address the rash of "recruitment improprieties" as the Army euphemistically calls the coercive and fraudulent tactics employed by recruiters in their efforts to meet their quotas. Recruiters have resorted to hosting banquets for students in my District, and taking over entire classes that would be better devoted to the core curriculum of our public school system. Recent media reports have shown video of recruiters coaching a recruiting prospect on how to forge a diploma and how to cheat a urine test to conceal recent marijuana use. Other reports have suggested that recruiters have concealed disqualifying conditions including asthma and mental illness. And my office gets calls about the activities authorized by the Leave No Child Un-Recruited provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Recruiting is down. The New York Times reports that recruiters feel pressure from their chain of command to "bend" the rules in

order to meet their quotas. The Recruiting Command has announced a new fifteen month enlistment in an effort to fill the ranks. Of course the fine print will commit an enlistee to eight years plus however long may be necessary to comply with the backdoor draft already at work in the form of stop-loss orders.

The American Friends Service Committee tells us that over 400 recruiters have been relieved of recruiting duty for misconduct in the past ten years. In just the Army and the Navy, over 1,290 were admonished, short of re-assignment. This week, Major General Rochelle's Recruiting Command holds its Stand Down training for every Army recruiter. His public affairs people keep referring to the "bad apples" in their mix. Yet the numbers suggest something far more systemic is at play.

Some fear that our recent debate related to the role of women in combat is merely a prelude to reinstituting conscription. No one believes that a draft will be politically feasible if women face the draft and potential combat assignments. For the most part, I can support my colleagues' statements on the role of women in the military. But I would go further and ask: why are we so concerned about keeping our daughters from harm's way, but not our sons as well? Why do we pursue foreign policies that result in soldiers heading one way while body bags come back the other?

In addition, the world was shocked with the Pentagon's treatment of detainees at its detention centers, including Abu Ghraib. That the leadership of the Pentagon and this country have knowingly engaged in torture and the facilitation of torture ultimately becomes a question of the respect that this Administration has for international law. Its behavior in Iraq, in some cases, has clearly been outside the bounds of law.

Our nation has squandered its position of moral authority in the global community. My office received a postcard from a constituent, with a photo of Specialist Charles Graner, Private Lyndie England—both giving a thumbs up, as they stand smiling before a pyramid of naked Iraqi prisoners stacked on top of one another. The caption reads: "Remember Abu Ghraib? How the Arab world views US. Courtesy George W. Bush".

I recognize the hard work of my colleagues and of the Committee staff and their sincere efforts to oversee the Pentagon in order to provide for the common defense. And in fact, there are some provisions of this mark-up which I can support. I wish we had had the commitment to those who serve in uniform to extend the SGLI Death Benefit past the terms of the Supplemental to include it in the National Defense Authorization Act for FY–06, though.

Even so, I was unable to support our Committee's report back to the Floor of the House, for many of the reasons listed above, and expect to oppose this bill on the Floor as well.

The words of my dissent to the FY–1999 Defense Authorization (my first year on this Committee) still ring true today and require very little change in the post 9/11 environment. Back then, I wrote:

> The committee's recommendations still reflect a Cold War era mentality by finding ways to finance a too-large military force structure; an overly aggressive, and in many cases misguided, weapons modernization program; an overly programmed requirements to maintain short-term

readiness, rather than planning successfully to pay for our involvement in peacekeeping and humanitarian ventures.

In the early days of World War II, bi-partisan concerns for the threat that war profiteers posed to the national security gave rise to passage of the Truman Commission which was empowered to return excess profits to the public coffers. Our nation would be well served to use such a system again.

But it will take more than the careful oversight of the authorized programs let as no-bid contracts to DynCorp, Halliburton and the Carlyle Group to seriously address the bloat in spending at the Pentagon. We must commit ourselves to the active pursuit of transformation by retiring existing systems and halting investments in new Cold War weapons systems that still seem to dominate Defense spending.

This would include the Missile Defense Agency. Current plans for research and development of new space technologies are leading the world into a new costly and dangerous arms race. U.S. leadership in developing anti-satellite weapons, the nuclear rocket, new generations of war fighting satellites, military space plane, and other systems are creating pressure on the rest of the world to follow along. This will inevitably lead to a destabilizing arms race that in the end will make life on Earth more unstable for everyone involved. The U.S. refusal to seriously discuss the Prevention of an arms space in outer space (PAROS) at the U.N. is blocking the development of new international treaties that would protect space from the bad seed of war.

While I am grateful that this mark has zero'd out the High Altitude Airship program (about which my office has documents suggesting gross mismanagement), the MDA still is budgeted for nearly $3.5 billion for the Groundbased Midcourse Defense program. Our Committee failed to adopt an amendment to require an independent testing of this technology prior to deployment. The last three launch tests were complete failures.

Although the Navy recommended retiring one of its twelve aircraft carriers, the Committee reversed them and has instructed that this unneeded carrier remain in service.

Saying we need a military is not the same as saying we need this military. The flag grade officers of the Center for Defense Information once estimated—perhaps a decade ago—that a military budget 3% of the then current budget would be sufficient to defend the territorial borders of the United States. Approving endlessly larger budgets is not the same as exercising Congressional or civilian control and oversight.

The reasons for my opposition to this bill are too numerous to list here in the short time allowed for the filing of this dissent. They would include cuts in environmental clean-up at the nuclear weapons complex, the unattended toxic dumps scattered on bases across the nation, the incineration of chemical warfare agents upwind of the communities I represent, a policy of militarization that seems to have displaced diplomacy in our dealings with the global community, the risks of nuclear Armageddon and on and on.

I want to end this statement, though with the words of a now repentant former Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara. He once acknowledged that had the United States been conquered in

its War against the people of Vietnam, instead of being merely defeated, that he and President Johnson would likely have been prosecuted as war criminals for the mass slaughter of civilians they unleashed. In this month's issue of Foreign Policy, Mr. McNamara wrote in an article entitled: "Apocalypse Soon":

> It is time-well past time, in my view-for the United States to cease its Cold War-style reliance on nuclear weapons as a foreign-policy tool. At the risk of appearing simplistic and provocative, I would characterize current U.S. nuclear weapons policy as immoral, illegal, militarily unnecessary, and dreadfully dangerous. The risk of an accidental or inadvertent nuclear launch is unacceptably high. Far from reducing these risks, the Bush administration has signaled that it is committed to keeping the U.S. nuclear arsenal as a mainstay of its military power-a commitment that is simultaneously eroding the international norms that have limited the spread of nuclear weapons and fissile materials for 50 years. Much of the current U.S. nuclear policy has been in place since before I was secretary of defense, and it has only grown more dangerous and diplomatically destructive in the intervening years.

It is time—well past time, in my view—for the United States to get serious about its efforts to reduce the threat that Weapons of Mass Destruction pose to global peace and security. But to do so, we must recognize where those weapons are and what dynamics create the instability which can turn the dooms-day clock back on toward its short countdown to nuclear conflageration. In spite of the high costs of doing so, we have yet to turn up any of the WMD's we were told were held in Iraq. Fissile materials are scattered across the former Soviet Union and the Nunn-Lugar program, if fully funded could go far to help us contain that threat. But the nuclear warheads on hair-trigger alert are overwhelmingly deployed by our nation. And it is our leadership that will be necessary to address the crisis of proliferation we face. It is up to us to lead the way to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

And until this Congress and our nation has demonstrated that we are ready to exhibit that sort of leadership for global peace, I will continue to vote against the so-called National Defense Authorization Act and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

CYNTHIA MCKINNEY.

○